

**Management Team**  
**November 13, 1997**  
**Ongoing Common Program Issue Assessment**

<b>ERPP</b>	
<i>ISSUE RAISED</i>	<i>PROCESS TO RESOLVE ISSUE</i>
Question if benefits of increased spring and winter flow targets and increases in shallow water habitat are supported by data. May overlook other processes (e.g., transitional wetland foodweb). Results may be detrimental to marsh species.	ERPP under review. Have received comments of both Scientific Review Panel and many public comment letters. Work will continue on refinement, reflected in EIR/S.
Integration of Delta Native Fishes Recovery Plan and Anadromous Fish Restoration Program goals	
Need more specific implementation objectives	
Aquatic species goals should focus on reversing declines or low abundance levels rather than static levels based upon historic data - targets set as response is measured.	
Question information supporting the visions and actions for the Delta and Suisun Bay and Marsh: → productivity loss of nutrients to diversions → effect of flows upon production of algae and zooplankton in Suisun Bay and the western Delta. → higher spring and winter flows and increased shall water habitat will result in significant restoration of Delta smelt.	
Need explicit ERPP conceptual model.	
Significant agriculture impacts from actions in ERPP	Relooking at acre numbers and working to identify prime agricultural land impacts, but impacts of willing seller/buyer actions will occur. Believe actions proposed are in line with solution principles.

<b>Water Quality</b>	
<i>ISSUE RAISED</i>	<i>PROCESS TO RESOLVE ISSUE</i>
Need to extend action strategies into an implementation plan	Discussion continues on Water Quality in technical team meetings and CALFED staff/EPA meetings.
Need a range of SDWAA rule making outcomes from bromide	
Delete dilution actions	
<b>Water Use Efficiency</b>	
<i>ISSUE RAISED</i>	<i>PROCESS TO RESOLVE ISSUE</i>
Need significant progress on water transfer policy	Discussions ongoing in Agency and BDAC Transfers workgroups. Believe we can frame the issues adequately in draft EIR/S, but recognize we will need to resolve third party impacts and groundwater issues prior to Phase III.
Must recognize limits of AB 3616 MOU; regulatory or incentive practices; CALFED demonstrate benefits as incentives	
Need more aggressive water reclamation element	
<b>Water Pricing/Cost Allocation</b>	
<i>ISSUE RAISED</i>	<i>PROCESS TO RESOLVE ISSUE</i>
Need policy discussion re: water pricing and allocation of new facilities and other techniques <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes in Demand/Pricing Structures</li> <li>• Reclamation, Conservation, Pricing</li> </ul>	Need policy on water acquisitions for ERPP and who pays. Should be reflected in final Finance Plan.
Object to 1/3 allocation of new storage to public benefits	
	Discussion will continue on who pays, but concept of equitable allocation seems agreeable.

<b>Water Supply Reliability</b>	
<i>ISSUE RAISED</i>	<i>PROCESS TO RESOLVE ISSUE</i>
Must analyze alternative water supply reliability options in a comprehensive manner	In process of doing more detailed analysis on yield impacts of urban and ag conservation and reclamation measures.
Efficiency must be integrated into analysis of need for new storage/facilities	Should note that CALFED storage & conveyance and WUE less than 2020 dry year demand -- we are "balancing the Delta" and not meeting any set demand level.
<b>Other ...</b>	
<i>ISSUE RAISED</i>	<i>PROCESS TO RESOLVE ISSUE</i>
Question if non-regulatory approach has been agreed to as preferred approach; preferences should be based on assumption of what will work in each circumstance	Recognize issue - no implication that existing regulatory authorities will be diminished through CALFED solution implementation.
Alternatives do not include sufficient detail to adequately assess; alternative 1 not defined enough to be viable as compared to others	IDT discussions detailing the alternatives.
Need to better describe process of how analysis, judgment and public input will be used to measure performance of options; detailed evaluation criteria should be provided	Continuing to refine as part of information in distinguishing characteristics.
Still confusion of how common programs will be implemented under various alternatives	Believe that subsequent discussions at Management Team and Policy Group answers remaining confusion.
Common Program elements do not meet Governor's water policy principles in treatment of ag land and water use	Believe Program is in conformance with Governor's water policy principles. Ex: Specific criteria for transfers is directly in line with Governor's criteria.
Concerned with potential impacts to agriculture from all the Program elements and that Program will not meet CEQA requirement re analysis of ag impacts.	Understand some agriculture impact will occur, but within solution principles. EIR is CEQA element of analysis - all requirements will be met.