

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WATERSHED SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Summary

Meeting Date/Location: Friday, April 15, 2005
10:00 AM to 3:00 PM
Jones & Stokes
2600 V Street, 2nd Floor Boardroom
Sacramento, CA

Meeting Attendees: See Attachment A

Meeting Handouts: See Attachment B

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

Robert Meacher, California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) Watershed Subcommittee (Subcommittee) co-chair, opened the meeting with a round of introductions and a quick discussion of meeting logistics, including the announcement that the scheduled to give the local watershed presentation was unable to make it to the meeting. He also apologized on behalf of Martha Davis, his co-chair, who couldn't make it to the meeting. Mr. Meacher turned the meeting over to John Lowrie, the Watershed Program Manager, for an update on Watershed Program business.

CALFED WATERSHED PROGRAM UPDATES AND BUSINESS

Mr. Lowrie informed the group that every year, each CALFED element updates their program plan. The Watershed Program hopes to adopt its program plan in June. The latest draft of the Watershed Program Plan is available in the handouts as well as on the Watershed Program's website (<http://baydeltawatershed.org/>).

Mr. Lowrie then debriefed the Subcommittee on the most recent Authority meeting, which was held on April 13 and 14. There have been recent conversations among a narrow set of stakeholders about long-term financing for the whole CALFED Program, which is on shaky ground. After the current bond money runs out, sources for finances get squishy. People are starting to position themselves to get what they want out of the Program if it collapses. The Watershed Program is attempting to stretch out the existing funding; it should last two more years before needing additional funding.

Senator Machado and Assembly member Wolk are interested in the development of a proposal whereby beneficiaries would pay for all or part of the CALFED Program. However, the potential fee providers are not happy about this proposal. This is leading to talk of shrinking the scope of the program to match the existing level of funding and jettisoning the elements they

don't feel are totally necessary, like the Watershed Program, the Water Use Efficiency Program, and other programs identified as nonessential to meet the needs of water users and Delta environmental issues. The new focus would be on the "problem area" as opposed to the "solution area".

The legislature is now asking the Authority for a scoped-down program and a reduced financing strategy. The word at the most recent Authority meeting was skepticism about spending any money in southern California. The conversations at this point are Delta-centric.

The senate authorizing committee has temporarily zeroed out all budget requests from the Authority until the Authority submits a new financing plan. If the CALFED budget remains zeroed out, it would result in a \$5.5 million reduction in funds for the Watershed Program. This budget reduction would affect the funds provided to DWR for program support, to DOC for the watershed coordinator program, and some of the funding for the Watershed science panel work. Mr. Lowrie is most concerned about the Watershed Program's ability to continue funding of the watershed coordinator program through the third year.

According to Mr. Meacher, Senator Machado has made it clear that the legislature is angry about CALFED's apparent lack of performance. They are concerned about the 2-year financing plan—they likened it to life support and believe it would take a miracle to revive the program after two years. At this point in the process, broad-based user fees are not an option for funding. The only acceptable form of user fees would appear to be on a voluntary, "beneficiary pays" basis, based on "linkages and assurances". To the Metropolitan Water District, that would mean a guarantee of increased pumping. However, most water users are opposed to beneficiary-based user fees.

On a side note, DWR is proposing a "state water resources investment fund" to support its broad, statewide infrastructure projects, which would be similar to a phone service surcharge. DWR is beginning to view water as a utility that requires infrastructure rather than as a public trust. Senator Machado has proposed looking more fully into this "investment fund" idea and potentially situating the CALFED program within its framework.

Mr. Lowrie indicated that three of the CALFED program elements are under consideration for some sort of fee coverage: the Ecosystem Restoration Program, the Levee System Integrity Program, and the Environmental Water Account. Fees would be less for less work—hence the argument for a scaled-back program. Kern County terms this scale reduction a "focus on the core values of the program". The Watershed Program is not under consideration for fee coverage, as it provides broad and often diffuse benefits. The Watershed Program would be more logically funded by the public (i.e. State of California), as it covers the broadest base of "users".

