SAN JOAQUIN RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM

RESTORATION ADMINISTRATOR

2013 ANNUAL REPORT

1 Introduction & Context

This Annual Report is prepared in accordance with the Stipulation of Settlement filed September 13, 2006 in the case of NRDC, et al., v. Kirk Rodgers, et al. Pursuant to the Stipulation of Settlement (Settlement), the annual report shall include a summary of settlement implementation activities of the previous year, findings of research and data collection, any additional recommended measures to achieve the Restoration Goal, a summary of progress and impediments in meeting targets established pursuant to Paragraph 11, and a summary of expenditures from the Restoration Administrator (RA) Account.

2 Findings of Research and Data Collection

In the past few years, the San Joaquin River Restoration Program (SJRRP or Program) Implementing Agencies typically undertake 40 to 60 technical studies per year, with many of those studies being multi-year, multi-disciplinary or multi-agency efforts. The SJRRP compiles Mid-Year and Annual Technical Reports to document and present the results of technical studies; the reports are posted to the SJRRP web site (at http://restoresjr.net/flows/index.html). Additionally, the 2014 Monitoring and Analysis Plan (2014 MAP) included for the first time a section that compiled a 'Conceptual Population Model' for the San Joaquin River, plus more detailed analysis by themes (Rearing habitat, Spawning and Incubation, etc.) of the current State of Knowledge. This MAP summary is posted at (http://restoresjr.net/flows/MAP/2014_MAP/2013.1104_MAP.pdf). As these MAP sections are further enhanced, expanded and integrated in future years, they should provide a solid summary of both current and future target aquatic conditions for the Restoration Goal.

3 Assessment of SJRRP Progress During 2013

3.1 Specific Milestones and Accomplishments during 2013

Based on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 Work Plan, funding for 'Program Support Activities' (including programmatic documents such as the EIS/R, programmatic public outreach, Reclamation data management and Reclamation support funding to various Implementing Agencies) will total over $13M in FY 2014, and was likely at similar levels for FY 2013. This would suggest on the order of 65+ Full Time

Equivalent (FTE) employees of Implementing Agencies or consultants working on Program Support activities, with numerous additional staff on a per-project basis. It is likely that 200 to 300 professionals and support staff are directly engaged in project work activities at any given time. The Program is moving forward on a wide array of projects and activities concurrently. The SJRRP web site (http://www.restoresjr.net/) provides a snapshot of the work in progress and products of the Program. Some of the key Program milestones and accomplishments include:

- The 2013 Interim Flow Allocation and Interim Flow Schedule Recommendation submitted by the Restoration Administrator (RA) was approved by the SJRRP Program Manager, covering flow releases from Friant Dam the period from March 1, 2013 through February 28, 2014.
- 2013 spring Interim Flow releases commenced on February 1 as required by the Settlement and continued until the end of May, as provided for by the Settlement.
- Updated RA 2013 Flow Schedule and Real Time Management Recommendations to the Program Manager on February 1, April 12 and 30, May 10, 17 and 28, were reviewed and implemented by the SJRRP.
- The Fall 2013 Flow Allocation Recommendation submitted by the RA was approved by the SJRRP Program Manager, covering flow releases from Friant Dam the period from October 29, 2013 through November 7, 2013.
- A new RA was recruited and engaged to replace the outgoing (retiring) RA in August of 2013.
- A final version of the Restoration Flow Guidelines (RFG's) was completed and issued by Reclamation on December 30, 2013, in accordance with Paragraph 13(j) of the Settlement. It is anticipated that the revisions protocols included in the RFG's will be utilized to further refine the RFG's once the RFG's have been utilized in real-world allocation situations.
- The Program made continued progress towards reintroduction of Chinook salmon, with trap-and-haul of fall run and continued implementation of a conservation hatchery program.
- An initial Channel Capacity Report was published by the Channel Capacity Advisory Group (CCAG) to determine and update estimates of then-existing channel capacities in the Restoration Area, and to maintain Restoration Flows below levels that would increase flood risk.
- Completion of the process at the State Water Resources Control Board to permanently change the permit for Reclamation's water rights for the San Joaquin River to be able to implement Restoration Flows.
- Completion of a five-year Environmental Assessment (EA) to allow the recirculation of Restoration Flows.
- Completion of the Final EA and FONSI for the Arroyo Canal Fish Screen and Sack Dam Fish Passage Project.

