

# **CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM**

## **Interim Interagency Watershed Advisory Team**

### **Meeting Summary**

The Interim Interagency Watershed Advisory Team (IIWAT) met on July 8, 1998, to discuss the following topics:

- Functional relationship between the IIWAT and the new BDAC Watershed Work Group;
- CALFED Watershed Management Program's draft goals and objectives
- Stage I Implementation (1-7 years) vs. Watershed Management Strategy and linkages among program elements;
- Responses to comments on the Draft Programmatic EIR/EIS; and
- Comprehensive Monitoring, Assessment, Research Program - update on development of watershed monitoring protocols and plans for stakeholder participation.

#### **Introduction**

Judy Heath (CALFED Bay-Delta Program) began the meeting with introductions. An attendance list is attached.

The IIWAT meetings have been extended from two hours to three hours. This timeframe will allow ample time for agenda items and better facilitate those members who travel from outside the Sacramento area. The agenda was discussed and the following meeting materials were distributed: July 8, 1998 IIWAT Meeting Agenda; June 22, 1998 IIWAT Meeting Summary; *Developing a Draft Preferred Program Alternative (Draft)*; *Watershed Management Program Briefing Packet for BDAC Watershed Work Group Co-Chairs (July 8, 1998)*; and *Watershed Management Issues developed by Julie Tupper (member of Agency Revision Team)*.

#### **Functional Relationship Between the IIWAT and the BDAC Watershed Work Group**

Judy introduced the co-chairs of the newly formed BDAC Watershed Work Group - Martha Davis (Sierra Nevada Alliance) and Bob Meacher (Plumas County/Regional Council of Rural Counties). As mentioned in the last IIWAT meeting, the functional relationship is similar to those for other BDAC Work Groups. The BDAC Watershed Work Group will provide advice and be responsible for involving stakeholder input on IIWAT work products. The BDAC Work Group will provide updates and information to stakeholders and the general public to ensure public involvement in the Program. The Work Group will in turn relay information they gain to the IIWAT.

Martha and Bob hope to attend future IIWAT meetings and would like to arrange the BDAC Work Group meetings in coordination with IIWAT meetings to exchange information. Martha and Bob are currently working on selecting organizations/groups to participate on the Work Group and they have been provided an electronic version from Judy Heath. They currently have

the list narrowed down to 40 organizations/groups, with the intention of narrowing that down to around 15-20. The co-chairs have committed to two public workshops to provide public outreach for the Program. The IIWAT will be notified when the Work Group and public workshops meeting dates are set.

### **Goals and Objectives of the Program**

The Program's draft goal and objectives has been an agenda item for the last four IIWAT meetings. However, the topic was opened for discussion during this meeting because a concern was raised regarding the lack of closure on the goal and Objective I. The primary concern is that there are linkages, or commonalities, among many of the other Common Programs and that the objectives needed to not duplicate efforts. For instance, watershed activities are mentioned in the Water Quality Program (WQP), Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan (ERPP), and the Watershed Management Program. There may be duplicative efforts that should be avoided. A suggestion was made to assist other CALFED Common Programs, particularly Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration in defining the significance of relevant watershed activities. A benefit of the Watershed Management Program addressing these issues is that the concept of watersheds is an integral part of all the CALFED programs and could provide a communication link between all of them.

It was suggested and agreed upon that the Program will address the issue of linkages and share the outcome with the other CALFED programs for their review, comments, and possible direction. Joe Karkoski agreed to provide suggested amendments to address the above information. After this inclusion, the draft Goals and Objectives will then be distributed to the Work Group for their review.

(Update: Please find the amended goal and objectives attached. Joe's proposed additions have been incorporated and are reflected in italics. Please review and let Judy Heath know if there are any comments on Joe's proposed language.)

### **Stage I Implementation**

Loren Bottorff (CALFED Consultant Team) briefed the meeting attendees on the concept of developing a draft preferred program alternative and the Stage I implementation (1-7 ½ yrs). Loren explained the first stage of implementation begins a series of actions that will ultimately form the CALFED solution. The first stage does not set a direct path to any specific predefined solution, but begins a process where the solution can change depending on the outcome on predefined conditions.

*Loren discussed*

- preferred alternative*
- common programs*
- staged decision making*

Judy Heath asked the IIWAT members to review the document, specifically pages B-8 and B-9

which refer to a set of draft watershed implementation actions for Stage I, and provide comments. The Work Group co-chairs will also review the document. After the comments have been incorporated, the document will then be distributed to the Work Group for their review.

### **Responses to Comments on the Draft Programmatic EIR/EIS**

Judy Heath has received many comments regarding the draft Programmatic EIS/R watershed text and the Program's strategy. She asked if anyone would like to volunteer some time to help formulate responses. Comments are broad in scope and include such issues as fire management, area of origin water rights, and whether or not Trinity Basin should be included in the CALFED geographic scope (this latter issue may need to be elevated as a policy issue). John Lowrie and Julie Tupper both offered to provide assistance. Judy indicated that since the comments are so broad in scope that maybe help from some of the other agencies represented on IIWAT, would also be beneficial. Judy will organize the comments according to the issues related to IIWAT agencies interests to more fully determine the scope of issues. John Lowrie's assistance will be used to help coordinate responses.

### **Comprehensive Monitoring, Assessment, Research Program Update**

Peter Stine, Carolyn Marn, and Ann Dennis from the U.S. Geological Survey - Biological Resources Division attended the meeting to update the team on the status of the Comprehensive Monitoring, Assessment and Research Program (CMARP). Peter stated that they are currently in a design phase to develop a comprehensive monitoring, assessment, and research program by January 1998. The plan should be viewed as a living document. It is important to note that the program is in the design phase - there is no monitoring occurring at this time. The CMARP staff is working with the CALFED Common Programs to identify the monitoring and research needs of each program. **Currently, the CMARP staff is seeking to develop a work team to help with this task. Please notify Peter or Judy if you are interested in participating.**

The following are specific issues that the Program will need to examine for its integration into CMARP:

- How to divide the CALFED geographic scope;
- How to define the watersheds within the CALFED geographic scope;
- Identification of indicators that are suitable for determining the health of a watershed;
- Identification of existing monitoring programs; and
- Identification of clear and specific goals of the Program.

This last task is crucial to the Program. The CMARP team will need clear goals and objectives of the Program to ensure that the proper monitoring takes place to meet these goals and objectives. All monitoring should tie back to well articulated goals.

A comment was noted that some of the Program's goals and objectives will be difficult to monitor for, such as supporting education and outreach. It was suggested that the CMARP staff should look beyond the traditional ecological monitoring tools and consider other methods for

monitoring objectives such as these. An example of monitoring efforts for an education outreach program might be as simple as answering the question "was a program formed and implemented?" or by using more complex statistical methods that measure changes in public attitudes.

*Other Issues Raised*

- *standardization of monitoring techniques*
- *need for adequate baseline data*

**Future IIWAT Meetings**

The next two IIWAT meetings were scheduled for the following dates:

- Wednesday, July 22, 1998, 12:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.
- Wednesday, August 5, 1998, 12:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.