



**Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy
Interim Executive Officer's Report
October 6, 2010**

Conservancy Meeting Schedule (Action Item from 10/6/10 meeting – (Attachment 1)

After reviewing and revising Board meeting schedule documents and discussion with North Delta Water Agency, Conservancy staff have compiled possible options for monthly Delta Conservancy Board meetings. **Action requested** is a decision by Board on whether to change meeting days/times starting in January 2011.

Possible options

- move Conservancy Board meetings to third Wednesdays
- move Conservancy Board meetings to any Friday of the month (furloughs are over)
- continue current schedule of first Wednesdays at 9am

Conservancy Staffing Update

Executive Officer – exemption request update

Conservancy Headquarters Search

Conservancy's Role Regarding CEQA Process (Attachment 2)

During the June 9th Board meeting, Conservancy staff were directed to investigate and define the role of the Delta Conservancy in the CEQA review process. Staff have prepared a document providing background information and an overview of the possible roles the Conservancy will have in the CEQA review process under different scenarios.

Revised High Level Year One Agenda (Attachment 3)

High level agenda was updated to reflect tentative agendas for December 2010 and January 2011 Board meetings. Please see attachment.



SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN
DELTA CONSERVANCY

3500 Industrial Blvd.
West Sacramento, CA 95691
<http://www.deltaconservancy.ca.gov>

Consideration of Delta Conservancy Board Meeting Schedule

Requested Action: Discuss alternatives regarding the 2010 Board meeting schedule based on water district request. Provide direction to staff regarding any changes to the 2010-11 meeting schedule.

Background

North Delta Water Agency wrote a letter requesting that the Conservancy Board change its meeting time as it conflicts with their regularly scheduled meeting. The Board directed staff to update the List of Meeting Dates completed in June, with the four Delta water agencies monthly meetings and make a recommendation.

The four water districts have day and evening schedules as follows: Zone 7 Water Agency meets the third Wednesday, 7 p.m., the North Delta Water Agency meets the first Wednesday, 10 a.m., the Central Delta Water Agency meets the second Tuesday at 9:30 a.m. and the South Delta Water Agency meets the first Wednesday at 1:30 p.m. Updated calendars attached.

Based on regularly scheduled meetings, the third Wednesday of the month and any Friday are available for the Board's meetings.

List of Attachments

Attachment 1— List of Meeting Dates of Selected Boards and Commissions

Contact

Susan Roberts, Board Liaison
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy
Phone: (916) 375-2088

Abbreviations used in Attachment 1

DCP = Bay Delta Conservation Plan Steering Committee

BOS = Boards of Supervisors

CCC = California Coastal Conservancy

CDWA = Central Delta Water Agency

CVFPB = Central Valley Flood Protection Board

DPC = Delta Protection Commission

DSC = Delta Stewardship Council

NDWA = North Delta Water Agency

SDWA = South Delta Water Agency

SFBCDC = Bay Conservation and Development Commission

Zone 7 = Zone 7 Water District

Attachment 1 —List of Meeting Dates of Selected Boards and Commissions

October 2010						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
					1	2
3	4	5 BOS meetings: --Contra Costa --Sacramento --San Joaquin --Solano	6 NDWA SDWA	7 BDCP Steering Comm. SFBCDC	8	9
10	11	12 BOS meetings: --Contra Costa --Sacramento --San Joaquin --Solano --Yolo CDWA (a.m.)	13 BOS meetings: --Sacramento (a.m.)	14	15	16
17	18	19 BOS meetings: --Contra Costa --Sacramento --San Joaquin	20 Zone 7 (p.m)	21 BDCP Steering Comm. CCC DPC (alternate) SFBCDC	22	23
24	25	26 BOS meetings: --Contra Costa --Sacramento --San Joaquin --Solano --Yolo	27 BOS meetings: --Sacramento (p.m.)	28 DSC	29 DSC	30
31						

