

**CALFED Policy Group**  
**Summary of Key Discussion and Action Items**  
**January 26 and 27, 1998**

**Options for Release of Phase II Document and EIR/EIS**

- *The Policy Group agreed that the draft Phase II report will be released at the same time as the Draft EIS/EIR.*
- *The CALFED Program will provide agencies with copies of the draft Phase II Report and the new technical appendices by the beginning of February. CALFED agencies should call to request any existing documents they have not yet had the opportunity to review.*

**Rollout Strategy - General Outreach and Legislative Outreach**

- *CALFED Program staff will provide an updated rollout strategy identifying potential meeting dates as soon as possible.*

**Recommendations for Process for Release of EIR/EIS**

- *The Policy Group approved a 75-day comment period for the Draft EIS/EIR and would allow for a 15-day extension, if necessary. The cover letter will be signed by Lester, Bob Perciasepe (EPA), and Doug Wheeler (Resources Agency). The administrative signing notices will be signed by Roger Patterson for the Federal agencies and Doug Wheeler for the State agencies.*

**Restoration Coordination Program -- 1998 Proposals and 1998 Designated Actions**

- *Policy Group directed that the Restoration Coordinator develop criteria to indicate when contract amendments will come back to the Policy Group for approval/denial. These criteria should be at a significantly high level and not include minor changes to the contracts.*
- *Policy Group agreed to fund \$2.6 million in North Bay projects in the 1998 cycle, with the Overriding Principles amended (changes underlined) as follows per the Policy Group's recommendation:*
  - *The importance of additional restoration data obtained from a proposal that will help implement the ERPP;*
  - *The importance of a demonstration dredge reuse project to provide data for future wetlands restoration as part of the ERPP;*
  - *The importance of maintaining funding for all major geographic areas in the eligibility areas to reflect the broad ecosystem approach of CALFED, plus the importance of North Bay projects to further CALFED's Ecosystem Restoration goals; and*
  - *The importance of further demonstration of watershed management projects. (This watershed stewardship is not limited to North Bay.)*

- *The Policy Group approved the 1998 funding package recommended by the Ecosystem Roundtable.*

### **Discussion of Phase II Report Contents**

Comments from Policy Group members on what should be discussed in the Phase II report included the following:

- In the Program Overview we need to review the history of the problem, i.e., what's wrong with the Delta and what will happen if we don't fix it.
- Section 6 must adequately describe the other distinguishing characteristics in addition to export water quality and reduced diversion effects on fisheries.
- The report should reflect the overlapping benefits of the common programs.
- Must include straightforward talk regarding public concerns about Alternative 3 **being** another attempt at a Peripheral Canal. We have to express that we understand the concerns and how we plan to deal with them.
- The Policy Group wants to make sure this document is set up to frame conversation, get people talking about the Program and get the public input we need.
- Documents needs to explain that we're striving for a *balance* and to accomplish that balance, we have to do certain things.

### **Issues of Importance - Water Quality - Bromide**

- *In refining this issue between the draft and final EIS/EIR, CALFED staff have recommended convening a Scientific Review Panel to help address the issues.*
- *The Policy Group recommended that some evaluation of costs be done.*

### **Primary Issues of Concern to be Addressed Between Draft and Final**

The following is a generalized list of primary issues of concern identified to be addressed between the draft and final EIS/EIR.

1. Fish Diversion Effects: entrainment effects, screening feasibility, flow effects
2. Drinking Water Quality (bromides)
3. Water Use Efficiency Strategy
4. Transfer Policy/Program
5. Watershed Management Program
6. Water Quality Program
7. Implementation Plans
8. Operating Criteria: interim, long-term
9. Assurances
10. 404 Process
11. Flood Management
12. Agricultural Land Impacts
13. Seismic Vulnerability

## **Stakeholder Assessment Relative to the Phase II Document**

The Policy Group discussed primary stakeholder concerns that must be considered/addressed during the development of the final EIS/EIR. Following is a summary of these issues categorized by stakeholder group and region.

