QUARTERLY PROGRAMMATIC REPORT

Component Project Title: Coordination, Integration and Technical Administration
Component Project PI: G. Fred Lee
PI Affiliation: G. Fred Lee & Associates
Address: 27298 E. El Macero Dr., El Macero, CA 95618
Phone/Fax: (530)753-9630 / (530)753-9956
Email: gfredlee@aol.com

Program Manager Rebecca Kramer, NFWF Phone 415-778-0999
Project Manager Dr. G. Fred Lee Phone 530-753-9630
CALFED Project # 01-N61-01
Quarter Ending September 30, 2002

Deliverables

The following information is based on the Task 5 supplement to this component project and a rebudgeting of the funds made available for the peer review.

Task	Name of Deliverable	Due Date	% of Work Complete	Date Deliverable Completed
Task 1	Synthesis Report Final	10/31/02*	98	ongoing***
Task 2	Strawman Development	10/31/02*	100	ongoing***
Task 3	Peer Review	****	95	N/A**
Task 4	Technical Administration	ongoing***	95	N/A***
Task 5	Experimental Aeration Planning	10/31/02	50	ongoing

* revised due date. The comments on the peer review comments will be incorporated into the synthesis report in October 2002.

** N/A - Not Applicable.

*** Ongoing activity for which there is no specific deliverable due within the quarter.

**** URS, Inc. assumed responsibility per CALFED arrangements. Original funding for support of peer review was rebudgeted to support developing materials for TMDL Phase I activities.

Narrative

Task 1: Synthesis Report

During the fifth quarter of the project, further work on the synthesis report was devoted to incorporating responses to the peer reviewers' comments into the synthesis report. The synthesis report will be finalized during October 2002.

Task 2: Strawman Development

Since the Strawman report was developed in the fourth quarter, no further work was scheduled to be done on the Strawman development. While not required, work was done on evaluating the impact of urban stormwater runoff associated BOD, ammonia and organic N on

DWSC oxygen demand load. This information will be incorporated into the final version of the synthesis report.

The rebudgeting of peer review support funds within the project provided funds that could be used for further data analysis as part of the Strawman effort. B. Marcotte of CALFED requested in early July 2002 that these funds be shifted from further data analysis to support for developing a framework for follow-on studies that could be conducted during Phase I of the TMDL. This is still within the framework of the Strawman, and therefore did not require any shifting of funds within the overall technical administration budget or additional approval. Emphasis in this effort was to be devoted to developing guidance that would serve as the basis for monitoring and further evaluation that needed to be carried out in the Phase I TMDL in support of the final phase TMDL. This was to be a cooperative effort between C. Foe and G. F. Lee.

In accord with a request by CALFED staff, G. F. Lee developed a draft report that delineated six areas that needed further investigation as part of the Phase I TMDL, and discussed the justification for these followup investigations. C. Foe reviewed this draft and added several other areas that were pertinent to CEQA requirements that would have to be addressed as part of implementing the final phase of the TMDL to control low DO in the DWSC. This guidance document is a key component to the response to the peer reviewers' comments that was prepared by G. F. Lee.

This guidance was submitted to the SJR DO TMDL email lists for review and comment. Several comments were received in support of the guidance as written. R. Brown provided comments that were pertinent to details of some aspects of the guidance, and while he stated that his version of the guidance should replace the Lee/Foe guidance, in fact, he did not address a number of key areas that have to be addressed to develop the information that needs to be developed for the final TMDL, with the result that his comments are to be considered as further detail on some aspects of the guidance, but not as a replacement.

In addition to developing the overall guidance framework and justification for studies in each of the major areas that need study, in July and early August Dr. Lee, in response to Joe McGahan's request for details of what should be monitored, developed specific guidance for further monitoring of the Mud and Salt Slough watersheds. He also organized and participated in a tour of these watersheds, conducted by Joe McGahan and David Cory. Based on this tour, he developed additional guidance on monitoring/study programs that should be conducted in those watersheds to define the origin of the high algal/BOD loads and what could be potentially done to control them.

