

Action Items and Decisions

1. Round table members should consult the Attorney General's office regarding any questions about potential conflict of interest.
2. Flow related restoration actions, particularly those involving water acquisition, will not be indicated as suitable for Category III funding.
3. Water supply, hatchery expansion, land retirement, and modification of SWP or CVP Delta facilities or operations are example actions that will not be considered suitable for Category III funding.
4. A feasibility analysis of reintroduction of anadromous fish above large reservoirs can be included as an example action in the RFP.
5. Funding for regulatory related actions will be considered on a cases by case basis.
6. Educational actions will be considered for funding.
7. Example restoration actions will be included as an informational item in the RFP mailing.
8. Changes in the text of the RFP will be made in response to Round table comments.
9. Ranking or prioritization of stressors or actions will not be included in the RFP. Priority setting will be left to the technical review panels.
10. Names of potential technical review panel members should be suggested to Kate Hansel as soon as possible.

Future meetings of Round table are as follows:

Friday, June 13, 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

Friday, July 11

Friday, August 8

Draft Meeting Notes

The meeting began at 9:50 a.m. with introductions, a reminder to sign in for the meeting, and a show of appreciation for the work that Cindy Darling has done over this past eight months. This will be Cindy's last meeting before she goes on leave.

Cindy briefly reviewed the schedule and components of the RFP, including information package items and the proposal formats, to provide background for those individuals that may have not been at the last Round table meeting. Answers to questions about the RFP process raised during the April 30 meeting were provided in a two-page response document that was distributed during the meeting. Cindy briefly reviewed each of the answers to questions. Question #4 regarding beginning work prior to the executed contract requires some additional follow-up to answer questions related to items that may be in process prior to funding (i.e., land acquisition projects). Regarding Question #5, all proposals become public at the conclusion of the review process. It was suggested that this list of answers to questions be appended as needed and used for the

upcoming public meeting and other forums in order to consistently and clearly answer many common questions that are liable to arise during the RFP process.

Cindy reviewed Attachment 3 to the meeting packet information regarding Instructions for Filing Category III applications. The RFP will likely will be separated into 3 different types of requests: Public Works Contracts, Real Estate Transactions, and Other Proposals. Other comments and discussion regarding the Instructions for Filing Applications included the following.

- Regarding the list of restoration actions--the text should note that the actions are intended to provide information and examples. They are not an all-inclusive list.
- Available funding sources for RFP. It was noted that there will be different requirements for different funding sources. CALFED staff will decide on the appropriate funding source to be used for any proposal. It is not the responsibility of the applicant to do that.
- Review and Selection Process. Quick Look proposals are expected to be funded in January, after a full proposal is received in the fall. This process is separated in time from the initial formal proposals.
- It should be noted in the RFP that proposals of all sizes are encouraged.
- There should be a page limit on the length of the proposals.
- A one page summary should be included for each proposal. The RFP should include a sample format for the summaries.
- Conflict of Interest. There was extensive discussion and additional questions of the conflict of the interest provisions in the RFP. Round table members were encouraged to discuss specific conflict of interest concerns with the Attorney General's office by contacting Ken Williams at 327-7859. There was general agreement by the Round table members that member organizations not apply for Category III funds in part due to the perceived conflict of interest. A clarification was requested regarding the difference between government and other organizations with regard to conflict of interest in responding to the RFP.

EXAMPLE RESTORATION ACTIONS

Cindy reviewed Attachment 5 on example restoration actions. This list is a "virtual pool" that may be applicable to many different funding sources. A subset of this list will be used for this years' first round of Category III funding.

Some of the example actions developed by the technical teams raise policy issues associated with Category III funding or overall CALFED policy guidance. These issues, along with the recommended response agreed to by the Round table, are summarized below:

1. **Flow Related Actions.** Many of the actions identified to address the stressor of Hydrograph Alterations are flow related and so may not be appropriate for Category III funding.
Recommendation: Do not include examples such as water acquisition. Retain flexibility to take actions such as ones that could provide flow benefits as ancillary benefits of the project (e.g., land acquisition for habitat that also comes with some water rights, Battle