

# Meeting Summary (8/14)

**CALFED Policy Group**  
**Thursday, August 14, 1997**  
**Meeting Summary**

**A. CALFED Bay-Delta Program Issues**

**1. Alternative Evaluation Process**

**A. Step 1, Narrowing**

Steve Yaeger reviewed the evaluation process that will be used to select the draft preferred alternative. The narrowing process entails a coarse evaluation of alternatives based on implementability. Program staff reviewed all 17 variations, modified some to remove technical problems, then compared variations for functional equivalents. When equivalents were identified, one variation was recommended to be eliminated due to higher cost and/or greater adverse effects. The following variations of Alternatives were recommended for elimination from further consideration in the evaluation process:

- **Alternative 3F (Chain of Lakes)**
- **Alternative 2C (Multi-Intake Conveyance)**
- **Alternative 3G (Ship Channel)**

The following alternatives were recommended by both BDAC and PCT to be retained for evaluation:

- **Alternative 3C (Pipeline) and Alternative 3A (Canal).** Originally, Program staff had recommended Alternative 3C to be eliminated, primarily due to cost. However, both PCT and BDAC wish to retain this pipeline option until further detail is available.
- **Alternative 3D (Pipeline) and Alternative 3B (Canal).** Originally, Program staff had recommended Alternative 3D be eliminated, primarily due to cost. However, both PCT and BDAC wish to retain this pipeline option until further detail is available.

It was suggested by the Policy Group that the pipeline configuration be analyzed as part of Alternatives 3A and 3B thereby eliminating Alt. 3C and 3D as stand alone alternatives. Lester Snow assured the Policy Group this would not require substantial additional Program time.

**Action:** Policy Group decided to drop Alternatives 3F, 2C, 3G, 3C and 3D, and perform a sidebar analysis of the pipeline configuration as part of Alternatives 3A and 3B.

**B. Step 2, Detailed Evaluation**

Detailed evaluation is necessary for more specific review of the alternatives using the Program objectives, solution principles, and other concurrent processes (prefeasibility, impact analysis, etc.). Distinguishing characteristics are being identified which are critical in comparing alternatives and in selection of a preferred alternative. It is important to develop an adequate list of distinguishing characteristics at this time to ensure that all critical areas are examined during the detailed evaluation.

Loren Bottorff, Program consultant, gave an overview of the original list of 16 distinguishing characteristics, then reviewed amendments and 2 additions that were made as a result of PCT and BDAC input bringing the list to 18. Each of the 18 distinguishing characteristics contains supporting categories of finer detail and will be arrayed in a matrix. The 12 remaining variations will move forward to this detailed evaluation.

The Program is requesting the Policy Group give general approval that the 18 distinguishing characteristics are an adequate set, although it will probably need refinement as we progress.

There was a concern about whether to include water use efficiency as a distinguishing characteristic. Some Policy Group members felt that they needed a presentation in the future and more information before they would be comfortable excluding it from the distinguishing characteristics list. There was also a concern that the water user community would be opposed to having X2 as a distinguishing characteristic. The Program should broaden this characteristic, but not eliminate it.

There was a general consensus among the Policy Group that these characteristics are a good starting point. However, members wanted to clearly state their position that the characteristics are not decision criteria; they will help Policy Group compare alternatives, but other issues will contribute to the selection criteria.

**2. Program Schedule Issues**

Lester Snow requested that the Policy Group approve an extension of release of the draft EIR/S from November 1997 to January 1998 because of the increase in the level of detail over a classic programmatic level. Doug Wheeler voiced strong concern about extending the draft EIR/S deadline. Lester indicated that the primary factor for the delay in releasing the draft is to provide for an increased level of detail. Many of the stakeholders also believe that January is still not enough time.

### 3. CALFED Policy Group Decision Process

Lester also noted that the following three actions are also needed from the Policy Group:

1. An interagency legal team to begin drafting documents to prepare for the release of the draft EIR/S;
2. Identification of key agency "go to" people to assist with revising the draft and developing the preferred alternative; and
3. A Management Team or subset to start working on the basic structure of the draft and a release strategy.

