

X-Sender: sbuer@goldeneye  
 X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58  
 Date: Mon, 13 Sep 1999 16:24:02 -0700  
 To: selkirk@water.ca.gov  
 From: Stein Buer <sbuer@water.ca.gov>  
 Subject: Fwd: FY00 Priorities

>From: Patrick\_Leonard@fws.gov  
 >Subject: FY00 Priorities  
 >Date: Fri, 10 Sep 1999 15:04:57 -0700  
 >To: sbuer@water.ca.gov  
 >X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on FW0HUB1/FWS/DOI(Release 5.0.1|July 16,  
 >1999) at 09/10/1999  
 > 04:02:02 PM

>Stein,

> I'm not sure who we're supposed to provide these comments too; it it's  
 > not you, sorry--but could you pass them along to the right person?  
 > Thanks!

> Our comments focus on Attachment 3, "Draft Ecosystem Restoration FY  
 > 2000 Priorities."

> In general, there seems to be too great an emphasis on studies and  
 > analysis, with too low a priority for on-the-ground implementation  
 > actions to actually benefit fish and wildlife. The priorities should  
 > be more directly tied to the resources that have the greatest need for  
 > improvement. Looking at the list, we prefer the language in A.1, which  
 > includes creation of habitat along with the evaluation, to the  
 > language of A.4, which just "evaluates a need".

> We also recommend more reliance on the priorities identified by the  
 > DNCT. These would include habitat restoration in the north delta,  
 > including Cache Slough, and restoration in the west delta, especially  
 > in the areas that are being rapidly converted to vineyards. It is not  
 > clear that the DNCT priorities have been used in the development of  
 > this list.

> The EWA seems to be missing from this list (both development and  
 > implementation); making sure there's an EWA ready to go at the time of  
 > the ROD should be one of our highest ecosystem priorities for FY00.

> Line-by-line comments:

> A.1: change to something like "Creation of fresh emergent wetland  
 > habitat, and evaluation of its benefits, in the south delta." Modify  
 > the area as appropriate, based especially on the DNCT priorities.  
 > (This could be done in two bullets, if it was important to retain the  
 > idea of evaluating at least two conflicting approaches to habitat  
 > restoration in the south delta.)

> A.2: Are there willing sellers along Georgiana Slough? Does this  
 > priority put too many eggs in one basket? It might be more useful to  
 > say something like "Restore tidal habitats (1) along Georgiana Slough;  
 > (2) in Suisun Marsh; and (3) elsewhere in the Delta (being more  
 > specific if possible)." This is also a suggestion that restoring parts  
 > of Suisun Marsh to rail/mouse/fish habitat should be a priority!

> A.3: Where would this occur? Is this really meant just as a "study",  
 > or are we saying it's a CALFED priority to begin to implement  
 > ecosystem restoration/levee setback projects (which we can learn from  
 > to improve similar projects in the future)? Our priority is more like  
 > the latter.

> A.4: We understood that the ERP position was that all these diversions

> "need" to be screened. Our priority for FY00 should be to develop a  
 > screening program, including an assessment of priorities and an  
 > implementation schedule, and to actually put some screens in place. We  
 > should be looking for on-the-ground opportunities to test these  
 > screens, to better understand their costs and benefits.

> B.1: This sounds more like a Phase II Report statement, or part of the  
 > north delta ERP or flood control project-specific EIS, than a  
 > description of an annual priority. It needs to be made more specific:  
 > what exactly would we like to do? why?

> B.2: Again, this seems like a subject that could be better treated in  
 > the project-specific environmental planning for north delta ERP. A  
 > better priority for FY00 would be to expand the acreage of protected  
 > and restored habitat in and adjacent to these areas.

> B.3: This should be made more specific.

> C.1: This seems to be a workload priority, not an ecosystem priority.  
 > Ecosystem priorities should focus on those actions that actually  
 > benefit the ecosystem, not on the activities that may help us work  
 > better and smarter in the future (not that those aren't also  
 > priorities, they're just in the wrong category).

> C.2: This is an overall CALFED priority, but it is not an ecosystem  
 > priority. It would have to be much more specific to show how actions  
 > in the watersheds could be ecosystem priorities.

> C.3: This does not seem to be a "system-wide priority", with its focus  
 > on Cache Creek. Why is source control of mercury a higher priority  
 > than, for example, source control of selenium?

> C.4: This should be revised in two ways (perhaps two bullets): first,  
 > to provide funding for projects submitted in response to the last RFP,  
 > that met the priorities identified in that RFP, but that weren't  
 > funded because of the lack of funds available. We told the applicants  
 > that good, unfunded proposals would be held over to FY00, and we never  
 > told them we'd be changing the priorities in that time.

> It should also be changed to narrow its apparent scope a little. We  
 > won't automatically fund (or give a high priority) to  
 > previously-funded projects, if they haven't been able to show some  
 > success with the previous funding.

> C.5: Delete this, or explain it. What does it mean?

> D.1 and D.2: delete these; they are workload and planning priorities,  
 > but not ecosystem priorities. They would be more useful listed in the  
 > overall CALFED priorities.

> Let me know if you have any questions; the new number is 414-6600.

> p.l.