

BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WATERSHED SUBCOMMITTEE
Meeting Summary

Meeting Date/Location: Friday, March 19, 2004
10:00 AM to 3:00 PM
Jones & Stokes
2600 V Street, Sacramento, CA
Conference Boardroom

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.

Mr. Meacher mentioned that he recently met with Lester Snow, who is the newly appointment Director of the California Department of Water Resources (DWR). He invited Mr. Snow to join one of the Watershed Subcommittee meetings in the near future to witness the group's energy. Mr. Meacher stated that Mr. Snow agreed with the "watershed approach" and was excited to work with the Watershed Subcommittee.

Mr. Meacher also provided an overview of a recent lawsuit between the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the El Dorado County Water Agency involving area of origin rights. At the request of Mr. Meacher, Ken Coulter (SWRCB) stated that he would ask a SWRCB representative to attend the April Watershed Subcommittee meeting to discuss the case further.

Watershed Program Long-term Financing Strategy

Mr. Meacher introduced Steve Hatchett to provide an update on the long-term financing strategy for the Watershed Program. Mr. Hatchett explained that the purpose of this effort is to illustrate options for financing the Watershed Program and to provide a basis for fiscal planning. Based on initial meetings with Watershed Program staff, it is estimated that the funding needs for the Watershed Program range between \$10 million and \$40 million per year, depending on the scope of the Program.

A number of handouts were distributed to the meeting participants that discussed the financing strategy in more detail. Mr. Hatchett reviewed the materials and discussed the tables with the

group. Table 1 illustrated two different scenarios for allocating the Watershed Program costs. Another table illustrated the preliminary cost range for implementing the Watershed Program. The table highlighted certain implementation actions of the Watershed Program such as watershed assessments; training and technical assistance; local projects; and oversight, coordination and science.

Questions and Comments

Mr. Hatchett was asked if the training and technical assistance element was meant for allocating money to agencies or to hire out for technical assistance. John Lowrie, Watershed Program manager, replied that it has not been decided yet; it could very well be for both.

A question was raised about what was meant by “oversight, coordination, and science” – and does that include funding for monitoring. Mr. Lowrie replied that the “oversight, coordination, and science” element basically means paying for Watershed Program staff and the cost of Program organization. Funding for monitoring is built in to all of the elements rather than being a separate line item.

A comments was made that Watershed Program funding to benefit water quality should be focused below the dams. Mr. Lowrie replied that some of the funding will likely go to projects below the dams, but will also address areas above the dams. There are 11 elements in the Bay-Delta Program, most of which are focused on areas below dams. If the Watershed Program does not address areas above the dams, then they will largely go unaddressed by the Bay-Delta Program.

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	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Alliance
Ames, Laurel	California Watershed Network
Andrew, John	California Department of Water Resources
Blakeslee, Jeannie	California Department of Conservation
Bratcher, Tricia	California Department of Fish and Game
Brodie, John	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
Cantrell, Scott	California Department of Fish and Game
Carter, Kristin	California State University Chico
Clark, Henry Dr.	West County Toxics Coalition
Coulter, Ken	State Water Resources Control Board
Cornelius, James	Calaveras County Water District
Crooks, Bill	City of Sacramento
Davis, Martha	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Deen, Alisha	Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
DiStefano, Jenny	California Department of Conservation
Dotson, Whitney	Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
Drake, Nettie	MFG, Inc.
Everts, Conner	Southern California Watershed Alliance
Farrell, Sharon	Aquatic Outreach Institute
Fateman, Abby	Contra Costa County
Frances, Pamela	County of Lake Department of Water
Gould, Randy	U.S. Forest Service
Harris, Michael	Western Shasta Resource Conservation District
Hatchett, Steve	Western Resource Economics
Heiman, Dennis	Regional Water Quality Control Board
Hopkins, Dale	San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board
Horney, Cindy	Glenn County Resource Conservation District
Jacobsen, Peter	Metropolitan Water District
Keller, Mary	County of Sutter
Kilgour, Laura	Alameda County Public Works Agency
King, Audrey	California Bay-Delta Authority
Knecht, Mary Lee	Jones & Stokes
Kopchik, John	Contra Costa County
Lavelle, Jane	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Lorenzato, Stefan	California Department of Water Resources
Lowrey, Jan	Cache Creek Conservancy
Lunt, Tina	Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District
Martin, Sara	Jones & Stokes
Meacher, Robert	Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee
Ohlson, John	Yolo County Democratic Committee
Robins, Paul	Yolo County Resource Conservation District
Rooles, Heidi	California Bay-Delta Authority
Sanger, Patrick	City of Sacramento
Sharp, Leigh	Napa County Resource Conservation District
Shortridge, Doug	Labor Compliance Specialists

Snowden, Vicky	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Suarez, Megan	Sierra Nevada Alliance
Swearingen, Vieva	Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group/Deer Creek Watershed
Conservancy	
Talbert, Shelly	Panoche/Silver Creek and Cantua/Salt Creek CRMP
Thoms, Marilyn	County of Orange
Wallace, Ben	California Association of Resource Conservation Districts
Walsh Cady, Casey	California Department of Food and Agriculture
Wills, Leah	BDPAC Drinking Water Quality Subcommittee Member
Wong, Evan	California State University
Taylor, Ernie	California Department of Water Resources
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