

Overall work plan to support Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force in 2008:

A. Work areas (seven in three categories):

Follow up on near term actions recommended in vision:

1. Near Term Actions follow up (including work through Delta Vision Committee)

Work areas required for strategic plan:

2. Ecosystem function: The Delta as integral part of healthy estuary
3. Reliable water supply for California
4. Delta as a unique and valued place, warranting recognition and special legal status
5. Governance and strategic finance
6. Other (any additional work needed to satisfy Executive Order)

Additional work area included in vision:

7. Assessment of dual conveyance as preferred direction (complete by June 2008)

B. Task Force meetings (all meets include public comment and are web cast):

1. Meetings include sessions on seven work areas above, with time and effort allocated variable
2. Meeting sessions in at least three formats:
 - “Hearing” where representatives of agencies and others speak to topics selected by Task Force (perhaps similar to congressional hearing model)
 - Work area updates (by participants in work area, consultants, and/or staff)
 - Task Force discussion and direction to staff
3. Major agenda items by meeting month (always with direction to staff and usually questions to agencies and others):

January	Direct staff re work plan; direction re NTA
February	Approve work plan and initiate work in all areas; first report on performance measures in all areas; greatest emphasis on ecosystem; NTA follow up
March	Greatest emphasis on Delta as place; NTA follow up; discussion of integration of all work; update on conveyance assessment
April	Greatest emphasis on water for California; NTA follow up; discussion of integration of all work; update and review of conveyance assessment
May	Greatest emphasis on governance and strategic finance; review draft re conveyance assessment and make preliminary recommendations; discussion of integration of all work
June	Final recommendations re assessment of conveyance; review first draft of strategic plan
July	Review second draft of strategic plan
August	Review third draft of strategic plan
September	Preliminary recommendations re strategic plan
October	Final recommendations re strategic plan
November	Respond to any questions or direction from DV Committee
December	Unknown; continuity?

C. Achieve integration within strategic plan and effective linkage to other processes by:

1. Drive all work from vision (use goals, concepts, language, etc. from vision). If that is not clear, turn next to the Executive Order.
2. Bring relevant data and results from other processes into Delta Vision Strategic Plan effort and use time frames and other organizing devices that are in common use when possible.
3. Create a common structure of expectations for products in each work area:
 - goals (from vision)
 - performance measures by which to measure progress toward goals, including benchmarks for progress in time periods (e.g., over three, ten and twenty years)
 - assessment of system capacity (institutions, policies, physical systems) to achieve goals, given four common expected challenges of:
 - (i) Sea Level Rise of mid-point in range proposed by Delta Science Advisors (forty-seven inches??) by 2100 with XXX inches by 2020 and XXX inches by 2050 (these are midpoints in the first two 30 year time periods used by the CA climate change group),
 - (ii) loss of levees for nine islands in Delta to floods or seismic event by 2020 and 20 islands by 2060 (numbers and locations of islands lost expected to be adjusted to conform to other analyses),
 - (iii) reduction of water flowing into the legal Delta because of increased diversions in the larger watershed by the amount of XXX AF annually by 2020 and XXX AF annually by 2060 (request expected values from SWRCB and/or DWR), and
 - (iv) increased variability in total water availability and timing of that availability in the Delta watershed because of climate change effects, including reduction in snow pack and variation in timing and strength of storms (get numbers from DWR????).
 - propose changes in system capacity that will achieve goals, including estimated costs and time lines
 - test proposals against four challenges above and also spatially at the scale of the Delta, plus with reference to sub areas, the Delta watershed, and the State of California, as appropriate. New initiatives and solutions may come at any spatial scale.
 - Revise proposals as needed
4. Draft strategic plan by June, iterations through October include major focus on integration

D. Organize work through these structures (for discussion on Thursday and possible action on Friday):

1. Delta Science advisors and CALFED science program
2. Stakeholder Coordination Group (expect three or four full group meetings)

Charge for SCG provided, to be approved as part of work plan
3. Work groups with charges from Task Force (members from SCG, agencies, NGOs, others)

An illustrative example of charge to work group and composition is available.

Work groups could track the major areas of work:

- (i) Delta as place,
 - (ii) Ecosystem,
 - (iii) Water
 - (iv) Governance and strategic finance
4. Work shops (one or two day structured explorations of issues, with a report, as in CALFED science program)

Work shop topics will emerge over the next weeks, but one being discussed is: "Ways to achieve greater integration of federal and state water projects and advantages and disadvantages of alternative approaches."

5. Joint fact-finding (as was done for Figure 7b in the vision)

Possible areas for joint fact finding include:

- (i) Identification of specific ecosystem functions, dimensions of water quality, and human uses and facilities most likely to be impacted negatively or positively by changes in the factors listed under C.3
 - (ii) Further exploration of diversions seen in Figure 7b, with attention to (a) better agreement on information provided (e.g., apparent difference re in-Delta water uses), and (b) addressing uncertainties (e.g., on likely increased diversions in Delta watershed)
 - (iii) Technical features of water system design (capture, storage – ground and surface – and conveyance, plus operations and uses) to achieve either (a) "xx" levels of water supply reliability given factors under C.3 or (b) to handle greater variability in water supply
 - (iv) Implementation processes to change water use patterns under California law (follow up to OAG analysis and see also current MWD efforts as one example)
6. Focused "invention" to make selected concepts and strategies available for effective use in the strategic plan (e.g., reasonable use and public trust principles, Coastal Zone Management Act and other examples of federal-state relationships, incentives to move private behaviors to support vision). These efforts are expected to include expertise from universities, think-tanks, stakeholders, non profits, and others, as appropriate.
 7. Possible external submission of proposals responsive to criteria approved by the Task Force

E. Other areas of work:

1. Media and outreach (especially using Task Force members effectively; no new personnel or contracts are planned)
2. Policy processes (responding to requests to participate in legislative hearings and other policy processes)

F. Working relationships and human resources

“Formal” relationships with (these are collaborators, who commit resources + active participation):

1. BCDC (pending)
2. BDCP
3. CALFED
4. DFG
5. DPC
6. DWR
7. SWRCB
8. USBR

Less formal relationships with:

1. ABAG
2. CALTRANS
3. Food and Ag
4. NGOs
5. State lands
6. US Corps of Engineers

Human resources:

1. Project manager
2. Researcher for short term projects and other assignments as needed
3. DV team members linked to work areas and structures
4. “Champions” of each work area (a consultant such as Stuart Siegel or Greg Young)
5. Consultants for key work

ACTION items (for Friday):

1. Preliminary approval of work plan with whatever direction given for modification, to be finalized at the February 28-29 Task Force meeting, after review and comment from SCG and public.
 2. Guidance on form of recommendation on conveyance expected, with possibilities including at least:
 - (i) Judgment that dual conveyance is preferred direction is affirmed (or rejected)
 - (ii) Further direction regarding specifics of conveyance (e.g., alignment to East or West is preferred, sizing alternatives)
 - (iii) Identification of specific issues of concern to address during subsequent processes (CEQA, NEPA, or ??) (e.g., alignment, sizing alternatives, governance, impacts on sub areas of Delta, addressing infrastructure issues....)
-