
3.0 NEAR TERM (STAGE 1A) ACTIONS

Implementation of actions begins in Phase III. This period will include site-specific environmental review and permitting as necessary. The first stage of Program implementation is critical to its long-term success because it will serve as an indication of the CALFED agencies and stakeholder community capacity to act on a cost-effective, practical, and equitable set of actions which advance the Program objectives.

The preliminary actions have been grouped into 7 bundles either to provide a balanced suite of actions for specific regions within the CALFED problem and solution areas, or to provide programmatic balance between actions which are not necessarily associated with any specific geographic area. The bundles highlight certain critical ongoing programs which will require implementation decisions in the near future, but do not include the many other ongoing monitoring and improvement programs in the Bay-Delta region.

Lower San Joaquin River and South Delta Region Bundle

This bundle is designed to address water management and fisheries concerns in the south Delta and lower San Joaquin River region, for local water uses as well as State and federal exporters. Specific issues to be addressed include fisheries, water quality, water supply reliability, recreation, flood control, and wildlife habitat. The preliminary actions are designed to advance feasibility and environmental evaluations and to implement corrective actions in the south Delta region as well as in upstream watersheds which affect the quality and quantity of flows in the San Joaquin River.

Lower Sacramento River, North Delta Bundle

This bundle is designed to develop a balanced solution to concerns surrounding fishery and water quality impacts of diversions from the Sacramento River into the central Delta, to address regional flood concerns, and to substantially enhance riparian and wetlands habitat corridors in the region.

Yolo Bypass, Suisun Marsh, and West Delta Bundle

This bundle is designed to address water quality, fisheries protection, and habitat enhancement actions for the west Delta region, including Suisun Marsh, the west Delta islands, and the Yolo Bypass. Because of the concern over toxicity effects of mercury originating in the Cache Creek basin, this bundle includes substantial research to identify those sources and potential remediation tools.

Delta-Wide ERP/Levees Bundle

This bundle is designed to achieve a reasonable balance between implementation of ecosystem improvement actions and levee system improvement actions. In addition this bundle includes actions to improve fisheries, water quality, and habitat throughout the Delta, including protection and enhancement of Delta in-channel islands.

Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tributaries Bundle

This bundle includes ecosystem restoration primarily fisheries habitat, hatchery management, and floodplain and meander belt restoration along key river reaches.

Integrated Water Management Bundle

This bundle includes actions which can lead to improvements in water supply reliability and flexibility through improvements in water use efficiency, water transfers, water storage and conveyance facilities (groundwater and surface water), water quality, and water associated habitats. The proposed actions include the Program problem area and solution areas, including state and federal project service areas and upper watersheds. It includes key actions that comprise the Integrated Storage Investigation and implementation of the Environmental Water Account.

Governance Bundle

This bundle addresses certain organizational issues to assure that orderly implementation of Program actions can occur as the level of activity increases substantially. These issues include the potential formation of a CALFED management entity, an ERP implementation entity, comprehensive monitoring, and actions to assure that water quality and water use efficiency measures can be fully implemented. While creation of new entities may be proposed, no agency will transfer any existing regulatory authority to these new entities.

The Stage 1a actions are identified in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1. Draft Early Implementation Actions

