

**Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee
California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee
May 22, 2002 9:30 a.m. - 3:00 p.m.
Bonderson Building
901 P Street, Hearing Room 102-A
Meeting Summary**

Subcommittee members (or their alternates) and liaisons present:

Gary Bobker (TBI)	Ryan Brodrick (Ducks Unlimited)
Tom Zuckerman (CDWA)	Steve Evans (F.O.T.R.)
Serge Birk (CVPWA)	Tim Ramirez (Resources Agency)
Ronda Lucas (for Becky Sheehan, CFBF)	Bernice Sullivan (for Dan Fults, FWUA)
Lisa Holm (for Greg Gartrell, CCWD)	Brian Kinnear (for Mike Acetuino, NMFS)
Rick Brietenbach (for Sue Ramos, USBR)	Marie Sullivan (for Mike Thabault, USFWS)

Introductions and Subcommittee status report

The meeting began with introductions and a subcommittee status report. Dan Castleberry (Ecosystem Restoration Program) reminded the members that they need to identify their alternates so that the subcommittee membership list could be updated. The draft description of the subcommittee was briefly discussed and redistributed.

Ecosystem Restoration Program Status Report

Dan C. gave the **Chief's report**. He provided an update on the status of the Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP). He highlighted major work efforts, including completing the 2002 proposal solicitation and review process, executing the Year 1 and developing the Year 2 work plans and budgets, improving program and project tracking, moving forward with the regional focus, and developing the Environmental Water Program. An announcement will be made in early June regarding the final recommendations for the 2002 proposal solicitation and review.

Next, Terry Mills (ERP) gave an update on the **EWP**. The EWP wants to develop a framework for long-term program implementation including coordination with other related programs, and to move forward initial implementation through the Pilot Water Acquisition Program. The biological flow criteria developed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for the Central Valley Project Improvement Act Water Acquisition Program were used as a basis in identifying 5-6 key tributaries to target for the pilot program. These tributaries support a variety of endangered and threatened species. The EWP hopes to establish a strong scientific framework for water acquisition, to further engage the Agency and Stakeholder Ecosystem Team (ASET) and the Independent Science Board (ISB), to develop hypotheses and conceptual models, and to continue to establish physical and biological priorities. The focus of this effort is to clearly establish the scientific foundation for the program.

Tom Zuckerman asked how the EWP is being integrated with other water acquisition programs and efforts. Terry responded that CVPIA WAP were the most similar to the EWP in terms of coordination. Similar elements of these programs have been closely coordinated. Gary Bobker voiced concerns regarding the timeline for implementing the EWP. Terry answered that although the timeline was not firm, he anticipated that we

should begin soliciting for water acquisitions within this year. Water may be acquired through a directed action process or more broadly solicited request for proposals. Several members of the subcommittee voiced concern with the continual delays in implementing the program. Others supported the need to further develop the scientific foundation.

Next, Dan Ray (ERP) gave an update on the project solicitation and review process launched last August with release of the Ecosystem Restoration Program's **2002 Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP)**. In response to the PSP, the ERP received 260 proposals requesting a total of \$472 million. Requests ranged from \$28,000 to \$32,500,000, and the average request was \$1.8 million. The ERP, with help from the CALFED Science Program, conducted a rigorous, science-based review process. Nearly 400 experts from all over the continent were involved in independent science reviews and technical panels. A Selection Panel provided an initial recommendation in April. The panel recommended that 55 proposals totaling \$57 million be funded as is, in part, or with conditions and that another 36 proposals totaling \$129 million be considered as directed actions in annual work plans. The public was invited to comment on the Selection Panel's initial recommendation. Over 1200 visits were made to the web site where the recommendation was posted and 400 letters were received commenting on the recommendations for 78 proposals. The Selection Panel reconvened in May to consider the public comments and develop a final recommendation. The final recommendations will be made available in mid-June. Some members requested that they receive the public's comments on CD.

Next, Terry Mills gave an update on the **budget**. In the Record of Decision for the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, \$1.42 billion was projected as the budget in Stage 1 for the ERP (over a 7-year period). The ERP Stage 1 budget identified three funding categories: State providing \$510 million, Federal providing \$510 million, and others (local cost share) providing \$400 million. Terry gave a breakdown of the various funding sources within the State, Federal and other categories, with one of the sources being the CVPIA. Serge stated that the goals of CALFED and CVPIA differ and that this needs to be considered; hence he hopes the ERP will work closely with CVPIA staff to continue to identify common goals.

