CACHUMA CONSERVATION RELEASE BOARD

*****REVISED***** RATIFICATION MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 6, 2015

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Daniel E. Griset, General Manager

RE: 2015-16 CCRB Budget Ratification

Recommendation:

CCRB member agencies are requested to ratify the adopted CCRB budget for fiscal year 2015-16.

Discussion:

The 2015-16 CCRB adopted budget is presented as an attachment for use in the ratification process by each CCRB member agency.

The attached budget material has been further refined to respond to the approval action and direction the Board gave at its June 19, 2015 meeting.

Key among these refinements is the Board's decision to eliminate the annual rollover of funds from previous budget years that were assessed but not spent in the most recent year. This will result in a transition during the first quarter of the 2015-16 fiscal year where all unencumbered and unspent 2014-15 funds on the CCRB books will be returned on a pro-rata basis to the member agencies.

Prior to the completion of this transition the Board authorized staff to retain $10,000 in remaining funds to meet any unexpected obligations that might occur prior to the closing of the 2014-15 fiscal year.

Going forward each new fiscal year will begin with a Zero Funds balance that, beginning with receipt of the first quarter's member assessments will begin to provide CCRB with the new funding needed to implement the tasks identified in the budget adopted for the new fiscal year.

At the Board's direction the Health and Safety tasks (Cardno-13.0 and Stetson-3.0) have been reduced from $70,000 to $25,000.

In addition to the Board's unanimous adoption of the new budget, the Board by a separate unanimous vote requested that the following actions be taken in the 2015-16 fiscal year :

- Monthly financial reports that track expenditures by individual tasks in the budget;
- A proposal for establishing a policy on discretionary budget authorities for the General Manager to be presented at the next CCRB Board meeting (July 22, 2015);
- A report on the CCRB cash position as of July 1, 2014 and the cash balance as of June 30, 2015, adjusted for expected unpaid invoices for the 2014-15 budget year (see Page 4 of the attached 2015-16 Budget);
- A proposal for reporting to the Board when consultant expenditures may exceed amounts or require further Board authorization as specified in the adopted budget (to be developed during the first quarter of the new fiscal year);
- A compilation of the scopes of work that will guide the consulting efforts in the new fiscal year (see attachment of consultant scopes); and,
- A mid-year budget review by the Board to monitor the effectiveness of new financial management controls aimed at real-time transparency and accountability and to determine whether any modifications in budgeted consultant work is needed.

SUMMARY OF KEY BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT CONTROL FEATURES

1. The total adopted CCRB budget for 2015-16 is $1,480,275, an increase of more than $380,000 when compared with the 2014-15 fiscal year. This increase is a result of certain increases in expenses, as well as a new budget format.

   Though General and Administrative expenses are lower, Legal expenses are higher and subject to different application. Future legal expenses related to the Biological Opinion reconsultation (Account 7001) will no longer be shared with ID#1. Also of note, the CalTrout litigation expenses (see Account 7003) allow for activity that may become moot during the new fiscal year and result in a downward revision of the budget and of later member assessments.

   The impact of a new budget format this year complicates comparisons with last year's budget that had a bifurcation between certain authorized and assessed consulting tasks and "contingent" tasks. Combining these two categories allows for some comparison of the 2014-15 budget accounts with the new 2015-16 budget proposed now for ratification.

   For example, in the case of consulting expense related to the Biological Opinion (Account 6001), the apparent increase of $245,375 owes to the presentation of only the authorized and assessed tasks in the 2014-15 budget. Not shown in the new 2015-16 budget is the total proposed consultant budget from 2014-15 which was $1,099,000 and included a number of "contingent" tasks. These "contingent" tasks were to be considered by the Board for subsequent authorization and assessment should they be needed during the 2014-15 fiscal year. (Of these "contingent" 2014-15 tasks, only the Fish Passage tasks were eventually authorized by the Board in an amount of $196,500.) Compared to the total proposed 2014-15 budget for Account 6001, this year's budget is $749,875, a reduction of $349,125.

   The 2015-16 budget includes two accounts (6001 and 7200) where the expense for specified consulting work will be shared with ID#1; in such instances ID#1 will pay for 11.58% of the costs of that work.

2. The CCRB cash position in its Union Bank account on July 1, 2014 was $828,688. Over the 2014-15 fiscal year CCRB received a total of $476,104 in member assessments, along with less than $100 in bank interest. The estimated fiscal year end cash that is unspent and unobligated before final adjustments is $722,788. Allowing for $10,000 of temporary cash retention (to be distributed by the end of the first quarter) and for funding of the Fish Passage Study by Cardno and Stetson ($196,500) and for paying remaining unpaid 2014-15 invoices (estimated at $50,955), all other remaining cash ($465,333) will be distributed on a pro-rata basis to the CCRB member agencies by the end of July 2015.

3. After the 2014-15 cash adjustments the remaining surplus amount ($465,333) available for a pro-rata distribution to the CCRB agencies is as follows: Goleta Water District-$214,193; the City of Santa Barbara-$190,228; and Montecito Water District-$60,912. These amounts will be distributed by the end of July 2015. Any remaining unspent 2014-15 surplus funds will also be distributed on a pro-rata basis by the end of the first quarter of the new fiscal year.

4. The proposed quarterly CCRB assessments for 2015-16 are as follows: Goleta Water District-$159,817; City of Santa Barbara-$141,936; and Montecito Water District-$45,449.

5. Because of the intensive restructuring of the CCRB budget this year, a new financial process will be implemented for monthly tracking of the various 2015-16 budget accounts and all tasks identified within a budget account. This structure for greater accountability and real-time management information will bring into real-time any spending that may be approaching exceedance of the amounts in the approved budget. This process will also expedite and simplify future preparation of CCRB budgets and contribute to greater financial transparency and accountability.

6. Any adjustments needed in the budget that involve transfers of funding between accounts or changes in the assessment of the CCRB members can be considered by the Board during any budget review occurring during the fiscal year. At the end of the 2015-16 fiscal year, any surplus funds that are unspent and unobligated will be refunded to the CCRB members.