| Bundle Action # | Action Description | Details/Assumptions | Primary Effects | CALFED Program | Secondary CALFED Program | FY 2008 Cost (millions) | FY 2007 Cost (millions) | Implementing Entity | Implementing Authority Required? |
|-----------------|---|--|--|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 2 | Lower San Joaquin River and South Delta Region Bundle Ecosystem Restoration Program: South Delta Region | Identify and advance specific regional ERP goals, coordinated with other facilities and operational changes, such as flood protection, barriers, and export operations. Consolidate and screen local ag diversions based on an appropriate priority and initiate a screen maintenance program, per Water Quality Control Plan, May 1995. A component of #31 | Improve fisheries and wildlife habitat | ERP | Levees | \$2.0 | \$3.0 | | |
| 2.1 | Agricultural Diversions Screening Program | Strategy to resolve regional water quality problems; initiate highest priority actions. | Reduce fisheries entrainment impacts | ERP | | see 31 | see 31 | | |
| 3 | Water Quality Actions | | | WQ | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Stockton Dissolved Oxygen Solution Alternatives | Evaluate and implement appropriate actions to improve San Joaquin River dissolved oxygen conditions. Possible cost share with Contra Costa Water District. | Improve WQ in San Joaquin River in vicinity of Stockton | WQ | ERP | \$1.0 | \$1.0 | | |
| 3.21 | Veale Tract Drainage Discharge Relocation Feasibility Study and Environmental Documentation | | Improve drinking water | WQ | | \$1.0 | \$4.0 | | |
| 3.22 | Feasibility Study: Management, Relocation and/or Treatment of RD 800 Drain Discharge | Coordination with CCMD and other affected entities | Improve drinking water | WQ | | \$1.0 | \$6.0 | | |
| 3.3 | Implement On-Farm drainage management measures | Salinity and Selenium management. | Reduce transport of salinity and selenium contaminants to San Joaquin River | WQ | ERP | \$0.5 | \$0.5 | | |
| 3.4 | Implement regional irrigation efficiency improvement programs to reduce saline drainage | | Reduce volume of saline drainage | WQ | ERP | \$0.5 | \$0.5 | | |
| 3.5 | Evaluate/Implement as Appropriate Release of saline agricultural drainage water during high flow periods | Implement regional and on-farm drainage retention facilities and manage discharges. | Improve late season WQ in lower San Joaquin River, potential drinking water quality impact | WQ, not yet listed | | \$0.1 | \$0.1 | | |
| 3.6 | Study: Non-sewer water sources of bromide (Br ⁻) in San Joaquin drainage. | Determine if non-sewer water sources of Br ⁻ in San Joaquin Drainage are significant and impact water quality | Improve drinking water source quality. ID most important sources, develop abatement strategies | WQ | ERP | \$0.5 | \$0.5 | | |
| 3.7 | Seek to provide water for San Joaquin River flows to meet WQ, VAMP, ESA, and other flow objectives through water purchases/transfers from willing sellers. Study: Evaluate Recirculation Benefits and Impacts | Component of Environmental Water Account. See #33, #34 | Increased instream flows during significant periods | WT | ERP | see 34 | see 34 | | |
| 3.8 | | If feasible, acquire from willing sellers water to recirculate to meet WQ and VAMP objectives. | Potential to improve water quality and meet VAMP flow requirements in lower San Joaquin River | SAC | ERP, WQ | \$0.1 | \$0.1 | DWR, USBR | |
| 3.9 | Implement spring flow management action, such as the Proposed Vernalis Adaptive Management Plan (VAMP) | Manage San Joaquin River flows, Delta exports, conduct fishery studies, evaluate benefits and minimize impacts. Establish San Joaquin River Water Quality Protection Reserve Fund to address impacts. Report on how VAMP funds will be used to improve water management practices. | Improve salmon survival, curfew management us, improve understanding of fish vs flow | external | ERP | \$4.0 | \$4.0 | USBR, DWR, and SURGA | |

| Bundle Action # | Action Description | Details/Assumptions | Primary Effects | CALFED Program | Secondary CALFED Program | FY 2000 Cost (millions) | FY 2001 Cost (millions) | Implementing Entity | Implementing Authority Required? |
|-----------------|---|---|---|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| 4 | Plan, Design & Construct CVP test Tracy Fish Facility, 500 cfs screen, plus Sorting, Holding, Transport, and Release | New fish screens for TPP full export capacity to be completed by end of Stage 1 | Improve fish survival | SIC | ERP | \$6.5 | \$30.0 | USBR | |
| 5 | Plan, Design, & Construct new SWP Clifton Court Forebay Intake, including fish screens and salvage facilities, average daily capacity 10,300 cfs. New Screened Intake with Gates and Lift Pumps | Based on results of this investigation, either construct intake and add 4600 cfs screened export capacity to CCFB or build new screen and salvage facilities at Tracy Pumping Plant. Also evaluate intake between Delta Mendota Canal and Cal. Aqueduct | Improve fish survival, water supply loss, and reliability, drinking water quality stages, canalization, and | SIC | ERP | \$2.0 | \$4.0 | DWR, USBR | |
| 6 | Feasibility and Environmental study of SWP/CVP Intakes between export facilities and canals | Allow SWP and CVP to shift allowable exports between pumping plants to minimize environmental impacts and improve operational flexibility and water supply reliability. | | SIC | ERP | \$1.0 | \$2.0 | | |
| 6.1 | Implement Joint Point of Diversion | Improve operational flexibility and water supply reliability. | | external | SIC | | | SWRCB | |
| 7 | SWP 10,300 cfs Permits, with appropriate regulatory constraints | Interim increase to 6500 cfs export capacity may be sought if benefits justify | Increased operational flexibility for water supply and environmental benefits. | | | | | | |
| 8 | Plan, Design, and Construct Permanent Operable Barriers at Head of Old River, Middle River, and Old River at Tracy. | Phase out temporary barriers as soon as feasible (permanent barriers, dredging, and egg intakes extensions completed. Retain options for future construction of permanent operable Grant Line Canal barrier if other actions fail to address local water supply availability needs. Costs shown are for design. | Improve fish passage (HOR), and local water supply availability and quality (MR, ORT) | | | \$0.5 | \$2.0 | | |
| 8.1 | Barrier Operations | Establish Barrier Operation Coordination Team, operate for fisheries, water quality, and water supply availability goals. | | | | | | | |
| 8.2 | Barrier Monitoring | Monitor barrier effects on fish, stages, circulation, and water quality to support real time ops and planning process. | | | | \$0.5 | | | |
| 9 | Channel Dredging of Selected Channel Segments | Dredge to limit scour velocities, for water supply availability, for navigation, and flood control. Costs shown are for design. | | | | \$0.2 | \$1.0 | | |
| 10 | Agricultural Diversions Extension and Screening | Extend egg intakes where necessary, with operable barriers in place, to meet local water supply availability needs. Costs shown are for design and agreements. | | | | \$0.2 | \$1.0 | | |
| 11 | Flood Conveyance Improvements in lower San Joaquin River System, including Paradise Cut, San Joaquin River, Old River, and Middle River, per FEET Report, 1997 Subtotal | Channel dredging, limited levee setbacks, and flood plain restoration in conjunction with ERP actions | Improve levee integrity, channel conveyance, flood plain storage, fisheries and wildlife habitat. | SIC | ERP | \$1.0 | \$1.0 | Corps, DWR | |
| | | | | | | \$22.6 | \$61.2 | | |