- Completion of the Fiscal Year 2014 Annual Work Plan

3.2 Progress toward Achieving Paragraph 11 Requirements During 2013

Paragraph 11 of the Settlement identifies required channel and structural improvements that must be developed and implemented to fulfill the Settlement. Sub-paragraph 11(a) identifies the highest priority (Phase 1) improvements, and sub-paragraph 11(b) identifies Phase 2 improvements, which are also high priority improvements, but whose implementation is not to delay completion of Phase 1 improvements. It was anticipated that the Paragraph 11(a) improvements could be developed and implemented in accordance with the milestone dates included in Exhibit C of the Settlement.

Paragraph 11(a) identifies ten separate projects/actions (in subsections 11(a) (1) through 11(a)(10)) that were to be completed by December 31, 2013, subject to Paragraphs 21(c), 24 36, and other provisions of the Settlement. By December 31, 2013, none of the ten projects/actions set forth in Paragraph 11(a) were completed.

Many planning, permitting, design and stakeholder outreach tasks required for implementation of the Paragraph 11(a) projects have been completed, as documented herein, in previous Annual Reports, and on the SJRRP web site. At this juncture, however, there is no accurate schedule as to when the remaining implementation of the Paragraph 11(a) projects will be completed.

3.3 Progress toward Achieving Paragraph 13 Requirements During 2013

Paragraph 13 and Exhibit B of the Settlement outline Restoration Flow requirements, and Restoration Flows are to commence on January 1, 2014. In general, release of Interim Flows (as required under Paragraph 15 of the Settlement) has been successfully achieved and has provided a basis for development of process and procedures necessary for the release of Restoration Flows. Although it is anticipated that it may take several seasons of releases to fully refine operations and operational response (for example, refinement of releases to resolve seepage losses and additional refinement of the RFG's), the Program is well positioned to undertake the release of Restoration Flows.

3.4 Progress toward Achieving Paragraph 14 Requirements During 2013

Settlement Paragraph 14 and the enabling legislation require completion of several actions by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service relating to reintroduction of fall-run and spring-run Chinook salmon.

The Program has completed several tasks and activities that are necessary to effect a long-term reintroduction (including genetics management planning and progress towards a conservation hatchery). However, the success of the long-term reintroduction hinges to a large degree on the successful completion of the physical channel modifications pursuant to Paragraph 11 of the Settlement

(as described above). As originally envisioned in the Settlement, initial runs of spring- and fall-run Chinook would be established while Interim and Restoration Flow releases increased as improvements to channel and other infrastructure were completed; the Restoration Goal is based on the premise of achieving volitional fish movement in a flowing river. However, since the Paragraph 11 modifications are well behind schedule, there is a need to undertake bridge measures to continue the process of reintroduction, build fish stocks and to continue to glean valuable monitoring data to further adaptive management actions. As a specific example, it may be necessary to implement a temporary (a few years) trap-and-haul program to move adult and juvenile salmonids up and down the river until sufficient river connectivity is established to allow consistent volitional movement. The details of what a temporary program might entail are currently under development.

On December 31, 2013, NMFS completed and published in the Federal Register designation of Central Valley spring-run Chinook in the San Joaquin River as a nonessential experimental population under section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Additionally, NMFS also established take provisions under section 4(d) of the ESA for the San Joaquin experimental population. Pending a concurrence opinion from California Department of Fish and Wildlife (expected by April 1, 2014), programmatic permitting to allow reintroduction will be complete.