November 2010						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	1	2 BOS meetings: --Contra Costa --Sacramento --San Joaquin --Solano	3 NDWA SDWA	4 BDCP Steering Comm. SFBCDC	5	6
7	8	9 CDWA (a.m.) BOS meetings: --Contra Costa --Sacramento --San Joaquin --Solano --Yolo	10 BOS meetings: --Sacramento (a.m.)	11 Veteran's Day	12	13
14	15	16 BOS meetings: --Contra Costa --Sacramento --San Joaquin	17 Zone 7 (p.m.)	18 BDCP Steering Comm. DPC (regular) SFBCDC	19	20
21	22	23 BOS meetings: --Contra Costa --San Joaquin --Solano	24	25 Thanksgiving Holiday	26 State Holiday— Day After Thanksgiving	27
28	29	30 BOS meetings: --Contra Costa --Sacramento --San Joaquin				

December 2010						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
			1 NDWA SDWA	2 BDCP Steering Comm. CCC SFBCDC	3	4
5	6	7 BOS meetings: --Contra Costa --Sacramento --San Joaquin --Solano --Yolo CDWA (a.m.)	8 BOS meetings: --Sacramento (a.m.)	9	10	11
12	13	14 BOS meetings: --Contra Costa --Sacramento --San Joaquin --Solano --Yolo	15 BOS meetings: --Sacramento (p.m.) Zone 7 (p.m.)	16 BDCP Steering Comm. DPC (alternate) SFDCDC	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30 BDCP Steering Comm.	31	



Staff Report Regarding Background and Overview of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Summary

At the June meeting of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy, Board Liaison Advisor Emma Suarez inquired about the Delta Conservancy's obligations under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Staff is working with the Board's legal counsel to determine what, if any, action the Board may need to take to ensure CEQA compliance. In the interim, this Staff Report will provide a brief history and overview of CEQA for informational purposes only.

Background

WHAT IS CEQA?

The CEQA statute is found in the California Public Resources Code CEQA § 21000 et seq. The act, passed in 1970, sets forth the State's environmental protection policy, and a protocol by which all State and local agencies, in their respective jurisdictions, must make environmental protection a part of their decision making process. CEQA applies to all public projects. It also applies to private projects when discretionary approval of a permit or other entitlement by a California public agency, including state, regional, county, and local agencies is involved.

CEQA OBJECTIVES

Specifically, the objectives of CEQA are to:

- Disclose to the public the significant environmental effects of a proposed discretionary project, through the preparation of an Initial Study (IS), Negative Declaration (ND), or Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
- Identify and prevent or minimize damage to the environment through development of project alternatives, mitigation measures, and mitigation monitoring
- Disclose to the public the agency decision making process used to approve discretionary projects through findings and statements of overriding consideration

- Enhance public participation in the environmental review process through scoping meetings, public notice, public review, hearings, and the judicial process
- Improve interagency coordination through early consultations, scoping meetings, notices of preparation, and State Clearinghouse review

To ensure that each of the law’s objectives is accomplished CEQA sets forth a series of detailed procedural requirements. The table below illustrates each CEQA objective and some of the procedural requirements designed to accomplish each goal.

Table 1. CEQA Objectives and Procedures

CEQA OBJECTIVES	CEQA PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT
Disclose environmental impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial studies • Negative declarations • Environmental impact reports (EIRs)
Identify and prevent environmental damage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation measures • Alternatives • Mitigation monitoring
Disclose agency decision making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings • Statements of overriding consideration
Enhance public participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scoping • Public notice requirements • Response to comments • Legal enforcement procedures
Foster intergovernmental coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early consultation • Scoping meetings • Notices of preparation • State Clearinghouse review

CEQA TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Project: Different standards apply to public and private activities. Any private activity that has potential for a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment and involves a discretionary approval is subject to CEQA. Any activity directly undertaken by a public agency, which includes public works construction activities, clearing or grading of land, improvements to existing public structures, enactment and amendment of zoning ordinances, and adoption and amendment of local general plans is subject to CEQA. Activities that are supported (in whole or in part) by a public agency,

which include contracts, grants, subsidies, loans, or other assistance from a public agency are subject to CEQA. Any activity involving the public agency issuance of a lease, permit, license, certificate or other entitlement for use by a public agency is subject to CEQA.