Mike Spear also added that the HCP may prove a factor in the delay in that we can't develop assurances without details. The stakeholder community wants more than programmatic assurances and won't commit money without those assurances.

Policy Group asked several questions about the HCP, and how it affects the Program schedule. Some of the items discussed include:

- The ERPP provides a baseline for the HCP. The HCP won't have to handle integrated recovery, because that's already contained in the ERPP.
- There are 60 possible storage sites. This must be brought down to 6-8 sites to make the HCP process manageable if it is to give any assurances relative to storage.
- The HCP needs to be considered in the Category III evaluation process. We need to use the \$60 million to address issues affecting endangered species and their habitats.
- Currently, the 404 process and HCP are running parallel courses. At this time, neither one is holding up the other, but they may have the potential to do that later this year.

**Action:** By September: (1) Agencies be prepared to provide the Program with names of "go to" people to work on developing the preferred alternative; (2) the Program should provide to Policy Group, Management Team and PCT, a flowchart of activities and a calendar of events/meetings through January.

Regarding Program resource needs, Ryan Broddrick requested direct and clear communication from Lester on a level of commitment of resources, including integration panel, etc. Currently requests are not well coordinated and have not resulted in a clear allocation of resources. Doug Wheeler agreed that different levels of staff handling requests independently makes it difficult for agencies to allocate resources.

The Group discussed the possible structure of the preferred alternative. Some members favored a hybrid of two variations, so long as it isn't overly broad and doesn't imply a reluctance to make the hard decisions. Work needs to begin soon to develop strategies and incorporate with the development of the preferred alternative.

#### **4. Other Issues - Restoration Coordination**

Kate Hansel will be drafting a memorandum to Policy Group summarizing outcomes of the RFP. They are currently working to create an integration panel with 19 members, balanced between agency and non-agency representatives. By the October meeting, we'll have a report detailing species, findings etc.

#### **B. Accord Extension**

Tom Hagler described the CALFED agency team headed by Patrick Wright. The team has held several conference calls and one meeting. The team recognizes the disagreement among stakeholders group, as well as agencies, regarding the Accord. They're drafting language to extend the current Accord, recognizing the continued need to work out issues, e.g., ESA, no net loss, State/Federal standards, and commitments, such as biological opinions, the 1995 Water Quality Control Act, and voluntary commitments.

The Accord Extension team is recommending a two-part document outlining the extension. The first part is a short, formal legal statement of the extension. The second part is a longer memorandum (in the form of a press release) including additional details regarding the important issues and what the extension means. These documents are expected to be available for the September Policy Group meeting. They will be included as part of the September meeting packet.

#### **D. Cost Share Agreement**

Tom Hagler briefed the Policy Group on the status of the Cost-Share Agreement document. The October 1 deadline for completion is about six weeks away. Agencies should come to the cost share group regarding their expenditures for additional credit for expenditures above the baseline amounts. Tom conveyed a message from David Cottingham, that CALFED needs to make the Cost-Share, Direct Program Approach and the RFP process mesh better or potentially lose support for federal funding.

The Policy Group was requested to generally concur with the concept of the Cost Share document.

The Policy Group also agreed to assign a team to work on Direct Program Approach. Lester responded that the Program already has a team working on this through the BDAC Ecosystem Roundtable. Tom's team should work with Kate Hansel, then run the approach through the Roundtable.

Policy Group discussed how Direct Approach and agency proposals in the RFP process will affect each other. Ryan Broddrick indicated that DFG was modest, cutting their proposals from 50 to 10. He also urged Policy Group to come to an agreement on the baseline. Tom Hagler explained that they haven't had each agency come up with base, just The Resources Agency and the Department of the Interior. The first agency out of the shoot will have the burden of identifying the base. An agency could add more of their own money to any RFP grant they may receive.

State agencies brought up the difficulty of getting RFP and Direct Approach coordinated with the state budget cycle.

**E. NMFS Steelhead Listing Update**

Jim Lecky updated Policy Group on the National Marine Fisheries Service's status review of evolutionary significant units (ESUs). ESUs are groupings of genetically similar species. NMFS performs a risk analysis, including population size, habitat, integrity of stocks, etc.