3.5 Overall Program Challenges

The Restoration and Water Management Goals as laid out in the Settlement represent one of the most ambitious comprehensive restoration projects in California history, the success of which will be best judged some decades in the future. This Program has encountered various challenges in implementation, most of which have been documented through time in previous RA Annual Reports and are summarized briefly here:

Schedule

The Settlement included very aggressive timelines for implementation, and *"are based on an implementation schedule that was developed during the Settlement process assuming that ideal conditions throughout all stages of implementation in terms of available funding and cooperation from other Federal, state, and local agencies and from landowners and the general public are met."* (PMP, 2007). In actuality, the Program has not faced ideal conditions in several areas, and the expedited timelines have not been met. At this juncture, virtually none of the original major schedule milestones have been met; going forward, many of the major milestones may take two to three times as long to accomplish, under nominal or even best-case scenarios, than was originally specified in the Settlement. Some of the schedule impediments have been outside of the anticipation or control of the Program; many of the schedule impediments could have been anticipated and addressed. However, at this juncture it will be important to identify a realistic schedule, based on current conditions and potential future conditions that can be reasonably anticipated. With such a schedule established and with a focused and comprehensive effort to implement it, the Program can eventually be successful in realization of the Restoration and Water Management goals.

Scope and Vision

The overall size and complexity of Program, coupled with an operating structure that is spread over five Implementing Agencies presents substantial challenges to efficient implementation. Each of the Implementing Agencies brings its own history, regulatory responsibilities, policies and procedures, project management style and approach, and administrative procedures and protocols. Because of the scope and magnitude of the Program, it would be unreasonable to expect consistency of vision, creativity and support for the Program, either among Implementing Agency staff, Settling Parties or other third parties that will be impacted by the Program. Further, several non-settling and Third Parties have distinctly different interpretations of the Settlement.

The Fiscal Year 2014 Annual Work Plan includes a cost estimate of over $272 million over the course of fiscal years 2014 through 2016, with approximately 2/3 of the expenditures designated towards actual land or easement acquisition or construction activities and 1/3 to program support including administration, outreach and overhead. Although actual funding levels for the Program are uncertain and will likely not rise to the level of the cost estimates included in the 2014 Annual Work Plan, there are still tremendous levels of resources being dedicated to the Program. Effectively managing these resources across multiple Implementing Agencies, with what is essentially a voluntary management and accountability structure among some of the Implementing Agencies, has been and will remain a challenge.

Design Challenges

The Program has encountered numerous real-world design challenges during implementation. The Settlement recognized and acknowledged the most salient of these realities; however the on-the-ground extent of some of these challenges has far exceeded what was specifically addressed in the Settlement. Physical conditions and constraints that were not anticipated during the development of the Settlement continue to plague project implementation.

- Channel capacity limitations for existing flow pathways, levees and channels were not anticipated to be a major impediment to the release of Restoration Flows. However, geotechnical analysis has shown that there are potential concerns regarding the level to which Restoration Flows can be released without causing levee stability impacts. Although considerable progress has been made in evaluating the extent of limitations (see Draft Channel Capacity Report, 2014 Restoration Year at http://restoresjr.net/program_library/02-Program_Docs/20130927_ChannelCapacityReportPublicDraft.pdf), the near-term and long-term projects necessary to allow full Restoration flows will be costly and challenging to implement.
- The San Joaquin River in the Restoration Area is generally very porous, with considerable seepage occurring. The potential for seepage impacts from Restoration releases seems to be greater than envisioned in the Settlement, and to varying degrees limits flows the Program can release in Reaches 2, 3, and 4. Although full extent of potential seepage impacts is

unknown, the Program is exhibiting caution in taking proactive steps and working with landowners to avoid Project-related seepage impacts. Seepage protection in Reaches 2 through 4 is being addressed with the purchase of seepage easements or the construction of seepage relief projects. The extent of seepage concerns was not foreseen in the Settlement, and seepage improvements will have consequences for the overall project schedule and budget.