Table 3.1 cont.

| Bundle Action # | Action Description | Details/assumptions | Primary Effects | CALFED Program | Secondary CALFED Program | FY 2008 Cost (millions) | FY 2001 Cost (millions) | Implementing Entity | Implementing Authority Required? |
|------------------------|--|--|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Table 3.1 cont. | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Lower Sacramento River, North Delta Bundle Restore Tidal Marsh and Riparian Habitats along Georgiana Slough | The assumption is that improved habitat will decrease the diversion effect on fisheries. | Improve fisheries and wildlife habitat | ERP | | \$1.5 | \$1.0 | | |
| 14 | Study North Delta ecosystem and flood control improvements including the Lower Mokelumne River | | Flood control and habitat creation w/ levee berms | S/C | ERP | \$1.0 | \$2.0 | DWR | |
| 15 | Acquire and Convert Land for Shallow Water, Wetland, and Riparian Habitat | This action will contribute to establishment of a Mokelumne River Corridor. | Flood control and habitat creation w/ breached levees | ERP- Mokelumne Corridor | | \$3.0 | \$3.0 | DWR, DFG, and others | |
| 16 | Study Feasibility of Delta Cross Channel Reop and 2-4000 cfs Hood Diversion | | Balance water quality and fisheries benefits, potential for improved drinking water quality | S/C | ERP, WQ | \$1.0 | \$1.0 | DWR | |
| | Subtotal | | | | | \$6.5 | \$7.0 | | |

| Table 3.1 cont. | | Primary Effects | | Secondary CALFED Program | | FY 2000 Cost (millions) | | FY 2001 Cost (millions) | | Implementing Entity | | Implementing Authority Required? | |
|---|--|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Bundle Action # | Action Description | Detail/Exceptions | Primary Effects | CALFED Program | Secondary CALFED Program | FY 2000 Cost (millions) | FY 2001 Cost (millions) | FY 2000 Cost (millions) | FY 2001 Cost (millions) | Implementing Entity | Implementing Authority Required? | Implementing Authority Required? | |
| Yolo Bypass, Suisun Marsh, and West Delta Bundle | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Implement Suisun Marsh Diversion Screening Program | It is assumed that fish screens in this area will aid in the recovery of threatened or endangered fish species. | Reduce fisheries entrainment impacts | ERP | | \$0.25 | | \$1.0 | | | | | |
| 19 | Suisun Marsh and Van Sickle Island | Evaluate and restore tidal wetlands. | | ERP | | \$6.0 | | \$3.0 | | | | | |
| 20 | Provide Needs and Opportunities Analysis for Improving Ecosystem Restoration and Flood Bypass Habitat for the Yolo Bypass area | This is a portion of a general effort for flood bypass areas, including Colusa Basin, Butte Basin, Sutter Bypass, Yolo Bypass, Chowchilla Bypass, Esabide, Fresno Slough, and James Bypass. See action 42. | Improve diverse habitat, fish passage, and WQ | ERP | | \$1.0 | | \$6.0 | | CALFED; Multi-Agency | | | |
| 21 | Cache Creek Mercury Source Control Study | | Develop ways to reduce Hg transport to wetlands | WQ/ERP | | \$3.0 | | \$2.0 | | | | | |
| 22 | Clear Lake upper watershed mercury remediation actions | | | WQ/ERP | | \$1.0 | | \$1.0 | | | | | |
| 23 | Frank's Tract Habitat Restoration | Further evaluate and restore portions of Frank's Tract to provide for channel islands and tidal wetland habitat using clean dredge materials and natural sediment accretion. Combine the habitat restoration with a program to control or eradicate nuisance aquatic plants. | Create shallow water habitat, riparian | ERP | | \$1.5 | | \$1.5 | | DWR, Corps | | | |
| 24 | Dredged Materials Reuse | Pilot Studies and Implementation, as materials and appropriate opportunities become available. | Materials for habitat, levees | ERP | Levees | \$0.5 | | \$0.5 | | DWR, Corps | | | |
| 25 | Barber Slough Watershed Restoration | | Improve WQ, sediment, and habitat (Watershed severely impacts North Bay Aqueduct water quality. | WQ | ERP | \$0.8 | | \$0.8 | | | | | |
| Subtotal | | | | | | \$14.05 | | \$15.80 | | | | | |