However, the environmental justice community pointed out that these funding/scope discussions are taking place among a very narrow set of stakeholders—mostly water exporters. Water exporters and the environmental community are generally at odds about what should happen, but they do agree that more of a focus should be given to critical delta issues.

Rob Alcott pointed out that there are two schools of water users concerned with the future of

CALFED: (1) those users that rely on Delta exports, who are looking to streamline the program as much as possible, and (2) the water users in the Sacramento Valley and foothills who are worried that a reduction in CALFED's scope would put them at a disadvantage. Mr. Lowrie agreed. He feels that a scope reduction would lead to a decreased focus on non-exporting communities. Mr. Alcott feels that these discussions regarding CALFED's future need to be done through a transparent public process.

Mr. Meacher offered his take on the situation. First off, he believes that the Watershed Program needs to show a significant benefit to water quality and fisheries in order to stay alive. Secondly, it appears to him as though the water exporters from southern California have combined forces with Delta interests to narrow the focus of the CALFED program and revert back to the old-school thinking that a watershed begins at the base dams—that water somehow magically springs from the Delta.

Robin Freeman inquired as to whether or not water users have explained why they feel a beneficiary-based fee would negatively affect them. Mr. Lowrie responded that water users are not so much opposed to a broad-based fee, but opposed to a specific fee levied only on them. Mr. Meacher explained that the water user representatives are aware that they work for boards of directors and if fees go up, they would probably lose their jobs. This is the reason that discussion is turning to a reduction in the program—it would mean fewer fees—and to “assurances”. Southern California is willing to pay for specific projects (ecosystem restoration projects, for example) if it will assure greater flow out of the Delta.

Fraser Sime asked if it was time to call out the dogs of war. What can the watershed community do? Mr. Meacher suggested writing letters to Patrick Wright, Gary Hunt, and legislators. A meeting attendee proposed partnering with the Sacramento Valley Environmental Water Caucus or any of the Bay Area Environmental Water Caucuses to take some action.

CALEPA AND RESOURCES AGENCY MOU AND WATERSHED MANAGEMENT STRATEGIC PLAN

Mr. Meacher introduced Cathy Bleier, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Resources Agency, to present the CalEPA and Resources Agency MOU and Watershed Management Strategic Plan. The Resources Agency and CalEPA recently updated a memorandum of understanding (MOU), required by the Watershed, Clean Beaches, and Water Quality Act of 2002, to coordinate and provide stakeholder input to watershed programs and investments. The MOU establishes a forum of deputy directors to accomplish these objectives by implementing the state's strategic watershed management plan and by aligning it with existing and new resource conservation and protection programs that have watershed elements or objectives, such as CALFED and the Ocean Action Plan.

The four goals of the Strategic Plan are:

- Improving agency coordination and collaboration,
- Demonstrating watershed health,
- Encouraging collective investments, and
- Providing for local involvement.

The original California Watershed Management Strategic Plan was developed in 2003. It

created the California Watershed Council (CWC), a stakeholder forum. During 2003 and 2004, various CWC subcommittees met regularly to formulate recommendations for implementation of the strategic plan. In February of 2005, the Resources Agency and CalEPA convened eleven departments, boards, conservancies, and offices to serve as a steering committee and to update this plan by prioritizing policy and program needs and developing an action plan for the next 18 months. The committee reviewed accomplishments of the last two years and considered recommendations for additional action by the CWC, and is moving forward with recommendations in all categories that can be done with existing funding. This committee has met four times, and includes deputies from 19 departments.

However, the committee is still concerned about closing the loop with local participation. Through implementation of the 18-Month Action Plan, certain individual programs and initiatives (like the Oceans program) will have stakeholder forums, but public forums are lacking in other regions of the state, especially the east side of the Sierra Nevada and some areas in the northern Sacramento Valley. One potential solution would be to require Integrated Regional Planning Grant recipients to incorporate watershed forums into their programs.

