

Agenda Item: 10-5
Meeting Dates: February 9 and 10, 2005

JOINT MEETING WITH BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2005 MULTI-YEAR PROGRAM PLAN DEVELOPMENT

Description: This report provides information on the multi-year program planning process. Multi-Year Program Plans, which describe implementation of each of the 11 program elements over the next few years, will be presented to the California Bay-Delta Authority and Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee in April.

Recommended Action: This is an information item only. No action will be taken.

Background

The California Bay-Delta Authority Act of 2003 requires the Authority to annually review and approve Multi-Year Program Plans and long-term expenditure plans. The Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) recommends approval or modification of the program plans to the Authority. The program planning process provides the forum to describe what has been and will be accomplished, identify issues or problems and propose steps for resolving the issues; identify available funding and additional funding needs, and ensure cross-program integration and balance is occurring in the Program.

Process and Content Overview

Each year the implementing agencies, with the assistance of BDPAC subcommittees and the public, prepare the Multi-Year Program Plans. Attached is a listing of BDPAC subcommittees and the program plans they will review (Attachment 1) along with the schedule for preparing and reviewing program plans (Attachment 2).

Authority staff oversee and coordinate the preparation of the program plans. BDPAC subcommittees review and comment on the plans and make a formal recommendation to BDPAC. The program plans will be submitted to the Authority and BDPAC in April for review and comment. At its June meeting, the Authority will consider the recommendations of BDPAC, the agencies and staff on the program plans.

Program accomplishments and priorities are presented in the Multi-Year Program Plans, which in turn provide information used in assessing Program progress and preparing the Authority's Annual Report. Detailed information on financing the Program was included in the Finance Plan approved by the Authority in December. The Finance Plan and the Annual Report all interact and coordinate with the Multi-Year Program Plan to ensure an open and detailed flow of information to the public, BDPAC, and the Authority on the status of the CALFED Program.

Integration of Program Plan Approval Criteria, Delta Improvement Projects and Science.

Draft criteria for approval of program plans were distributed to BDPAC and the Authority at the May and June 2004 meetings, respectively. The Authority approved the criteria in August 2004. The criteria (Attachment 3) were provided to the implementing agencies with their instructions for preparing the plans. Further, a listing of Delta Improvement Projects (Attachment 4) was distributed to the implementing agencies, with directions for describing these activities in the Accomplishment and Activities sections of the program plans. Lastly, information was provided that outlines the content of the Science component (Attachment 5) in each program plan.

List of Attachments

- Attachment 1 -- Public Review Process
- Attachment 2 --Schedule
- Attachment 3 -- Approval Criteria
- Attachment 4 -- Delta Improvement Projects
- Attachment 5 -- Science Component Template

Contact

Rick Breitenbach

Phone: (916) 445-0144

Public Review Process

Each program element needs to be reviewed by the appropriate subcommittee(s). Each subcommittee should provide an initial comment letter to BDPAC for the April meeting as well as a final letter for the June meeting indicating support or not for the program plan. Some subcommittees might consider joint meetings to discuss cross program issues if the subcommittee members wish to review other plans. Otherwise, all plans are reviewed by BDPAC and the Authority and the subcommittee can comment at those forums.

Listed below are the subcommittees and their primary program plans to review. In addition, also listed are some suggested program plans that subcommittees may need to consider/review to ensure integration .

<u>Subcommittee</u>	<u>Program Plan (required)</u>	<u>Program Plan (suggested)</u>
Levees	Levees	Conveyance
Drinking Water Quality	WQ	Conveyance
Watershed	Watershed	
Water Supply	EWA, Conveyance, Storage, Transfers.	Levees? WQ
Ecosystem Restoration	ERP	EWA? WQ
Environmental Justice	OC (EJ and Tribal section)	All (EJ and Tribal Sections)
Working Landscapes	ERP	
Water Use Efficiency	WUE	

The Science program plan does not have a subcommittee but is usually reviewed by BDPAC and the Authority. IEP will have a public process integrated into CALFED.

Program Plan Schedule 2004-05

December 8th – January 21st

Revising and updating program plans

January 24th

First Draft program plans due to CBDA for internal review

February – May 16th

Subcommittees Review and Comment

February 9th & 10th

Joint Authority/BDPAC Meeting – beginning process

February 15th

Send to ACT

February 22nd

ACT Meeting – Review and comment

February 25th

First Draft Due to CBDA for internal review

March

Revise to incorporate ACT, Subcommittee and Internal Comments.

