

BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WATERSHED SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Summary

Meeting Date/Location: Friday, January 16, 2004
10:00 AM to 3:00 PM
Jones & Stokes
2600 V Street, Sacramento, CA
Conference Boardroom, 2nd Floor

Meeting Attendees: See Attachment A

Meeting Handouts: See Attachment B

Welcome and Introductions

Martha Davis and Robert Meacher, Watershed Subcommittee Co-chairs, began the meeting with a round of introductions of all meeting participants (see Attachment A), and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Watershed Program General Updates

Martha announced that the Watershed Program (and the other CALFED program elements) are conducting assessments of how/if the goals laid out in the record of decision (ROD) have been met over the last three years. The ultimate goal of this self-assessment for CALFED is to determine if there are any imbalances in the program as a whole, a crucial step considering the current economic condition of the state and the fact that CALFED has still not received federal authorization.

A potential imbalance is reflected in the Napa Agreement, which places a very large focus on water supply. The next edition of WEF's Western Water will feature an analysis of the Napa Agreement. A link to the article will be posted on the Watershed Program's website (www.baydeltawatershed.org).

Development of Watershed Program Work Plan for 2004

John Lowrie described the Watershed Program (WP) process for developing a 2004 Work Plan. A "Preferred Plan" will be written, for use if full funding is allocated to the Program. Several contingency variations of the work plan will also be produced, for different scenarios with less funding.

There are some common goals for all of the variations:

- All variations will contain a **modified grant process**, which will be redesigned after significant analysis of the success of the first three grant cycles. WP staff is considering a focus on watershed issues like forest management, zoning ordinances, capacity building, etc.
- All variations of the work plan will also ensure that a core group of state implementing agency folks will be kept on hand for **technical assistance**.
- The Department of Conservation (DOC) **watershed coordinator grants** will also continue under each work plan variation.
- A self-evaluation of **performance indicators** will be performed during 2004 under each variation as well.
- Finally, the Watershed Partnership seminars will also continue at a planned rate of about 2 seminars per year.

Comments were then taken from the meeting attendees on the 2004 Work Plan. Tricia Bratcher suggested that a strategy for the self-assessment could be taken from the Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP), which has been working on an access database over the past 8 months to track their achievement of milestones. She suggested that the database could be used as a model, but that a lesson regarding the extensive amounts of time that inventory is taking should also be taken.

Cindy Horney expressed three points of concern. First, she feels that the agency contacts (technical assistance) are crucial to the success of the program. Second, she asked how this self-evaluation process fits in with the recommendations of the California Watershed Council (CWC). Third, she stated that it is wonderful that the WP would like to continue with the watershed coordinator grant program, but that it would be devastating to those small groups if the program were to disappear after the next year of funding is over.

Lowrie responded that the WP staff has the same concerns – that once Prop. 50 money is gone, there is no built-in source of funding. That is the reason why CALFED is strategizing for long-term financing, looking at public funds, as well as user fees or beneficiary payments to support the programs. The WP staff definitely does not want to pull funding out from under small groups prematurely, before they have built the capacity to sustain themselves. As for the CWC, their recommendations will be taken as a policy cue and implemented as best as possible.

Another meeting attendee asked if the WP has enough data to really see what the outcomes relative to the goals and objectives are and whether the WP has as much data in that regard as ERP. Lowrie answered that some trends being monitored by ERP are very hard to evaluate in the short period of time that has elapsed since ERP began. Fraser Sime suggested that a monitoring program to help with self-analysis might be a good idea. Dennis Bowker agreed and pointed out that to an extent, that's what this self-analysis process is all about. Very few public agencies could tell you if their expenditures over the last 10 years have yielded the desired results. In that regard, CALFED is a trendsetter in the analysis of large public expenditures.

Syd Brown asked if the WP assessment will take into account projects from other CALFED programs that have watershed components. Lowrie answered that yes, WP staff is pulling across

those projects from ERP.

