

BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WATERSHED SUBCOMMITTEE
Meeting Summary

Meeting Date/Location: Friday, February 20, 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

Robert Meacher, Watershed Subcommittee Co-chair, began the meeting with a round of introductions of all meeting participants (see Attachment A), and welcomed everyone to the meeting. He apologized on behalf of Martha Davis, the other Subcommittee Co-chair, who was at a water quality-related retreat and thus unable to attend the Subcommittee meeting. Robert then asked for comments on the agenda. Caitlin Cornwall asked if an update on the Department of Conservation Watershed Coordinator grant awards would be provided, and if a discussion of the prevailing wage issue would be covered. John Lowrie responded that Andrew Rush could do an update on the Watershed Coordinator grants at the end of the meeting, and Robert informed the group that the prevailing wage issue would be an agenda item at the March meeting.

Mr. Meacher announced that since the staff from the Working Landscapes Program was not yet in attendance, the meeting would move directly into agenda item #4, an update on the Watershed Program performance evaluation. He pointed out that the Watershed Program is unique because it was built from the ground up by the attendees of these meetings, not built by technical staff. The program has always been adaptively managed, and this evaluation will be the first look at the overall performance of that management strategy.

WATERSHED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Mr. Lowrie explained that all of the Bay-Delta programs are conducting assessments of how/if the goals laid out in the Record of Decision (ROD) have been met over the last three years, and whether or not the programs are moving along at similar paces. Once Watershed Program staff figure out where the program is relative to those goals, they will begin a process of reflection and of redefining program objectives and targets for improvements over the next three or four years. Results and refinements of the analysis will be presented during the March, April, and May Subcommittee meetings, and conversations will be initiated with the Subcommittee and the Interagency Watershed Advisory Team (IWAT) regarding revising the objectives and possibly

taking the Program in new directions.

Dennis Bowker then described the evaluation process so far. The Watershed Program team has been sorting through mountains of paper to determine where the program is relative to the stated goals and objectives. The team posted draft performance measures on the website for public review and comment and received 720 comments. The performance measures have now been refined into a final set based on the comments. The elements being analyzed include the proposal solicitation process and grants, support of watershed coordinators, and the Watershed Partnerships Seminars. A summary of Mr. Bowker's initial findings follows.

Watershed Program Accomplishments

- \$27.4 million distributed through 84 grant projects to 50 community-based organizations.
- Partnership Seminars have trained 80 local and agency personnel.
- Support for 26 Watershed Coordinators.
- 9 million acres of vegetation mapped.

Draft Findings—Proposal Solicitation Element

1. Project awards have been distributed throughout the Bay-Delta System, although the distribution is a bit heavier in the Sacramento River region.
2. First year review and selection process was transparent and effective.
3. Distribution among project types is not in balance. This became apparent through comparing what watershed groups need and what has been available for them from the Watershed Program.
4. The funding source shift had a negative impact on priority pursuits. The Watershed Program was best able to meet the needs of watershed groups in the first year of funding grants. The major causes of this shift can be attributed to the restrictions on Proposition 13 (Prop. 13) money during the Phase 2 Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP), and restrictions of the State Board's process during the Phase 3 PSP.
5. Changes in the PSP process strongly biased project submittals. Prop. 13 funds in the second year and State Board involvement the third year caused a major increase of grant applications for water quality projects and a decline in the number of grant applications for water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration projects.

Draft Findings—Watershed Partnerships Seminar Element

1. The Seminar has been a useful aid in building local capacity to effectively manage watersheds affecting the Bay-Delta system
2. Seminar alumni have had a noticeable impact in their local communities.
3. Irregular scheduling has diminished the ability for potential applicants to attend.

Draft Findings—Watershed Coordinator Element

1. The project has been an effective partnership with the Department of Conservation (DOC). Contracting is efficient and timely, this type of support connects to the Program's capacity building priority, and implementation has improved partnerships between the Program and local watershed communities.
2. Defined connections between Coordinator work plans and Program goals and objectives are insufficient. Not all coordinator positions are aware of the CBDA Watershed Program connection, and DOC performance indicators are not always well aligned with

Program performance indicators.

