

DRAFT

Notes for the Monday 4/27/98 13:00-16:30 Central Valley Fish Facility Coordinators Team Meeting at DWR-ESO in Sacramento.

In attendance: Alan Baracco DFG-IFD, Ron Brockman USBR, Randy Brown DWR-ESO, Jim Bybee NMFS, Jim McKeivitt USFWS; Serge Berk, Jim Buell, Marianne Hallet NRCS, Charlie Liston USBR-Denver, Dan Odenweller DFG-IFD, Ron Ott CALFED, Kevan Urquhart DFG-Bay/Delta

Last Meetings Action Items: There was no response to Berk and Buell's attempts to contact John Kane NHI, and Rod Fujita EDF. McKeivitt wasn't able to get a hold of Elise Holland of the Bay Institute. Odenweller said she expressed interest in participating in informal conversations with him, but needed a formal invitation. Brown will re-invite her formally.

Discussion Items:

Fiscal control by the IEP FF Coordinators or its technical team - The same concern was raised at previous formation meetings in 1997. The group consensus was the intent is to have both levels of the FF group make recommendations for priorities, and comment on conflicts that may arise, as well as be a clearing house for technical review at the lower technical team level (the latter is still formally un-named, initially proposed as the FF Coordination and Review Team)

Staff assignments for the 'Coordination and Review Team' - this was discussed, many members preferred only one voting member from each agency, but USBR still wanted more than one representative to attend from their agency. >>>>Though no one set a specific deadline, it was clear that the agencies/stakeholders will need to define/finalize their representatives to the technical team no later than by the next IEP FF Coordinators meeting, and should forward their nominations to Odenweller ASAP, since he has to set up a meeting of the technical group prior to the next FF Coordinators meeting.<<<<

New Action Items:

Mission Statement - Baracco presented a draft mission statement and there was some discussion. Emphasis of comments and consensus of the group was to keep the mission Central Valley focused. Brockman will review and revise the mission statement one last time for Baracco to distribute. (was distributed 4/28/98 via e-mail)

E-mail Reflector & Home Page - Brown will have his staff create an e-mail reflector for this group, and will look into having an Internet Home Page for the group set up on the IEP web site where we can post white papers and meeting minutes.

Try to Obtain USACOE Participation - Both this group and the IEP in general have had trouble engaging the US Army Corps in various working groups. The consensus of the group was that

we really need their participation here. Bybee said he would contact the USACOE and try at least to get someone to participate on the FF Coordinators level, if not also on the technical team level, which he felt was less likely.

Assignments for the 'technical review team' - though this team hasn't developed its mission statement or finalized its membership, Odenweller will be the DFG voting representative and the interim chairperson. He will set up a meeting in late May or early June for the team to address two issues: 1) the review and critique of the existing USBR Tracy Fish Facility Improvement Program (TFFIP) which has a variety of studies under way and proposed for the next few years; 2) review and critique last years IEP Concept Proposals produced by DFG-Bay/Delta's Fish Facility Program, and any further Summary Quality Assurance Program Plans (Summary QAPPs) developed for the 1999 IEP Planning Cycle which begins in June 1998. The objective will be to review and critique both programs or sets of ideas on their own merit, to suggest changes and additions, as well as to see how they could be combined or refined to better mesh with or balance each other, with the intent of developing cooperative studies as was done years ago by interagency groups evaluating options for new facilities. Brockman and Liston emphasized that their program is already underway but they would be open to suggestions and interagency participation in other new/additional studies to be conducted at the Tracy Fish Collection Facility (TFCF). So far the following persons have committed to be their agencies representatives on the 'technical review team': Marianne Hallet NRCS, Charlie Liston USBR-Denver, Dan Odenweller DFG-IFD. Stakeholder representatives will include: Serge Berk and Jim Buell.

Darryl Hayes' Periodic Informal FF Updates - Brown recollected how much he appreciated these periodic ad-hoc summaries that Hayes used to produce. Most familiar with them agreed they were useful. Odenweller reminded everyone that it was a time consuming effort to go solicit input and content for this, as project leaders/authors didn't automatically or regularly submit content to Hayes, rather he had to aggressively solicit it. Due to workloads, no other agency volunteered to take on this task. Brown committed an as yet un-named member of his staff to produce this on a quarterly or semi-annual basis, deadlines and periodicity to be finalized later and set by the need or demand for the Update. The FF Update would include status of completed or ongoing projects, and the availability of data or reports. Brown also wanted to see a complete database of all FF projects/research programs made available. Odenweller and Bybee reminded everyone that the NMFS already had such a database under development, as did the USFWS/USBR Anadromous Fish Screening Program (AFSP) for its own projects only. This NMFS database was the basis for much of the 'FF Grapes' document handed out previously. The NMFS database includes basically: who is the leadperson/agency, what is the project/program, where, agencies funding it, project cost, cfs screened, & status to date. McKevitt noted that the USFWS was contracting with NMFS in Santa Rosa for FF engineering support staff for the AFSP who could also help work on this FF database project if it was deemed a high enough priority.

Information Items:

Cal-Fed CMARP Process - Brown wants a summary of FF monitoring and research needs to be

included in the planning documents being produced by IEP & CALFED staff for the Comprehensive Monitoring & Restoration Plan (CMARP). For example, Steve Thomas is designing a monitoring protocol to evaluate AFSP screening projects for post-project compliance criteria, and Brown wonders if this effort cannot be revised for CALFED Category 3 purposes under CMARP.

CALFED EIR/EIS Information Needs on FF Project Staging - Ott wanted to know if the 'IEP FF technical review team' and the temporarily inactive CALFED FF technical Review Team (previously lead by Hayes & Odenweller) could be reactivated and utilized to advise CALFED on staging of FF under its three proposed Alternatives. CALFED needs to know what projects/facilities should come first and at what size to be effective, if possible without precluding other options from being implemented. If the latter was often the case, then CALFED would need to know what stages were critical/irretrievable and committed one to certain courses of action or precluded others. CALFED wants to know what would be best to do in which sequence in order to avoid stranded costs for unused/underutilized/abandoned stages. Brown said the out-of-State technical experts were still under contract to DWR-ESO (specifically Ned Taft of Alden Research Labs & Ken Bates of Washington State), and could be available pending their own schedule conflicts. Brown & Odenweller agreed they could reconvene the group, but that it might take some lead time (e.g. 30 days+).