- The Settlement envisioned the possible use of the Eastside and Mariposa Bypasses as pathways for Restoration Flows and fish. These bypasses are part of the State's flood control system, but are located on private property. The State owns flood easements for the bypasses. Since the Restoration Flows are not flood flows, flowage easements to allow Restoration Flows to be conveyed through the bypasses are being acquired by the Program. In addition, seepage protection for the land adjacent to these bypasses is also being addressed with the purchase of seepage easements or the construction of seepage relief projects.
- Subsidence is a tremendous concern both within and outside of the SJRRP project area. Reports by USGS (http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2013/5142/pdf/sir2013-5142.pdf) and DWR (http://restoresjr.net/program_library/02-Program_Docs/CCAG_Report_Appendix_F_-_2013_Accessible.pdf) underscore the severity and potential impacts of the phenomenon. Although the subsidence issues are not a result of the SJRRP subsidence vastly complicates the design and planning for necessary SJRRP projects.

In particular, the challenges of ongoing subsidence and a weak channel confinement (flood control) system are not just challenges to the Program, but are regional issues that would need to be addressed regardless of the SJRRP. Resolution of these regional issues will require DWR and the Bureau of Reclamation to exhibit strong leadership and commitment to work with entities outside of the umbrella of the Program.

In addition to the design issues posed by seepage, subsidence and levee stability realities, local landowners and stakeholders will have a large influence on ultimate design outcomes. The Program dedicates a considerable effort to stakeholder outreach, engagement, and involvement. Regardless, the Program represents a quantum shift in land use priorities going back 60 or 70 years, and in some areas and among some impacted stakeholders support is slow to manifest. The Program walks a fine line of engagement, balancing the need for rapid progress with seeking buy-in from the landowners and stakeholders who will live with the outcomes of the Program far into the future. This continued and evolving stakeholder engagement represents a challenge to project designers, who need to accommodate Program needs along with stakeholder-friendly aspects.

Funding Challenges

It is probable that funding will become a substantial constraint Project implementation. To date, it is not apparent that funding limitations have substantially constrained the planning and design tasks undertaken to date. However, several of the construction elements that are likely to be undertaken in

the next few years have substantial price tags, and funding levels could impact the timing and sequence of those projects.

Decision Process Challenges

Several factors contribute to a challenging and thus usually slow decision process with and around the Program. The Settlement and San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement Act (Act), which was enacted in 2009 and provides authority for Program implementation, are not always unambiguous, and opportunities for differences of opinion on interpretation can take time to work through. The Program is high-profile; as a result there is interest from, and scrutiny by, elected officials, news media, and stakeholder groups – which in turn leads to a careful, thorough and deliberative decision process by Implementing Agencies and Settling Parties even on relatively minor issues. Additionally, decisions between and among the Implementing Agencies can be protracted due to the different perspectives of the Agencies. Finally, constituents within the non-federal Settling Parties may not be totally unified, which may also result in a more lengthy decision process.

Time Challenges

Finally, while not a specific impediment to implementation progress, I believe that time is not on the side of the Program. The Settlement and Program have strong supporters but also vocal and influential opponents. An ongoing perception of a lack of demonstrable, tangible, physical success (in my opinion, measured by the completion of construction projects, year round flows in the River, a reintroduction of salmon that does not rely on human transportation, and the opportunity for various aquatic species to make use of those flows) diminish the chances for success of the overall Program. At this juncture, I believe that time is the utmost imperative for the Program, and that rapid completion of key components of the Program far outweigh any benefits of additional delay in the name of precision or perfection. I believe that it is vital for the success of the Program to re-instill a sense of absolute urgency for progress across all Implementing Agencies and Settling Parties. This will also require a willingness and ability to compromise on key issues, be flexible in implementation decisions, and filter decisions through a lens of need for rapid progress.