Cachuma Conservation Release Board
FY 2015-16 Approved Budget

Account Number	Account Name	Authorized Budget FY 2014-15	Estimated Expenditures FY 2014-15	Approved Budget FY 2015-16	Variance FY 14-15 vs. FY 15-16	ID#1 Share FY 2015-16	CCRB Share FY 2015-16
GENERAL & ADMINISTRATIVE						0.00%	100.00%
5100	Audit	8,000	5,587	8,000	0	0	8,000
5200	Liability Insurance	14,000	4,186	4,200	(9,800)	0	4,200
5260	FICA/Medicare	4,590	125	0	(4,590)		
5201	Workers Comp. Insurance	1,000	682	700	(300)	0	700
5301	General Manager Compensation	60,000	66,000	66,000	6,000	0	66,000
5304	Administrative Support	4,500	5,823	5,000	500	0	5,000
5312	Misc. Administrative Expense	3,000	1,666	4,500	1,500	0	4,500
5313	Communications/Computer	7,500	3,329	7,000	(500)	0	7,000
5316	Admin Fixed Assets	3,000	0		(3,000)		
5330	Administrative Travel	2,000	1,351	3,000	1,000	0	3,000
5331	Travel For Federal and State Meetings	20,000	1,017	9,000	(11,000)	0	9,000
5332	Transportation	1,000	176	0	(1,000)		0
	General and Administrative Total	*128,590*	*89,941*	*107,400*	(21,190)	*0*	*107,400*
CCRB LEGAL EXPENSES						0.00%	100.00%
7000	General Legal	50,000	21,715	25,000	(25,000)	0	25,000
7001	BO Reconsultation Legal Support	125,000	53,385	150,000	25,000	0	150,000
7002	SWRCB Water Rights	0	913	50,000	50,000	0	50,000
7003	CalTrout v. USBR Litigation	0	47,079	150,000	150,000	0	150,000
	Legal Expenses Total	*175,000*	*123,092*	*375,000*	200,000	*0*	*375,000*
TOTAL GENERAL, ADMINISTRATIVE & LEGAL		**303,590**	**213,033**	**482,400**	**178,810**	**0**	**482,400**
CCRB ONLY CONSULTANT ACTIVITIES						0.00%	100.00%
7300	Public Outreach Program	30,000	0	30,000	0	0	30,000
7400	Governmental Affairs and Facilitation	150,000	150,000	108,000	(42,000)	0	108,000
7500	Hydrologic Technical Support	30,000	12,400	20,000	(10,000)	0	20,000
TOTAL CCRB ONLY CONSULTANT ACTIVITIES		**210,000**	**162,400**	**158,000**	**(52,000)**	**0**	**158,000**
SHARED CONSULTANT ACTIVITIES						11.58%	88.42%
6001	BO Reconsultation Activities	504,500	385,650	749,875	245,375	86,836	663,039
7200	SWRCB Proceedings Support	30,000	0	40,000	10,000	4,632	35,368
TOTAL SHARED CONSULTANT ACTIVITIES		**534,500**	**385,650**	**789,875**	**255,375**	**91,468**	**698,407**
CCRB CONTINGENCY						0.00%	100.00%
6500	Contingency	**50,000**	**0**	**50,000**	**0**	**0**	**50,000**
	TOTAL BUDGET	**1,098,090**	**761,083**	**1,480,275**	**382,185**	**91,468**	**1,388,807**

= Amount on which Assesments are calculated.

Cachuma Conservation Release Board

Consultant Activities Summarized

FY 2015-16 Approved Budget

Account Number	Account Name	Authorized Budget FY 2014-15	Estimated Expenditures FY 2014-15	FY 15-16 Total Budget	Variance FY 14-15 vs. FY 15-16	ID#1 Share FY 2015-16 Budget	CCRB Share FY 2015-16 Budget
	CONSULTANT ACTIVITIES						
6001	**BO Reconsultation / Drought Activities**	100.00%		**100.00%**		**11.58%**	**88.42%**
	Cardno	296,000	248,355	**412,875**	116,875	47,811	365,064
	Donahue	15,000	13,350	**71,000**	56,000	8,222	62,778
	Stetson Engineers	60,000	105,595	**217,000**	157,000	25,129	191,871
	Hanson Environmental	49,300	18,350	**49,000**	(300)	5,674	43,326
	Strategic Guidance	50,000	0	**0**	(50,000)	0	0
	ID1 Staff	25,000	0	**0**	(25,000)	0	0
	Reconsultation Contingency	9,200	0	**0**	(9,200)	0	0
	Total	504,500	385,650	**749,875**	245,375	**86,836**	**663,039**
7200	**SWRCB Proceedings Support**					**11.58%**	**88.42%**
	Cardno	10,000	0	**10,000**	0	1,158	8,842
	Stetson Engineers	10,000	0	**20,000**	10,000	2,316	17,684
	Hanson Environmental	10,000	0	**10,000**	0	1,158	8,842
	Total	30,000	0	**40,000**	10,000	**4,632**	**35,368**
7300	**Public Outreach Program**					**0%**	**100%**
	Communications Firm (TBD)	30,000	0	**30,000**	0	**0**	**30,000**
7400	**Governmental Affairs and Facilitation**					**0%**	**100%**
	California Strategies	150,000	150,000	**108,000**	(42,000)	**0**	**108,000**
7500	**Hydrologic Technical Support**					**0%**	**100%**
	Hydrologic Consultant	30,000	12,400	**20,000**	(10,000)	**0**	**20,000**
	TOTAL CONSULTANT ACTIVITIES	744,500	548,050	**947,875**	203,375	**91,468**	**856,407**