### **Sacramento Valley**

- Area of origin
- Surface storage in order to implement conjunctive management
- Groundwater basins
- Water quality
- Common pool
- Land conversion
- Land retirement for demand management
- Drainage, seepage - from over irrigation
- Assurances

### **Delta**

- Levees
- Land conversion
- No new channel!
- Common Pool - 100%
- Water quality

### **San Joaquin**

- Pro-transfer
- No land conversion for Demand Management
- Drainage

### **Agriculture**

- Assurances (especially ESA, etc.)
- Want additional storage
- Affordability
- Transfers, reallocation of water
- New water
  - CVP -> Replace lost Yield
- Land conversion issues
- Equitability
- Water Quality

### **Fisheries**

- Entrainment
- Implementation of CVPIA
- Commercial fishermen
  - ESA (regulatory concerns)

- ▶ Sustain harvestable surplus of all recreational and commercial species (role of hatcheries)
- Undesirable species (white bass, etc.)
- Assurances - restoration of fisheries to get relief from ESA regulation - (recreation/commercial)
- Restore more natural Delta circulation
- Toxics
- Public access (fishing from shore vs. restoration of shallow water habitats)
- Shorter seasons, quotas
- Reintroduce anadromous fish above dams (RCRC proposes laddering Shasta, Oroville)

### Environmental

- Need more “soft path” solutions
  - ▶ Improved WUE
  - ▶ Emphasis on common programs
- Demonstrate why more water is needed
- Concern about increased export to detriment of environment (outflow)
- Beneficiaries pay
  - ▶ Full Cost
  - ▶ Don’t allocate cost to environment (public)
- Assurances
  - ▶ Especially facility operation
  - ▶ Balanced assurances, i.e., HCP gives too much
  - ▶ Assurances at odds with Adaptive Management
  - ▶ ERPP must be big enough to offset above issues
  - ▶ Adverse reaction to new facilities
  - ▶ Much broader ecosystem concerns (than fisheries)
  - ▶ Baseline - environmentalists believe they’re starting with a deficit
  - ▶ Rules won’t be changed
  - ▶ Can’t assure environmental outcome: what if target species don’t benefit/what if exotic species do?
- Adaptive Management seen as “shell game.” Need new institution with broad cross section to oversee
- Science Review needed
- Nontraditional Groups Issues
  - ▶ toxics
  - ▶ grassroots issues
  - ▶ watershed groups
- Artificially priced water
- Near shore habitat - waterfowl v. fishery interest
- ERPP - not enough focus on flows
- Water quality

### Urban

- New institution needed
- Access to transfers (drought management)
- ESA assurances
- Cost: don't want to pay for everything!
- Must get better together - linkage to ensure equality
- Right amount of storage
- Just fix it!
- Public Health: drinking water quality

### Rural

- Flood control/Local flooding
- Economic impact of transfer and other
- Safe harbor
- Land Conversion
- Area of Origin
- Loss of tax base
- Rural interest not involved (How to stay "up" on the issues)
- Land use impacts and incompatibility (adjacent properties)
- Local impacts - ESA
- Private property rights
- General lack of perceived benefits

### Business

- Transfers Market
- Fix it! (reliability)
- Cost: they're already paying for CVPIA, why should they pay more?

### Power Customers

- Restoration Fund - We already paid
- Market limit on ability to pay

### CALFED Administrative Issues

- *The Policy Group discussed the options for continuation of CALFED and referred it to the Management Team for further deliberation. Alf Brandt will provide a list of issues regarding the establishment of a Joint Powers Authority.*

### Status of SWRCB Bay-Delta Water Rights Hearing

- *Alf Brandt will contact Walt Pettit to get a better understanding of the state process and ensure that the federal agencies are in agreement. He will also work with Walt to develop a strategy to identify and address stakeholder concerns.*

### **Outside Attendance at Management Team and Policy Group Meetings**

- *The Policy Group agreed that U.C. Berkeley staff would not be allowed to attend Policy or Management Team meetings. Patrick Wright and Mary Scoonover will work on a letter of response.*

### **Water Use Efficiency Conservation Criteria**

- *During a discussion of the current language regarding conservation criteria, the Policy Group determined that the Bureau of Reclamation-type measurement and pricing criteria for buyers only would be portrayed as under consideration by the CALFED agencies.*

### **Corps of Engineers**

- *An update on the status of the Corps' Comprehensive Review will be presented at each Policy Group meeting.*

### **CALFED Conservation Strategy (ESA Compliance)**

- *Program staff need to ensure that CALFED agencies have the opportunity to review the ESA compliance strategy component of the draft EIR/S.*