



650 Capitol Mall, 5th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
916.445.5511 FAX 916.445.7297
<http://calwater.ca.gov>

Agenda Item: 10B
Meeting Date: December 14, 2006

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA AUTHORITY

CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING 2006 PROGRAM PLANS

Description: The Chairs of the Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) Subcommittees will present their assessment of their respective Program Plans and request BDPAC concur with their findings. The California Bay-Delta Authority (Authority) will then have an opportunity to discuss and take action on the Program Plans.

Recommended Action: The California Bay-Delta Authority adopt the attached Resolution 06-12-03 approving the 2006 CALFED Program Plans.

Background

The California Bay-Delta Authority Act of 2003 requires the Authority to annually review, potentially modify and approve Program Plans and long-term expenditure plans. The program planning process provides a forum to describe what has been accomplished, strategically plan for future implementation actions, identify problems and propose steps for resolving issues, identify available funding and additional funding needs, and ensure cross-program integration and balance.

The CALFED implementing agencies have shared their Program Plans with other agencies and their respective BDPAC Subcommittees. At the December meeting, the Chairs of the Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) Subcommittees will present their assessment of their respective Program Plans and request BDPAC concur with their findings and transmit those recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior. Following BDPAC's action, the Authority will be asked to approve the Program Plans and adopt the attached Resolution 06-12-03. The draft Program Plans have been electronically provided to the Authority.

As discussed in the past, with the approach of the End of Stage 1, the Authority will need to make a number of key decisions. With two exceptions, the activities that must be completed in order to make those decisions are included in the Year 7 Program Plans. The two exceptions relate to the process identified in the CALFED Preferred Program Alternative for determining the conditions under which any additional conveyance facilities and/or water management actions would be taken in the future. The process includes:

1. An evaluation of how water suppliers can best provide a level of public health protection equivalent to Delta source water quality of 50 parts per billion (ppb) bromide and 3 parts per million (ppm) total organic carbon (TOC). This will include an equivalent level of investigation and studies on all of the actions which could be used to achieve CALFED's targets; and
2. An evaluation based on two independent expert panels' reports: one on CALFED's progress toward these measurable water quality goals; and the other on CALFED's progress toward ecosystem restoration objectives, with particular emphasis on fisheries recovery.

Attachments

Attachment 1 – List of tentative BDPAC subcommittee presenters

Attachment 2 – Criteria for review, approval, and modification of program plans and expenditure plans

Resolution 06-12-03

Contact

Rick Breitenbach
Resources Agency

Phone: (916) 445-0144

Tentative Program Plan Presenters
12/14/06

Program Plan	Presenter(s)
Storage	Steve Hall/Jerry Meral
EWA	Steve Hall/Jerry Meral
Conveyance	Steve Hall/Jerry Meral
WUE	Frances Spivey Weber/David Guy
Levees	Marci Coglianesse/Tom Zuckerman
ERP	Gary Bobker
Watershed	Martha Davis/Robert Meacher
Water Quality	Greg Gartrell

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?



650 Capitol Mall, 5th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
916.445.5511 FAX 916.445.7297
<http://calwater.ca.gov>

Agenda Item: 10B
Meeting Date: December 14, 2006

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA AUTHORITY

RESOLUTION 06-12-03

APPROVING PROGRAM PLANS

WHEREAS, Section 79423 of the California Water Code requires the implementing agencies to annually submit to the Director of the California Bay-Delta Authority their annual Program Plans;

WHEREAS, Section 79423 (i) of the California Water Code requires the Authority to review and approve, and, as appropriate, authorizes it to recommend that implementing agencies modify, program plans and long-term expenditure plans;

WHEREAS, the plans prepared by the Authority and the implementing agencies include annual Program Plans and expenditure plans; and

WHEREAS, the Program Plans submitted to the Authority are consistent with the mandate of the California Bay-Delta Act of 2003.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Authority approve the Program Plans presented for activities in Year 7.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned Assistant to the California Bay-Delta Authority does hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution duly and regularly adopted at a meeting of the Authority held on December 14, 2006.

Dated: _____

Julia E. Alvis
Assistant to the California Bay-Delta Authority