

Agenda Item: 13-9

Meeting Dates: April 13 and 14, 2005

JOINT MEETING WITH BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2005 DRAFT PROGRAM PLANS

Summary: The draft Multi-Year Program Plans have been prepared by the CALFED implementing agencies, and have been reviewed and discussed by the Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) subcommittees. The draft plans are presented at this time for members of the California Bay-Delta Authority and BDPAC to become familiar with their structure and integration among all program plans, and to hear any outstanding issues from BDPAC subcommittee co-chairs at this early stage of their development. These draft plans, prepared by agency staff, have not yet been adopted by the implementing agencies. Based on continued discussions among the CALFED agencies and BDPAC subcommittees, revised versions of the plans will be submitted to the Authority and BDPAC for final review and approval in June 2005.

Recommended Action: This is an information item.

Relationship to Near-term Priority Setting

This year, the CALFED Program is undergoing a review of near-term program priorities in light of the declining funds that will occur in the next two to three years. The Authority and the CALFED implementing agencies are meeting with stakeholders and legislative staff to discuss near-term priorities and available funding. The materials associated with this effort are under development and, therefore, could not be incorporated into the draft program plans before this mailing. The proposed near-term priorities and available funding will be discussed at the April meeting (see Finance Planning, Agenda Item 13-8). The relationship between the near-term priorities and the program plans will be fully described at the April meeting. However, to allow the Authority and BDPAC members an opportunity to review the draft plans before a final approval is sought at the June meeting, the draft plans have been included as an addendum to the April packet. The only draft plan not included at this time is the Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP) Plan. The ERP implementing agencies determined that additional work and review is needed on the ERP Plan before being submitted to BDPAC and the Authority. The BDPAC Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee did discuss an earlier version of the ERP Plan at its March 17, 2005 meeting.

Background on Program Plan Development

The California Bay-Delta Authority Act of 2003 requires the Authority to annually review and approve, and, as appropriate, authorizes it to recommend that implementing agencies modify, multi-year program plans and long-term expenditure plans. BDPAC considers the plans and the recommendations of its subcommittees and makes a recommendation to the Authority. The program planning process provides the forum to describe what has been and will be accomplished with available funding, identify issues or problems and propose steps for resolving the issues; identify activities that would require additional funding, and ensure cross-program integration and balance is occurring in the Program.

Each year the implementing agencies are required to prepare annual program plans. Included in these multi-year plans are annual program and expenditure plans describing how the implementing agencies are proposing to implement their respective program elements during the upcoming budget year.

Authority staff oversees and coordinates the preparation of the program plans. BDPAC subcommittees review and comment on the plans and make a formal recommendation to BDPAC. 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).

The program plans are being submitted to the Authority and BDPAC at this time for early review and comment. At its June meeting, the Authority will consider the recommendations of BDPAC, the implementing agencies and staff recommendations on the program plans.

Program accomplishments and priorities are presented in the Multi-Year Program Plans, which in turn provide information used in assessing CALFED 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 implementing the CALFED Program.

Consideration of Program Plan Review, Approval, and Modification Criteria

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 additional guidance on preparing the plans.

Integration of the Delta Improvements Package into the Program Plans

The Delta Improvements Package Implementation Plan was adopted by the Authority in August 2004. At the joint Authority and BDPAC in February 2005, the CALFED agencies committed to explicitly identifying the actions listed in the Delta Improvements Package in the Multi-Year Program Plans. The intent is to ensure that each action listed in the Delta Improvements Package is matched with a responsible agency and the activity is linked to a budget and updated timeline.

At each Authority meeting since August 2004, Authority staff has provided an update on the Delta Improvements Package schedules. In addition to updated schedules, in Attachment 4 Authority staff have also included a comparison of these “expected” dates with those anticipated in the CALFED Record of Decision (when available), and the Multi-Year Program Plan in which the specific project is discussed in more detail.

As discussed at the February joint Authority and BDPAC meeting, CALFED agencies acknowledged the relationship between the evaluation of Franks Tract and the investigations of the Delta Cross Channel operation and the Through-Delta Facility. These studies and associated Delta water quality, fisheries, and levees issues are central to the determinations that must be made by the State and Federal agencies at the end of Stage 1 as described in the CALFED Record of Decision. Therefore, the agencies will provide a briefing on these important issues, including Franks Tract, at the meeting during this agenda item.

Discussion of Key Issues

At the joint Authority and BDPAC in December, a number of issues were identified as priorities for 2005, including implementation of the Finance Plan, implementation of Delta Improvements Package, initiation of the Comprehensive Levee Assessment (now referred to as the “Delta Risk Management Strategy”), establishment of performance measures, support for water measurement legislation, completion of the Water Quality Strategic Plan, a work plan to implement the Mercury Strategy, and continued refinement of regional profiles.