| Bundle Action # | Action Description | Detail/Assumptions | Primary Effects | CALFED Program | Secondary CALFED Program | FY 2000 Cost (millions) | FY 2001 Cost (millions) | Implementing Entity | Implementing Authority Required? |
|------------------------|--|---|--|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Table 3.1 cont. | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | Delta-Wide ERP/Levees Bundle Levees Subventions | | Levee System Integrity | Levees | | \$10.0 | \$11.0 | DWR, Corps | Congressional authorization may be required for Corps participation with Non-Project Levees |
| 28 | Levees Special Projects | | Levee System Integrity | Levees | | \$11.0 | \$11.0 | DWR | |
| 29 | Emergency Response Program | | Levee System Integrity | Levees | | \$11.0 | \$3.0 | DWR | |
| 30 | Identify Risks to Delta Levees and Develop a Risk Management Strategy | | Levee System Integrity | Levees | WQ, ERP, Conveyance | \$1.0 | \$1.0 | CALFED | |
| 31 | Evaluate the Need to Screen Small Diversions in the Delta and implement | Consolidate and screen local ag diversions based on an appropriate priority and initiate a screen maintenance program, per Water Quality Control Plan, May 1995 | Reduce fisheries entrapment impacts | ERP | | \$1.0 | \$1.5 | DFG, DWR | |
| 32 | Normative Invasive Species (NIS) (Note: Expand to actions in SF Bay and Suisun Marsh, to reduce further invasions and eradication of <i>Lepidodermis</i>) | Demonstration projects. This action is part of an ecosystem-wide effort to control non-native invasive species with early emphasis on the Delta and the Bay. | | ERP | | \$2.0 | \$3.0 | USFWS | |
| 33 | Total Organic Carbon Evaluation | General Evaluation and Pilot Study: Total Organic Carbon Reduction, DWR to do engineering and technical oversight. | Improve in-Delta drinking water source quality. | WQ/ERP | | \$4.5 | \$2.0 | | |
| 34 | ERP Levee Relocations, Berms, Veg. Management | Cost included with In-Channel Island Restoration | Delta Shallow Water, tidal wetlands, and riparian habitat. | ERP | | \$1.0 | \$1.0 | DWR, DFG | |
| 35 | In-Channel Islands Restoration | | Tidal wetlands, riparian habitat, special status species | ERP | | \$1.0 | \$1.0 | DWR, DFG | |
| 36 | Assessment of source and magnitudes of loadings of constituents of concern for drinking water | Includes TOC, nutrients, salinity, pathogens, and Br on Delta wide basis | | WQ | | \$0.5 | \$1.0 | | |
| 37 | Determine Key Acquisition Areas for Conservation of Special Status Plant Species in the Delta, Suisun Marsh, and S.F. Bay | | | ERP | | \$0.5 | \$1.0 | | |
| 38 | Studies to Determine Propagation Techniques and Restoration Protocols of Rare Plants in the Delta, Suisun Marsh, and S.F. Bay | | | ERP | | \$0.5 | | | |
| | Subtotal | | | | | \$44.0 | \$36.5 | | |

Table 3.1 cont.