Draft Recommendations—Proposal Solicitation Element

1. Grant fund source should be from a fund with high compatibility with Program goals, objectives, and priorities.
2. Implementing agency support should be from an agency with high compatibility with Program goals, objectives, and priorities.
3. The original review and selection process should be reinstated, and used to focus on new Program priorities.
4. Any combined proposal solicitation should be structured such that individual funds retain their unique purposes.
5. Contracts should be ready to implement work within 6 months of award.
6. Proposal solicitations should be targeted to current program priorities.
7. Solicitation criteria should reflect adjusted priorities of both the Program and of CBDA Bay-Delta Program at large.
8. A complete assessment of cumulative work products by grant coordinators should be completed by 2007.

Draft Recommendations—Watershed Partnerships Seminar Element

1. Provide regular, long-term schedule for Seminars.
2. Solicit middle and upper management to attend.
3. Link outreach and scholarships to Program priorities on an annual basis.
4. Provide an active network to connect graduates, including an annual or bi-annual workshop.
5. Work with other Bay-Delta Program elements to include critical partners in the Seminar.

Mr. Bowker explained to the Subcommittee that the next steps are to identify specific watersheds, research topics, and project types in order to better focus the next years of proposal solicitations, and to develop performance measurements in order to quantitatively assess Program accomplishments. He then asked the Subcommittee to e-mail any comments to him within the next two weeks (dennisbowker@volcano.net). Robin Freeman expressed his relief to see this type of introspection within the Program, and asked what type of comments Mr. Bowker was looking for. Mr. Bowker answered that he would welcome any comments, whether they are on the draft findings, draft recommendations, performance measurements, or anything else.

PROGRAM INTEGRATION: WORKING LANDSCAPES

Denny Bungarz, Chair of the CBDA Working Landscapes Subcommittee, introduced himself and Ken Trott, staff on the Working Landscapes Subcommittee. He stated that the purpose of this presentation would be to inform the Watershed Program about the goals and activities of the Working Landscapes Subcommittee, and that ultimately he hopes to integrate the Working Landscapes Subcommittee on some levels with the Watershed Program. The Working Landscapes Subcommittee is focused on getting funding to private landowners to help them start and/or continue ecosystem restoration projects on their property.

Ken Trott then presented some more detailed information about the Working Landscapes Subcommittee. The California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), DOC, and the

California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) all staff the Working Landscapes Subcommittee. It was created two and a half years ago as a workgroup, and elevated to subcommittee status two years ago in response to concern within the CBDA program that there was a lack of recognition of the role private landowners could play in the CBDA. The subcommittee meetings themselves are a forum for local governments and landowners who play a role or would like to play a role in restoration on private land.

The subcommittee itself is developing ways to facilitate restoration and agriculture—to make them coexisting activities that are not mutually exclusive. The current focus is on easements. Also, the subcommittee is looking at ways to make sure policies are in place to ensure that local governments are made whole when acquisitions are necessary. A program called Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) does exist to address this need, but it is voluntary and the federal government rarely pays. The state did have a good record of PILT payments, but these payments have tapered off with the budget problems of the past two years. The Working Landscapes Subcommittee Workplan identifies these goals as follows:

1. Support locally based collaborative initiatives that provide opportunities for working landscapes to assist the Bay-Delta Program in meeting its program objectives.
2. Minimize/mitigate adverse Bay-Delta Program project impacts on agricultural resources consistent with the commitments in the CALFED Record of Decision.
3. Coordinate funding and outreach to support a working landscape approach to meeting Bay-Delta Program objectives.

John Brodie asked if the Working Landscapes Subcommittee had considered attempting to institute something like a safe harbor agreement for landowners who would like to perform restoration activities on their land. Mr. Trott said that that concept is being discussed. Mr. Bungarz mentioned that the Sacramento River Watershed Landowner Protection Committee is working on that right now.

Mr. Trott invited everyone who might be interested to attend the next Working Landscapes-sponsored workshop, a half-day event geared toward delta growers and landowners that will be hosted by the UC Davis Co-op Extension on March 5. The Working Landscapes Subcommittee meets the first Thursday of every month. To sign up on the Working Landscapes Subcommittee listserv, e-mail Casey Walsh Cady at ccady@cdfa.ca.gov.