Cachuma Conservation Release Board

Consultant Activities Detail

FY 2015-16 Approved Budget - Cardno, Stetson, Hanson

Objective	Task	Task #	Consultant	Proposed Budget FY 2014-15	Authorized Budget FY 2014-15	Estimated Expenditures FY 2014-15	Approved FY 2015-16 Budget	Variance FY 2014-15 vs. FY 2015-16	Estimated Work Timing	Dependent upon
SWRCB Proceedings Support	Technical Support re SWRCB Draft Decision	1.0	Cardno	10,000	10,000	0	10,000	0	Q1-Q2	Delivery of SWRCB draft order
		2.1	Stetson	10,000	10,000	0	20,000	10,000		
		1.0	Hanson	10,000	10,000	0	10,000	0		
			Total	30,000	30,000	0	40,000	10,000		
Biological Opinon Support	Review & Respond to Draft BO	2.0	Cardno	83,000	83,000	80,000	70,000	(13,000)	Q1-Q2	Issuance of Draft BO
		2.0	Donahue	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	0		
		2.0	Hanson	1,600	1,600	1,600	10,000	8,400		
	Supplemental Analyses in Support of Draft BO and Review of Hydrologic Analyses from NMFS for LSYR	1.1	Stetson	30,000	30,000	27,860	20,000	(10,000)	Q1-Q2	Issuance of Draft BO
	Evaluate tributary creeks on South Coast Conduit (SCC)	1.8	Stetson	8,000	8,000	0	5,000	(3,000)	Q1-Q2	Issuance of Draft BO
	Hydrologic Analyses of Alternative Release Scenarios	1.2	Stetson	45,000	0	0	45,000	0	Q1-Q2	Issuance of Draft BO
	BA/BO negotiation meetings	3.0	Cardno	28,000	28,000	9,735	28,000	0	Q1-Q2	Issuance of Draft BO
		3.0	Hanson	24,100	24,100	0	14,000	(10,100)		
	Strategic Literature Survey and Build the Administrative Record	4.0	Cardno	10,000	10,000	900	2,000	(8,000)	Q1-Q2	
	Linking BA Conservation actions to the Recovery Plan	5.0	Cardno	13,500	13,500	3,325	10,175	(3,325)		
	Finalize the BA		Cardno	40,000	40,000	40,000	0	(40,000)		Completed FY14-15
			Hanson	19,600	19,600	13,000	0	(19,600)		
			Total	305,800	260,800	179,420	207,175	(98,625)		
BA/BO Supporting Studies	Evaluate NMFS's comments on Water Rights Order	6.0	Cardno	14,700	14,700	0	14,700	0	Q1-Q2	NMFS comments on the draft order
		2.2	Stetson	0	0	0	10,000	10,000		
	Confidential Study #1 (Downey Brand)	7.0	Cardno	36,000	0	0	36,000	0	Q1-Q2	3,000
		7.0	Donahue	56,000	0	0	56,000	0		
		1.7	Stetson	20,000	0	0	20,000	0		
	Confidential Study #2 (Downey Brand)	8.0	Cardno	69,000	0	0	69,000	0	Q3-Q4	rainfall and water in SYR
		1.6	Stetson	25,000	0	0	25,000	0		
	Impacts of Beaver on Steelhead in the LSYR Basin	9.0	Cardno	34,000	34,000	3,785	22,000	(12,000)	Q3-Q4	rainfall and water in SYR
	Impacts of Nonnative Predators on Steelhead in the LSYR Basin	10.0	Cardno	29,000	29,000	10,110	29,000	0	Q3-Q4	rainfall and water in SYR
	Flow Regimes to Address Beaver and Bass in the LSYR	11.0	Cardno	28,800	28,800	5,500	25,000	(3,800)	Q1-Q2	
		1.4	Stetson	15,000	15,000	0	15,000	0		
	Adult Steelhead Passage Flow Analysis for the LSYR*		Cardno	161,500	0	0	0	(161,500)	Q3-Q4	Flow in SYR
		1.3	Stetson	35,000	0	0	0	(35,000)		
	Geomorphic Analysis of Changes in Mainstem Corridor	1.5	Stetson	12,000	0	0	12,000	0	Q3-Q4	Flow in SYR
			Total	536,000		19,395	333,700	(202,300)		
Stategic Support	Stategic Support	12.0	Cardno	15,000	15,000	37,000	52,000	37,000	Q1-Q4	
		1.9	Stetson	7,000	7,000	30,810	30,000	23,000		
		4.0	Hanson	4,000	4,000	3,750	5,000	1,000		
		12.0	Donahue	12,000	12,000	10,350	12,000	0		
			Total	26,000	26,000	71,560	87,000	61,000		

* Tasks were removed from FY2015-16 budget based on Board authorization on June 19, 2015 to conduct and fund these tasks with FY2014-15 contingency and existing unencumbered, unbudgeted CCRB funds.

= Highlighted tasks to be assessed but will require authorization for implementation by the Board when needed

Continued on next page....

Objective	Task	Task #	Consultant	Proposed Budget FY 2014-15	Authorized Budget FY 2014-15	Estimated Expenditures FY 2014-15	Approved FY 2015-16 Budget	Variance FY 14-15 vs. FY 15-16	Estimated Work Timing	Dependent upon
Water Supply / Health and Safety	Continued Health and Safety Analysis	13.0	Cardno	new task	new task	n/a	15,000	n/a	Q1-Q2	
		3.0	Stetson	new task	new task	n/a	10,000	n/a		
			Total	0		0	25,000	25,000		
Contingency	Contingency	14.0	Cardno	58,000	0	58,000	40,000	(18,000)	as needed	
		1.10	Stetson	27,000	0	46,925	25,000	(2,000)		
		5.0	Hanson	50,000	0	0	20,000	(30,000)		
			Total	135,000		104,925	85,000	(50,000)		
	Total for all Tasks by Consultant		Cardno	630,500	306,000	248,355	422,875	(207,625)		
			Donahue	71,000	15,000	13,350	71,000	0		
			Stetson	234,000	70,000	105,595	237,000	3,000		
			Hanson	109,300	59,300	18,350	59,000	(50,300)		
	Grand Total			**1,044,800**	**450,300**	**385,650**	**789,875**	**(254,925)**		

= Highlighted tasks to be assessed but will require authorization for implementation by the Board when needed

FY 2015-16 CCRB MEMBER UNIT SURPLUS DISTRIBUTIONS AND COST ALLOCATIONS

Distribution of FY 2014-15 CCRB Surplus		
CCRB Cash Balance (as of 6-22-15)		722,788
Passage Study Task Funding for Cardno & Stetson		(196,500)
Estimate of Remaining Unpaid Invoices		(50,955)
Surplus Amount Retained until Final Distribution		(10,000)
Remaining Cash for CCRB Member Return		465,333
Allocation of Surplus:		
Goleta Water District	46.03%	214,193
City of Santa Barbara	40.88%	190,228
Montecito Water District	13.09%	60,912
TOTAL DISTRIBUTION	100.00%	465,333

Allocating FY 2015-16 CCRB Budget Expenses of:	**$1,388,807**	**PERCENT %**	**Annual**
Goleta Water District		46.03%	639,268
City of Santa Barbara		40.88%	567,744
Montecito Water District		13.09%	181,795
TOTAL		100.00%	**1,388,807**

Quarterly Assessments for Adopted Budget	**PERCENT %**	**Quarterly***
Goleta Water District	46.03%	159,817
City of Santa Barbara	40.88%	141,936
Montecito Water District	13.09%	45,449
TOTAL	100.00%	**347,202**

* Quarterly assessments subject to Board mid-year budget review

CARDNO

SCOPE OF WORK

Cardno
Shaping the Future

Cardno

201 N. Calle Cesar Chavez
Suite 203
Santa Barbara, CA 93103
USA

Phone 805 962 7679
Toll-free 800 368 7511
Fax 805 963 0412

www.cardno.com

July 1, 2015

Mr. Dan Griset
General Manager
Cachuma Conservation Release Board
629 State Street, Suite 244
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Subject: Proposed Fiscal Year 2015-16 Scope of Work and Cost Estimate for Cachuma Project Biological Opinion Reconsultation Support

Dear Mr. Griset:

Cardno is pleased to submit this proposed scope of work to support Cachuma Conservation Release Board (CCRB) and Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District, Improvement District #1 (ID#1) with the consultation on Southern California Steelhead with the National Marine Fisheries Service under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. For Fiscal Year 2015-16, we have identified sixteen tasks that will provide CCRB and ID#1 with information critical to the consultation. These are described fully in the scope of work below. The total estimated cost to complete this scope of work in FY2015-16 is $231,700 plus $409,300 in estimated roll-over budget from FY2014-15. The majority of the rollover funds were for tasks which were rainfall and flow dependent, or and/or which have not yet been authorized by CCRB.