Lead Agency: "Lead Agency" means the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project. The Lead Agency will decide whether an EIR or Negative Declaration will be required for the project and will cause the document to be prepared. Criteria for determining which agency will be the Lead Agency for a project are contained in § 15051 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Responsible Agency: "Responsible Agency" means a public agency which proposes to carry out or approve a project, for which a Lead Agency is preparing or has prepared an EIR or Negative Declaration. For the purposes of CEQA, the term "Responsible Agency" includes all public agencies other than the Lead Agency which have discretionary approval power over the project.

Categorical Exemption: "Categorical exemption" means an exemption from CEQA for a class of projects based on a finding by the Secretary for Natural Resources that the class of projects does not have a significant effect on the environment. (§15354) The Resources Agency has established 32 classes of categorical exemptions.

Statutory Exemption: "Statutory exemption" means projects specifically excluded from CEQA consideration as defined by the State Legislature. These exemptions are delineated in § 15260. A statutory exemption applies to any given project that falls under its definition, regardless of the project's potential impacts to the environment.

Negative Declaration: "Negative Declaration" means a written statement by the Lead Agency briefly describing the reasons that a proposed project, not exempt from CEQA, will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore does not require the preparation of an EIR.

Environmental Impact Report: "EIR" or "Environmental Impact Report" means a detailed statement prepared under CEQA describing and analyzing the significant environmental effects of a project and discussing ways to mitigate or avoid the effects.

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF CEQA PROCESS

There are three phases of the CEQA process: 1) Preliminary Review, 2) Initial Study, and 3) Environmental Documentation. Attachment 1 is an outline of this process.

Preliminary Review: Phase 1 typically consists of a pre-application consultation between a project's applicant and the permitting agency, followed by a formal application for a permit (or some other kind of discretionary approval). Then the lead agency has a specified time period in which to determine whether the project meets the definition of a "project" under CEQA. If the request does not meet the definition of a project then no further review or action is required by the lead agency. If the request is determined to meet the definition of a project the lead agency must then determine whether the project is exempt from CEQA as

a categorical exemption or statutory exemption. If the project is determined to be not exempt, further review is required and Phase 2 is triggered.

Initial Study: In Phase 2 the lead agency must conduct an Initial Study. According to [CEQA Guidelines §15063\(c\)](#), the purpose of an Initial Study is to provide a preliminary analysis of a proposed action to determine whether a Negative Declaration or an Environmental Impact Report should be prepared. An Initial Study also enables an applicant or Lead Agency to modify a project, mitigating adverse impacts in lieu of preparing an EIR, thereby potentially enabling the project to qualify for a Negative Declaration. The Initial Study provides a factual basis for the Negative Declaration, or serves to focus an EIR on the significant effects of a project. An Initial Study Checklist has been provided as Attachment 2 for reference.

Environmental Documentation: Once the Initial Study has been completed Phase 3 is triggered. Depending on the significance of the environmental impacts identified the lead agency must either complete a Negative Declaration or an Environmental Impact Report.

CEQA AND THE DELTA CONSERVANCY

There are several ways that the Delta Conservancy (“Conservancy”) may be involved in the CEQA process. If the Conservancy were to own land and wished to undertake a project that required a discretionary permit approval (i.e. Streambed Alteration Agreement from DFG) the Conservancy would be the project applicant. Staff anticipates that the most likely exposure to CEQA would be with the Conservancy as a reviewing agency. Conservancy staff will review and, where necessary, provide comment on CEQA documents (Negative Declarations and EIRs) that have bearing on the Conservancy’s interests and objectives during the public review period prescribed by CEQA.

As mentioned above, staff and counsel are working together to determine what, if anything, the Delta Conservancy must do as a public agency in order to ensure CEQA compliance. This report was provided for informational purposes only. If it is determined that any action is required by the Conservancy to ensure CEQA compliance such action will be brought before the Board at a later date.

