

Ecosystem Roundtable Meeting of December 4, 1997

Agenda Package

Agenda Item 1A

Near-Term Implementation Guidance Document

1. Introduction

The workgroup and CALFED staff are continuing to develop additional detail on revising the approach to priority setting and project selection. This draft paper reflects some of the goals developed by the workgroup and some by CALFED staff. It also discusses steps needed to be taken in January and several issues which Roundtable input is required on.

2. Goals:

- ▶ Better implement the concept of the "virtual pool".
- ▶ Revise and update the planning process so it is fully integrated with the ERPP and more solidly based on restoration of natural processes.
- ▶ Develop priority actions to be implemented in the next three years through the virtual pool.
- ▶ Improve the administrative process for funding programs to increase stakeholder involvement and to target funds more directly through focussed grants, directed programs, development of new programs, reserve funds, and options for long term endowments.
- ▶ Increase Roundtable members opportunities for involvement in the planning and project selection process.

3. Content of Guidance Document

The Guidance Document will identify the priority ecological targets and stressors for a three year period and the assumed amount of funding available in the "virtual pool". The document will lay out for each priority, what types of actions are needed to address the priority and a recommended program to fund those actions. The funding program could contain recommendations for focussed grants, programs to be undertaken by state, federal, or local agencies, and development of reserve funds or endowments.

4. Simplified steps to develop Guidance Document

Step 1: Identify priority ecological targets and stressors.

Step 2: Identify the types of actions needed to address them.

Step 3: Identify how actions will be funded and implemented.

A. Step 1 Tasks for January 1998

Expert review of 1997 process: Solicit advise from several experts who have worked with other restoration programs on what the strengths and weaknesses were in the 1997 process.

Issue for Roundtable discussion: Several experts from the Science Review Panel may be available to help evaluate the 1997 process. Are there other experts that should be considered?

Development of priority ecological targets and stressors: Convene technical panel to advise on ecological targets and stressors that are the highest priority to be addressed over next three years. This panel should work closely with the Indicators group who are working on the conceptual model of the ecosystem and the indicators. It is expected the Indicators group will have made substantial progress by January.

The charge to the panel would be "Using at least the ERPP, the AFRP and the 1997 Implementation Strategy, revise priorities for ear-term ecosystem restoration so they are for three years and are based on restoration of natural processes."

Issue for Roundtable discussion: Are there any suggested modifications to the make-up of the Integration Panel or can it be used as the new technical panel? Are there any suggested modifications to the panel's charge?