Ms. Jean Baldrige will continue to be Cardno' primary contact and technical lead supported by Joel Mulder for day-to-day project management, quality assurance, and additional technical support will be provided by Sarah Horwath or other Cardno staff.

Cardno values our long-term relationship with the CCRB and ID#1. In reflection of this valued relationship, Cardno is continuing to provide Ms. Baldrige's services at a 40 percent discount from her standard hourly rate. Additionally, we have reduced our expense and subcontractor markup from 15% to 5%.

Thank you for your consideration of this scope of work. We are available to address any question or comments you have concerning this work.

Sincerely,

Joel Mulder
Senior Project Scientist for Cardno

Cachuma Conservation Release Board
July 1, 2015

Cardno
Cachuma Project Biological Opinion Reconsultation Support

Scope of Work
Fiscal Year 2015-16

This scope of work presents the tasks and budget for assisting Cachuma Conservation and Release Board (CCRB) and the Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District, ID #1 (ID #1) with Reconsultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for the operation and maintenance of the Cachuma Project on the Lower Santa Ynez River (LSYR). This scope of work assumes that the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) Water Right's Hearing Process is completed in Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-16. Table 1 (at the end of the document) provides a summary of the proposed budget for FY 2015-16. All cost estimates are based on the Cardno FY2015-16 Schedule of Fees (attached).

Overview

The reconsultation on the Cachuma Project can take three possible pathways to arrive at a final Biological Opinion (BO). The first step for all three pathways is submission of the Draft Biological Assessment (BA) by Reclamation to NMFS. This was completed in November 2013. NMFS determined that the draft BA was sufficient to begin formal consultation. Thus, no Final BA is will be necessary , however additional information will need to be developed to support areas of the BA that were not developed in the draft and to address question raised by Reclamation or NMFS. Reclamation has received a number of additional information requests related to the Draft BA. Cardno and other consultants have assisted Reclamation with these responses. NMFS may continue to request additional information or clarification of material submitted from Reclamation that will require support from the consulting team and attorneys.

NMFS will produce a Draft BO which will be either a) a non-jeopardy opinion, b) a jeopardy opinion with Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives (RPAs) to avoid harming the steelhead population, or 3) recommended changes to the Proposed Action to avoid a jeopardy opinion. Reclamation will comment on the Draft BO and may choose to negotiate changes to the Proposed Action to avoid a jeopardy opinion in the Final BO (Path 2) or comment on the RPAs associated with the jeopardy opinion (Path 3).

It is uncertain how long it will take NMFS to release the Draft BO, however, we anticipate the BO may be released in late 2015. The Draft BO has been delayed by consultation between NMFS and Reclamation on the critical drought and fish water releases to the lower river, as is required in the 2000 BO and other drought consultations that have been prioritized over the long-term BO for the Cachuma Project.

We also anticipate comments from NMFS on the SWRCB's Draft Water Rights Order within 30-45 days of the Draft Order. These comments are likely to provide some insights on NMFS's direction for comments on the Draft BA and potential outcomes for the Draft BO. In this scope of work, we propose examining both NMFS's comments on the Draft Water Rights Order and the SWRCB's final Water Rights Order to determine if modifications to the Proposed Action in the BA will be required. If the Draft BO is released prior to the Draft Water Rights Order, this task may not be necessary.

TASK 1.0 – Technical Support for SWRCB Water Rights Order Public Review Draft

Total Estimated Budget: $10,000

The timing of the release of the SWRCB's Water Rights Order public review draft has been uncertain due to the statewide drought emergency. The Order may require actions on the part of Reclamation that could include additional water releases to support steelhead in the LSYR and/or studies in the Upper Basin. Cardno will evaluate the draft Order to determine if changes to the Proposed Action included in the Draft BA are needed.

We will provide CCRB/ID#1 and Reclamation with a written summary of the implications of the draft Order on the Draft BA and our recommendations for refinements of the Proposed Action to avoid a potential jeopardy opinion. Discussions with Reclamation and CCRB/ID#1 will further evaluate potential changes to the Proposed Action, and if they are required, Cardno will revise the effects analysis in the BA as directed.

If the water rights order is released by mid-May 2015, this task may be accomplished in FY2014-15 and will not be required for FY2015-16.

TASK 2.0 – Review & Respond to Draft BO

Estimated Budget: $70,000

Under this task, Cardno will review and respond to a Draft BO, including review and comment by CCRB/ID#1 and Reclamation. The review will include additional analyses that are responsive to NMFS's RPAs/RPMs and CCRB/ID#1 and Reclamation's direction. This task also includes new and re-analyses required to address issues raised by Reclamation or CCRB/ID#1 in light of any NMFS additional information requests and comments. The response to the Draft BO may also incorporate additional data derived from focused studies (described in Tasks 5 through 11 below). One potential outcome of the Draft BO review may be changes or additions to the proposed action. If this is the case, Cardno will revise the proposed action and complete the effects analyses associated with any changes in the proposed action.

This scope of work assumes that NMFS will provide a Draft BO during the 2015-16 fiscal year. While awaiting it, Cardno proposes a list of parallel actions to complete in preparation for responding to RPAs that may be included as part of a possible jeopardy opinion. Efforts to support preparation of the Draft BO have been ongoing during FY2014-15 and will be continued in FY2015-16. Sub-tasks for preparing for the Draft BO include:

- Complete analysis of monitoring data to determine statistically-robust, credible population estimates for the LSYR, led by Dr. Bill Warren-Hicks, Technical Director of Statistics.
- Strategic guidance: internal calls and meetings with managers, attorneys and project team members; calls and meetings with Reclamation, led by Ms. Jean Baldrige, Technical Director.
- Incorporate results from additional studies and analyses conducted during FY2014-15.
- Incorporate comments from CCRB/ID#1 and Reclamation on the Draft BO for Reclamation to submit to NMFS.
- Respond to NMFS and Reclamation requests for additional information.