Although my tenure as RA is brief, I suspect a number of causes and effects. Staff embroiled in working on various components of the larger Program may not have appreciation of, or even be aware of, critical path timelines. The Program at this juncture has missed many deadlines, and eventually a casual approach to schedules could become the norm. Implementing Agencies carefully work through their standard processes and protocols, not necessarily adopting a fast-track, creative and urgent approach to resolving issues. Settling Parties wrangle small details, sometimes repeatedly. Key resources are stretched, since there are no clear priorities – everything has a similar priority.

Most everyone I have encountered in and associated with the Program are capable individuals with the success of the Program firmly in mind. However, I believe refinement and focus on key project elements will be necessary for Program success.

4 Recommendations (for Addressing Impediments)

1. Need a Framework for consistent vision. The Program needs to develop a Framework for Implementation (Framework) that continues to be consistent with the Settlement and Act but includes an implementable schedule based on reasonable funding assumptions, includes an incisive focus on priority projects (or project complements), and reflects the degree of urgency to complete specific elements of the overall Program. A Framework can help not only to instill a necessary sense of urgency, but also to focus Program efforts to a more narrow scope (in recognition of anticipated funding constraints), as well as to provide a platform for a more consistent shared vision amongst Implementing Agencies and Settling Parties. To the extent possible, this Framework should be crafted in a manner that the non-Federal Settling Parties can support.

2. Specific Scheduling Assignment within Implementing Agencies. As described above, the sheer scope of the Program and distribution of responsibilities across multiple Implementing Agencies presents unique challenges in efficient implementation. Hopefully, an updated Framework (and realistic comprehensive master schedule) will be the foundation for a more efficient and focused implementation effort. It is recommended that each of the Implementing Agencies take possession of maintenance of that portion of the master schedule over which they have control, and that the comprehensive master schedule be updated no less frequently than quarterly. Hopefully, this regular focus on schedule will help to maintain focus on critical path tasks by all of the Implementing Agencies.

3. Strategic plan to address levee stability issues. Levee stability along the San Joaquin River and associated bypasses is a regional flood management issue and a potential challenge to the Program, as there are concerns that the current levee systems is marginally sufficient for potential flood flows (Draft San Joaquin Regional Flood Management Plan Flood Hazard Assessment, 2013) . While Restoration Flows will be less than the maximum flood channel capacity, there are concerns about the impact that longer duration flows might have on the system. Improvements to the levee system may be necessary to accommodate Restoration Flows; however, such improvements will also have benefits for flood protection. A comprehensive strategic and tactical plan is needed to apportion benefits (and ultimately cost responsibility) among Program and flood protection interests. One approach to effect this necessary planning effort would be to expand the mandate of the Channel Capacity Working Group (CCWG) to include not just an assessment of channel capacity, but also to develop a strategic plan. In parallel, the Upper San Joaquin Regional Flood Management planning process is another venue for strategic planning, and any Program-developed plan would ideally be reflected in the SJRFMP. The Program should seek to convene, and develop a work plan for, an appropriate strategic planning group in the first half of 2014.

4. Strategic plan to address subsidence issues. Subsidence is a regional issue that impacts both Program projects and many other state and local interests. In some areas within or near the

Program area, subsidence has occurred for decades, and in some areas still continues at a rapid rate. Numerous stakeholders, water interests and local water authorities are working to understand and limit subsidence; however the pace of those efforts may not be sufficient to allow continued Program implementation, and the success of those efforts may not be known for some years into the future. As a result, the Program needs to develop a strategic plan that will allow implementation of Program projects within a reasonable time frame, but will also protect those Program investments into the future. For example, in the near term the Program could design and construct facilities that can accommodate current subsidence rates for 20 years. After ten years, if subsidence rates are not in decline or under control, the Program (likely via one of the Implementing Agencies or some other third-party) would need to increase efforts to work with districts and landowners to take more formative steps to protect the assets of the Restoration Program.

