

**Reclamation ROC Tiger Team Meeting on Adaptive Management Implementation Framework
NMFS Internal Notes
December 4, 2018**

Attendees

- Josh Israel, Mike Hendrick; Reclamation
- Matt Nobriga (ph); USFWS
- Ted Sommer, Gardner Jones (ph); DWR
- Carl Wilcox; DFW
- Evan Sawyer, Cathy Marcinkevage; NMFS
- Stephanie Theis; Stantec

Take Away Points:

- USFWS, NMFS, CDFW, and DWR (Agencies) are unanimous that document should be revised to be a supplement to the Five-Agency AMP developed for CWF.
- Reclamation desires more control over operations, but agencies feel that document currently writes other agencies out of decision-making.
- Agencies feel that identification and commitment to a process to determine structured decision-making approach is better alternative than trying to identify (and get agency approval of) all details of process in this short turn-around time.
- Agencies to provide feedback by Dec 7; likely will NOT see another draft before something is included in the PA.
- Closing comment that this AMIF is not the same as the programmatic section of the PA (initially, Section 4.11) further supports the confusion exhibited by USBR on its incorporation of AM into the project description.

Recap:

The ROC Adaptive Management Implementation Framework (AMIF) document had been distributed shortly before the previous meeting on November 30. Agencies agreed to review it for this Dec 4 meeting with eye towards 1) integration with the Five-Agency Adaptive Management Program (AMP) document developed as part of CWF BA and 2) review of “roles and responsibilities” for the different teams noting any overlap with CWF AMP or other program roles.

Follow-Up from Last Meeting:

Josh provided review of answer to why this was included in the PA.

- USBR would like clearer control of RTO, noted that timeliness of allocations, which is a USBR action, is hindered by agencies.
- Agencies do not consider all objectives of projects, and not even of other fish agencies, and complicate USBR decision-making with species needs pitted against each other.

- Noted “conflicting messages” that result from not taking a holistic approach to meeting the various agencies’ species needs and would like more control over that.

Agency Feedback:

CDFW, USFWS, NMFS, and DWR were consistent in the following items and made strong cases for them:

- As written, the AMIF risks “holding hostage” restoration projects unless water supply flexibility is provided.
- As written, the AMIF gives USBR full control over operations in a way that is not even within the ESA. If USBR wants that control, they must be willing to do so within the bounds of the ESA/CESA. It has written out the agencies.
- Suggest that the AMIF be revised to be a supplement or addendum to the Five-Agency AMP developed for CWF BA. Pointed out that all agencies are on board with that document and approach (and so were contractors at time of its creation); if USBR is trying to get to no-jeopardy PA in short timeframe, they should work with this approach.
- Agencies are willing to revisit the Five-Agency AMP, but USBR should not rush them to agree to details because this is too important of a process. Incorporation of SDM approach and use is okay, but at this point should commit to working out a process and securing funding to support SDM (and participation by agencies) by a specified date rather than identifying all processes, positions, means of interacting/absorbing existing groups, etc., in a rushed way. Noted issues with current DSP SDM process because USBR wants to move forward but agencies have not had resources to be involved to be sure that it is properly vetted and using the knowledge of qualified experts (rather than knowledge of those who are able to be in the room).

Reclamation Feedback:

Five-Agency AMP and IICG, etc., is too Delta centric and doesn’t consider full suite of CVPIA. Agencies adamantly disagreed, noting that formation of IICG has been put on hold by USBR because of issues that they have yet to disclose. IICG can be revised (e.g., broader CVP contractor representation) to address USBR needs.

USBR also expressed belief that proposed IICG activities are duplicated in CAMT and IEP directors. Agencies has some agreement, noting that some CAMT activities will better sit with IICG. Agencies described IICG role as “traffic control” to make sure that resources for identified efforts are in budgets and have contractor buy-in, pointing out that contractors are not involved in IEP, and that IICG was developed *at contractor request*.

Next Steps:

- USBR will share feedback with management. Expect a short follow-up call this week to relay USBR management thoughts on agency feedback.
- Evan will make a figure similar to Figure 1 of the AMIF but showing the groups of the Five-Agency AMP. This will allow comparison of different proposed groups.

- Comments on AMIF can be provided to Josh, preferably by Friday, December 7.
- NMFS needs to follow-up on a closing comment that this AMIF is not the same as the programmatic section of the PA (initially, Section 4.11). This comment further supports the confusion exhibited by USBR on its incorporation of AM into the project description.