Cardno will be supported on this task by Ed Donahue (FEC): *$3000*

TASK 3.0 – BO Negotiation Meetings

Estimated Budget: $28,000

NMFS will produce a Draft BO which will be either a) a non-jeopardy opinion, b) a jeopardy opinion with Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives (RPAs) to avoid harming the steelhead population, or 3) recommended changes to the Proposed Action to avoid a jeopardy opinion. Reclamation will comment on the Draft BO and may choose to negotiate changes to the Proposed Action to avoid a jeopardy opinion in the Final BO or comment on the RPAs associated with the jeopardy opinion.

Cardno will support CCRB, ID#1, and Reclamation during this process, utilizing information from studies and analyses conducted in preparation for negotiations and/or RPAs. This effort will be led by Ms. Jean Baldrige, Technical Director.

TASK 4.0 – Strategic Literature Survey and Build the Administrative Record

Estimated Budget: $9,000

Strategic survey of the literature and building the administrative record for the Section 7 consultation will ensure relevant, recent NMFS BAs and BOs and other studies or literature are analyzed for potential influence or consequences on the reconsultation, and so they can be referenced during potential future legal actions. This task was started in FY 2012-13 as component of the draft BA preparation with investigation into strategic literature by James Lecky. It will be continued in FY2015-16 in order to complete the administrative record.

TASK 5.0 – Linking the Biological Assessment to Southern California Steelhead Recovery Plan Recovery Actions

Estimated Budget: $10,175

We anticipate that in preparing the Draft BO, NMFS will refer to the recovery actions outlined in the Recovery Plan in developing additional conservation measures and potential RPAs (if a jeopardy opinion is determined). NMFS has already indicated that these are likely to include passage around Bradbury Dam and increased passage and summer rearing flows in the LSYR.

In order to protect CCRB/ID#1's water supplies, Cardno will assess the suite of recovery actions in the Recovery Plan to identify additional conservation measures NMFS could require of Reclamation in the BO. The assessment would 1) identify the recovery action as cited in the Recovery Plan; 2) evaluate the feasibility and practicability of the action for implementation in the Santa Ynez River; and 3) describe reasons why the action is not included in the current Draft BA. The evaluation would also include a description of how the conservation measures in the Draft BA provide the benefits and support the desired outcomes of the recovery plan, making direct linkages from the measures to the recovery plan goals. We will prepare a technical memo that would support Reclamation during discussions with NMFS in the negotiation of the Final BA and, if required, negotiations of the RPAs, providing them with documentation of the benefits of the conservation measures already proposed in the Draft BA. Work on a draft document was completed in FY 2014-15 and a final document will be prepared in FY 2015-16

TASK 6.0 –Evaluate NMFS's Comments on SWRCB Water Rights Order Public Review Draft

Total Estimated Budget: $14,700

As described in Task 1 above, the timing of the SWRCB's Water Rights Order public review draft has been uncertain due to the statewide drought emergency; however it may be available before June 2016. NMFS's comments on the Draft order may provide insight on the direction they will take in the ESA consultation, both during the informal portion of the reconsultation and in their Draft BO. Cardno will evaluate NMFS's comments on the draft Order to determine if changes to the Proposed Action are needed to avoid a potential jeopardy opinion.

We will provide CCRB/ID#1 and Reclamation with a written summary of the implications of NMFS's comments on the Draft BA and our recommendations for refinements of the Proposed Action to avoid a potential jeopardy opinion. As directed, we will incorporate the recommendations into the Proposed Action and revise the effects analysis as needed to address the revised Proposed Action.

TASK 7.0 – Confidential Study #1 (Downey Brand)

Estimated Budget: $36,000

Cardno will be supported on this task by Ed Donahue (FEC): *$56,000*

TASK 8.0 – Confidential Study #2 (Downey Brand)

Estimated Budget: $69,000

TASK 9.0 – Impacts of Beaver on Southern California Steelhead in the LSYR watershed

Estimated Budget: $22,000

Beavers alter the hydrology, biogeochemistry, vegetation, and production of the waterways they inhabit and are considered to be habitat-modifying keystone species in freshwater ecosystems. The most cited negative impact of beaver dams on salmonids is the creation of passage impediments to upstream and downstream movements. Impacts of Beaver on steelhead were partially addressed under this task in for the Beaver Management Plan in FY 2014-15. In FY 2015-16, a study will evaluate the impacts of dams on steelhead movement and migration, which could have important ramifications relating to passage flow supplementation and passage improvement projects. It is critical to document the impacts of beaver dams on the steelhead population so that appropriate management actions can be developed to support the steelhead population in the LSYR.

This study includes two tasks: (1) a smolt retention survey to determine if downstream migration of smolts may be impeded by beaver dams, and (2) assessment of beaver dams as upstream passage barriers.

The upstream passage barrier assessment portion of the study was to be completed in FY2012-13, prior to the June 2013 BA submittal date. However, because WY2013, WY 2014, and WY 2015 were extremely dry years without sufficient flows to conduct the study, the fieldwork for this study was postponed and is planned for completion in FY2015-16. The smolt retention survey and the passage barrier assessments will be conducted pending rainfall and sufficient flow in the river. This task will be led by Mr. Joel Mulder for Cardno, who will provide field leadership, project coordination and oversight to Cardno staff, reporting and analysis.

TASK 10.0 – Impacts of Non-native Predators on Southern California Steelhead in the LSYR watershed

Estimated Budget: $29,000

Since implementation of the flow targets at the Alisal and Refugio reaches in the LSYR mainstem as required by the 2000 BO, COMB fisheries staff have observed an increase in warm-water nonnative, predatory fish (particularly largemouth bass) in the Alisal and Refugio reaches during fisheries surveys. It is hypothesized that predation of steelhead fry and juveniles by bass is impacting the steelhead population in the LSYR. The BA requires an analysis of all direct and indirect effects of the project on all steelhead life stages. Water releases which result in an increase in steelhead predators could be considered an indirect effect under the ESA. Evaluation of the impact of non-native predators on steelhead is critical for effective management and continuation of target flows in the Refugio and Highway 154 Reaches, and as partial justification for discontinuation of the Alisal Reach target flows.