NMFS recently completed an analysis on steelhead, in six separate regions. Following is a list of these regions and the actions taken:

- Klamath Mountain Province (includes part of Oregon): deferred listing
- North California - deferred six months
- Central California coast - threatened species
- South Central Coast - threatened species
- Southern California - endangered species
- Central Valley - deferred six months

The next species for review is Chinook salmon, which will be done in late December or January.

**F. Ops Group Update**

Bob Potter gave a status report on the CALFED Ops Group. Additional water was lost in June, and last Friday's aqueduct collapse also interrupted exports. There's still a possibility of makeup in November and December, however, Bob is still concerned that makeups will affect the spring run salmon.

The Ops Group is still having considerable discussions with the stakeholders in that there is ongoing concern about giving up more water and the No Net Loss provision. Ops Group isn't optimistic about making up the water, but they're still trying.

The stakeholders are trying to figure out how to make the B(2) process work. Policy Group was concerned about heavy criticism that this will not get resolved before the spring. The Management Team will provide some oversight with this issue when it next meets in September.

**F. (B)2 Discussions**

Patrick Wright updated the Policy Group on B2 activities. There is a policy team as well as three committees (Fish, Modeling and Toolbox). The three committees meet once or twice per week, and the Policy team meets monthly.

Lester pointed out that the intense effort to discuss these issues helps CALFED in the long run, however, B(2) is a resource focus for agencies and stakeholders at the present time. B(2) activities is getting priority over model runs of the Delta. Mike Spear agreed that B(2) efforts are a major resource constraint to putting more staff on the Delta.

Bob Potter stated that DWR believes the B(2) water has already been spent. Lester stated that he believed that for the stakeholders, the key issue is money. Agricultural stakeholders aren't necessarily opposed to providing the B(2) water; they just want the restoration fund to pay for it. The environmental stakeholders do not agree with that contention.

**Meeting with Stakeholder Representatives on B(2)**

Doug Wheeler made welcoming remarks to stakeholder representatives Dan Nelson, Barry Nelson, Gary Bobker, Tom Clarke, Randy Kanouse and Tim Quinn who joined the Policy Group for a short session to discuss B(2) issues.

The following summarized key issues and points raised by these representatives of the environmental, agricultural and urban water communities:

- Agricultural representatives were concerned and represented the Department of Interior's manner of implementing CVPIA and B2 as being close to breaching the Accord. The Accord was to provide regulatory certainty, integration of statutes, and transfer of authority over California resources from the federal government to the state.
- All stakeholders expressed concern that the level of effort needed for participation in the B(2) process is distracting efforts from the CALFED process.
- The environmental community felt that what was accomplished with the Accord has been lost and that we are right back to where we were in 1994.
- The urban community feels that CVPIA issues must be resolved quickly.

- In participating in the toolbox group it is becoming obvious that there is insufficient data to provide certainty. Each of the tools will cost money and we are trying to identify pots of money to implement the Program, to ensure forward movement.
- CVPIA and CALFED integration needs to occur. We must integrate the CVPIA Restoration Roundtable and other institutional items.
- There is a fundamental inequity that must be addressed. A federal law in 1992 provided a standard for CVP users and these standards are used to double the fish population. However, only one set of water users is being asked to double the fish population. This is the responsibility of other parties besides the CVP south of Delta water users.
- 1997 Ops Group gave up project water and now there are impediments to making up the water. There's supposed to be "no net loss" and CALFED could lose consensus.
- Toolbox can be link between CVPIA and CALFED. There is a potential for environmental assurances -- challenges -- package to assure we move forward together.

Doug Wheeler agreed that it's important to maintain consensus, and recognized the large demand of B2 on resources. We're seeing the result in slippage in CALFED deadlines. The question is how to integrate CVPIA, CALFED and the toolbox committee to avoid duplication of effort.

Bob Perciaseppe reiterated consensus commitment. He mentioned stakeholder and BDAC input on narrowing, which was discussed earlier in the day. CALFED is starting to see patterns in stakeholder comments.

Patrick Wright asked the representatives to express to their constituents that this can work. The CALFED agencies are committed to it.

### **Next Policy Group meeting**

The Group agreed that the next Policy Group meeting would be held on September 23.