

Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee Meeting
Thursday, February 13, 2003
Resources Agency Auditorium
1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, CA
Meeting Summary

Subcommittee members (or their alternates) and agency liaisons present:

Gary Bobker (TBI)	Perry Herrgesell (CDFG)
Ryan Brodrick (DU)	Tim Ramirez (Resources Agency)
Serge Birk (CVPWA)	Pat Akers (CDFA)
Walt Hoye (MWD)	Pat Rivera (USBR)
Lisa Holm (CCWD)	Mike Hoover (USFWS)
Todd Manley (NCWA)	Scott Clark (USACE)
Kane Totzke (KCWA)	Mike Acetuino (NOAA-Fisheries)
Bernice Sullivan (Friant WUA)	
Steve Evans (FOTR)	
Ronda Lucas (CFBF)	
Doug Lovell (California Trout)	
Michael Schaver (Big Valley Rancheria)	

Introductions and Subcommittee Status

The meeting began with introductions and a subcommittee report. The summary of the previous meeting was reviewed and no changes proposed.

Co-chair Gary Bobker reported about the continuing discussion regarding the Sumner Peck Ranch litigation. There is no California congressional support for financing and restoration funds will not be used for the settlement. The funding source for the settlement is still undetermined.

Co-chairs Gary Bobker and Ryan Brodrick were invited to participate in the Delta Levee program subcommittee discussions as the Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee representatives. The Delta Levee Subcommittee wants to move forward with projects that help enhance habitat and are consistent with ERP goals, opportunities, and funding. This is seen as a good first step in integrating programs, such as understanding how the Drinking Water Subcommittee and the Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee can share information and in trying to broaden integration of ERP with the two other CALFED programs.

Gary Bobker announced that Senate President Pro Tem John Burton appointed Marc Holmes of The Bay Institute to the new California Bay Delta Authority as an at large member.

Ryan Broddrick reported that the Working Landscapes Subcommittee met last week and they need to make final recommendations regarding \$20 million in Ecosystem Restoration Program Proposition 50 funds. They are ready to adopt some guidelines and hope to do so at the March meeting.

The subcommittee discussed attendance and membership, and expressed the need to make sure everyone signs in when they attend a meeting. Attendance is summarized at the top of meeting summaries; people can check the website to see which meetings they may have forgotten to sign in.

Ecosystem Restoration Program Status Report

Dan Castleberry began his report by announcing that an Ecosystem Restoration Program Brown Bag Lunch Seminar would follow the subcommittee's meeting and all were invited. He also pointed out that copies of the 2002 CALFED Bay-Delta Program Annual Report, the California Bay Delta Authority Act, and an update (fact sheet) about the CBDA were available at the table just inside the entrance to the auditorium. Mike Schaver commented that there was no tribal representation listed in the CBDA and that was inconsistent with CALFED ROD commitments.

Ronda Lucas asked what the transition to the CBDA meant for State and especially Federal staff working on CALFED. Dan Castleberry explained that most State staff will transition to CBDA staff, but that Federal staff likely will remain with their Federal agencies.

Dan provided an update on contracting issues for ERP including the following:

- GCAP was selected as the new contracting entity for the ERP contracts approved for contracts since May 2002. GCAP is expected to be under contract in early March 2003 and to begin contacting grant recipients as early as late March or April 2003.
- CALFED recently received approval to proceed with two contracts for services resulting from a request for qualifications (RFQ) contracting process, however the contracting mechanism was still being worked out. One result of delays in getting these contracts up is that Ron Ott, who was to give a presentation on Delta water management-related activities at this meeting, currently is not under contract, and so had to cancel the presentation. Contracts are expected to be signed soon. The time frame and funding level for the contracts is 3 years and \$20 million. The consultants are Jones and Stokes Associates for the environmental contract and CH2M Hill for engineering.
- The ERP's Independent Science Board is supported in part by a subcontract with the Association of Bay Area Governments. This contract is paid through SB 23 funds, but the ERP is working to get an amendment to this contract using Proposition 204 funds.

Ryan Broddrick brought up the concern that the June through October time frame is critical for many of the ERP projects and that the contracting delay posed a serious problem for ERP projects—in effect, crippling ERP implementation at times.

Dan Castleberry then reported about the ISB meeting that included discussion about how the ISB wanted to focus work through ISB subcommittees. The last ISB meeting worked on the Delta Regional Ecosystem Restoration Implementation Plan (DRERIP) and commented on the scientific aspect of the plan. ISB also commented on the science behind the Environmental Water Program, and the Mercury Strategy (which will be released soon). There were fruitful discussions about the overall science in the Delta water operations.