In WY2014, this study was commenced to sample largemouth bass from the Long Pool for stomach contents analysis. Field efforts were performed by Cardno staff and COMB fisheries staff. The results of DNA analysis confirmed that bass prey upon steelhead. However, due to the drought of WY2014 and lack of flow events to facilitate downstream movement of many smolts from Hilton Creek to the LSYR mainstem, the sampling was conducted following rescue and relocation of *O. mykiss* to the Long Pool which had resulted from a HCWS failure. Further, snorkel surveys in the mainstem prior to sampling indicated that few *O. mykiss* were present in

the lower mainstem reaches, possibly due to the drought conditions; thus, sampling only occurred in the Long Pool.

To more fully evaluate the impacts of non-native species on juvenile steelhead, this study will be continued in FY2015-16, pending rainfall and flow events. Future efforts will increase sample size and the extent of the study. To quantify predation during seasonal volitional passage of juvenile steelhead, sampling of predators will be conducted following out-migration inducing flow events, as monitored by the migrant trapping program in Hilton Creek. Additional locations in the LSYR mainstem will be sampled, ideally in the Refugio and Alisal reaches.

Cardno holds the required permits to complete this work and will lead the effort, with support from COMB fisheries staff.

TASK 11.0 – Flow Regimes to Address Beaver and Bass in the LSYR

Estimated Budget: $25,000

Since implementation of the flow targets at the Alisal and Refugio reaches in the mainstem LSYR as required by the 2000 BO, COMB fisheries staff have observed an increase in warm water, nonnative, predatory fish (particularly largemouth bass) in the Alisal and Refugio Reaches. Since initiation of the flow targets, annual monitoring has also documented a notable increase in the number of beaver dams on the LSYR and tributaries. It is hypothesized that predation of steelhead fry and juveniles by bass is impacting the steelhead population in the LSYR, and predation on steelhead by bass was confirmed during the 2014 predator stomach sampling study. Beaver dams create passage barriers that likely impede both upstream and downstream migration and that create pond-like habitats potentially favoring non-native predators.

During the analyses conducted in preparing the Draft BA, the magnitude of the impacts on steelhead from both beaver and bass in the Highway 154 and Refugio Reaches became apparent. A more extensive management strategy is needed to address the impacts of beavers and bass. Steelhead could potentially benefit from a flow regime that more closely mimics natural flow conditions and which may reduce beavers and bass in the LSYR. Such a management strategy may include allowing the lower river to go dry during dry years. The current Proposed Action eliminates target flows in the year after a spill in the Alisal Reach in an effort to reduce the bass population.

In FY2014-15, we began working with Stetson Engineers to develop an appropriate flow regime to protect steelhead and reduce beaver and bass populations. The flow regimes will be further refined and a report to CCRB/ID#1 will be completed in FY2015-16. This task includes revising the Proposed Action based on the refined target flow management approach and re-evaluating the effects analysis in response to the Draft BO.

NMFS has expressed a desire for additional flow releases to support habitat in Hilton Creek and permanent flow every year in the Alisal Reach. Given NMFS's likely concerns with reducing summer rearing flows in some years rather than increasing them, the revised analysis will clearly describe the advantages and disadvantages of such a strategy on steelhead population-level dynamics. The analysis will identify ways in which the conservation measures in the BA, taken as a whole, will increase steelhead population without supporting beaver and bass habitat. This analysis will include linkages to the Recovery Plan to demonstrate how the revised flow management, in the context of the overall conservation measures, will support the recovery goals.

TASK 12.0 – Strategic Support Tasks

Estimated Budget: $52,000

Considerable strategic development and coordination between CCRB/ID #1, Reclamation, Cal Strategies, the consultant team, and attorneys has been underway and is expected to continue to be required to address strategic considerations, including strategic memos to the Board Members, meetings with the City of Santa Barbara, and the Boards of the Goleta Water District and Montecito Water District, meetings and discussions with elected officials and their staffs and other as yet unforeseen strategic efforts.

Cardno will be supported on this task by Ed Donahue (FEC): *$12,000*

TASK 13.0 – Continued Drought Support and Health and Safety Analysis

Estimated Budget: $40,000

Water year 2014-15 was the fourth year of drought in Southern California, which has put stress on the water supplies for the South Coast. As Lake Cachuma water levels have continued to drop, the Member Units, with Cardno's support, have conducted analysis of future water availability for human health and safety uses on the South Coast. Cardno will continue to support CCRB in FY2015-16 with ongoing health and safety analysis. Cardno will also support additional critical drought consultation work between Reclamation and NMFS related to determining releases for fish to the lower river during the critical drought, as needed.

TASK 14.0 – Contingency

Estimated Budget: $40,000

This scope of work includes a contingency for additional strategic tasks and meetings as requested by the individual Boards and City. The budget estimates for the above tasks are based on our understanding of the level of effort required to adequately complete the tasks as described. We anticipate additional funding may be needed due to the uncertainty in the timing and elements of some of these tasks. The contingency funds may be used to support additional effort for these tasks or for new, unanticipated efforts on other tasks on an as-needed basis. Contingency funds will only be utilized as directed by the CCRB General Manager.

Key Staff

The following key staff will participate in the development of the BA and studies to support the Reconsultation process.

Ms. Jean Baldrige, Technical Director, Water Resources Management
Ms. Baldrige has twenty years' experience with the Cachuma Project and extensive experience with complex, controversial ESA salmonid consultations in a variety of watersheds throughout the west. Ms. Baldrige provided expert witness testimony on behalf of CCRB/ID#1 during the series of State Water Resources Control Board Water Rights Hearings and was the principle author of the 2000 BA, providing technical support to CCRB/ID#1 and Reclamation during the initial ESA consultation with NMFS in 2000. Ms. Baldrige is Cardno's technical and strategic lead for the Reconsultation process and brings considerable institutional knowledge, technical

expertise and strategic perspective to the project leadership. She is a key author of the BA and provides technical oversight of the supporting studies.

Mr. James Lecky, Senior Consultant, Fisheries/ESA Expert
Mr. Lecky has 36 years of experience as a biologist with the NMFS. He served as Assistant Regional Administrator for NMFS in California and spent seven years as the Director, Office of Protected Resources for NMFS in Washington, D.C. During his tenure at NMFS, Mr. Lecky worked with a myriad of federal agencies in many arenas to discover ways for Federal Actions to proceed without jeopardizing the continued existences of threatened and endangered species or resulting in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. He consulted with Reclamation on the present BOs for the Cachuma Project, Robles Fish Passage Project and Vern Freeman Diversion Project. He was also instrumental in many other consultations throughout California. For instance, he consulted with both USACE and Reclamation on a number of other California water projects, including those for the Salinas Valley Water Project, Russian River Operations and Maintenance, Shasta Dam, Redbluff Diversion Dam and the Central Valley Water Project and State Water project.