List of Attachments

1. Three Phases of the CEQA Process, *CEQA Deskbook*, Bass, Herson, and Bogdan
2. Initial Study Checklist, Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines CCR Title 14 § 15000 et seq

Contact

Cindy Messer, Interim Executive Officer
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy
(916) 375-2090

THREE PHASES OF THE CEQA PROCESS

PHASE 1	PRELIMINARY REVIEW	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-application consultation • Application submitted to Lead Agency • Application determined to be complete (30 days from submittal) • Determination that project is subject to CEQA • Review for exemptions 	
PHASE 2	INITIAL STUDY	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Study Checklist completed • Consultation with Responsible and Trustee Agencies • Decision to prepare Negative Declaration or EIR (30 days from application completeness) 	
PHASE 3	NEGATIVE DECLARATION	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation measures, if any, identified and agreed to by project proponent • Draft Negative Declaration prepared • Public notice and review • Responses to Negative Declaration received, comments considered • Negative Declaration completed • Commenting agencies notified of date of hearing • Negative Declaration adopted • Mitigation reporting and monitoring program adopted • Lead Agency makes determination on project • Notice of Determination filed • Notice of Determination posted • Responsible Agency makes decision on project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice of Preparation (NOP) sent to responsible and trustee agencies • Responses to NOP sent to Lead Agency • Preliminary Draft EIR prepared • Independent review by Lead Agency • Draft EIR completed and submitted for review • Notice of completion filed • Public notice and review of Draft EIR • Public hearing on Draft EIR (optional) • Written comments received • Responses to comments prepared • Responses sent to commenting agencies • Final EIR certified by Lead Agency • Lead Agency makes decision on project • Findings written and adopted • Mitigation reporting and monitoring program adopted • Notice of Determination filed • Notice of Determination posted • Responsible Agency makes decision on project

Appendix G
Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project title:

2. Lead agency name and address:

3. Contact person and phone number:

4. Project location:

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

6. General plan designation: _____ 7. Zoning: _____
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or

participation agreement.)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

_____	_____
Signature	Date
_____	_____
Printed Name	For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR

or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

- a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
- a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

SAMPLE QUESTION

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</p>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</p>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -				
- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XIV. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21087, Public Resources Code. Reference: Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151, Public Resources Code; Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino, 202 Cal.App.3d 296 (1988); Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, 222 Cal.App.3d 1337 (1990).

Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy High Level Planning Calendar

Version 10/2010

June 9, 2010	July 7, 2010	August 4, 2010	September 1, 2010
Initial Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oath of Office • Election of Officers • Adopt Board meeting procedures • Appoint Interim Executive Officer • Introduce Conservancy Staff • Conflict of Interest Code/Bagley-Keene • Personnel Packets 	Updates: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oath of Office (if necessary) 2. Executive Officer Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Officer Recruitment • Conservancy Staff Hiring (Board Liaison) • MOU & Headquarter Search Update • Coordinating with Other Delta Planning Efforts • Budget • CEQA Role • Action Item from 6/9 meeting • Legislation Update 	Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Officer Recruitment • Conservancy Staffing • Conservancy Headquarters Search • Budget • Coordinating with Other Delta Planning Efforts • CEQA Role • Legislative Update • Revised High Level Planning Calendar 	DELTA TOUR
Briefings <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementing Legislation 2. Governor's Budget 3. Headquarters Search 4. Legislation 5. Related planning efforts 	Briefings <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delta Plan (Delta Council) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview, Current Status Conservancy's Role (Joe Grindstaff) 2. BDCP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview, Current Status, Conservancy's Role (Karla Nemeth) 3. Central Valley Joint Venture Implementation Plan (Robert Schaffer) 	Briefings <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Safe, Clean, Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2010 (Prop. 18) and Implications of Postponement 2. Central Valley Joint Venture Management Plan 3. Delta Counties Habitat Conservation Plans 	Briefings <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Flood Planning 2. Levees 3. Emergency Preparedness & Response
Action Items <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delegation of Authority/Interim Executive Officer (EO) 2. Executive Officer Recruitment Contract 3. Executive Officer Selection Committee 	Action Items <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ratify Org Chart 2. Conflict of Interest Code, Approve, TAKE Action re Code, Direct staff to initiate rulemaking process with OAL. 3. Review Revised High Level 1 Year Agenda 	Action Items <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statement of Incompatible Activities 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. MOU Regarding West Sacramento Office 5. Board meeting schedule 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Consent Calendar 		
<p>Discussion/Direction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consistency between Board's Strategic Plan and Other Delta Planning Efforts 2. Year One Agenda 	<p>Discussion/Direction</p>	<p>Key Items and Dates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Board members have until December 9 to complete online ethics training. 	<p>Key Items and Dates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conflict of Interest Code 45-day review period ends September 6.