The committee is now seeking public comments on the Draft 18 Month Action Plan, and Ms. Bleier mentioned that the Watershed Subcommittee is the first group who will have had the opportunity to comment on the plan.

Mr. Freeman pointed out that in addition to geography gaps, there are also scale gaps in relation to public involvement. It is often hard to get voters to understand that they are part of a watershed, let alone part of a statewide watershed program. He asked if the Resources Agency and CalEPA were interested in bringing the process down to a city or county planning level. Ms. Bleier indicated that there are insufficient staff and funding to take the process to so many small areas. It is because of this staff/funding shortage that they are looking into other regional opportunities to bring public watershed forums to additional areas.

A meeting attendee asked how the Draft 18 Month Action Plan deals with interrelationships among the agencies, and how it handles improving internal efficiency. Ms. Bleier thinks that a lot of progress has already been made—a culture of collaboration and coordination is already becoming evident.

Laurel Ames said that at Watershed Education Day, Mike Crisman talked about a bottom-up approach to running state agencies. However, this Strategic Plan and Draft 18 Month Action Plan are agency documents aimed at agencies. She wanted to know how the plans fit in with Crisman's vision. Ms. Bleier explained that the Strategic Plan does call for substantial public involvement, and the CWC was their first attempt at bringing all the stakeholders to the table. However, they found that many interested stakeholders couldn't make it to monthly meetings held in Sacramento. That is why they are now seeking partnerships at a more regional local level.

Another meeting attendee inquired as to how the newly formed Sierra Nevada Conservancy fits in. Ms. Bleier answered that they will fit in however they want, once they're an official entity. They simply haven't been at the table yet.

Linda Ballentine asked if it would be okay to distribute the Draft 18 Month Action Plan to Resource Conservation District Boards. Ms. Bleier responded that yes, it would be fine, and that she will craft a request for comments to accompany the draft Plan.

Paul Veisze stated that he is concerned about the disappearance of the CWC and its clear public participation structure, and wonders how the Resources Agency and CalEPA will ensure that their implementation actions are presented to and guided by the public. Ms. Bleier answered that this is a communication question with several potential solutions. Right now they are thinking about the possibility of mini regional forums or partnering with the California Watershed Network (CWN). Mary Lee Knecht added that the CWN is proposing a statewide watershed forum in the fall to give watershed groups a forum in which to speak out.

Dale Hopkins indicated that the first MOU was about bringing stakeholders into the conversation about deciding how to spend bond money, and asked where that priority is now as it seems the stakeholders have been excluded from the process. Ms. Bleier clarified that the original MOU only specified two CWC meetings per year, the requirements for which were as simple as providing a forum for receiving comments. The Resources Agency and CalEPA went far beyond that requirement for the CWC in 2003 and 2004, and are now following up on the CWC's recommendations, including the recommendations of the CWC funding subcommittee, which were to prioritize the integrated regional planning and grant programs.

WATERSHED LEGISLATIVE FORUM

Mr. Meacher turned the floor over to Laurel Ames, of the CWN, to debrief the April 2005 Watershed Education Day for Legislators. She explained that 2005's Watershed Education Day was a joint effort by CWN, CalCoast, and the Wetlands Recovery Project. The latter two organizations are oriented to southern California, and the event got a great southern California turnout. Unfortunately, northern California and watershed groups did not turn out in very big numbers. Ms. Ames feels this might have been due to the prohibitive cost of participation this year.

She stressed that every day can be Watershed Education Day—all legislators have office hours for speaking with the public, and they even have office hours in their home districts. She encouraged watershed groups to meet with their legislators, show them what their groups are doing, and to tell them why the CALFED Watershed Program is important. There are clearly forces at work with well-lined pockets who are trying to do away with the Watershed Program, but the watershed community has constituent power, which was demonstrated on the volunteer labor issue. She concedes that the watershed community won't have much power over the decisions about the new state budget, but she urged everyone to do what they can to ensure that as much money as possible is in the budget for watershed activities.

