

* 10/16 @0000

Memorandum

SEP 12 1997

Date : September 11, 1997

To : Lester Snow
CALFED Bay/Delta Program

From : Randall L. Brown *RLB*
Environmental Services Office
Department of Water Resources

Subject: Interagency Ecological Program and CALFED

This is a follow up of a meeting between you, Jerry Johns and me in which we discussed the possible role of the Interagency Program in CALFED and your perceptions about the Interagency Ecological Program itself. One of your responses to our question about what the program should be was something to the effect "What do you want it to be?". We then explored the possibility of an off-site meeting of the Interagency Coordinators which would focus on the program's future direction.

We had the off-site meeting on July 30 and 31, 1997. This is to update you on some of the main points resulting from the meeting and to forward a recommendation. The coordinators would like to meet with you and your staff to discuss some of the ideas and the recommendation in more detail. If the meeting seems appropriate, let me know (e-mail works) and I will ask my secretary to arrange it.

*SY, RW
DL*

Before the off-site meeting we asked several agency and stakeholder representatives a few questions about the current program, the desirability of expanding its geographic and technical coverage, the program's possible role in CALFED and the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, and potential changes in program structure. Interviewees included Bob Potter, Peter Moyle, Dave Schuster, Rick Woodard, Byron Buck, Pete Rhoads, Nat Bingham, Jason Peltier, Gary Bobker and Greg Gartrell. Their responses to the questions were summarized and discussed at the meeting.

The meeting itself was divided into two distinct sections - fine tuning the existing program and future directions. Below are some main points from each section.

Fine tuning

- o There was general agreement that the existing program is working well but that there is considerable room for improvement, especially at the mid-management level.

SURNAME

DWR 155 (Rev. 2/88)

D - 0 2 7 5 2 8

Lester Snow
September 11, 1997
Page Two

- o There was also general agreement that key program staff and managers are being pulled in several directions by CALFED, CVPIA, Delta Wetlands and internal agency programs which makes it difficult for us to devote sufficient time to the IEP.
- o We need more effective stakeholder involvement.
- o We need a better way of conveying data and information to a wide variety of interested users. This communication includes an expanded peer review component as well as brochures and guides geared to general audiences.
- o The attachment describes a series of steps designed to increase the effectiveness of the existing program.

Future direction

- o The program must continue to provide the long-term data bases that are being used by the Bay/Delta community, including CALFED, to identify trends in the abundance and distribution of key aquatic organisms and communities. Adjustments will be necessary to include the broader range of indicators being developed by CALFED.
- o The coordinators believe the Interagency Program must play a key role in conducting and coordinating Central Valley and Bay/Delta monitoring and special studies. The main rationale is that the nine IEP agencies have much of the management and monitoring authority and responsibility through CALFED, CVPIA, State Water Resources Control Board, Endangered Species Act and other programs.
- o There was general, but not unanimous, support among the coordinators and interviewees for the IEP to expand geographically and technically.
- o There was also agreement that the IEP should both coordinate as well as data collection analysis, and data storage - it would be impossible (and undesirable) for the IEP to carry out all monitoring activities. The IEP's Central Valley Salmon Team provides a model for such a role in that the team helps define the studies needed, conducts some of the work and coordinates the work of others to achieve the long-term

goals of documenting changes in abundance and possible causes for these changes.

- o There is presently no entity that conducts and coordinates the kind of project-specific monitoring that will be integral components of CALFED restoration activities. We need to discuss IEP's possible role in this area.
- o We discussed several options for program structure including:
 - Existing structure/existing mission
 - Existing agencies and structure but with most of staff housed in one location.
 - Existing structure but with expanded role in coordination of monitoring and assessment programs.
 - Create a separate entity to conduct monitoring and special studies.

Recommendation

To emphasize the linkage between the Interagency Program and CALFED, the coordinators recommended that the next annual meeting of the IEP directors be part of the October or November CALFED Policy Group meeting. At that time the directors will be asked to approve the proposed 1997-98 program and be briefed on possible changes to increase the program's effectiveness, especially in relation to CALFED.

In preparation for such a joint meeting the coordinators agreed to:

- o Prepare a short concept paper describing where the program has been, is, and where it wants to go; (This paper would be available by October 1, 1997.)
- o Meet with you and your staff to determine if and how to proceed with the joint meeting of the agency directors;

Lester Snow
September 11, 1997
Page Four

- o Obtain buy off on the concept and scope of the joint meeting from agency management;
- o Continue discussions with the interviewees.

Attachment

cc: Penny Howard
Environmental Affairs Division
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way, MP-150
Sacramento, California 95825

Bob Potter, Chief Deputy Director
Executive Division
Department of Water Resources

copies sent via E-mail to:
Agency Coordinators
Pat Coulston