

April 25, 1997

To: Lester Snow

From: Rick Woodard



Subject: Program Clarification

At Cindy Darling's request, I have been trying to help formulate language for her RFP. In that connection I prepared a draft showing suggested priority water quality subject areas and project selection criteria. This draft was distributed for review and comment at the April 1, 1997 meeting of the Water Quality Technical Group (WQTG). Attached is a copy of the draft document along with a digest of the comments that were received.

The comments on this draft highlight what I believe is a problem for CALFED. The following is my attempt to articulate the issue. I would appreciate the opportunity to meet with you in the near future to discuss the matter.

A Pollutants Working Team (PWT) was organized under the Ecosystem Roundtable to make recommendations on CALFED actions to reduce contaminants in the system that are harmful to the ecosystem. In other words, the function of this team is to evaluate and recommend ecosystem water quality actions to the Ecosystem Roundtable as part of the Ecosystem Restoration Program. This team has had no connection to the Water Quality Program except that a few people, such as Chris Foe from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, have been involved both in the PWT and the WQTG. The PWT made recommendations for project funding, though I was unaware of that until stakeholder responses were received on the Water Quality Program input to the RFP.

One problem the stakeholders responses identify is a lack of coordination between the Ecosystem Restoration Program and the other CALFED resource areas, including water quality. A manifestation of this is seen in the lack of consistency between the water quality recommendations of the PWT and WQTG to the Ecosystem Roundtable, which is also reflected in the comments.

It has come to be my view that CALFED has two water quality programs. The ecosystem water quality program falls under the Ecosystem Restoration Program and Ecosystem Roundtable. This program features an advisory committee (PWT) and, most importantly, funding mechanisms and an independent, comprehensive ecosystem water quality assessment program that is being created presently. These functions are completely unconnected to the other water quality program.

The other program, the one to which I am attached, is called the Water Quality Program and, ostensibly, has three main components, ecosystem, urban, and agricultural water quality. Like the other program, this one features an advisory committee and a comprehensive water quality monitoring and assessment activity, except that this monitoring is for all beneficial uses, not only

for ecosystem. Unlike the other program it is unclear how, or whether, the monitoring program and other features will be implemented.

Numerous stakeholders have observed that the Water Quality Program was a CALFED afterthought. Indeed, the function of this program appears not to be well defined, especially with respect to the water quality functions of the Ecosystem Restoration Program and Ecosystem Roundtable, and with respect to the role of the Water Quality Program, if any, in decision making over resource allocations.

Because the two water quality programs have operated independently, the present organization seems to have more potential for confusing stakeholders and issues than for meeting CALFED needs. Evidence of this is seen in Chris Foe's statement that *CALFED consists of four groups, including Ecosystem Restoration and Ecosystem Water Quality*. Stakeholders, even ones such as Chris who have been significantly involved in CALFED activities, are generally not able to differentiate the ecosystem water quality program within the Ecosystem Restoration Program and Ecosystem Roundtable and the ecosystem water quality component of the Water Quality Program.

I believe we need to give further consideration to what the role of the Water Quality Program to which I am attached should be, if any.

Attachments

cc: Steve Yaeger

0425LS