Each of these priorities should be reflected in the appropriate program plan. Each program plan describes the process for establishing performance measures and updates the targets and priorities set in the finance plan. In addition, the Delta Risk Management Strategy is described in the Levee Program Plan; the water measurement legislation is described in the Water Use Efficiency Program Plan; the Water Quality Strategic Plan is described in the Water Quality Program Plan; the implementation work plan based on the Mercury Strategy is located in the Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan; and the regional profiles are described in the Oversight and Coordination Program Plan.

Fiscal Information

Each draft program plan contains a description of major activities and how each program element will fund the activities. Based on estimated available funding, each program prioritized activities within the program element. A cost estimate for science, environmental justice, and tribal relations has also been provided. As noted above, the draft plans will be revised as a result of ongoing near-term priority setting.

List of Attachments

Attachment 1 – Program Plan Public Review Process
Attachment 2 – Schedule for Program Plan Development and Approval
Attachment 3 – Criteria for Review, Approval, and Modification of Program Plans
Attachment 4 – Delta Improvements Package Revised Summary of Schedules (note
new format)

Contact

Rick Breitenbach
Deputy Director for Administration

Phone: (916) 445-0144

Program Plan 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.

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 to ensure program integration.

<u>Subcommittee</u>	<u>Program Plan (primary)</u>	<u>Program Plan (suggested)</u>
Levees	Levees	Conveyance
Drinking Water Quality	WQ	Conveyance, ERP
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 does not have a science-focused subcommittee. BDPAC and the Authority review the Science Program Plan.

Schedule for Program Plan Development and Approval, 2004-05

December 8 th – January 21 st	Revising and updating program plans
February – May	Subcommittees Review and Comment, Agencies review and revise based on comments
April 13 th & 14 th	Joint Authority/ BDPAC Meeting and Comment
April – May	Agencies revise to incorporate Authority, BDPAC, Subcommittee, agency, and public comments.
June 8 th & 9 th	Joint Authority /BDPAC Meeting – BDPAC makes recommendation and Authority Approve

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 IMPROVEMENTS PACKAGE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Summary of Schedules

Updated March 30, 2005

Water Supply Actions	Program Plan	ROD Target Date	Expected Date	Comments
SWP/CVP Integration Plan ➤ SWP/CVP OCAP and BO and early consultation on immediate actions ➤ Response Plans for use of Joint Point of Diversion ➤ Complete NEPA/CEQA analyses and public review of interim SWP/CVP operation actions ➤ Initiate formal consultation and request preliminary BO on interim actions ➤ Implement intermediate SWP/CVP actions	Conveyance		Fall 2004 (Completed) 8/04 (Completed) Spring 2005 Spring 2005 During 2005	
Delta Mendota Canal/California Aqueduct Intertie ➤ Complete envir. studies ➤ Obtain construction funding, initiate construction ➤ Complete construction, begin operations ➤ Obtain Federal study authorization for 900 cfs interite capacity	Conveyance	7/04 12/04	4/ 05 10/ 05 2006 10/06	Delay due to the delays in obtaining study funding.
San Luis Reservoir Point Improvement Project ➤ Complete Appraisal Study ➤ Complete Draft EIS/EIR ➤ Obtain authorization for construction	Storage	12/04	5/05 5/06 10/06	

<p>8500 cfs / Permanent Operable Barriers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Complete EIR/EIS ➤ Secure permits ➤ Obtain funding for Head of Old River Barrier ➤ Obtain funding for Middle River, Old River and Grantline Canal Barriers ➤ Transition implementation of 8500 cfs, complete dredging/diversion improvements ➤ Complete barrier construction, begin barrier operation, and full operation under 8,500 cfs 	<p>Conveyance</p>	<p>12/02</p> <p>7/03</p> <p>12/06</p> <p>12/07</p>	<p>12/05</p> <p>2/06</p> <p>2/06</p> <p>2/06</p> <p>2006-2007</p> <p>4/08</p>	<p>Delays due to the complexity of the project and incorporation of elements contained in the OCAP Biological Opinion.</p>
<p>Water Quality Actions</p>		<p>ROD Target Date</p>	<p>Expected Date</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>South Delta Improvements Project/Permanent Operable Barriers</p>	<p>Conveyance</p>			<p>See 8500cfs / Permanent Operable Schedule under Water Supply Actions</p>
<p>San Joaquin River Salinity Management Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Coordinated Drainage Strategy ➤ Salt Load Management and Reduction ➤ Recirculation ➤ Voluntary Water Exchanges and Transfers ➤ Real Time Monitoring ➤ Coordination of East Side Tributary Operations ➤ Introduction of Potential High Quality Wastewater Treatment Plant Flows ➤ Westside Groundwater Management 	<p>Water Quality</p>	<p>Begin Implementation of source control measures by 2003</p>		<p>Alternative TMDL approach must show progress by 2007 (under TMDL) Depending on funding, SJRIP currently 20% Implemented</p> <p>18 months to 2 Years for Federal Feasibility study Depends on funding</p> <p>WQP has funded in past. Currently no direct funding. Applicant did not apply for Prop 50. Little or no benefit according to studies</p> <p>Low priority</p> <p>Dependent on funding</p>