Ms. Ames was asked during Watershed Education Day, "where is the home of the Watershed Program?" She feels that ultimately, the Watershed Program should be housed under the wing of another agency. Anyone with ideas should feel free to send them to Ms. Ames at laurel@watershednetwork.org. She restated that action must be taken, as there is a lot of work to do to save the Watershed Program, as the Metropolitan Water District is definitely not going to save it. Fraser Sime interjected that agency staff cannot save the Watershed Program from the

inside—legislators will listen to letters received from the public far more than they will listen to recommendations from agency staff.

Stefan Lorenzato informed the Subcommittee that during the afternoon panel at Watershed Education Day, the agency secretaries talked about how important the watershed management paradigm is. They said it is important to move toward it, but admit that it will take a long time to achieve. Since those statements have been publicly made, Mr. Lorenzato suggested holding them to it by asking how they are moving themselves toward that paradigm. He feels this presents a real opportunity to move ahead—even republican legislators’ offices know that the watershed management paradigm is important, but feel it is infeasible at the moment due to the special fees it would entail. Mr. Lorenzato feels that perhaps it should be approached differently. Many representatives’ offices are talking about conjunctive use and coordinated emergency response plans, so they already have a couple of watershed issues on the table.

Craig Benson pointed out that county boards of supervisors have great connections with the legislators in their areas. Mr. Meacher agreed, and said that especially in rural areas, legislators have a great reliance on boards of supervisors to feed them the issues that are important to their constituents.

Mr. Sime said that the bottom line is building relationships with legislators and staff before a crisis like this hits, and that everyone in the watershed community should be working to forge these relationships.

—Break for Lunch—

MAY IS WATERSHED AWARENESS MONTH

Mary Lee Knecht announced that May will be California’s first Watershed Awareness Month. The CWN wrote Governor Schwarzenegger requesting his support in the designation of a Watershed Awareness Month, and within two weeks he responded with a proclamation committing California to Watershed Awareness Month. The CWN is encouraging watershed groups to organize their own local events in celebration of Watershed Awareness Month, and register those events at the CWN website to get them all on an events calendar on the site. The website is www.watershednetwork.org.

Mr. Meacher encouraged everyone to submit an agenda item to their county board of supervisors to officially adopt May as Watershed Awareness Month at a county level. He suggested making a presentation and ensuring that the media is there to cover it.

Mr. Lowrie informed the Subcommittee that in honor of Watershed Awareness Month, the Watershed Program would like to do something special for the May Watershed Subcommittee meeting by turning it over to the subcommittee to discuss anything its members would like to explore. If the subcommittee suggests issues it would like to discuss, staff could arrange panels.

Mr. Freeman indicated that he would like to find out what watershed groups are accomplishing

on the ground. Mr. Benson agreed, and would like to see the May Subcommittee meeting structured as an opportunity to get to know what people on the ground are doing. He suggested inviting speakers to discuss projects that embody CALFED goals and explain how that is manifested at a local level.

Conversation then turned to potential locations for this special meeting. It was agreed that the meeting should be held somewhere different than the normal location at Jones & Stokes, preferably outdoors. Linda Ballentine suggested that everyone try to bring an influential person to the meeting, in order to get the word out about the great things the Watershed Program is accomplishing. Ms. Knecht said she would send a request to the Governor's office for Mr. Schwarzenegger or Ms. Shriver to speak at the event. Kathleen Robins suggested that Watershed Program staff post a template invitation on their website so local watershed folks can send invitations to the meeting sporting their logo along with the CBDA logo.

Ms. Knecht will work on meeting logistics and details about the location and agenda of the next meeting will be sent out via the listserv.