5. Flexible project design. The Settlement is crafted in precise legal terms, which can be a challenge when applied to an imprecise science such as restoration biology. In many aspects of Program design, much effort has been expended to carefully craft and design Project elements almost to the point of final design parameters, reflecting *current* scientific knowledge. A more logical approach would be stepwise, with basic designs that do not preclude flexibility to adjust habitat conditions as the future observations might dictate, and do not attempt to lock in final outcomes. In reality, the Restoration Program will be a many decades long *experiment in adaptive management*. Scientific knowledge will advance, some current theories will be disproven and new understanding will emerge – particularly with the benefit of a few years of operations and observation of system response to restoration actions. Design at this juncture can be beneficially limited to developing initial stages of projects that can be repurposed or utilized differently to respond to future biological observations.

6. Adapt to current conditions in order to implement the Settlement. The challenges to the Program overall (as described previously) translate into challenges to implementation. To adaptively manage the implementation process, three things need to occur:

    a. All of the Settling Parties and Implementing Agencies need to embrace the time imperative, cost containment and priority focus objectives that should be forthcoming in the Framework;
    b. Settling Parties need to embrace a more robust collaborative partnership, improve relations and trust, be able to resolve effectively and efficiently major issues and relinquish discussions over minutia. Likely this will require a more empowered, decision-capable individual or group to represent each Party and Implementing Agency; and finally,
    c. Implementing Agencies need to filter their activities and prescriptions through a lens of urgency and cost containment, and be prepared to find creative work-around strategies, or even policy exceptions, in the interest of rapid and efficient forward progress. Likely, this will require additional commitment from each Implementing Agency to empower senior policy and legal staff for rapid assessment

and resolution of issues wherein policy or procedures conflict with schedule and budget imperatives.

5 Priority Tasks for 2014

The following are the primary tasks for the RA, supported by the TAC, for 2014.

1. Provide flow prescriptions in a timely fashion, in consultation with Implementing Agencies and water interests, pursuant to the and in conformance with the Settlement.
2. Support development of a Framework to provide direction for Program actions and activities. The RA and TAC are prepared to undertake a substantial role in compiling a Framework document, including actual drafting components of the plan if necessary in order to expedite the process.
3. Press for, and support, development of strategic planning processes to begin to address long-term issues of levee stability and subsidence. Tasks will include participation in Project working groups or third party meetings such as the Upper San Joaquin Regional Planning process.
4. Provide timely comments on key Program documents, such as the Reach 2B environmental documents.

6 Specific 2012 RA and TAC Activities Completed During 2013

6.1 RA Transition

2013 saw the retirement of one Restoration Administrator (RA) and the recruitment and engagement of another. The transition effectively occurred on August 1, 2013. As a result, two different RA's participated in program activities (including flow recommendations, coordination of TAC activities, and providing input to the Program).

Rod Meade served as RA from 2009 until July 31, 2013. Tom Johnson commenced service as RA as of August 1, 2013. There were no changes to TAC positions in 2013.

The RA position has certain obligations as specified in the Settlement; however, the RA has considerable discretion as to the performance and approach to those obligations. Further, each RA will bring a unique skill set and perspective to the position of RA. As a result, although many elements of the RA and TAC work and work product will be consistent, there will likely be changes in style, priorities and perspective between pre- and post-August 2013.

6.2 RA and TAC Activities and Work Products

The RA and TAC completed a variety of tasks and work performed during 2013 to support and contribute to SJRRP agency implementation efforts.

- Updating the TAC Work Plan Update (January through May)
- RA Recommendations for the 2013 Interim Flow Program (February 1), and updated RA recommendations to address changing water year conditions, on the following dates:
    - March 20, 2013;
    - April 12, 2013;
    - April 30, 2013;
    - May 10, 2013;
    - May 17, 2013;
    - May 28, 2013.
- RA transmittal of the RA 2012 Annual Report to the Settling Parties on April 22, 2013;
- Completion and transmittal of a technical report Reach 2B Floodplain Analysis Report and transmittal with RA findings and recommendations to Reclamation on May 3, 2013 (see report attached to the RA transmittal of the Mid-year Report);
- RA Recommendations for the 2013 Fall Pulse Flow on October 22, 2013.