Jan Lowrey asked about the status of state funds for implementation of new contracts. There has been talk that it is being “zeroed-out”. John replied that as of now, there is no money in the new state budget for new contract implementation. Dennis added that ultimately, the WP’s goal is for watershed management to be perceived as a part of everyday life (like schools, police, etc.) and as very important at a local level. This means that watershed management needs to be woven into the structure of local governance, because the state funds simply can’t keep coming. He offered some advice to small groups to really make an effort to keep in contact with local public works departments.

Kristin Carter pointed out that there has already been a drop-off in federal and state funding options for watershed programs in other states, and that they have already had to come to terms with the need for local fundraising, for making the value of watershed management relevant to local communities. She expressed her view that the focus of the WP should be, as Dennis said, on this type of local capacity building – on sustainability.

Joan Clayburgh announced that the next meeting of the CWC Education, Outreach, and Capacity-Building Workgroup will be held on February 2, and agreed to send out an announcement to the WP Subcommittee listserv.

Role of Interagency Watershed Advisory Team

Stefan Lorenzato then began his presentation on the role of the Interagency Watershed Advisory Team (IWAT). He explained that the IWAT is comprised of representatives from the implementing agencies, and that at this point in time, their most important role is to help support the program evaluation. The IWAT met 2 or 3 times in 2003, with the most recent meeting having taken place in November, 2003.

One of the meeting attendees asked how to communicate with the IWAT. Stefan answered that showing up at the subcommittee meetings is the best way to do so, as most of the members of IWAT also attend the subcommittee meetings. The meeting attendee then asked how to get an item on IWAT’s agenda. John offered to post a comment link on the WP website that anyone could use to provide input on agency discussions.

– Break for Lunch –

Local Watershed Presentation

After lunch, Robert announced the local watershed project presentation would be about the Landcover Mapping and Monitoring effort by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF). He then introduced Russ Henly, the Watershed Assessment Manager for CDF’s Fire and Resource Assessment Program. Russ introduced his two co-workers, Chris Keithley and Mark Rosenberg, and explained that the Landcover Mapping and Monitoring effort consists of two general components:

1. Information Development and Provision – collection and compilation of the following

California land cover data into GIS layers, and posting these layers on the website (<http://frap.cdf.ca.gov>) in hydrologic unit boundaries useful to watershed groups:

- Vegetation
- Fuels
- Fire Perimeters
- Communities at risk for fire
- Fire threat
- Timber Harvesting Plans
- Roads
- Hydrography
- DEMs

2. Technical Assistance – helping watershed groups and agencies to use the data, and development of a California Watershed Assessment Manual with UC Davis as the contractor.

CDF's objectives for this data are to:

- Develop accurate and up-to-date vegetation and monitoring data for upland watersheds,
- Provide seamless and consistent GIS based vegetation data across all ownerships,
- Work collaboratively and leverage existing data, and
- Coordinate long-term maintenance of vegetation data on a 5-year cycle.

Russ then turned the presentation over to Mark Rosenberg, the Vegetation and Fire GIS Specialist, who led the subcommittee through a PowerPoint presentation. The program funding provided to CDF for this project by the WP in 2001 was specifically to assist this cooperative effort in three areas within the CALFED solution area that had not previously been mapped, and to facilitate the use of all of the inventory's data by watershed groups. In addition to CALFED, other partners in this mapping effort include USFS, USFWS, CDF, DFG, and National Parks and incorporate plans for maintenance of the data and products. Mark explained that working collaboratively reduces costs to each agency, leverages existing investments, facilitates development of seamless and consistent data across all lands, improves comparison across ownerships, and helps interagency communication regarding vegetation resources.

CDF has divided the state into five regions, and each region's data will be updated every five years, where landcover changes have occurred. "Cause of change" information is also stored for those changes in landcover, as well as whether the change is permanent or temporary.

Three areas were targeted for baseline mapping using the WP funds: the bay area, the sierra foothills, and the interior coast range. Mapping for both the bay area and the sierra foothills has already been completed, and mapping of the interior coast range is scheduled to be completed in August of 2004.

