

# **Delta Long Term Management Strategy Interagency Working Group September 22, 2005**

## **Draft Meeting Summary**

The Interagency Working Group (IWG) of the Delta Long Term Management Strategy (Delta LTMS) met at the California Bay-Delta Authority in Sacramento at 1pm on Thursday, September 22. Purposes of the meeting were to:

- receive updates on the survey process
- review the draft Process Framework
- discuss “roll out” of Delta LTMS

Participants included:

Eric Nagy, USACE  
Sue McConnell, CVRWCQB  
Sergio Guillen, CALFED  
Brian Ross, USEPA (on phone)  
Charles Gardiner, CirclePoint (on phone)  
John Clerici, CirclePoint  
Sonja Wadman, CirclePoint

## ***Survey Update***

Sonja provided a handout of every person that has been interviewed and highlighted those yet to be interviewed—only DWR management and USFWS (Ryan Olah) remain. Ryan is scheduled for next Wednesday (9/28). A number of key stakeholders have been surveyed since the last IWG meeting (8/18), including Brian Ross, Tom Zuckerman, MBK Engineers, Port of Sacramento, DeltaKeeper, CA Fish and Game, CALFED staff, the Nature Conservancy, and State Water Contractors. Sonja commented that these interviews were very interesting, particularly in light of the recent hurricane/flooding in New Orleans. Stakeholders remained true to their cause. A few interviewees recommended contacting Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency. Sergio commented that Stein Buer would be the appropriate person to involve at SAFCA—he has been involved in Delta issues for a long time while working for various agencies. Eric agreed but recommended involving SAFCA peripherally as a stakeholder, not a key player. Brian stressed the importance of keeping a list of stakeholders to keep involved throughout the process where appropriate. Sonja told the IWG that CirclePoint is compiling a database of every individual and group mentioned in the interviews or through research. Sue stressed the importance of Bill Jennings’ input, even if he is no longer head of DeltaKeeper. Sonja agreed and noted that even though he handed off this assignment to the interim DeltaKeeper executive director (Kari Burr), Bill is now serving as spokesperson for the CA Sport Fishing Alliance, thus it is very likely he will be involved in this process. Sergio complimented CirclePoint on the number and breadth of stakeholders interviewed.

## *Draft Process Framework Review*

Charles informed the group that an initial version of the draft Process Framework was discussed between CirclePoint and Eric last Thursday, 9/15. Since then, a few revisions and additions have been made. Charles stressed that this is a work in progress. Eric encouraged the IWG to take a hard look at the document and recommend ways to accurately capture the importance of this issue. This is or will lead to a marketing advertisement for the LTMS, so it needs to be accessible and enticing.

Charles asked for comments on the introduction. Sue asked about the geographic scope of the LTMS study—the introduction refers to the Bay-Delta and she commented that the Bay is not part of the Central Valley Regional Board’s purvey. If the Bay is to be included, then the SF Regional Board needs to be involved. The group agreed that the SFRWQCB does not need to be involved in this process, thus it was recommended to remove “Bay” from “Bay-Delta” in the second and third paragraphs. Eric and Brian did not think a description of the geographic boundaries was needed since this document will be used to shop for money thus it should not be overly restrictive. It was suggested to add the number and types of endangered species in the Delta to the second paragraph.

The group recommended adding a water quality paragraph to those listed among the problems, challenges and opportunities. Sergio suggested adding the number of inhabitants protected to the levees paragraph. He commented that they are trying to determine that number at CALFED.

Eric said that the flooding disaster in New Orleans has resulted in congressional discussions of Delta projects including the LTMS. Questions are coming from all directions and are going to various spokespeople, many of whom have been consulting Eric. Eric commented that there is a need for unified talking points and that this is a great time to educate folks about the LTMS.

Brian commented that purpose statements go through many rounds of review at the executive level—don’t waste time word-smithing because it will be changed. He recommended adding the words “agencies will cooperate” or “work collaboratively” and strongly suggested replacing the word “spoils” with “dredged material” throughout the document. He recommended inserting “management of dredged materials” to the purpose, goals and objectives. The group discussed the use of the word streamline—it makes some people nervous because they equate that to “cutting corners.” In study goals, Brian recommended inserting “agencies will integrate authority, cooperate, and coordinate to help maintain Delta functions and manage dredged materials.” It was suggested to add a second bullet “maintain water quality and aquatic species.” Sergio said that aquatic ecosystem should be mentioned with terrestrial ecosystems. The group felt that the last goal could become a study objective. They agreed that for the purpose of this study, ecosystem restoration should take a back seat to water quality. The group briefly discussed the difference between goals and objectives. Charles said CirclePoint will think more about the objectives with input from the IWG.