| Bundle Action # | Action Description | Detail/Assumptions | Primary Effects | CALFED Program | Secondary CALFED Program | FY 2000 Cost (millions) | FY 2001 Cost (millions) | Implementing Entity | Implementing Authority Required? |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------------|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| 40 | Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tributaries Bundle Sacramento River Meander Corridor Studies and Implementation | Continue studies and demonstration projects which address potential changes in hydrology and geomorphology, local economic impacts, and other issues associated with ongoing riparian restoration work. Develop a corridor management plan. | | ERP | | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | DMR | |
| 41 | American River Corridor Management Plan | | | ERP | | \$0.25 | | | |
| 42 | Develop Tuolumne River and Other High-Priority Sediment Management Plans | Develop a sediment management plan that includes evaluating coarse and fine sediment transport and the need to augment gravel supplies, and is consistent with efforts to restore the Tuolumne River corridor. First year funding for contract to cover study period. | | ERP | | \$5.0 | | | |
| 43 | Tuolumne River Restoration Implementation Actions | The Tuolumne River has been identified as a large scale demonstration stream in the ERP. | | ERP | | see 42 | | | |
| 44 | Fish Management | Develop Biological and Genetic Management Plans to Address Restoration and Recolonization of Streams in the Central Valley by Chinook Salmon and Steelhead | | ERP | | \$2.0 | \$1.0 | | |
| 45 | Hatchery Operations | Develop an integrated hatchery management strategy that reduces the potential conflict with wild fish, maintains a viable harvest strategy, and optimizes progress toward the goal of self-sustaining populations of wild, native fish. | | ERP | | \$0.50 | \$0.5 | | |
| 45.5 | Marking and Tagging Program | Develop and implement a comprehensive Implementation Plan for a statistically designed marking and tagging program for Chinook Salmon produced at Central Valley facilities consistent with existing programs throughout the West. | | ERP | | \$1.25 | \$1.25 | | |
| 46 | Upgrade Weir at Battle Creek Coleman Fish Hatchery | Repair and Modify Weir | | ERP | | \$1.5 | | | |
| 47 | Butte Creek Restoration | | | ERP | | \$5.0 | \$5.0 | DWR | |
| 48 | Deer Creek Restoration | | | ERP | | \$0.5 | \$5.0 | DWR | |

Table 3.1 cont.

| Benefit Action # | Action Description | Details/Assumptions | Primary Effects | CALFED Program | Secondary CALFED Program | FY 2006 Cost (millions) | FY 2007 Cost (millions) | Implementing Entity | Implementing Authority Required? |
|------------------|---|---|-----------------|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| 49 | Comprehensive Flood Control Study | Major evaluation of Sacramento River and San Joaquin River systems, coordinated with ERP flood plain restoration opportunities. | | External | Coord. Levees, SIC | | | Corps, DWR | |
| 50 | Sacramento River Mercury Source ID and Control/Remediation Study | | | WQ | | \$0.3 | \$0.8 | | |
| 51 | Sacramento River Levees Restoration | | | SIC | | \$2.0 | \$2.0 | Corps, DWR | |
| 52 | San Joaquin River & Tribe Study, possible Implementation, and Acquisition | Implementation of components of Comprehensive Flood Control Study | | ERP | | \$10.0 | \$5.0 | DWR, Corps | |
| | Subtotal | | | | | \$35.3 | \$28.6 | | |