Mark then described that some of the ways this data could be useful to watershed groups include assessing wildlife habitat, monitoring forest management, tracking trends in forest mortality, comparing vegetation characteristics through time, quantifying watershed characteristics, and in making watershed management decisions. All of the data that has been collected so far is available for public use at the project's website, listed above. Mark then opened the floor for

questions.

Q: How do you label agricultural areas?

A: There are very generic labels for agricultural areas, because the effort is focused mainly on native vegetation.

Q: How do you gather the vegetation data?

A: The data is all based on infrared photography, but supplemented and checked through on-the-ground surveys.

Q: Could you produce a viewshed from a certain viewpoint, like a fire lookout?

A: It is within the capability of the software, but it would take some time to produce one.

Q: How do folks make use of this information?

A: All the data is on the website and divided by watershed. It can be reached via the website listed above, or through the CWC Watershed Portal (<http://cwp.resources.ca.gov>), which contains a link to the site.

Q: How much was CALFED's investment in this program?

A: \$970,000, which breaks down to 12.5 cents an acre.

Q: Can you project potential changes (in canopy cover, vegetation type, etc.) through modeling in a watershed context?

A: Growth and harvest projections can be done. There are no push-button models, but CDF has used an overlay of general plan (land use) information to predict what type of changes will occur. John Lowrie pointed out that combining land use and vegetation data can be a great tool for watershed planning.

Q: Do you work with local fire safe councils?

A: Yes, this data goes out to fire planners, and the fire planners deliver it to the fire safe councils. The program has a strong desire to create a "local-up" feel, so if a local group has a question, they are first referred to the local CDF unit.

Mark ended the presentation by reminding everyone that the data is available at their website, and that special requests can be made by contacting Russ (Russ.Henly@fire.ca.gov) or by contacting a local CDF unit.

Discussion of Watershed Program Grant Program

Fiscal Year 2001-2002

Lowrie informed the subcommittee that out of 29 2001-2002 WP projects, 2 contracts have been executed to date by the State Board. The State Board is attempting to move quickly to get the remaining contracts executed by April 30, 2004. Martha informed the group that any contracts not executed by April 30 will not be guaranteed funding. One meeting attendee who happens to be one of the two proponents whose contract has been executed offered some advice to others who are still waiting. She suggested contacting their local Regional Board representatives and encouraging them to contact the State Board contracting department, as the projects that have

clear support from the Regional Boards get better service.

Joan recommended that project proponents waiting for contract execution should be very proactive with the State Board. She suggested calling the State Board, setting up conference calls with the contract analysts, and really closing the loop on the contract.

Dan Wermiel pointed out that the State Board's website contains a table with the status of all the 2001-2002 contracts along with State Board contracting contact names and phone numbers. He encouraged everyone to check the website for their contract's status. Ken Coulter announced that Alice Stebbins is in charge of contracting and can be reached by e-mail at stebbina@swrcb.ca.gov or by phone at 916.341.5797.

Fiscal Year 2002-2003 Grant Process (the 2003 Consolidated RFCP/RFP)

The final funding recommendations were scheduled to be released at the end of January, but the State Board is not ready to release those final recommendations. All of the proposals have gone through the prescribed review process, and some have already been recommended for no funding, but the rest need some specific modifications to address technical issues or to be made contract ready. The applicants will be given 30 days to make the requested changes, in response to technical issues and once review of those is complete, the final recommendations will be made. The State Board expects this process to set the schedule back by 2 months.

One meeting attendee asked if an applicant receives a letter requesting modifications to their proposal, would it be safe to assume that as long as the modifications are made, that the project would be funded? Betty Yee answered that that is indeed the current understanding. There is enough money in the pot to cover all of the proposals. The letters from the State Board requesting modifications, or stating that a proposal has been recommended for no funding, are scheduled to be sent out on January 26. After the letters are sent, the same information will be available on the State Board's website. Dennis pointed out that this information consists only of what he, John, Betty, and others, have been told by the State Board – that they are in no way on the inside track.