This further guidance was not distributed to the SJR email lists, since L. Ploss, Chair of the SJR DO TMDL Steering Committee, indicated he did not want it discussed until the general framework for upstream studies had been developed through a stakeholder meeting. Those meetings were held in Los Banos in mid-September and in early October in Merced. The overall guidance and the detailed guidance for the upstream studies, as well as the guidance for the San Joaquin River studies between the upstream watersheds and the DWSC

that was developed by G. F. Lee, will be included in the final synthesis report that is to be available by the end of October 2002.

Task 3: Peer Review

During the project fifth quarter, responses to the peer reviewers' comments were developed and distributed to the SJR Steering Committee for review and comment. Final SJR email list reviewers' comments have been recently received and are being incorporated into the synthesis report.

Task 4: Technical Administration

During the fifth quarter, all invoices received from the component project PIs were reviewed and, after appropriate changes to conform to NFWF requirements were made, submitted to NFWF for payment.

All of the component project PIs were required to submit their project final reports by August 31, 2002. As of October 7, five of the 12 final reports have been submitted (Stringfellow/Quinn, Nader/Rajbhandari, Brown-Tidal Exchange, Murdoch-city of Stockton and Brown review of Chen 2002 modeling runs) As of October 7, 2002, final reports are still due from Lehman, Litton, Jacobs, Brown-Aeration, Hutton, Tulloch/Quinn, and Kratzer.

There has been confusion throughout the CALFED Low-DO Directed Action project regarding contracting with the USGS/Kratzer. During the fifth quarter, the contracting situation was somewhat resolved, although there are still some important questions that have not been answered. CALFED entered into a master contract with the USGS which included support for the SJR low-DO studies proposed by Kratzer. This contract was developed in the fall of 2001. A copy of this contract was provided to G. F. Lee by R. Kramer of NFWF in November 2001. C. Kratzer stated in December 2001, and then again in January 2002, that he had not worked on developing final reports for the 2000 and 2001 studies since CALFED and the USGS had not developed a contract to cover these studies. However, it was pointed out to C. Kratzer by G. F. Lee in December 2001 and again in January 2002 that the contract had been executed in November 2001.

In reviewing this matter in connection with providing the Steering Committee with the status of component project PIs' submission of their final reports, it was learned that, contrary to what was indicated earlier, the CALFED-USGS contract was not going to be handled through NFWF, but was to be handled directly between CALFED staff and the USGS. In review of the contract that was provided, it was found that no date by which the draft or final reports for the USGS studies was to be submitted was included in the contract. This was brought to the attention of B. Marcotte. She indicated that she would review this matter and get back to G. F. Lee on it. She has thus far not done so.

As it stands now, based on the contract provided to G. F. Lee, there is no date for submission of the USGS reports covering the CALFED support of the C. Kratzer low-DO project. There is, however, in accord with the terms of the conditions established by the Steering Committee for all component projects, the requirement of C. Kratzer to comply with the requirements applicable to all component projects, including submissions of quarterly

progress reports, final reports, etc. Except for the initial quarterly report, C. Kratzer has not provided quarterly reports that were due in January, April and July, and he has not provided a final report. In the fall of 2001 P. Dileanis, who worked with C. Kratzer on this project, provided the data that were collected by the USGS to Chris Foe for use as part of the Strawman effort. He also provided additional information on preliminary data workup to G. F. Lee for the synthesis report in March 2002.

One of the issues that cannot be resolved until at least a draft of the USGS low-DO component project is available, is the QA/QC efforts that the USGS and Dr. Dahlgren of UCD were to undertake during the 2001 studies. In the 2000 studies it was found that there were differences in the concentration data for chlorophyll taken at the same time and location by C. Kratzer and R. Dahlgren. This led to an effort by G. F. Lee to develop a QA/QC program which would address these issues. An overall QA/QC program was submitted by G. F. Lee to the component project PIs in July 2001. The first phase of this was conducted in August 2001, where the investigators who were making DO measurements were to compare their results on the same water samples at the DWR Rough and Ready Island station. Will Stringfellow developed a report of the results, which is on the SJR DO TMDL website and is discussed in the synthesis report.

