

CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM

Interagency Watershed Advisory Team

Meeting Summary

The Interagency Watershed Advisory Team (IWAT) met on July 22, 1998, to discuss the following topics:

- Revised Watershed Program Goals and Objectives (draft);
- BDAC Watershed Work Group Update (membership development);
- Criteria for CALFED Participation in Watershed Programs;
- Discussion on Categories of Watershed Activities (including those received for Category III funding) to consider for Implementation Actions; and,
- Input into CALFED draft document entitled "Developing a Draft Preferred Program Alternative" (Stage I Implementation Actions for the First 7 ½ Yrs).

Introduction

Judy Heath (CALFED Bay-Delta Program) began the meeting with introductions. An attendance list is attached. The BDAC Watershed Work Group co-chairs - Martha Davis (Sierra Nevada Alliance) and Bob Meacher (Plumas County/RCRC) joined the meeting via telephone conference.

The agenda items were announced and the following meeting materials were distributed: *Restoration Coordination Program - 1998 Proposal Summary*; Recommendations for the BDAC Watershed Work Group (Work Group) from Martha Davis/Bob Meacher; and written comments from Russ Henly, Joe Karkoski, and Julie Tupper regarding the criteria for CALFED participation in watershed programs and/or the Stage I Implementation Actions.

Revised Watershed Program Goals and Objectives (draft)

The Draft Goals and Objectives of the Watershed Program were slightly modified over the last week based on comments received since the last IWAT meeting. The team members were mailed the revised version with two proposed inclusions on July 16, 1998, for their review. It was suggested during the meeting that the inclusion to the Objectives be slightly modified as follows:

"Identify watershed activities for inclusion into the *watershed element or other* appropriate CALFED Program element."

All of the IIWAT members agreed to this revision. However, it was decided not to include the proposed inclusion to the Goal which read as follows:

“To assist other CALFED Program elements in defining the significance of relevant watershed activities.”

It was stated that this is a required internal task of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program. This exercise is performed to identify any conflicts that may occur between watershed activities implemented by different CALFED Programs. The IIWAT agreed that this internal task will be mentioned in the revised Strategy document.

BDAC Watershed Work Group Update

The Work Group co-chairs - Martha Davis and Bob Meacher - presented a draft Watershed Work Group membership list. Recommendations were largely based on an individual's geographic region and represented interest(s). It was noted that this is only a starting point for forming a core Work Group. After a consensus is reached by the Work Group co-chairs and the IWAT, invitation letters will be sent to the proposed individuals. Because a quick turn-around is needed to meet deadlines for the Program, it was suggested that any major flaws be identified during the meeting and specific comments should be provided to Martha Davis. The following comments were noted during the meeting:

- Because there is a California Department of Forestry on the IWAT (Russ Henly), perhaps another representative from the same agency should not participate on the Work Group.
- A concern was raised regarding having two Sierra Nevada Representatives participate on the Work Group. However, Martha stated that she lives in Southern California and can not bring the local knowledge and contacts to the table that Laurel Ames can.
- Support was given to the recommendation of David Guy (Farm Bureau) and Dave Bishel to represent timberland owners.
- A concern was raised that there should be additional representation from the Bay Area and North Bay.
- A concern was raised that some of the individuals recommended may not adequately represent local watershed efforts.

Martha asked the team to provide specific comments to her via e-mail at mlcmartha@aolcom by Friday, July 24, 1998. She will then turn over results by early the following week.

Criteria for CALFED Participation in Watershed Programs

Comments were received from Joe Karkoski and Julie Tupper regarding the criteria for CALFED participation in watershed programs. However, it has not been made clear as to what exactly these criteria will be used for. Judy indicated that these criteria were going to be used as a tool to determine CALFED participation (funding, etc.) in watershed programs. She indicated that it is

intended that CALFED would be providing a revenue stream for watershed activities and the criteria would be used in a "Request for Proposals" sense. The discussion then focused on the availability of watershed funds in the near term (other than Category III and Prop 204). It was decided to forego this topic until further direction is obtained on the applicability of the criteria. Judy agreed to discuss this issue with management and provide further information.

(Update: Judy Heath has asked Judy Kelly to discuss this issue at the next IWAT meeting on August 5, 1998)

Discussion of Categories of Watershed Activities to Consider for Implementation

Rebecca Fawver (California Resources Agency) was in attendance to present an overview of the general types of watershed proposals received for funding through the Ecosystem Restoration Coordination Program. CALFED received 181 proposals in response to the May 1998 Proposal Solicitation Package. The three most popular topic areas were projects pertaining to (1) floodplain management and habitat restoration, (2) local watershed stewardship, and (3) environmental education. The proposals are currently under review by a technical review panel and are expected to be completed by mid- to late August. The proposals will be then be reviewed by an integration review panel through mid-September.

The issue of the unfunded projects from the first phase of proposals was brought up for discussion. It was suggested to obtain abstracts on those projects that were deemed worthy of funding, but because there was not enough money available were not supported. This information should be used as a tool by the Program and the Work Group to (1) understand the types of projects that are being solicited and how they may be coordinated with the Program; and (2) identify projects that would be beneficial to the Program, but have not been solicited for. This information is readily available and could provide clues as to the line of thinking pertaining to watershed activities. The team agreed that this may be a helpful exercise, but did not want to allocate much time to the task. Judy agreed that she would research CALFED resources to see if someone could at least categorize the types of projects that were deemed worthy, but were not funded. It was also stated that this task should be coordinated with the work that the CALFED Policy Group is doing to avoid duplicative efforts. It was also suggested that the Principles of CALFED watershed activities needs to be further refined before the task of analyzing possible watershed projects is pursued.

Stage I Implementation Actions

During the last IIWAT meeting, members were asked to comment on the document entitled *Developing a Draft Preferred Program Alternative (Draft 7/8/98)*. Comments were received from Joe Karkoski and Russ Henly. A recommendation was made that the document should include parallel language for every program element. The Program should not be held at a higher standard than that of the other Common Programs. For example, the verbiage stating that "CALFED will participate where proposed watershed actions provide a **strong** link to **critical** Delta problems" should be altered to be consistent with requirements of the other Common

Programs. In addition, funding information should be provided for all Common Programs or none at all.

Another suggestion was made to focus on the watershed coordination aspect for the next seven years and let the actual watershed projects be implemented by the appropriate program; i.e., Water Quality Program (WQP), Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP), etc. However, the consensus of the team was to be active in both watershed coordination and project implementation, but at the same time work with the WQP and ERP to ensure that watershed projects are supported in the upper watersheds. A comment was made that the WQP and the ERP needs to provide a geographic scope map in the PEIR/S which is consistent with the Watershed Program and includes the upper watershed.

(Update: Judy Heath has invited Rick Woodard, WQP and Dick Daniel, ERP to the next IWAT meeting on August 5, 1998 to discuss integration and linkages with the Watershed Program).

Future IIWAT Meeting

The next IIWAT meeting has been scheduled for the following date:

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