Meetings Held or Attended by the RA and/or TAC and TAC Meetings Convened by the RA

The RA convened a total of seven TAC meetings through on the following dates:

- January 17, 2013;
- February 14, 2013;
- March 21, 2013;
- April 22, 2013;
- June 19, 2013;
- July 17, 2013;
- October 21, 2013.

Weekly TAC Convened by the RA and Including Agency Staff as Available

Weekly coordination calls involving TAC members and agency staff were convened to address river restoration issues, updates on meetings recently attended by TAC members, reports from agency staff on activities and questions where TAC input was desired. These meetings (conference calls) were useful in improving coordination among TAC members and between the TAC and agency staff, and occurred both prior to and after August 1, 2013.

RA Weekly Telephone Conferences with Alicia Forsythe (SJRRP Project Manager)

The RAs met via telephone on Monday mornings for between 30 minutes and one hour with Alicia Forsythe (SJRRP Program Manager) throughout the year to discuss upcoming events, program schedule, emerging issues, coordination of efforts and other matters.

RA and TAC Member Participation in Regular Water Quality, Monitoring and Flow Scheduling Conference Calls

The SJRRP initiated regular conference calls involving the Implementing Agencies, Settling Parties and RA/TAC to address water quality, flow monitoring and flow scheduling issues. These meetings contributed to improving communication between the various SJRRP participants on a range of flow scheduling and monitoring needs and activities.

RA Participation in Bi-Monthly Specific Project Team Meetings

Either the RA or designated TAC representative(s) attended bi-monthly Reach 2B and Reach 4B Team meetings either in person or by phone to stay current on progress and issues relating to these major program construction projects.

RA Participation in Monthly Settling Party Consultation Meetings

The RAs attended Settling Party Consultation Meetings convened through 2013. These meetings included the Program Manager and representatives of the Settling Parties and Implementing Agencies. These meetings focused on significant policy issues that needed the attention of SJRRP participants.

SJRRP Technical Work Group Meetings Attended by the RA

In 2013 the RA and/or members of the TAC participated in numerous technical work group and technical feedback meetings:

- The Fish Management Technical Work Group (Mar, Sept, Nov 2013)
- the Seepage Management Technical Work Group (Feb 8 and Apr 8, 2013)
- the Restoration Goal Technical Feedback Work Group (Mar 21, 2013)
- Restoration Flow Guidelines meetings (monthly through December 2013)
- Water Management Goal Technical Feedback meeting (Aug 23, 2013)
- Reintroduction Plan meetings (Aug 27, Sept 13 2013)
- Monitoring & Assessment Plan meetings (Sept, Nov 2013)

In an effort to broaden the RA's understanding of the interests groups/organizations and their priorities and concerns, the RA participated in meetings convened either by the following groups or initiated by the RA:

- Monthly Board Meetings convened by the SJR Resource Management Coalition (as available)
- San Joaquin River Partnership meeting to discuss 2013 Interim Flow Schedule Recommendations
- Reach 2B Stakeholder meeting
- FWA Joint Advisory & Policy and Legislative Committee meetings (monthly as available)

7 2013 RA and TAC Expenditures

The attached summary of expenditures was provided by Resources Legacy Fund (RLF), the administrator of the grant that funds operations of the RA and TAC.

Attachment: RA – TAC Expenditures

RLF Summary

San Joaquin River Restoration Grant Budget
FINAL 12/31/13

INCOME			Grant Share	Total Received	Variance
Current	DWR		1,100,000.00	1,100,000.00	-
Old	DWR 2007 Grant		$45,964.45	$45,964.45	-
	Interest		988.00	1,021.00	
		TOTAL	1,146,952.45	1,146,985.45	-