During August 2002 there was also supposed to be a cooperative effort among all investigators conducting chlorophyll analysis, where a single sample of water was to be split among the investigators, and each investigator was to determine the planktonic algal chlorophyll *a* and pheophytin in the sample. While G. Litton reported the results of his efforts, the other investigators have not reported their results from that effort. It was not possible to gain the cooperation of the component project PIs to conduct the QA/QC program that G. F. Lee developed in July 2001, except for comparison of DO measurements at one time at the Rough and Ready Island station in August.

Another problem area in conducting the low-DO component project was that some of the component project PIs did not provide the data management information needed for the overall project completion. Each of the component project PIs was, in accord with their scope of work for their project, required to submit the data they collected through September 2001 to the IEP database by the end of December 2001, and all data collected in the project, by the end of January 2002. While many of the component project PIs complied with this requirement, some did not. In July 2002, an attempt was made by G. F. Lee to determine the current status of data entry into and retrieval from the IEP database. Each of the component project PIs was asked to provide an updated status of their data submissions to the IEP database and the availability of their data from the IEP database. Presentations were made by Karl Jacobs at a TAC meeting in the spring 2002 to demonstrate how this can be done. Also, Karl Jacobs was asked to indicate his understanding of the current status of low-DO project data entry from each of the component projects. Several of the component project PIs indicated that they had entered their data; however, a number had not, with the result that, at this time, the current status of the requirement for all component project PIs to enter data into the IEP database and to be sure that the information is retrievable is not available.

Another significant problem that occurred that impacted fully accomplishing the low-DO Directed Action project objectives was the inability of CALFED and the Department of Water Resources to develop a contract to support DWR component projects. This contract should have been implemented in June, and certainly no later than July 2001. It still has not been signed. While some of the DWR component project PIs (such as Parviz Nader and Hari Rajbhandari) completed their final report for their component project devoted to South Delta Modeling by the August 31, 2002, deadline, others, such as P. Lehman, indicated that DWR management prohibited her from working on the reporting of the results of her approximately $400,000 study, conducted during 2001. This means, since she still has not properly reported the results of her 2000 studies, that there is almost $700,000 of work over two summers that is not available in properly reported form, that was conducted under her supervision. Further, thus far she has failed to respond to the requests for information on the status of data submission to the IEP database.

Another problem area related to CALFED contracting occurred with respect to the work that was to be done for modeling of upstream oxygen demand sources and their impacts on DO in the DWSC. CALFED did not support the original proposal submitted in January 2001 for the modeling effort, and instead issued a Request for Proposals to do modeling that CALFED wanted to do, which was in some undefined way related to the low-DO problem. The contractors for this modeling (HydroQual and Stanford University) were selected in the late summer 2002. As of yet, contracts to initiate this modeling work have not been issued.

Further, as discussed in the synthesis report, there is no integration of this modeling effort with the results of the rest of the low-DO project. This situation has directly affected one of the low-DO Directed Action component projects – namely, the DSM2 Upstream Modeling that was to be conducted by P. Hutton. P. Hutton and his staff expanded the DSM2 model to cover flow-related issues in the SJR upstream of the DWSC. He provided a brief summary of this work. He did not provide a final report for that phase of the work. Further, because of the inability of CALFED to issue a contract to HydroQual to do the upstream water quality modeling, Hutton and his replacement in DWR have not been able to initiate the upstream San Joaquin River water quality modeling that is necessary to translate oxygen demand loads that enter the SJR at Mud and Salt Sloughs and SJR at Lander Avenue to loads that reach the DWSC. This is another significant gap in information that has occurred because of the inability of CALFED to execute contracts.

Status of Final Invoice Submission. In June 2002 all of the component projects received a 90-day, no-cost extension of their contracts. This extension would allow the PIs to complete their final reports by the August 31, 2002, deadline. At this time the component project PIs − Murdoch (City of Stockton), Parviz Nader and Hari Rajbhandari (DWR) − are eligible to submit and have approved (when it conforms to NFWF requirements) a final invoice. All other component projects are deficient with respect to fourth quarter progress report and/or final reports. Without these having been submitted in a satisfactory form, the final invoice will not be processed.

B. Marcotte indicated that G. F. Lee and A. Jones-Lee are not responsible for critical review/processing of the invoices for the DWR low-DO Directed Action component projects. The review of these invoices will be conducted by CALFED staff.