Another meeting attendee asked if there is a way to extend the term of the contracts because of this huge delay in finalizing those contracts. Stefan Lorenzato answered that yes, there is a way to extend the term, but only in the year that the contract is scheduled to expire. Martha Davis suggested that those attendees who also frequent CWC workgroups ensure that a recommendation is made to the CWC regarding the terms for these delayed contracts.

DOC Watershed Coordinator Grants

A meeting attendee inquired after the status of the Department of Conservation Watershed Coordinator grants, asking when final selections will be made. Lowrie responded that the panel is scheduled to make funding recommendations to DOC and CALFED by February 11.

Next Request for Grants Proposals (RFP)

Lowrie reminded the subcommittee that the process for next years' SWRCB RFP is being discussed with the CWC's workgroups. Everyone was urged to get involved in these public meetings if concerned about next year's process. The next meeting will be of the CWC Integrated Planning workgroup and will take place on January 21. For more information or to

get on the CWC listserv, e-mail Ken (coulk@dwq.swrcb.ca.gov).

Dan Wermiel mentioned that the workgroups tend to be heavily agency-dominated – not many public stakeholders are showing up. He encouraged anyone to attend these meetings who feels that the public should have a say in the design of next year’s process. Ken pointed out that one doesn’t even have to travel to Sacramento to attend the meetings; all of the workgroup meetings are broadcast over the internet, and anyone can e-mail comments into the meeting.

Dennis Bowker put forward his belief that the slow contracting process will not change until there is very active participation in the CWC and its workgroups – until the state legislature hears that there are jobs out there waiting to be initiated, if only the contracts would get pushed through and signed. Kevin announced that the next Watershed Education Day at the state legislature will be on April 7, and would be a perfect time to raise that issue.

Jan Lowrey expressed his concern that because the RFPs have been run so poorly both for Phase 2 and Phase 3, it sends a message to applicants that they shouldn’t even bother. Lowrie said the WP is exploring using a different implementing agency for the next Bay Delta watershed Program grant cycle.

One meeting attendee asked if the WP could forward all CWC announcements to the WP listserv. Coulter explained that everyone on the WP listserv had been automatically added to the general CWC listserv, but that it is up to each person to go to <http://cwp.resources.ca.gov> and register themselves for any of the individual workgroup listservs. Lowrie agreed to forward any workgroup announcements to the WP listserv for a month or so, to give people time to register themselves on the individual listservs.

Discussion Regarding Future Watershed Subcommittee “Road Shows”

This discussion was tabled due to lack of budget to support road shows.

Other Watershed Updates

Casey Walsh Cady announced that the CALFED Working Landscapes Subcommittee met last week and is recommending that BDPAC recommend to CBDA that a person with a background in socioeconomics be added to the CALFED Independent Science Board. The Working Landscapes Subcommittee would like to get support on this endeavor from the WP, and requested a slot on next month’s WP agenda. Dennis felt that would not be a problem, since the WP has already gone on record calling for some social issue expertise on the Science Board.

Roger Buttermore, from USFWS, announced that a new invasive species has been spotted in California, the New Zealand snail. He offered to give a presentation about this species, as well as other invasive species, at next month’s meeting.

Bill Crooks said that he attended the Drinking Water Quality Program’s second strategic plan workshop, and that he suggested that a watershed focus, along with a cost-effective, comprehensive watershed plan would be the only solution to their problems. He pointed out to the WP subcommittee that water quality folks in California have cold hard cash, and that it’s

time for watershed groups to get together with water quality groups and work out cost-effective solutions to water quality problems. John agreed that watershed groups and solutions need to be focused on partnerships.

Kristin Carter announced that Chico State University is working on developing a California Watershed Funding Database, and that they are using a public process to get feedback on system design. She asked anyone who might be interested in helping out to contact her (kcooper-carter@csuchico.edu), and assured everyone that it would amount to only a small time commitment.

Cindy Horney announced that the USEPA is sponsoring a hydrology intern who will be available for project assistance until June. Any group can use her, as long as they go through the proper application process. If anyone is interested, please contact Cindy (cynthiamhorney@aol.com).