Next, Vance Russell (Kleinschmidt) gave an update and overview of the **Look Back Exercise**. The look back exercise consists of three phases: (1) Scoping to refine the objectives and develop methods for the evaluation; (2) Pilot Evaluation to refine the methodology by conducting a descriptive overview of all ERP projects and evaluating 28 funded projects in detail; and (3) Full Scale Implementation to extend the detailed review to all ERP-funded projects. The present effort is focused on completing phases 1 and 2. The results of phase 2 will direct and feed into phase 3. By the end of June, the final report on phase 2 will be completed and presented to CALFED. Phase 2 involves looking at all ERP projects on a programmatic level (excluding 2002). Proposals and scopes of work will be evaluated and summary statistics will be developed. This programmatic-level overview will not include project status information. On the project level, 28 projects (1997 and older) will be evaluated in detail to examine individual project status. Included in these 28 projects are all ERP-funded Butte Creek projects and some multiple habitat projects.

Gary requested budget information allocated towards this exercise, along with a more detailed program budget. Tom Z. questioned if there has been an effort to look at

projects that have not been successful. Vance replied not in this exercise. Tom emphasized that an objective look back will need to consider successful and unsuccessful projects. Ronda requested that future phases incorporate information on agricultural land protected and converted. Serge commented that the information from the Look Back Exercise needs to be carried forward and made available to everyone, so that the program can operate as efficiently as possible. Gary commented that the Look Back Exercise should incorporate a look at how the projects have changed over time with regards to amendments.

Next Steps for the Subcommittee

Gary presented a draft list of desired outcomes for the subcommittee. He stated that the subcommittee co-chairs needs to be prepared to present priorities and measures of success for the subcommittee at the next BDPAC meeting. BDPAC will be monitoring to make sure the committee is successful. Gary would like to have the list finalized to present to the next BDPAC meeting. Eugenia Laychak (CALFED) stated that many of the other subcommittees would be forwarding recommendations to the full committee. For example the Water Quality subcommittee is scheduled in September to forward a strategy for the Drinking Water Program overall. The full committee is committed to looking at program integration and priorities on an ongoing and annual basis.

Gary stated that the committee should focus on performance measures. Need to make sure that resources are available.

Tim Ramirez (Resources Agency) reminded the subcommittee that there are other resources to utilize to address the program issues (Independent Science Board, etc). Steve Evans (FOTR) would like to add under 'Implementation' on the draft outcomes handout, the goals and objectives in the ROD, and would like an assessment of what is being implemented to assess progress.

Gary would like to see within the year an institutional structure allowing CALFED to address contracting and integration between staff. Gary also stated that the issues on the handout need to be addressed soon. He would like everyone to come together at the next meeting with more thought on this. Perhaps a 3-4 person scoping effort addressing the integration on a regional level. The question he posed was how do you make the regional structure function with an integration of the Comp. Study, CVPIA and CALFED. He also asked the subcommittee if it was possible to have measures in place to secure additional funding.

Gary asked that the ERP staff give their judgement as to what in terms of acres, acre feet and other kinds of project deliverables were expected to have been achieved by the end of this year. These data would aid the subcommittee in addressing the implementation issue. Serge commented that we might want to reprioritize our strategy in terms of a more macro watershed approach. Gary requested that Serge draft this idea up for the subcommittee to review.

Gary stated that there needs to be an assessment of ERP staffing needs, what is sufficient in terms of budget, staff, and contracting in order to achieve 'real-world' results. He also stated that CALFED needs to identify funding sources so that its' programs can function at a sufficient level. Serge reiterated that CALFED and CVPIA need to be integrated more.

In general, the subcommittee seemed close to agreement on most of the areas outlined in the desired outcomes handout, save for issues relating to allocation of funding. Gary requested that prior to the next subcommittee meeting, that the members resolve their differences on the funding issue.

The subcommittee scheduled its next meeting for June 19th @ 1230pm, and the following meeting for July 17th @ 930 am.

Action Items

1. Update the membership list with alternates listed.
2. Provide a summary and list of action items for each meeting.
3. Report on staffing needs for the ERP.
4. Report on the status of funds and projects for Category III projects.
5. Report on the 2002 PSP process – what worked and what didn't work.
6. Report on the Year 2 budget in detail.
7. Refine draft list of desired outcomes for the Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee.
8. Review the ROD commitments with respect to the ERP and assess what the ERP has done for each of the commitments.