October 6, 2010	November 3, 2010	December 1, 2010	“Parking Lot” New
Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EO Report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staffing 2. Office location 3. Budget 4. Delta Planning efforts 5. CEQA responsibilities 6. DSC- Sept Early Actions mtg 7. Strategic Plan workshop 8. Legislation • Executive Officer Recruitment 	Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EO Report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staffing 2. Office location 3. CEQA responsibilities 4. Legislation • Delta Planning Efforts <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DSC Nov Early Actions mtg 2. DSC Delta Plan Ecosystem White Paper 3. Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) 4. Delta Habitat Initiatives Managers Team • Budget • Funding • Executive Officer Recruitment • Strategic Planning workshop 	Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EO Report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staffing 2. Office location 3. CEQA responsibilities 4. Legislation • Delta Planning Efforts <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DSC Nov Early Actions mtg • Budget • Funding • Executive Officer Recruitment • Strategic Planning workshop 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Performance Measures (conceptual) 2. Strategic Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals • Approach (mechanics) 3. Department of Fish & Game – PSP 4. Suisun Marsh Tour (April 6?) 5. Delta Habitat Initiatives Managers Team presentation 6. Yolo Bypass Tour
Briefings <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DPC National Heritage Area 	Briefings <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan 	Briefings <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TBD 	
Action Items <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adopt Conflict of Interest Code 	Action Items <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change Meeting Time 	Action Items <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conservancy’s CEQA Role 	

January 5, 2011	February 2, 2011	March 2, 2011	“Parking Lot” New
Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EO Report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staffing 2. Office location 3. Legislation • Delta Planning Efforts <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. DSC Dec Early Actions mtg • Budget • Funding • Executive Officer Recruitment • Strategic Planning workshop 	Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EO Report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staffing 2. Office location 3. Legislation • Delta Planning Efforts • Budget • Funding • Strategic Planning workshop 	Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EO Report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staffing 2. Office location 3. Legislation • Delta Planning Efforts • Budget • Funding • Strategic Planning workshop 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Performance Measures (conceptual) 2. Strategic Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals • Approach (mechanics) 3. Department of Fish & Game – PSP 4. Suisun Marsh Tour (April 6?) 5. Delta Habitat Initiatives Managers Team presentation 6. Yolo Bypass Tour
Briefings <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delta Habitat Initiatives Managers Team 	Briefings <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. DPC Economic Sustainability Plan 	Briefings <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yolo Bypass Tour 	
Action Items <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. TBD 	Action Items <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 TBD 	Action Items <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. TBD 	

April 6, 2011	May 4, 2011	June 1, 2011	“Parking Lot” New
Updates: 2. EO Report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staffing 2. Office location 3. Legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delta Planning Efforts • Budget • Funding • Strategic Plan 	Updates: 1. EO Report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Staffing b. Office location c. Legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delta Planning Efforts • Budget • Funding • Strategic Plan 	Updates: 2. EO Report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Staffing b. Office move c. Legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delta Planning Efforts • Budget • Funding • Strategic Plan 	1. Performance Measures (conceptual) 2. Strategic Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals • Approach (mechanics) 3. Department of Fish & Game – PSP 4. Suisun Marsh Tour (April 6?) 5. Delta Habitat Initiatives Managers Team presentation 6. Yolo Bypass Tour
Briefings 1. Suisun Marsh Tour	Briefings 1. TBD	Briefings 1. TBD	
Action Items 1. TBD	Action 1. TBD	Action Items 3. TBD	