Lowrie announced that a workshop will be held in Sacramento on February 26 focusing on improved relationships and communication between tribal organizations and CBDA. He encouraged watershed groups to attend, as it would be a good opportunity for watershed folks to get into contact with tribal groups and foster some partnerships.

Next Meeting

The next Watershed Subcommittee meeting will be held on **Friday, February 20, 2004**, at Jones and Stokes (2600 V Street, Sacramento), from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m.

Attachment A

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Name	Affiliation
Alcott, Rob	East Bay Municipal Utilities District
Anderson, Michael	UC Davis
Bowker, Dennis	CA Bay-Delta Authority—Watershed Program
Boyd, Dick	South Yuba River Citizen’s League
Bratcher, Tricia	CA Department of Fish and Game, Redding
Brown, Syd	CA Department of Parks and Recreation
Buttermore, Roger	US Fish and Wildlife Service, Stockton
Cady, Casey Walsh	CA Department of Food and Agriculture
Carter, Kristin	California State University, Chico
Clayburgh, Joan	Sierra Nevada Alliance
Coulter, Ken	State Water Resources Control Board
Crooks, Bill	City of Sacramento
Dahms, Dick	Yuba Watershed and Fires Safe Council
Davis, Martha	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
DiStefano, Jenny	CA Department of Conservation
Foley, Mary Jane	Orange County (Consultant)
Francis, Pamela	Lake County Department of Public Works
Garver, Lyn	Kings River Conservation District
Gould, Randy	US Forest Service
Harris, Bob	Cow Creek Watershed Management Group
Harris, Michael	Western Shasta Resource Conservation District
Harter, Rick	Los Angeles/San Gabriel Watershed Council
Haze, Steve	Millerton Area Watershed Coalition
Henly, Russ	CA Department of Forestry
Herman, Allison	Southern Sonoma County Resource Conservation District
Horney, Cindy	Glenn County Resource Conservation District
Hopkins, Dale	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
Horne, Mark	EIP Associates
Huntsinger, Josh	Placer County Department of Agriculture
Jacobsen, Peter	Metropolitan Water District
Jerauld, Frank	Amador Resource Conservation District
Klasson, Mick	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
Lavelle, Jane	SFPUC—Planning
Laychek, Eugenia	California Bay-Delta Authority
Lorenzato, Stefan	CA Department of Water Resources
Lowe, Patrick	Napa County
Lowrey, Jan	Cache Creek Conservancy
Lowrie, John	California Bay-Delta Authority
Lunt, Tina	Cosumnes River Task Force
Maben, Judy	Water Education Foundation
Marovich, Rich	Lower Putah Creek Coordinating Subcommittee
Martin, Sara	Jones & Stokes
McWhorter, D. Paul	California Concrete Pipe/Bay Saver
Meacher, Robert	Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee
Means, Dave	Wildlife Conservation Board

Nassar, Sonia	Orange County (Consultant)
Ohlson, John	Yolo County Democratic Central Committee
Paquin-Gilmore, Sharon	Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy
Peisch, Amanda	CA Department of Water Resources
Robins, Kathleen	SRCD
Rosenberg, Mark	CA Department of Forestry
Sevelius, Pia	Butte County
Sharp, Leigh	Napa County Resource Conservation District
Shilling, Fraser	UC Davis
Sime, Fraser	CA Department of Water Resources Watershed Program
Strachan, Susan	Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance
Stefano, Jenny D.	CA Department of Conservation
Suarez, Megan	Sierra Nevada Alliance
Swearingen, Vieva	Cottonwood Watershed Group
Taylor, Ernie	CA Department of Water Resources – San Joaquin District
Templin, Bill	Friends of the South Fork Kings River
Teves, Nani	Tehama County Resource Conservation District
Timmer, Kerri	California Watershed Council Data & Information Workgroup
Ward, Kevin	UC Davis ICE
Wermiel, Dan	California Bay-Delta Authority
Yee, Betty	Regional Water Quality Control Board
Ziegler, Sam	US Environmental Protection Agency

MEETING MATERIALS

- Meeting agenda
- “CDF Roles in BDA Watershed Program” – supplementary materials for the local watershed presentation