INDEPENDENT SCIENCE BOARD

Mr. Meacher pointed out that a good first step in collaborating with the Working Landscapes Subcommittee would be to consider their proposal for a joint request to BDPAC for an agricultural resource economist to be added to the CALFED Independent Science Board (Board). Mr. Trott handed out their memo on the topic. He informed the group that the Working Landscapes Subcommittee has already received support, some of it qualified, from other subcommittees.

Robin Freeman expressed his support of the idea, but pointed out that urban working landscapes often fall off the map, yet tend to have the same problems as agricultural and economic landscapes. He believes that if a new position is created on the Board, that it should call for

someone who also has an understanding of environmental justice. Caitlin Cornwall agreed and mentioned that it seemed like a few different types of economic expertise on the Board may be needed to cover all the bases, including agricultural economics, natural resource economics, and environmental justice.

Mr. Trott said that the Ecosystem Restoration Program Subcommittee also believes that this recommendation should be broadened beyond just agricultural resource economics and the Working Landscapes Subcommittee's focus on irrigated agricultural land. Steve Haze asserted that the Working Landscapes Subcommittee could gain a lot more support in general from some big constituencies if they expanded their focus to rangeland and forested lands. Russ Henly said that the California Department of Forestry (CDF) has been using the term "working landscapes" to refer to rangeland and forested land for 12 years. Mr. Trott said that the Working Landscapes Subcommittee would love to see attendance from rangeland, forested land, and urban stakeholders, as the attendees of the meetings drive the direction of the Subcommittee's work.

John Lowrie pointed out that the Watershed Program Plan makes a strong commitment to support local efforts that involve level of service and projects on private land. He expects to define that commitment to creating successful working landscapes even more clearly in the refinements that are currently being made to the Program goals, as well as a call for closer integration of programs. Bill Crooks also mentioned that the time is ripe for integration with water quality groups who are beginning to understand that point-source restrictions will not solve the major water quality problems in California—that watershed management plans are the key.

Laurel Ames asked for clarification on what the Board is, and what supporting a recommendation for a resource economist on the Board would mean. John Lowrie explained that it is a high-level group of scientists appointed by the Authority to advise the Bay-Delta Program on scientific policy and adaptive management of the Bay-Delta system. Dennis Bowker mentioned that when the formation of the Board was announced, Robert Meacher had gone to great lengths to show that it lacked representation on social and economic issues. The group agreed that a background presentation on the Board should be added to the agenda for the next month's meeting.

– *Break for Lunch* –

CALIFORNIA WATERSHED ASSESSMENT MANUAL

Russ Henly, of CDF, presented an overview of the current development of a California Watershed Assessment Manual (CWAM). The project began in 1999 with the publication of "12 Steps to Watershed Health". A steering committee was formed to guide the development of a manual that would assist watershed groups in performing their own watershed assessments, and up to this point, 7 chapters have been drafted. They are currently having some funding issues, and are looking for some additional funding to round out the geographic scope of the manual. However, some agencies are waiting to see a full draft before committing more funds. When the draft manual is complete, it will be sent out for public review, and an announcement will go out to the Watershed Program Subcommittee listserv. As far as costs are concerned, the project has spent \$204,000 to date, with another \$60,000 allocated to carry it through the next nine months

and the completion of this initial draft. The next draft will be developed in collaboration with watershed groups.

Fraser Shilling of UC Davis, project manager for the development of the manual, then presented some background information. The development of a watershed assessment manual is crucial for California watershed groups, as watershed assessments form the basis of functioning watershed plans. However, an assessment is a complicated and daunting process which many watershed groups lack the resources to figure out on their own. This manual will help watershed groups get their arms around how to go about doing a watershed assessment as well as how to analyze the data once it is collected. The manual is not proscriptive—rather it shows watershed groups ways in which assessments can be performed.