March 21st

Second Draft due to CBDA for internal review

March 25th

Comment letters from Subcommittee due to CBDA

March 28th – 30th

Reproduction for Authority/BDAPC

March 22nd

Mail to ACT

March 29th

ACT – All Day review

April 1st

Mail to Authority/BDPAC

April 13th & 14th

Joint Authority/ BDPAC Meeting and Comment

April

Revise to incorporate Authority, BDPAC, Subcommittee, ACT, and Internal Comments.

May 16th

Subcommittee recommendation letters due to CBDA

May 16th

Final Draft due to CBDA for internal review

May 23rd – 25th

Reproduction for Authority/BDPAC

May 26th

Mail to Authority/BDAPC

June 8th & 9th
Approve

Joint Authority /BDPAC Meeting – Authority

DRAFT CRITERIA FOR REVIEW, APPROVAL, AND MODIFICATION OF PROGRAM PLANS AND EXPENDITURE PLANS

1. Previous year's activities:

Criterion: The Program Plan adequately addresses and evaluates the progress of previous year's activities and accomplishments.

Context: This criterion is intended to make sure that the Program Plans are responsive to issues associated with balance, and address performance and funding gaps identified in the previous year's annual report.

Guiding Questions: Consider the major activities from last year's plan and compare with this year's accomplishments. Is the progress of the activities consistent with what was proposed in the Program Plan? Discuss which, if any, activities were not completed and why. Are all major activities and accomplishments listed? Do the major activities address the gaps identified in the annual report?

2. Performance:

Criterion: The Program Plan demonstrates adequate progress towards meeting the objectives of the program element and the Record of Decision (ROD), and the development of performance measures for each program element.

Context: Each program element needs to be able to evaluate progress in achieving the goals and objectives in the ROD and include activities, which will advance the program element. Performance measures provide a consistent method of measuring progress at different scales.

Guiding Questions: Does the Program Plan include activities which advance the program element and help achieve the goals and objectives in the ROD? Does the Program Plan describe progress toward the development of three levels of performance assessment as outlined in the prototype performance measures developed for the CALFED program?

3. Funding:

Criterion: The Program Plan clearly describes projected program expenditures, funding gaps, and priorities for funding.

Context: This criterion is intended to ensure that major activities identified in the Program Plan are funded. Program Plans should describe where funds will be spent and the projected funding amount needed for the program. Multi-year Program Plans should reflect the finance principles, including the principle of "beneficiary pays", funding targets and cost allocations in the Finance Plan adopted by the Authority at its December 2004 meeting. Furthermore, priorities for funding should be clearly articulated and the need for adjustments to cost estimates and allocations should be evaluated.

Guiding Questions: Do the Program Plans include tables that identify near term approved funding and future funding targets? Does implementation of the program reflect a beneficiary pays approach, including appropriate federal, state, and local shares. If not, why not. In the accomplishments and major activities sections, do the Program Plans discuss why certain activities have not or cannot be done with the funding available and discuss how that affects the schedule of activities?

4. Consistency with the ROD:

Criterion: The Program Plan is consistent with the goals and objectives of the ROD including the implementation commitments contained in the ROD.

Context: This criterion is intended to make sure Program Plan activities are consistent with, and help achieve the goals and objectives of the ROD including the implementation commitments contained in the ROD (pages 32-35). The Science, Environmental Justice, and Tribal Relations commitments have their own section in the Program Plan to highlight these specific activities. The rest of the implementation commitments are described throughout the Program Plan.

Guiding Questions: Is there a description of progress towards revising targets or discussion of new targets and process for revision? Does the Program Plan describe major activities and accomplishments undertaken for Environmental Justice and Tribal Relations and outline a plan with activities for the following years? In addition, are local leadership, working landscapes and any other implementation commitments, where applicable, included throughout the Program Plan?

5. Multiple Objectives:

Criterion: The Program Plan is adequately integrated with other program elements, and will result in implementation of projects or programs that meet the objectives of multiple programs.

Context: This criterion is intended to ensure the Program Plans implement activities that result in progress towards achieving the cross-program goals and objectives contained in the ROD. Activities should be implemented in a manner that coordinates and integrates with other program elements.

Guiding Questions: Does the plan contain activities and accomplishments that will result in progress towards achieving the cross-program goals and objectives contained in the ROD? Are cooperation and coordination described and summarized between the program and the other program elements?

6. Integrating Science:

Criterion: The Program Plan effectively incorporates science and peer review processes into program activities.

Context: This criterion is intended to make sure the Program Plans use science to help plan and evaluate their CALFED activities and decision making.

Guiding Questions: Does the Science section contain information on the following: critical unknowns, adaptive management practices, advisory panels and science advisors, peer review process, issues being addressed by studies, and research being conducted? Is there a description of how the implementing agencies use science to guide implementation of CALFED activities and inform decision-making?