Mr. Joel Mulder, Senior Project Scientist, Fisheries Biologist
Mr. Mulder is a fisheries biologist with five years' experience on the Cachuma Project and extensive steelhead experience throughout Southern California. Mr. Mulder is the key author of the BA and technical lead for the supporting studies.

Ms. Sarah Horwath, Senior Staff Scientist, Fisheries Biologist
Ms. Horwath is a fisheries biologist with four years' experience on the Cachuma Project, including significant experience in steelhead monitoring as a member of the COMB fisheries staff. Ms. Horwath provides key support in the development of the BA chapters and implementation of the supporting studies.

Table 1: Summary of Estimated Fiscal Year 2015-16 Cardno Budget.

Reconsultation Support	**Total Budget FY 15-16**
CCRB Funded Tasks	
Task 1: Evaluate SWRCB Water Rights Order Public Review Draft	$10,000
Task 2: Review & Respond to Draft BO	$70,000
Task 3: BO Negotiation Meetings	$28,000
Task 4: Strategic Literature Survey and Build the Administrative Record	$2,000
Task 5: Linking the BA to the Recovery Plan	$10,175
Task 6: Evaluate NMFS's Comments on SWRCB Water Rights Order Public Review Draft	$14,700
Task 7: Confidential Study #1 (Downey Brand)	$36,000
Task 8: Confidential Study #2 (Downey Brand)	$69,000
Task 9: Impacts of Beaver on Southern California Steelhead in the LSYR watershed	$22,000

Reconsultation Support	Total Budget FY 15-16
Task 10: Impacts of Non-native Predators on Southern California Steelhead in the LSYR watershed	$29,000
Task 11: Flow Regimes to Address Beaver and Bass in the LSYR	$25,000
Task 12: Strategic Support Tasks	$52,000
Task 13: Continued Health and Safety Analysis and Drought Consultation	$15,000
Task 14: Contingency	$40,000
SWRCB WR Order Total	*$10,000*
BO/BA Reconsultation/Drought Total	*$343,700*
TOTAL PROJECT COST	**$422,875**

* Task was removed from FY2015-16 budget based on Board authorization on June 19, 2015 to conduct and fund these tasks with FY2014-15 contingency and existing unencumbered, unbudgeted CCRB funds.

Table 2: Summary of Estimated Fiscal Year 2015-16 FEC (Ed Donahue) Budget.

Reconsultation Support	Total Budget FY 15-16
CCRB Funded Tasks	
Task 2: Review & Respond to Draft BO	$3,000
Task 7: Confidential Study #1 (Downey Brand)	$56,000
Task 12: Strategic Support	$12,000
TOTAL PROJECT COST	**$71,000**

Cardno project costs include a 3% Communications Fee. This fee, standard on the CCRB contract for over 20 years, is charged in lieu of time-of-use fees and unit costs associated with long-distance telephone and cell phone usage, conference call fees, photocopying and printing, cd/dvd preparation charges, and related project-specific charges.

STETSON

SCOPE OF WORK

STETSON ENGINEERS
PRELIMINARY SCOPE OF WORK FOR CCRB AND ID NO.1
FY 2015- 2016

The scope of work by Stetson Engineers in conjunction with the BO reconsultation and the SWRCB decision for the Cachuma Project consists of the following tasks for Fiscal Year 2015 – 16 (July 1 through June 30).

TASK 1: REVISED BO RECONSULTATION SUPPORT $197,000

This work is performed in connection with the reconsultation by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on the existing Biological Opinion (BO) for the Cachuma Project. The primary subtasks that Stetson will perform are described below:

a) Task 1.1- Supplemental Analyses in Support of Draft BA and Review of Hydrologic Analyses from NMFS ($20,000)

The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) submitted a draft BA to NMFS in November 2013. This task provides for any additional hydrologic analysis, information, and/or clarifications in response to comments or questions by NMFS regarding the material and analyses submitted in the draft BA. This task also includes furnishing information on supplemental data requests by NMFS on the Project operations

b) Task 1.2- Hydrologic Analyses of Alternative Release Scenarios ($45,000)

As part of NMFS's review of the draft BA, it is likely that NMFS will set forth its description of the proposed project, including a revised downstream release schedule and pertinent scientific information in support of their analyses. This alternative downstream release schedule could be proposed within two types of processes: either during NMFS' formal consultation with Reclamation or in response to a draft Jeopardy Opinion. Stetson will review the hydrologic components of NMFS' analyses and related studies. Stetson will undertake analyses and provide comments and questions on NMFS' scientific studies used to justify their proposals. NMFS has provided a report entitled "Annual Hydrograph Assessment for Steelhead Migration in the Santa Ynez River" by Humboldt State University River Institute dated June 30, 2014. Stetson has

performed work by analyzing this report in FY 2014-15. The key hydrologic studies and data that NMFS has acquired but not yet released include:

- Hydrodynamic 3-D model of the river channel that relates flow quantity with specific habitat properties (i.e. depth and area);
- Additional water quality monitoring that NMFS has performed to justify their release proposals.

Stetson will perform a thorough review of NMFS' hydraulic model, hydrologic analysis of pre-dam conditions, and water quality analyses. The review will evaluate the scientific merit of their analyses as it pertains specifically to the underpinnings of NMFS' alternative release schedule.

This task also provides for extensive modeling and other hydrologic analyses to assess the effects of any revisions to the proposed action by NMFS as well as by the Member Units. Most likely there will be several alternative scenarios of Cachuma Project operations that will be need to be tested, as well as several model iterations or refinements to the scenarios requested by the different parties involved. Stetson will perform these analyses in order to set forth the preferred approach for any variations to the proposed project using the most recent data, such as different release scenarios. Unless the Santa Ynez River RiverWare Model (SYRRM) has been fully calibrated, the Santa Ynez River Hydrology Model (SYRHM) will continue to be the primary modeling tool. Daily flows will be estimated from the model output similar to the modeling platform used for the existing BO, based on the disaggregation technique using key gaged tributary flows. The key impacts to the Cachuma Project water supply of the Member Units during drought periods will be assessed, as well as impacts to the magnitude, frequency, and pattern of flows downstream of Cachuma Reservoir for fishery purposes. Stetson will consult with Cardno-Cardno, CCRB, ID No. 1, and Reclamation on any potential changes or technical refinements to the flow-related components of the BA.

d) Task 1.4 – Modeling to support flow regime proposals to manage beavers and bass in the LSYR ($15,000)

