

CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM

Office Memorandum

Date: January 23, 1996
To: Sharon Gross
From: Michael Norris
Subject: Results of BDAC "List of Action Categories and Actions" survey that was sent out on 12-21-95

As per your instructions, I have completed transcribing the results of the survey of Action Categories and Actions that was sent to the Bay Delta Advisory Council (BDAC) on 12-21-95. BDAC was asked to rate 295 "action categories and actions" on a scale of 1 to 5 and to denote whether or not they should be "core actions". The results were pulled from the survey forms and put into an EXCEL spreadsheet. There were 20 respondents from the 31 BDAC members.

A blank answer or a written response in lieu of a number or a question mark or any mark other than a legible number was assigned a value of zero. This value did not affect the calculation of the average which was based on the number of legible number responses. Some respondents noted in the "comments" section that the lack of a score for an action did not necessarily mean that they did not support it but rather that more information was needed before a score could be arrived at. A "C" under the Core Action category was assigned a value of "yes". However, a blank in the Core Action category was assigned a value of "no". The survey form only requested a "C" under Core Actions and not a "no" response so the number of people who felt that an action category or action should not be a core action can only be inferred from the blanks. The following highlights of the survey are worth noting:

1. Some respondents suggested new actions such as:
 - a. "Project Reoperation" under Improvements of Flood Protection Levels and Seismic Stabilities action category. Another respondent also suggested this new action but felt it was more appropriate under Fish Harvest Management action category.
 - b. "Increased Research on Introduced Species Control" under Control of Introduced Species action category.
 - c. "Build New Screen to Prevent Fish Migration South of San Joaquin River Towards the Pumps" under Installation and Improvements of Fish Screens action category.
 - d. "Restoration of Bay-Delta System Low Salinity Habitat" under Action Categories to Restore Bay-Delta System Habitats.
 - e. "Use Economic Incentives to Control Drainage Production" under Management of Agricultural Drainage action category.

- f. "Encourage Investment in Remediation via Pollutant Tracing" under Management of Abandoned Mine Drainage action category.

These suggestions are noted here but the spreadsheet does not reflect these new additions nor are any hand written scores noted either although this information can be pulled from the individual survey forms.

2. One respondent questioned nearly every action category or action with a written response of some sort and hardly assigned any scores until later in the survey. However, this was an extreme of the 20 respondents. It was obvious that the respondent supported some of the actions by favorable written comments such as writing "yes" under the "Importance" level on some actions but every written comment in lieu of a score had to be given a value of zero.

3. The individual respondents tended to select too many core actions although collectively few were selected based on a majority. 274 of the 295 action categories/actions had at least one "yes" vote although most were not selected as core actions with at least 11 out of the 20 survey responses. No individual actions were scored in the majority although 13 action categories were selected as core actions as follows:

- a. Restoration of Bay-Delta System Shallow Water (Tidal) Habitat.
- b. Implementation of Integrated Habitat Management Programs.
- c. Control of Introduced Species.
- d. Restoration of Upstream Anadromous Fish Habitat.
- e. Delta Inflow/Outflow/Export Management.
- f. Installation and Improvement of Fish Screens.
- g. Improvements of Bay-Delta System Fish Migration.
- h. Water Conservation.
- I. Water Reclamation.
- j. Watershed Management.
- k. Groundwater Banking and Conjunctive Use.
- l. Long-Term Planning for Drought Contingencies.
- m. Levee Maintenance and Stabilization.

4. There are indications the respondents carefully read each action category/action. Low scores occurred within the Desalinization action category which could indicate only mediocre interest in this area whereas high scores and fewer zeros occurred in the Water Conservation and Water Reclamation action categories indicating a lot of interest there. In a number of instances, there were no scores of "1" or "2" assigned for actions within the Water Reclamation action category. The scoring within the Management of Agricultural Drainage category was consistent with mid-to-high 3's and 4's until the actions Export Agricultural Drainage to Other Watersheds and Dilute Pollutants in Delta Inflows from SJR Using Stored Water were read. Those selections were assigned much lower than average scores within the category. Another good example was the action Modify Weather to Increase Precipitation which was assigned a very low score including a record 13 scores of "1" within the Watershed Management action category. One respondent crossed the action out and a second followed the score of "1" with two

exclamation points as if to suggest the action was absurd.

5. There probably should have been more emphasis placed on the importance of selecting core actions given the 274 out of 295 action categories/actions that had at least one vote. You reported that there were no instructions included in the survey on attempting to restrict the number of core actions. Better scoring might have occurred if every respondent read the entire survey first and then scored it the second time around. However, it should be noted that it probably took a long time to complete the entire survey and it would be asking a lot to expect BDAC to read the survey twice.

sharon.sur