- Additional discussion focused on a letter that Gary Bobker sent to the ISB about how the ISB might weigh in on integration issues. The request was made that a copy of Gary's letter be sent to all Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee members. Gary agreed to forward the letter.
- Other items of interest from the ISB meeting include: an annual ISB report is planned to outline its activities to date; the ISB is planning on offering a floodplain restoration workshop; the ISB received an update about the indicators and milestone work that the Science Panel has been working on; and there was discussion of revising the "big model" paper and submitting it for publication in a peer-reviewed journal.
- Next ISB meeting is set for April 30—May 1, 2003.

Nancy Ullrey gave a brief presentation about the Annual Work Plan status and schedule. The Year 3 work plan was in its finishing touches and she anticipated having it finished by the subcommittee's next meeting. Handouts showed the time line to the new revised reporting process that will be established for the CBDA, and briefly explained the process. The three implementing agencies will have a larger role in preparing the new reports than they had previously, and it is anticipated that a draft Year 4 document will be available for the Subcommittee to review in March and April (according to the time line). The final Year 4 work plan is to be approved by the CBDA in June 2003 in time for the July 2003 budget year to begin.

Due some contracting problems, Ron Ott was not able to give his Delta water facilities presentation. Perry Herrgesell from the California Department of Fish and Game gave a presentation about coordinating and planning for actions requiring regulatory decisions affecting the Delta. He informed the Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee that the draft EWA EIS/EIR is coming, but the schedule has slipped.

Kim Taylor of the CALFED Science Program gave a presentation about how indicators and performance measures are being established. She explained that there is a "choke" point in the process because it is difficult to get people to spend the necessary time to complete data analysis and do the writing. There is

a need to write program and project-specific indicators, which means the scientist needs a work plan and specific schedule to look at and see if the program or project is accomplishing its stated goals.

The comment was made that policy makers need to be brought into this process early on because even if the science is great, if it doesn't meet the needs of the policy makers the science will not be useful. The broader population needs to be in the communication and feedback loops of this process. Gary Bobker suggested that it is important for indicators to be driven by the goals, not by the data available. The available data can be used as a "reality check" for the indicators. He suggested using a suite of indicators that represents a broad range of value. Kim agreed that indicators based on multiple metrics are more valuable than those based on an individual metric.

Gary Bobker also cited a potential "danger" in how the indicators and performance measures may be used or misunderstood. Indicators need to be measure the effects of human and management actions and account for natural variables; indicators that did this would be more useful and less prone to being misinterpreted.

Steve Evans asked what authority the CBDA has to make agencies meet CALFED goals. For example, what can the CBDA do about USBR decisions concerning Red Bluff Diversion Dam or their lack of progress on Battle Creek. Discussion revolved around the idea that it is unclear where policy decisions are made and how those decisions impact indicators. Discussion included what is the right way to measure the performance of implementing agencies. The Science Program and ERP need to figure out what tools to use for this, and they need to figure out the time for doing this. The statement was made that policy should be a function of good science. A rejoinder statement was that good management is a function of both policy and science, but if either one is not carried out correctly, then neither means anything.

Campbell Ingram of the Fish and Wildlife Service gave a presentation about the process of implementing the Environmental Water Program to the Subcommittee, including handouts of the slide show and a copy of the draft conceptual procedure guidance document. Comments about the presentation included:

- The EWP needs to be based on long-term sustainable flows.
- Has the EWP thought about downstream flows that will be kept in the ecosystem through the bay? This may be situational.
- That the EWP explore a suite of alternatives that keep water in streams for the ecosystem.
- That there needs to be an on-going effort for a permanent fix, not just a yearly effort.
- Need to look at the long-term, cumulative effect of these water acquisitions. This needs to be built into system accounting and stored in Shasta Reservoir for environmental water releases.

- EWP needs to communicate its awareness of the AB30 program.

Next Steps for the Subcommittee

The following proposed agenda items were listed for next meeting: a) status of Battle Creek and PG & E MOU, changes in scope and money; possible policy changes. Question: What's the point of spending \$62 million if the USBR is not interested in looking at founding populations? What are the common understandings of the obstacles and the opportunities? b) Status of work plan; c) priorities of the Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee for BDPAC; d) presentation about the Delta facilities part of the Delta water management plan, e) presentation about the Water Quality Subcommittee strategic plan and how that strategic plan interacts with ERP; f) Delta levee conversion; g) presentation of the Working Landscapes Subcommittee, and h) presentation of "What Counts"—an accounting of milestones and targets.

Next Meetings

The next meetings for the Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee were set for April 9 at the Resources Building, 9 a.m. to 1 p.m., and May 22, 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. (although note that it has since been determined that the meeting date needs to change due to conflicts with other activities).