To respond to anticipated suggestions from NMFS on the draft BA for increased and/or decreased releases downstream to manage beavers and bass, a hydrologic analysis is needed to determine what the water cost to the Member Units will be from the Cachuma Project. This task

involves undertaking model analysis of the lower Santa Ynez River channel to determine the water supply costs and downstream hydrologic conditions for different scenarios.

e) Task 1.5 – Geomorphic Analysis of Changes in Mainstem Corridor ($12,000)

The results of the 2013-14 study for the evaluation of the changes in location and extent of critical riffles would be reviewed with Reclamation and NMFS. A report would be prepared based on the field data, mapping and aerial photos. Mr. Matt Smeltzer of Geomorph Design will be working with Stetson on this task.

f) Task 1.6 – Confidential Study #2 **($25,000)**

g) Task 1.7 – Confidential Study #1 **($20,000)**

h) Task 1.8 – Evaluate Tributary Creeks on South Coast Conduit (SCC) **($5,000)**

Undertake the refinement of watershed model analysis on selected creeks, such as Mission and Carpinteria creeks, to determine the potential flow regimes for steelhead. Coordinate those analyses with Cardno-Cardno in connection with the NMFS' consultation on the SCC.

i) Task 1.9 – Meetings/Telephone Conference Calls and Coordination with Project Team, Reclamation and NMFS **($30,000)**

This task relates to working with CCRB, ID No. 1, Cardno-Cardno and Reclamation including strategic planning, participating in meetings and conference calls, and supplying data, information, and feedback during reconsultation with NMFS. This task also may involve meetings with NMFS on reconsultation including discussions of technical and hydrological aspects of the proposed project.

j) Task 1.10 – Miscellaneous Hydrologic Support **($25,000)**

This subtask relates to miscellaneous work items (unforeseen tasks) related to potential strategic analyses and answering questions from the Project Team. Often new topics of concern are identified as needing special attention during the BO reconsultation process. They also pertain to Cachuma Project storage and operations. Additionally, this task includes contingency for some of the work items that may require added efforts.

TASK 2: TECHNICAL SUPPORT FOR SWRCB DECISION ($30,000)

a) Task 2.1 – Review Draft Decision and Provide Technical Support **($20,000)**

This subtask is performed in connection with reviewing and analyzing the draft decision by the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) for the Cachuma Project water rights. This task includes preparing and testifying in a hearing (one day) on the draft decision at the SWRCB. This task may involve additional hydrology analyses to address potential concerns raised by the

draft decision.

b) Task 2.2 – Prepare Response to NMFS's Comments on Proposed Order ($10,000)

This subtask would provide analyses to respond to NMFS' comments on the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) draft water rights order, and any additional flow related studies that may be included in the SWRCB order. It also includes technical support to the attorneys in preparing for potential challenges to the SWRCB Final Decision on Cachuma Permits 11308 and 11310.

TASK 3: CONTINUED DROUGHT SUPPORT ($10,000)

Lake Cachuma is currently in the fourth year of a historical drought (2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015) since the spill in 2011 and rainfall has only averaged about 10 inches over these four years. This task involves continuing hydrologic support during this severe drought including, but not limited to, projecting available water supplies, lake elevations, and analyses in support of the Section 7 consultation between Reclamation and NMFS on the drought supply operations.

TOTAL TASKS 1-3: $237,000

COST ESTIMATE FOR CCRB AND ID NO. 1
SOW for Cachuma Project by Stetson Engineers
FY 2015-2016

	Principal		Senior		Associate		Assistant		Word Processing		Stetson Totals
	hrs	$225	hrs	$154	hrs	$127	hrs	$88	hrs	$68	
	256	**$57,600**	**591**	**$91,014**	**458**	**$58,166**	**252**	**$22,176**	**47**	**$3,196**	
Task 1: BO Reconsultation Support											**$197,000**
1.1 Supplemental Analyses in Support of Draft BA and Review of Hydrologic Analyses from NMFS	20	$4,500	55	$8,470	50	$6,350	5	$440	4	$272	$20,000
	30	$6,750	125	$19,250	120	$15,240	40	$3,520	4	$272	
1.2 Hydrologic Analyses of Alternative Release Scenarios	~~17~~	~~$3,825~~	~~100~~	~~$15,400~~	~~100~~	~~$12,700~~	~~32~~	~~$2,816~~	~~4~~	~~$272~~	$45,000
	12	$2,700	45	$6,930	30	$3,810	15	$1,320	4	$272	
~~1.3 Model Analysis for Downstream Routing Passage Flows~~											~~$35,000~~
	28	$6,300	12	$1,848	8	$1,016	25	$2,200	10	$680	
1.4 Modeling to Support Flow Regime Proposals to Manage Beavers and Bass i the LSYR	12	$2,700	70	$10,780	61	$7,747	40	$3,520	4	$272	$15,000
	25	$5,625	44	$6,776	30	$3,810	40	$3,520	4	$272	
1.5 Geomorphic Analysis of Changes in Mainstem Corridor											$12,000
	2	$450	2	$308	20	$2,540	16	$1,408	4	$272	
1.6 Confidential Study #2	80	$18,000	60	$9,240	19	$2,413	0	$0	5	$340	$25,000
1.7 Confidential Study #1	30	$6,750	78	$12,012	20	$2,540	39	$3,432	4	$272	$20,000
1.8 Evaluate Tributary Creeks on South Coast Conduit (SCC)	**42**	**$9,450**	**96**	**$14,784**	**0**	**$0**	**48**	**$4,224**	**23**	**$1,564**	$5,000
1.9 Meetings/Telephone Conference Calls and Coordination with Project Team, Reclamation and NMFS	28	$6,300	64	$9,856	0	$0	32	$2,816	15	$1,020	$30,000
	14	$3,150	32	$4,928	0	$0	16	$1,408	8	$544	
1.10 Miscellaneous Hydrologic Support											$25,000
	60	**$13,500**	**55**	**$8,470**	**40**	**$5,080**	**22**	**$1,936**	**15**	**$1,020**	
Task 2: Technical Support for SWRCB Proceedings											**$30,000**
1.1 Review Draft Decision and Provide Technical Support											$20,000

1.2 Prepare Response to NMFS's Comments on Proposed Order							$10,000
Task 3: Continued Drought Support							**$10,000**
	$71,100	$99,484	$63,246	$24,112	$4,216		
						TOTAL	$237,000

F:\DATA\2385\admin\FY15-16\FY 15-16_Stetson_Cost Estimate _V20150526.xlsx

DRAFT 5/26/2015

CALIFORNIA STRATEGIES

SCOPE OF WORK

(For Confidential Distribution)

NORMAN BROWN

SCOPE OF WORK

(For Confidential Distribution)