

May 15, 2000

TO: Federal-State Management Group

FROM: Mary Selkirk

SUBJECT: Meeting Outcomes, May 9, 2000

The following is a brief summary of outcomes from the CALFED Federal-State Management Group meeting held on Tuesday, May 9, 2000. Dick Daniel, CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program Manager, substituted for Steve Ritchie, who was making his weekly appearance before the State Assembly's Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee, chaired by Assemblyman Mike Machado.

1. Announcements and Followup

Report back on Federal-State Discussions - Lester Snow declared that he is optimistic about resolving the remaining issues and come to a decision in late May. Alf Brandt, Club FED coordinator, added that this may well be the busiest month for CALFED decision-making.

There was discussion about upcoming meetings of Bay-Delta Advisory Council and Policy Group scheduled for May 17 and 24 respectively.

Outcomes:

- BDAC meeting should occur as planned to continue to allow public comment in an open forum prior to a final decision being made on the EIS/EIR by the Policy Group.
- Policy Group representatives were still discussing the necessity of having a meeting as early as May 24. A decision would be made by the end of the day.

2. EIS/EIR Schedule - Rick Breitenbach, CALFED Environmental Documentation Director, reported on the progress of the EIS/EIR. The proposed schedule of the release of the Final EIS/EIR shows the documents will need to go to press by June 19, 2000 for an anticipated mid-July release to the public.

3. Integrated Storage Investigation - Fish Barrier Issues - Terry Mills, CALFED staff, reviewed the status of a cooperative Upper Yuba River Study to determine the feasibility of allowing spring-run chinook salmon and steelhead access to historical spawning and rearing habitat above Englebright Dam on the Yuba River. Spring-run chinook salmon have declined throughout the Central Valley to a level resulting in the Fish and Game Commission listing them as a threatened species under the State ESA; and the Steelhead trout at the same time declined and were listed as a threatened species under the Federal ESA. In addition to CALFED's interest in restoration of the ecosystem, the management of the Upper Yuba River watershed is also important for water quality needs in the Bay-Delta estuary.

The early public meetings for the study emphasized major concerns and key issues. CALFED redesigned the collaborative process to include a 52-member workgroup with a wide variety of representatives including business and property owners, county boards of supervisors from each of the affected counties, and all water districts. The workgroup was divided into three subteams: Lake, River and Agency. The workgroup's purpose is to determine if introduction of wild chinook salmon and steelhead to the Yuba River Watershed is biologically, environmentally and socio-economically feasible over the long term.

There are many key issues: upstream habitat, downstream habitat, local economic and social impacts, flood control, sediment control and water quality, and water supply; but the most difficult issue centers around possible removal of Englebreight Dam. Englebreight Dam was constructed in 1940 to prevent upstream hydraulic mining debris from moving downstream into the Yuba River. It is 260 feet tall creating a lake that is 9 miles in length with 815 surface acres surrounded by 24 miles of shoreline. There is no predetermined CALFED outcome as to removal of the dam.

The dialogue continues through a tightly planned facilitation approach grounded on dispute resolution principles. USBR contracting problems necessitated postponement of meetings until the facilitator can return to work.

Ted Frink, Fisheries Biologist with the Department of Water Resources, reported on the Fish Passage Improvement Program that involves the Integrated Storage Investigation staff and CALFED's Yuba River Program. The conceptual model for the program has two approaches: Assisting in projects already in progress or proposed and identifying new opportunities. Julie Tupper, USFS, later suggested that because many of those listed as involved coordinating agencies are the same as those who will be attending a watershed meeting on May 19 at the Sonoma County Fairgrounds, she suggested that Mr. Frink also attend the meeting.

It was suggested that CalTrans be added to the list of coordinating agencies in existing projects, and bridges and culverts be added to the list of barriers.

Outcome: No action, information only.

4. **Update on CALFED-approved DWR contracts** - Leo Winternitz, DWR Director's Office, presented an updated list of CALFED-approved DWR projects. This was in response to comments made by Greg Gartrell, Contra Costa Water District and Co-Chair of the Ecosystem Restoration Roundtable, at the Policy Group meeting on April 19. Mr Gartrell had stated the spreadsheet released by CALFED's Ecosystem Program indicates there has been no work done on a number of DFG and DWR projects. Leo reported that in most cases it was a matter of accounting or contractual problems.

Perry Herrgesell, DFG, reported a very similar situation exists in his Department.

Outcome: No action, information only.

5. **Ecosystem Restoration Program Water Acquisition Program** - Jim McKeivitt, USFWS, introduced CH2M Hill consultants, Kathy Freas and Ben Everett, who have been working on a USFWS study for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program. They have developed a series of interactive spreadsheet models for selected controlled streams to provide a systematic data-based means of determining (b)(3) acquisition priorities that are expected to be met on a monthly basis with existing hydrology in all water year types, and the flow priorities that may need to be acquired to achieve AFRP flow targets. Water acquisition is driven by biological need, hydrologic characteristics (including operations) and economic considerations. The biological flow needs were based on scenarios developed by the Service contained in the October 1996 Draft Guidelines for Allocation of Water Acquired Pursuant to Section 3406 (b)(3) of the CVPIA (Feather, Bear, Yuba, Mokelumne, Calaveras, Merced, Tuolumne and Stanislaus Rivers). The model, and its assumptions, are in preliminary form and will be refined based on continued discussions with biologists, economists and policy makers.

Outcomes:

- Jim McKeivitt will contact Corps and also talk with Steve Yeager to find out how this study links to the San Joaquin Comprehensive Study.
- Wayne White suggested a similar presentation be made at the Ecosystem Roundtable

6. **Status Report on Science Oversight Team** - Wendy Halverson Martin, CALFED Restoration Coordinator and member of SOT, reported that a stakeholder outreach meeting has been scheduled for May 31. She distributed a list of names of potential reviewers from State and Federal agencies for involvement in the 2001 Proposal review. She asked for agency commitment and requested additional names for consideration. The University of California, Davis, will serve as the administrator. The deadline date for submission of 2001 Ecosystem Restoration Proposals is 3 p.m., Monday, May 15, 2000.

Outcomes:

- Agencies would respond the following week with their commitment and additions.
- Status report on the Science Oversight Team will be heard next week.