| Bundle Action # | Action Description | Detail/Assumptions | Primary Effects | CALFED Program | Secondary CALFED Program | FY 2000 Cost (millions) | FY 2001 Cost (millions) | Implementing Entity | Implementing Authority Required? |
|---|--|---|---|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Table 3.1 cont. | | | | | | | | | |
| Integrated Water Management Bundle | | | | | | | | | |
| 53.1 | Initiate Ecosystem Science Program | Program to support the adaptive management element of the ERP. This will include science workshops, targeted research, assessment of relevant data and incorporation into the management process. | | ERP | | \$15.0 | \$15.0 | | |
| 53.15 | Monitoring, Assessment, and Research | Develop a process to design and implement the monitoring programs for the CALFED actions so that the data from the monitoring programs are interlinked. | | CMARP | | \$6.3 | \$10.3 | | |
| 53.2 | Supplement existing monitoring programs | Implement additional system or landscape level monitoring programs to provide for measurement of progress and evaluation of performance of the ERP. | | ERP | | \$7.0 | \$7.0 | | |
| 54 | Environmental Education Programs | Programs designed to develop a broader understanding of natural resource conservation issues at the individual and community level. | Increase public awareness | ERP | WQ | \$2.0 | \$2.0 | | |
| 55 | Develop a Long-Term Plan for In-Stream Flows | Develop Ecologically-based Hydrologic Models and Water Management Strategies and apply to formulate in-stream flow augmentation plans. | Improve fisheries and wildlife habitat | ERP | | \$0.5 | \$1.0 | | |
| 56 | Develop Ecologically-based Hydrologic Models and Water Management Strategies | | | ERP | | see 55 | see 55 | | |
| 57 | Provide Needs and Opportunities Analysis for Improving Ecosystem Restoration and Flood Bypass Habitats | Areas include but are not limited to: Colusa Basin, Butte Basin, Sutter Bypass, Yolo Bypass, Chowchilla Bypass, Eastside, Fresno Slough, and James Bypass. | Improve diverse habitat, fish passage, and WQ | ERP | | \$1.0 | \$1.0 | CALFED; Multi-Agency | |
| 58 | Diazinon and chlorpyrifos Assessment | Assess the fate and transport of diazinon and chlorpyrifos; begin implementation to reduce water quality impacts, using BMP's. | | WQ | ERP | \$0.4 | \$0.0 | | |
| 59 | Diazinon and chlorpyrifos Education | Develop an educational program that provides information on ways to reduce water quality impacts. Possible test market areas include Sacramento and Stockton. 1997/1998 Eco funding provided to develop BMP's. 2000-develop BMP's | | WQ | | \$1.6 | \$0.8 | | |
| 59.1 | Integrated Storage Investigations | | | | | | | | |
| 59.2 | Overall Storage Strategy | | | | | \$1.0 | \$1.0 | CALFED | |
| 60 | Groundwater/CU Feasibility Studies with local sponsors | | Improve Storage/CU utility | SC | | \$2.0 | \$5.0 | Local Cooperating Entities and CALFED | |
| 61 | Groundwater/CU Programs: (Develop and Impl. GW Monitoring and Modeling Programs) | | Improve Storage/CU utility | SC | | \$1.0 | \$2.0 | Local Cooperating Entities and CALFED | |
| 62 | On-Stream Storage Enhancement Studies (Friant Dam Engagement Recon Study) | | Improve Flood Control and Storage/CU utility | SC | | \$0.2 | \$0.2 | Proposed Joint study: USBR, Corps, and Rec Board | |
| 63 | North of Delta Off-Stream Storage Investigation (Sites and Alternatives Feasibility Study) | | Improve Storage/CU utility | SC | | \$10.0 | \$10.0 | DWR | |
| 64 | On-Stream Storage Enhancement (Shasta 6.5 ft Raise Feasibility Study) | | Improve Storage/CU utility | SC | | \$3.0 | \$1.5 | USBR | |

| Bundle Action # | Action Description | Detail/Assumptions | Primary Effects | CALFED Program | Secondary CALFED Program | FY 2000 Cost (millions) | FY 2001 Cost (millions) | Implementing Entity | Implementing Authority Required? |
|-----------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| 65 | In-Delta and Adjacent to Delta Storage: Feasibility Study | | Improve Storage/CU utility | SVC | | \$1.5 | \$2.0 | DWR | |
| 66 | Power Facilities Reoperations Evaluation | | Improve Storage/CU utility | SVC | ERP, WM | \$0.5 | \$0.5 | DWR, FERC, PUC, SWRCB, w/focal water entities and stakeholders | |
| 68 | Fish Migration Barrier Removal Evaluations | | | ERP | SVC | \$0.5 | \$0.5 | | |
| 69 | Financial Incentive Program | Local assistance (loans & grants) for cost effective water conservation/recycling actions, Low interest loans | reduces Demand | WUE | | | | | |
| 70 | | Urban | | WUE | | \$5.0 | \$12.0 | CALFED, Multi-agency | |
| 71 | | Ag | | WUE | | \$24.0 | \$50.0 | CALFED, Multi-agency | |
| 72 | | Managed Wetlands | | WUE | | \$1.5 | \$3.0 | CALFED, Multi-agency | |
| 73 | | Recycling | | WUE | | \$14.0 | \$28.0 | CALFED, Multi-agency | |
| 74 | Technical Assistance | Recoverable loss studies, on-farm conservation studies, funded through member agencies (USBR, DWR) | reduces Demand | WUE | | | | | |
| 75 | | Urban | | WUE | | \$0.8 | \$1.0 | CALFED, Multi-agency | |
| 76 | | Ag | | WUE | | \$3.0 | \$3.5 | CALFED, Multi-agency | |
| 77 | | Refuges of Managed Wetlands | | WUE | | \$0.2 | \$0.5 | CALFED, Multi-agency | |
| 78 | | Recycling | | WUE | | \$0.8 | \$1.0 | CALFED, Multi-agency | |
| 79 | Directed Studies | | | WUE | | | | | |
| 80 | | Research ET | | WUE | | \$0.2 | \$0.25 | DWR, UC | |
| 81 | | Pilot Measurement Program | | WUE | | \$0.5 | \$0.65 | CALFED, Multi-agency | |
| 82 | Establish the California Water Transfer Information Clearinghouse | Features of Clearinghouse in 2000/01; develop website to disseminate transfer information and approval process requirements. No user fees. Possibly house in new division of SWRCB. | Imp. Market efficiency | WT | | \$0.5 | \$0.5 | CALFED | |
| 83.1 | Streamline the Water Transfer Approval Process | Working with SWRCB, DWR, USBR to create a more standard application process. Would be available through the Clearinghouse, among other things. Several year effort. Initial effort is to clarify existing process thru SWRCB guidebook. | Assure disclosure of proposed actions | WT | | \$0.09 | \$0.00 | USBR, DWR, SWRCB | |
| 83.2 | Require Impact Analysis Disclosure for Water Transfers | Working with SWRCB, DWR, USBR to require transfer applicants to disclose socio-economic, groundwater, and cumulative impact assessments with approval applications. Several year effort. Requires agencies to add/modify existing requirements | | WT | | \$0.02 | \$0.02 | USBR, DWR, SWRCB | |