EXPENSES

RA Account			Committed	Invoiced	Committed Remaining
2013-0391	Johnson 10/13-12/13		$43,500.00	$40,008.05	3,491.95
2013-0345	Johnson 8/13-9/13		$31,824.00	$31,824.00	-
2013-0216	Meade 4/13-7/13		$59,666.39	$59,666.39	-
2012-0432	Meade 10/12-3/13		$108,950.89	$108,950.89	-
2012-0007	Meade 2/12-1/13		$151,029.07	$151,029.07	-
See box	Technical Asst		$29,348.88	$29,348.88	-
2012-0180	Misc (C3 Conferencing)		6,500.00	$5,240.43	1,259.57
		TOTAL RA	**$430,819.23**	**$426,067.71**	**4,751.52**
TAC Account					
2011-0004	FWA 2/11-3/12		27,442.68	$27,442.68	-
2012-0139	FWA 4/12-3/13		$32,793.64	$32,793.64	-
2013-0155	FWA 4/13-9/13		$24,602.01	$24,602.01	-
2013-0397	FWA 10/13-12/13		$5,700.00	$2,354.25	3,345.75
		SUBTOTAL	90,538.33	$87,192.58	3,345.75
2011-0003	Hanson 3/11-2/12		47,603.32	$47,603.32	-
2012-0140	Hanson 3/12-3/13		$61,905.39	$61,905.39	-
2013-0157	Hanson 4/13-9/13		$16,171.40	$16,171.40	-
2013-0400	Hanson 10/13-12/13		$7,850.00	$4,960.00	2,890.00
		SUBTOTAL	133,530.11	$130,640.11	2,890.00
2011-0096	McBain 2/11-2/12 (Partial)		$84,983.86	$84,983.86	-
N/A	McBain 2/11-1/12 (Partial)		(10,682.94)	($10,682.94)	-
2012-0141	McBain 3/12-3/13		$75,967.13	$75,967.13	-
2013-0156	McBain 4/13-9/13		$24,339.55	$24,339.55	-
2013-0399	McBain 10/13-12/13		$16,250.00	$16,119.64	130.36
		SUBTOTAL	$190,857.60	$190,727.24	130.36

Attachment: RA – TAC Expenditures

RLF Summary (cont.)

2011-0001	NRDC 3/11-2/12	25,389.83	$25,389.83	-
2012-0142	NRDC 3/12-3/13	$34,776.81	$34,776.81	-
2013-0263	NRDC 4/13-9/13	$15,451.18	$15,451.18	-
2013-0398	NRDC 10/13-12/13	$5,700.00	$4,615.18	1,084.82
	SUBTOTAL	81,317.82	$80,233.00	1,084.82
2011-0378	Rene Henery 9/11-11/11	$14,601.35	$14,601.35	-
	SUBTOTAL	$14,601.35	$14,601.35	-
2012-0176	Trout Unlimited, Inc. 12/11-3/13	$44,871.98	$44,871.98	-
2013-0158	Trout Unlimited, Inc. 4/13-9/13	$14,160.00	$14,160.00	-
2013-0401	Trout Unlimited, Inc. 10/13-12/13	$7,850.00	$3,819.89	4,030.11
	SUBTOTAL	$66,881.98	$62,851.87	4,030.11
2012-0274	NewFields Companies, LLC 6/12-3/13	$48,931.91	$48,931.91	-
2013-0159	NewFields Companies, LLC 4/13-9/13	$14,853.12	$14,853.12	-
2013-0402	NewFields Companies, LLC 10/13-12/13	$8,250.00	$4,354.84	3,895.16
		$72,035.03	$68,139.87	3,895.16
	TOTAL TAC	**649,762.22**	**$634,386.02**	**15,376.20**
	RA and TAC TOTAL	**1,080,581.45**	**$1,060,453.73**	**20,127.72**
	RLF Admin	66,000.00	66,000.00	-
	GRAND TOTAL	**1,146,581.45**	**$1,126,453.73**	**20,127.72**
	Funds Available & Uncommitted	371.00		
	Cash Available		$ 20,531.72	

** Part of this contract was paid using funds from SJRR 2007 grant.