Vernalis Flow Objectives	Water Quality	9/02	12/05	Plan to meet standards by Dec 2005
<p>San Joaquin River Dissolved Oxygen</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ RWQCB Phased TMDL and Basin Plan Amendment ➤ Complete monitoring and modeling studies ➤ Design, construct and operate a demonstration aeration system ➤ Evaluate other control projects and mitigation strategies ➤ Complete Final TMDL/Basin Plan Amendment for long-term control 	Ecosystem Restoration		<p>1/05</p> <p>6/07</p> <p>Fall 2005-2008</p> <p>4/04-12/08</p> <p>2009</p>	
<p>Old River and Rock Slough Water Quality Improvement Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Complete construction of Veale and Byron tracts drainage improvements ➤ Complete construction of first phase Canal lining project 	Water Quality	<p>Before permanent Barriers</p>	<p>12/05</p> <p>12/06</p>	Construction of permanent operable barriers completed – 4/08
<p>Franks Tract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Develop program plan ➤ Complete feasibility and EIR/EIS Study ➤ Implement project 	Water Quality		Under reevaluation	DWR is currently reviewing activities and target dates and will present a briefing to the CBDA on 04/14/05
<p>Delta Cross Channel Program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Complete studies; make recommendations ➤ Implement reoperation recommendations 	Conveyance	12/03	Under reevaluation	DWR is currently reviewing activities and target dates and will present a briefing to the CBDA on 04/14/05
<p>Through Delta Facility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Complete water quality & fish studies, and prefeasibility study; make recommendations ➤ If supported, seek funding and initiate EIR/EIS ➤ Obtain funding and authority to construct 	Conveyance	<p>12/03</p> <p>12/07</p>	Under reevaluation	DWR is currently reviewing activities and target dates and will present a briefing to the CBDA on 04/14/05
<p>Relocation of M& I Intake</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Complete evaluation of water quality improvements 	Water Quality		Date to be determined	CCWD is proceeding with scoping and environmental documentation

Environmental Protection Actions		ROD Target Date	Expected Date	Comments
OCAP ESA Consultation ➤ OCAP Biological Opinions Issued	Conveyance		Fall 2004 (Completed)	
SDIP ESA Consultation ➤ SDIP Biological Opinion issued	Conveyance		8/05	
Update of CALFED ROD Programmatic Regulatory Commitments and Programmatic Biological Opinions ➤ Complete assessment of efficacy of the EWA and progress toward achieving the milestones ➤ Update Programmatic Regulatory Commitments ➤ Update Programmatic Biological Opinions	Ecosystem Restoration		8/04 (Completed) 9/04 (Completed) 9/04 (Completed)	
Environmental Water Account ➤ Decision on continuing short-term EWA ➤ Draft EIS/EIR on long-term EWA ➤ Final EIS/EIR on long-term EWA	Environmental Water Account		9/04 (Completed) 12/05 12/06	DWR, USBR, USFWS, NOAA Fisheries and CDFG completed Long-Term EWA EIS/EIR public scoping meetings in March 2005
Delta Regional Ecosystem Restoration Implementation Plan ➤ Complete development of peer review of species life history and ecosystem element conceptual models ➤ Evaluate Delta ERP Actions and approve priority setting process ➤ Complete final DRERIP	Ecosystem Restoration		12/05 5/06 12/06	
Delta Levees Actions		ROD Target Date	Expected Date	Comments
Delta Levees ➤ Implement the Levee System integrity Multi-Year Program Plan	Levee System Integrity		Years 5-8	

Science Actions		ROD Target Date	Expected Date	Comments
Independent Science Board	Science		Ongoing	
Environmental Water Account Independent Reviews <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ EWA Science Panel review 	Science		11/04 (Completed)	
Study on South Delta Hydrodynamics, Water Quality and Fish <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Conduct pilot investigations ➤ Conduct scientific study ➤ Complete report 	Conveyance		12/05 1/06 – 12/07 No later than 2008	This study is being managed by DWR under the Clifton Court Fish Screens/10,300 cfs project.
Science PSP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Proposal Solicitation Package to public 	Science		10/04 (Completed)	
Study on Delta Smelt and Fish Facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Evaluate existing CHTR process ➤ Make recommendations 	Conveyance		4/04 - 6/07 7/08	This study is being managed by DFG and DWR under the Tracy Fish Test Facility Project. CHTR refers to the collection, handling, transportation and release of fish which occurs at the SWP and CVP fish salvaging process in the south Delta.
South Delta Fish Facility Improvements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Maintain and improve existing fish facilities ➤ Conduct alternative facilities configurations and op studies ➤ Make recommendations on new fish facility alternatives 	Conveyance		Ongoing 7/05 – 6/06 7/06	This study is being managed by DWR under the Clifton Court Fish Screens/10,300 cfs project.
Performance Evaluation and Monitoring Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Final Conceptual Plan ➤ Final Implementation Plan for Comprehensive Monitoring 	Water Quality		1/06 7/06	