Table 3.1 cont

| Baseline Action # | Action Description | Details/Assumptions | Primary Effects | CALFED Program | Secondary CALFED Program | FY 2000 Cost (millions) | FY 2001 Cost (millions) | Implementing Entity | Implementing Authority Required? |
|-------------------|---|---|--|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 84 | Expedite the SWRCB Approval Process for Some Water Transfers | SWRCB preparing guidebook on existing approval process. Help ID additional opportunities to expedite. | Imp. Market efficiency | WT | | \$0.50 | \$0.50 | USBR, DWR, SWRCB | |
| 85 | Develop Transferable Water Definitions for Various Types of Transfers | Develop definitions of transferable water for types of transfers that are of issue as identified in guidebook. Have to have agencies and stakeholders evaluate applicability of carriage water concept to transfers and develop consensus method to calculate IL. | Imp. Market efficiency | WT | | \$0.04 | \$0.04 | USBR, DWR, SWRCB | |
| 86 | Clarify Carriage Water Requirements for Cross-Delta Water Transfers | Establish more consistent application of rell criteria. Facilitate discussion between SWRCB, DWR, and USBR. | Imp. Market efficiency | WT | | \$0.09 | \$0.04 | CALFED, Multi-agency | |
| 87 | Refine Reill Criteria for Reservoir Storage Based Water Transfers | Develop accounting/tracking measures for 1707 transfers | Imp. Market efficiency | WT | | \$0.03 | \$0.00 | DWR, USBR | |
| 88 | Improve Provisions for In-stream Water Transfers | May be increased work effort at DWR and USBR | Facilitate ERP Impl. | WT | | \$0.08 | \$0.08 | CALFED, Multi-agency | |
| 89 | Forecast and Disclose Conveyance Capacity in State and Federal Project Facilities | Work with stakeholders and DWR/USBR to make some capacity available for transfers. | Imp. Market efficiency | WT | | \$0.50 | \$0.50 | DWR, USBR | |
| 90 | Evaluate policies for transferring water in existing project facilities. | CALFED is preparing a recommendation. No additional funding expected. | Imp. Market efficiency | WT | | \$0.02 | \$0.02 | DWR, USBR | |
| 91 | Evaluate the Need for Additional Water Rights Legislation | Incentive program for ground water management. Coordinate with conjunctive use programs/incentives. Incentive dollars would not be through the Water Transfer program. | | WT | | | | CALFED | |
| 92 | Local assistance for Groundwater Management Plans | Funding is for establishment and administration of EWA | Increase use of groundwater as a water management tool. | WT | SIC | | | CALFED | |
| 93 | Establish Pilot Environmental Water Account | Includes EWA funding | Improve Delta env. Protection and water supply reliability | ERP | SIC | \$1.0 | \$1.0 | CALFED | |
| 94 | Environmental Water Purchases | Assist local watershed groups and government agencies to develop watershed plans through grants, directed actions training and technical support. | Enhance fisheries habitat | ERP | SIC | \$60.0 | \$60.0 | CALFED | |
| 95.11 | Fund and implement watershed planning activities within watersheds of the greater Bay Delta ecosystem | Assist local watershed groups and government agencies to develop watershed plans through grants, directed actions training and technical support. | Manage land use, vegetation, and stream zones to reduce sediment, improve base flow, Reduce fire danger, reduce pathogens, and TDS. | WM | ERP | \$8.0 | \$8.0 | CALFED | |
| 95.12 | Fund and implement watershed conservation, maintenance and restoration activities within watersheds of the greater Bay Delta ecosystem. | Assist local watershed groups and government agencies to develop and implement programs, projects and other community based watershed improvement activities through grants, directed actions training and technical support. | Manage land use, vegetation, and stream zones to reduce sediment, reduce stream flashiness, improve base flow, Reduce fire danger, reduce pathogens, and TDS | WM | ERP, WQ | \$12.0 | \$12.0 | CALFED | |
| 95.21 | Provide funding to help build the capacity of locally led watershed groups that collaborate with local landowners. | Provide, or support capacity building programs to enhance sustainability of locally led watershed programs. Programs could include training in facilitation techniques, consensus building, conflict mgmt., fund raising and other similar skills, in addition to start up support for staff costs, administration, and other operating | Significantly increased capacity for local communities to undertake watershed management activities. | WM | | \$4.0 | \$4.0 | CALFED | |

