

Meeting Notes

Reinitiation of Consultation (ROC) on the Coordinated Long-term Operation (LTO) of the Central Valley Project (CVP) and State Water Project (SWP): Agency Core Team Meeting

Tuesday, July 18, 2017, 2:00pm – 3:30pm

650 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, CA

Attendees

Katrina Harrison, Luke Davis, Ben Nelson, Justin Ly, Kim Squires, Gail Kuenster, Garwin Yip, Heidi Rooks, Harry Spangler, Mike Ford, Chris Wilkinson, Katherine Sun, Jana Affonso, Janice Pinero

Meeting Purpose

To discuss the recent Clear Creek Technical Workgroup meeting and potential next steps, and Oroville operations and its inclusion in the Reinitiation of Consultation.

Short Agenda Items

- Hatchery operations will be discussed at next meeting.
- How will PMP comments be addressed as the PMP goes through NMFS review? Answer: Anything that need discussion will be mentioned in the Agency Core Team meetings (these meetings).

Clear Creek Technical Workgroup Debrief

- The Clear Creek Technical Workgroup met on July 6-7.
 - o A follow-up conference call will occur sometime in the near future.
- Most group members were hesitant to utilize the FAST process and wanted to focus on listing actions immediately.
 - o Showcasing the successes of the Clear Creek Technical Workgroup may help avoid this resistance at future technical workgroups.
- Comment: The objectives of the technical workgroup in the development of actions are different than the objectives of the stakeholders. End result may be that no one is happy with Reclamation's proposed action/NEPA alternatives.
- Comment: Any limitations Reclamation may have in the development of the proposed action should be mentioned at the beginning of the technical workgroup meetings.
 - o This may be difficult to do as Reclamation may not have set limitations at this time.
- General improvements on the technical workgroup meeting process.
 - o The facilitator role should be embraced and not downplayed.
 - Question: Will Ben and Katrina continue being the facilitators for future technical workgroup meetings? Answer: Yes, will likely do so for the remaining meetings.
 - o Having members with different career backgrounds, promotes diverse comments
 - The engineer on the Clear Creek Technical Workgroup meeting provided a unique perspective amongst the majority of fish biologists.

- Attendance of a DWR operator would be useful for future technical workgroup meetings
- Providing more complete background information to the members prior to the start of the technical workgroup meetings will enhance the process. Also informing members to start thinking of ideas prior to the meeting.
 - Only some background information was provided to the Clear Creek Technical Workgroup.
- Question: Is it reasonable to consider all ideas during the brainstorming process? (e.g. limiting ocean harvest of salmonids). Answer: Yes, ideas considered can be utilized during the NEPA process as alternatives even if Reclamation has limited jurisdiction.

American River Technical Workgroup

- Question: Which technical workgroup meeting should occur next? Answer: The American River, as it is likely the next least hard one to work on.
 - The date for this meeting has yet to be determined.
 - Question: Does DWR have any stake in the American River? Do they need to attend? Answer: Would likely be useful to have a DWR operator there at least.

Integration team

- An integration team would assess the large-scale picture of what the technical workgroups discuss.
 - Agencies should provide names of those who will attend.
 - Question: Should the integration team occur after all of the technical workgroups meet? Answer: The integration team can start meeting now to get a head start working through all of the ideas, but will also meet at the end after all of the technical workgroups meet.

Clear Creek/Trinity/Sacramento Stakeholder Workgroups

- Should there be one stakeholder group for Clear Creek, Trinity, and Sacramento? Or broken up into separate groups?
 - Would be ideal to conduct the stakeholder groups in as few meetings as possible.
 - There should be one Clear Creek/Trinity/Sacramento stakeholder workgroup and separate ones for the agency workgroups.
 - Question: What is the regional boundary for these workgroups? Are the sources of water (watersheds) considered?
 - The Sacramento workgroup should cover areas down to the Delta, while the Trinity should cover areas down to the lower Klamath.

Oroville Operations

- Oroville should be included in the ROC on LTO because:
 - Unless Reclamation designated FERC as the lead Federal action agency for the section 7 consultation, Reclamation has an independent responsibility to comply with ESA section 7(a)(2) on behalf of DWR (through the COA). Oroville operations were described in the

2008 BA. In the 2009 BiOp, NMFS deferred the operations of Oroville to the FERC consultation.

- The FERC action area does not include the entire Feather River, does not include SWP water contractors, and does not consider effects of Oroville operations in the Sacramento River and through the Delta.
 - The agencies are in agreement about this second point, and expecting the ROC on LTO to cover SWP operations outside of the FERC area.

Action Items

- Agencies to identify participants for the American River Technical Workgroup
- Agencies to identify participants for the Integration Team
- DWR and NMFS to discuss the first Oroville point with legal
- Katrina to follow up with Carl Wilcox about CDFW representatives for the American River technical workgroup
- Katrina to fix the inconsistency in the PMP schedule regarding sufficiency review (done)