7. Public and Stakeholder Involvement:

Criterion: The Program Plan provides for extensive public involvement and participation through a transparent process, including the Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) and its subcommittees and the public.

Context: This criterion is intended to address the issue of public comment and stakeholder involvement described in the implementation commitments of the ROD. CALFED is committed to providing a transparent decision making process for programs and activities.

Guiding Questions: Does the Program Plan identify opportunities for public involvement associated with the implementation of Program activities. Were the Program Plans developed with the assistance of the appropriate BDPAC subcommittees? Were they discussed in BDPAC and at the Authority?

8. Balance and Integration:

Criterion: The 11 Program Plans, when considered together, are likely to result in balanced implementation, as described in Section 79402 (b) of the California Bay-Delta Authority Act, for ecosystem quality, water supply reliability, water quality and levee system integrity.

Context: This criterion is intended to address any potential gaps in balance and program integration. The 11 Program Plans together should overall provide for balance in the program and be integrated to the maximum extent possible to achieve the goals and objectives in the ROD.

Guiding Questions: Do the Program Plans address performance and funding gaps to ensure balance and integration? Is the Program Plan responsive to any deficiencies or issues associated with balance, which were identified as a whole? Does the Program move forward consistently with the ROD based on the activities discussed in the Program Plans?

Delta Improvement Package Actions and Corresponding Program Plans

WATER SUPPLY ACTIONS AND SCHEDULES

SWP/CVP Integration Plan (Conveyance)

SWP/CVP Intertie (Conveyance)

San Luis Reservoir Low Point Improvement Project (Storage)

South Delta Improvements Project/Increase SWP Pumping to 8,500 cfs (Conveyance)

WATER QUALITY ACTIONS AND SCHEDULES

South Delta Improvements Project/Permanent Operable Barriers (Conveyance)

San Joaquin River Salinity Management Plan (Drinking Water Quality)

- Coordinated Drainage Strategy
- Salt Load Management and Reduction
- Recirculation
- Voluntary Water Transfers and Exchanges
- Real-time Monitoring
- Coordination of East Side Tributary Operations
- Introduction of Potential High Quality Wastewater Treatment Plant Flows
- Westside Groundwater Management

Vernalis Flow Objectives (Drinking Water Quality)

San Joaquin River Dissolved Oxygen (Ecosystem Restoration)

Old River and Rock Slough Water Quality Improvement Projects (Drinking Water Quality)

Franks Tract (Drinking Water Quality)

Delta Cross Channel Program (Conveyance)

Relocation of M&I Intake (Drinking Water Quality)

Through-Delta Facility (Conveyance)

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACTIONS AND SCHEDULES

OCAP ESA Consultation (*Ecosystem Restoration*)

SDIP ESA Consultation (*Ecosystem Restoration*)

Update of CALFED ROD Programmatic Regulatory Commitments and Programmatic Biological Opinions (*Ecosystem Restoration*)

Environmental Water Account (EWA) (*Environmental Water Account*)

Delta Regional Ecosystem Restoration Implementation Plan (DRERIP) (*Ecosystem Restoration*)

DELTA LEVEES ACTIONS AND SCHEDULES (*Levee System Integrity*)

SCIENCE ACTIONS AND SCHEDULES

Independent Science Board (*Science*)

Environmental Water Account Independent Reviews (*Science*)

Focused Study on South Delta Hydrodynamics, Water Quality, and Fish (*Conveyance*)

Focused Study on Delta Smelt and Fish Facilities (*Conveyance*)

Science Program PSP (*Science*)

SWRCB Periodic Review (*Science*)

South Delta Fish Facilities (*Conveyance*)

Performance Evaluation and Monitoring Program (*Science*)

Science Component Template

Describe how implementing agencies use science to guide implementation of the program element and inform decision-making. Work with representatives of the CALFED science program to draft this section of the program plan. If possible add information about what funding is required for each science activity listed, what entity is responsible for making sure that activity occurs, and when it will be done.

Specifically, this section should address two questions:

- 1) What science practices is the program using to achieve the stated goals and objectives, and how are these practices being used? Science practices are: Peer review of data, models, technical documents, which are used in program planning processes or in defining actions; Technical panel reviews (e.g., EWA tech panel review or CALSIM model review) of a body of technical information used to determine program actions, or in making decisions; Technical workshops to clarify the state of knowledge and reduce uncertainty about a complex program issue; Applied research to address unknowns and assess performance; and Monitoring to assess performance.
- 2) How will the program coordinate its science activities with the science activities proposed by the Science Program?