Laurel Ames mentioned that those who will be best served by the manual are those who don't have a technical background. She asked if the style of the CWAM is readable to those who are not experts. Mr. Shilling answered that everyone on the CWAM team has written for non-technical audiences before, and they have a technical editor to make sure it is understandable. Ms. Ames asked if the manual presents a way for groups who can't afford to do an intensive, expensive assessment to get results. Mr. Shilling said that the manual gives groups the ability to go through the process one step at a time, at their own pace, without having to spend a lot of money. Ms. Ames then asked whether the manual makes it clear that a watershed assessment includes the whole landscape, not just the streams. Mr. Shilling responded that yes, the manual has, aside from advice on how to perform a watershed assessment, includes a lot of education on watersheds, and will include a glossary to help define and set boundaries on commonly-used watershed terms.

The CWAM website (<http://cwam.ucdavis.edu>) contains a wealth of resources for watershed groups, including sample watershed assessments, descriptions of over 80 watershed assessment model types, and will ultimately link to the Information Center for the Environment (ICE). Questions can be sent to Mr. Shilling at fmshilling@ucdavis.edu.

PHASE 2 GRANT/CONTRACTING PROCESS

Barbary Evoy, of the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board), announced that the California Watershed Council Funding and Economics Workgroup had recently held an all-day session devoted to contracting. Half the day was spent discussing the Phase 2 contracts, and the State Board received lots of good feedback on the contracting process. She then passed out a projected schedule for the execution of all remaining Phase 2 contracts. She urged all project managers to check this spreadsheet to make sure they are aware of the next steps and to ensure that they are contacting the proper grant analyst—updates of this spreadsheet can be found on the State Board website. The State Board's attorneys are looking into other ways to get the money out with a quicker turnaround for those as of yet unencumbered projects. They believe that they are ready to move into a grant agreement process instead of contracts, as grant agreements are more streamlined and are subject to less requirements. They are also more flexible in the scope of work and don't need to go through the Department of General Services. The State Board anticipates getting all of the contracts and grant agreements for Phase 2 projects executed by April 30, 2004. Grant agreements will also be used for all of the Phase 3 projects. For all other questions, Ms. Evoy recommended first reading the handout "Questions and

Answers Involving the Processing of Phase II and phase III Grants Contracts” or calling each project’s State Board contract analyst.

Andrew Rush updated the group on the current round of DOC Watershed Coordinator grants. The recommendations for funding are nearly ready, but have not been released yet. Out of 82 applications, they expect to fund about 50 coordinators. Grant agreements are currently being worked out with DOC staff so that they are ready to go once the funding recommendations are released in late May/early June. DOC hopes to have the grant agreements executed and people working by June 30. Links to the funding recommendations will be posted on the DOC and Watershed Program websites once they are released.

PROGRAM INTEGRATION: DRINKING WATER QUALITY PROGRAM

Mr. Meacher then introduced Sam Harader, the director of the CBDA Drinking Water Quality Program DWQP. Sam gave the Subcommittee a brief presentation on what the DWQP does, what its goals are, and what areas the Watershed Program might be interested in teaming up with the DWQP on. The DWQP goal is “to advance efforts to provide safe, reliable, and affordable drinking water to the millions of Californians who rely on waters from the Delta watershed through cost-effective improvements to source water quality, water management, and treatment.” Their bottom line is delivered water quality.

Mr. Harader explained that their focus on source improvements and protection is a common goal with the Watershed Program. Other common goals and connections between the two programs include regional and local coordination and partnerships, local planning efforts, facilitating communication between state, regional, and local organizations, and developing balanced and effective projects with drinking water quality components. Mr. Harader proposed that the DWQP and Watershed Program work together to agree on some watershed best management practices to improve drinking water quality that the Watershed Program could recommend to local groups.

John Lowrie said that the themes introduced in the day’s meeting regarding program integration have recently been in consideration by the most of the programs. Integrating with other programs could mean that those programs are putting a bigger emphasis on source areas.

OTHER WATERSHED UPDATES

Laurel Ames announced that the Sierra Nevada Alliance, the California Watershed Network, the Resources Agency, and Sake of Salmon have working together to put together a proposal for a **statewide watershed circuit rider program**. For more information, contact Ms. Ames at laurel@sierranevadaalliance.org.