Tulloch/Quinn, on behalf of the Quinn/Tulloch project, submitted a final invoice where Quinn proposed to use the interim draft report prepared for the peer reviewers in the spring of 2002 as the final report. He was informed that this approach would not be satisfactory because he billed for several tens of thousands of dollars of work done beyond the date of submission of that report, where the results of these studies must be included in the final report. The invoice for that project is being held until a satisfactory final report is received from Quinn/Tulloch.

With respect to processing invoices, there have been chronic problems where component project PIs failed to follow the explicit directions provided by NFWF on how an invoice should be submitted. It has been found that following these directions, which are easily followed, will result in prompt processing by NFWF. Failure to follow these directions requires that the invoice be returned to the PI. A number of the invoices have several – sometimes as many as five – iterations before the PI and their accounting staff finally adopt NFWF's requirements for submitting invoices. Most of these problems relate to careless preparation of the invoices, where the arithmetic was not checked for accuracy, and the invoice was not internally consistent with respect to presenting the same numeric values for the same item in different parts of the invoice.

Plan for Completion of Project. The approach that G. F. Lee and A. Jones-Lee will follow with respect to completion of the low-DO Directed Action project includes finalization of the synthesis report, which will include the response to peer reviewers with appropriate changes made for the comments received from low-DO Directed Action Steering Committee members on the draft responses to the peer reviewers' comments. This response to the external peer reviewers will include the guidance Phase I TMDL study report that was requested by CALFED, as well as the upstream monitoring information that was developed by G. F. Lee. The synthesis report will be reviewed by G. F. Lee and A. Jones-Lee for technical content and editorial issues as part of finalization. No further work is contemplated on developing the information needed to initiate the Phase I TMDL until additional funding becomes available.

Quarterly reports and invoices received from component project PIs by October 31, 2002, will be processed. A request has been submitted to CALFED to cover the time and expenses needed to process quarterly reports and final invoices received after that date.

Task 5: Experimental Aeration Planning

During the fifth quarter, the subcontract with URS Inc. covering the development of scope of work for development of an experimental aeration project was executed. URS developed the draft scope of work for the experimental aeration project, which was distributed to the SJR email lists for review and comment. Detailed comments were provided on the draft by G. F. Lee. This subcontract is on track to be completed on time during October 2002.

Projected expenses for the next quarter:

Month 1 $ Total for quarter $ 58,180.00

Title: Coordination, Integration and Technical Administration

Original Budget Year: May 4, 2001 – April 30, 2002
Revised to May 4, 2001 – October 31, 2002
Statement Quarter: Project 5th Quarter 2002
(July 1-September 30, 2002)

Applicant: G. Fred Lee & Associates
CALFED Project Number: 01-N61-01

Total Estimated Cost
Funding from CALFED: $158,000 + $55,000 for Task 5
Other Funding: $180,000*

*These funds are being provided by G. Fred Lee & Associates through reduced hourly charge rates for Drs. G. Fred Lee and Anne Jones-Lee as well as time devoted to the project that has not been covered by the project budgets

Total Project Estimated Completion Date: Original: May 31, 2002 Revised: September 30, 2002			Project 5th Quarter 2002 Budget			May 4, 2001 – September 30, 2002 Project Budget		
			Budget	Accrued Expenditures	Variance	Budget	Accrued Expenditures	Remaining Balance
Task 1:	Synthesis Report	98% complete*	$2,300.00	$2,300.00	0	$35,000	$34,300.00	$700.00
Task 2:	Strawman Development	100% complete*	$0	$0	0	$18,000	$18,000.00	$0
Task 3:	Peer Review	95% complete	$14,500.00	$14,500.00*	0	$30,000	$28,500.00	$1,500.00
Task 4:	Technical Administration	95% complete*	$7,470.00	$7,470.00	0	$75,000	$71,270.00	$3,730.00
Task 5	Experimental Aeration Planning	50% complete	$2,750.00	$2,750.00	0	$55,000	$2,750.00	$52,250.00
Total:			**$27,020.00**	**$27,020.00**	**0**	**$213,000**	**$154,820.00**	**$58,180.00**