| Bonded Action # | Action Description | Details/Assumptions | Primary Effects | CALFED Program | Secondary CALFED Program | FY 2000 Cost (millions) | FY 2001 Cost (millions) | Implementing Entity | Implementing Authority Required? |
|-----------------|--|---|--|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| 95.22 | Provide funding and assistance to locally led watershed efforts to help build and administer watershed education programs. | Fund the development of local education programs through communities, schools, and universities, non-governmental organizations, local agencies and watershed stewardship. | Increased awareness and understanding within communities of the importance of: health functional watershed sound scientifically based watershed plans, and projects. | WM | ERP | \$1.0 | \$1.0 | CALFED | |
| 95.3 | Establish, fund and maintain assistance to local watershed groups, and landowners for project concept, design, and implementation | Ensure adequate levels of technical assistance and scientific support to locally led watershed management programs. | Sound scientifically based watershed plans, and projects. | WM | ERP | \$3.0 | \$3.0 | CALFED | |
| 95.41 | Assist CALFED's monitoring program to develop appropriate watershed management performance measures and monitoring protocols | Ensure that adaptive management can be applied at multiple scales (including site, project, and program) and across land ownerships by developing a suite of protocols to help track a wide range of watershed responses to change. | The program will have reliable data and information with to adaptively management the program, and program activities. | WM | ERP | \$0.5 | \$0.5 | CALFED | |
| 95.42 | Begin development of baseline information needed to conduct scientifically sound watershed planning and management within watersheds of the greater Bay Delta ecosystem. | Support watershed assessment efforts in the tributary basins of the greater Bay Delta watershed consistent with CALFED's monitoring program and local watershed program needs. | Expanded information base available for watershed planning, implementation and monitoring activities. | WM | ERP, WQ | \$1.5 | \$1.5 | CALFED | |
| 95.43 | Improve the use and usefulness of existing watershed resource information centers | Support the expansion of an active network of watershed data and information to assist watershed programs to conduct effective watershed management, conservation and restoration activities. | Expanded capability of watershed managers to collect, store, retrieve and exchange data and information. | WM | ERP | \$1.0 | \$1.0 | CALFED | |
| 95.5 | Provide oversight for the program through the CALFED oversight entity | Ensure adequate funding to conduct administrative, management, and oversight for the watershed program, within the framework of the overall CALFED oversight entity. | | WM | | \$0.5 | \$0.5 | CALFED | |
| 96 | Field Surveys for all special status species in and around all potential surface storage and groundwater sites | | | SC | | \$1.0 | \$1.0 | | |
| 96.5 | Feasibility evaluation of water exchanges between San Joaquin River/Tulare lake watersheds and urban water users to improve drinking water quality | | | WQ | WT | | | | |
| | Subtotal | | | | | \$194.9 | \$254.9 | | |

Table 3.1 cont.

Table 3.1 cont.

| Bundle Action # | Action Description | Detail/Assumptions | Primary Effects | CALFED Program | Secondary CALFED Program | FY 2000 Cost (millions) | FY 2001 Cost (millions) | Implementing Entity | Implementing Authority Required? |
|-----------------|--|--|---|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 97 | Governance Bundle | | | | | | | | |
| 98 | CALFED Entity | | | Gov | | - | - | | Existing Structure or Leg. Required. |
| 99 | Determine/Establish governing structure for CALFED Program Elements, including ERP, WQ, Levees, WM, SC, CMARP, WUE, WT | | | Gov | | - | - | | Existing Structure or Leg. Required. |
| 100 | Water Quality Actions Immunity: Federal Leg. | Develop appropriate balance of risk to cleanup entities and environmental due process responsibilities | Allow WQ actions to proceed w/o unacceptable liability risk | Gov | WQ | - | - | CALFED | New Federal Legislation |
| 101 | Identify Urban Water Certification Entity (UWCP) | | | Gov | WUE | - | - | CALFED | |
| 102 | Implement Ag Water Use Certification | | | Gov | WUE | - | - | DWR | |
| 106 | Maintain and enhance Program administration | The restoration component of the overall CALFED Program has increased substantially requiring the infusion of additional staff and related costs which is greatly above the existing project administration level. | | ERP | | \$4.5 | \$4.5 | | |
| | Subtotal | | | | | \$4.5 | \$4.5 | | |
| | Grand Total | | | | | \$322.8 | \$408.5 | | |