Ms. Ames also announced that the **Watershed Education Legislative Day** will be held on April 15 by the California Watershed Network in collaboration with Cal Coast, Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project, the Salmonid Restoration Federation, and others.

NEXT MEETING

The next Watershed Subcommittee meeting will be held on **Friday, March 19, 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
Austin, Carrie	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
Bagwell, Bonnie	American River Watershed Group
Bowker, Dennis	Bay-Delta Authority Watershed Program
Brodie, John	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
Bungarz, Denny	CDBA Working Landscapes
Buttermore, Roger	US Fish and Wildlife Service, Stockton
Casias, Lori	State Water Resources Control Board
Chetelet, Guy	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Cochrane, Steve	Friends of the San Francisco Estuary
Cornelius, Jim	Calaveras County Water District
Cornwall, Caitlin	Sonoma Ecology Center
Coulter, Ken	State Water Resources Control Board
Crooks, Bill	City of Sacramento
Dawley, Vicky	Tehama County Resource Conservation District
Dubay, Rae Ann	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Evert, Carmen	SCWA
Evoy, Barbara	State Water Resources Control Board
Fox, Dennis	DSCC
Francis, Pamela	Lake County Department of Public Works
Freeman, Robin	Environmental Justice Coalition for Water/East Bay Watershed Center
Garfield, Lynn	Wolf Creek Community Alliance/Friends of Wolf Creek/Garfield & Associates.
Harris, Michael	Western Shasta Resource Conservation District
Haze, Steve	Millerton Area Watershed Coalition
Heiman, Dennis	CA Regional Water Quality Control Board
Henly, Russ	CA Department of Forestry
Horney, Cindy	Glenn County Resource Conservation District
Hopkins, Dale	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
Howard, Vance	Adopt-a-Watershed
Huff, Linda	City of Sacramento Department of Utilities
Kiger, Luana	US Department of Agriculture/Natural Resources Conservation Service
King, Audrey	CA Bay-Delta Authority
Klasson, Mick	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
Knecht, Mary Lee	Jones & Stokes
Lamont, Juliet	Urban Creeks Council
Lorenzato, Stefan	CA Department of Water Resources
Lunt, Tina	Cosumnes River Task Force & Sloughhouse RCD
Martin, Sara	Jones & Stokes
McConnell, Nancy	Upper Merced River Watershed
McWhorter, D. Paul	Bay Saver/Stormwater Trade Association
Meacher, Robert	Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee
Miller, Eric	Butte County Water and Resource Conservation
North, Debbie	

Ohlson, John	Yolo County Democratic Central Committee
Robins, Kathleen	SRCD
Rush, Andrew	CA Department of Conservation
Russick, Kathy	Sacramento River Watershed Program
Sanger, Patrick	City of Sacramento Stormwater Management
Sharp, Leigh	Napa County Resource Conservation District
Sime, Fraser	CA Department of Water Resources Watershed Program
Suarez, Megan	Sierra Nevada Alliance
Todt, Iovanka	Floodplain Management Association
Trott, Ken	CA Department of Food and Agriculture
Wallace, Ben	CA Association of Resource Conservation Districts
Ward, Kevin	UC Davis ICE
Warner, Holly	Upper Merced River Watershed Council
Washburn, Barbara	CA Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
Watson, John	Cache Creek Conservancy
Wermiel, Dan	CA Bay-Delta Authority
Wollan, Otis	American River Watershed Institute
Yee, Betty	Regional Water Quality Control Board
Ziegler, Sam	US Environmental Protection Agency

MEETING MATERIALS

- Meeting agenda
- February 6, 2004 Memo from the Working Landscapes Subcommittee—“Socio-economic Expertise on the CBDA Science Board”
- Working Landscapes Subcommittee Workplan Recommendation, May 22, 2003
- Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee Recommendation re Membership of Independent Science Board
- DRAFT California Watershed Assessment Manual Executive Summary
- Draft California Watershed Assessment Manual Outline
- SWRCB’s “Questions and Answers Involving the Processing of Phase II and Phase III Grants Contracts”
- Prop 13 Phase II Projects Anticipated Contracting Schedule from the SWRCB
- January 16, 2004 Watershed Subcommittee Meeting Summary