The group discussed the study principles and felt that they are not appropriate at this time in the document. They take away from the meat of the issue and may be difficult for executives to agree to. They should be addressed later in different venues (Charter, agendas, attachments, etc).

The group discussed the structure, participants and roles of people in the LTMS. Charles commented that this was the most challenging questions for interviewees to answer. When told of the model that was used in the SF Bay LTMS, most stakeholders commented that the three-tiered structure sounds appropriate. Many interested parties (NGOs) expressed a desire to be involved in a more regular manner than just for document review. However, lack of staff and resources often preclude them from participating as frequently and as in depth as they would like. Charles felt that most of the work would happen in the management committee, which will be comprised of three interest groups (agency, dredging interests, and Delta resource interests). Brian commented that forcing people into interest categories might limit their participation. Charles explained that the management group would meet as one large group, it is not expected that the interest group would convene separately. The group pondered what the actual activities of the management group would be—project actions/studies or providing guidance on studies. Charles commented that he felt the management committee would focus on the overall study, such as providing direction on what technical studies (and related working groups) should be developed and which people to involve in those studies. The management committee would not be responsible for executing the individual tasks. Brian commented that the study activities should help focus the management committee.

Because of time constraints, it was agreed that the IWG would provide written comments to Sonja by September 29 to incorporate into a revised draft by October 6 (when the IWG will meet from 12-3). For background, Charles briefly reviewed the remainder of the document. He asked IWG members to provide more accurate descriptions of their regulatory roles and of related programs, if it is needed.

Brian asked if the study activities and phases of this Delta LTMS effort are to follow those dictated by the Corps when following their “LTMS” planning process. Eric responded that he wasn’t certain and will investigate if those phases will be imposed upon this effort since it is an “LTMS.” The group agreed that they should consider following the steps of the Corps’ LTMS just to be safe. It is likely that the phases required by the Corps are very similar to what the IWG/CirclePoint team would recommend. Brian recommended that Eric refer to what is written in the SF LTMS. He commented that even if it is not required, it might not be a bad idea to follow its generic structure or at least make reference to it. Eric told the group that he would take the lead on providing CirclePoint with information related the study phases. He will provide direction on other policies that might help the LTMS further along in the process, such as cost-sharing. Brian suggested referring to the recommendations of the National Dredging Team.

**Action Item:**

- **IWG members to provide written comments to Sonja by Thursday, September 29**

***Port of Stockton Meeting***

Sue informed the group that the Central Valley Regional Board had recently met with members of the Port of Stockton and their consultants. The Port expressed concern that the Delta LTMS was moving forward without involving them. Sue told them the LTMS was just getting started. While the LTMS process will involve the Port as much as possible, it is on a different time

schedule than that of the Port. The Port wants to proceed with studies they will need to for their immediate dredging and materials placement concerns. They are willing and anxious to assist the LTMS in moving forward and will fund studies or pilot projects, if needed. They are frustrated with time delays and are willing to throw resources at the project. Sue feels the LTMS process should take advantage of their offer and work collaboratively. She asked if the Engineering Research and Development Center (ERDC) contract for testing was being finalized. Eric commented that there were still disagreements about ERDC's scope of work and that it is not yet in place. He will be meeting with the Port next Tuesday and will discuss with them the opportunities for sharing resources. He added that he wants the LTMS to be pushed by stakeholders like the Port but not driven by them.

### ***Roll Out***

John briefly reviewed talking points and suggestions for rolling out the LTMS. CirclePoint recommends giving marketing presentations to management/executive level staff at DWR, the Corps, and others to shop for funding. Other presentations will focus on attracting participation. A list of CALFED subcommittee meeting dates (and DPC) was provided. The group agreed that the LTMS should strive towards being implemented (first meeting of the executive committee) by the beginning of the year 2006. A glossy brochure will need to be developed, but not before management has approved of the wording of the Process Framework document.

### ***Meeting Wrap Up***

The next meeting of the IWG is scheduled for October 6 from 12-3 at CALED.\*

Eric and CirclePoint will meet on Monday, September 26.

\*the meeting has been re-scheduled to Oct 5