WATERSHED PROGRAM 2005 PROPOSAL SOLICITATION PACKAGE

Kristyne Van Skike, from the Department of Water Resources (DWR), presented a preliminary schedule for the review and release of the Watershed Program 2005 Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP), which will be administered by DWR. The preliminary schedule can be viewed in the attached file "watershed PSP schedule.pdf".

The first schedule constraint is review and approval of the PSP by the Authority and BDPAC. The next joint BDPAC/Authority meeting will be held on June 6 and 7. After that, there will not be an opportunity for the Authority to approve the PSP until August. DWR is therefore aiming to complete the 30-day public review period before June and present the PSP to the Authority and BDPAC for approval in June, with an expected PSP release date in July.

The concept proposal application period will be 4 weeks long. The Interagency Watershed Advisory Team (IWAT) will facilitate the concept proposal review panel, and announce the full proposal invitations on September 1.

The full proposals will be reviewed by regional panels that will make their funding recommendations in January of 2006. Hopefully, final approval of funding decisions will be made by mid-March of 2006, leading Ms. Van Skike to refer to the entire process' schedule as "from St. Patrick's day to St. Patrick's day".

The application process will be web-based, most likely utilizing a database-driven Word document that applicants can download and submit electronically.

Mr. Lorenzato, co-presenting with Ms. Van Skike, then turned to the Subcommittee for input on the process. He mentioned that DWR would like to create an opportunity for some of the applicants to clarify certain questions to the selection panel during 5-15 minute presentations. Because of time constraints, the panel would not be able to hear from every applicant, only from those whose proposals need clarification for the review panel. Ms. Ames pointed out that with

the number of proposals likely to be in the category of “needing clarification”, the effort might be overwhelming.

A meeting attendee commented that as a likely applicant, they would welcome the opportunity to defend their proposal before the review panel. Mr. Freeman remarked that it would obviously be labor intensive to allow everyone a chance to ‘defend’, but it would be an ideal situation. Patricia Bratcher said that at her previous job, they successfully implemented a similar process, with a presentation opportunity for each applicant. She volunteered to share her experience and ideas with DWR on the matter.

Mr. Bowker pointed out that it might create some bad feelings if a certain applicant was not invited to ‘defend’ and ultimately did not end up getting funding, while another applicant was invited and did receive funding. Ms. Robins agreed that it would be a delicate situation that could generate political ill-will for those agencies involved in the process. A meeting attendee agreed that it is a political can of worms—that it would be best to invite everyone or invite no one. To preserve DWR’s sanity, he recommends inviting none.

Another meeting attendee took a different view. She feels that some organizations have great grant writers, whereas some have a great idea for a project, but aren’t good at grant-writing. It comes down to a question of whether the selection panel wants only well-written grants, or whether it wants a group of the actual best projects. She believes that the defense would be necessary, especially if DWR will not be holding regional workshops to work out the technicalities of the applications with the applicants. Mr. Lorenzato assured the Subcommittee that they would hold a couple of workshops during both the concept and full proposal development processes.

Mr. Sime asked the group at large if they would be willing to sacrifice some speed in the selection/contracting process to allow for these question and answer opportunities for every applicant. Jan Lowrey responded that it’s not an unusual approach to grant funding. For example, for the Urban Streams grants, they decided to announce the projects they were interested in funding, then tour the project sites. He warned that the important part is to be consistent—don’t promise to talk to everyone and then only talk to some.

Craig Benson suggested that the selection panel could give their questions to the applicants and let them choose to respond either verbally or through written correspondence. Under that model, there would be no preference given to those that were better speakers than writers.

Mr. Freeman asked what the response timeline would be for applications once the PSP is released. Mr. Lorenzato answered that right now they are planning for a four-week response period for the concept proposals and a six-week response period for the full proposals. He encouraged any potential applicants to start putting their concept proposals together before the PSP is released (based on the draft that will be distributed for public review before BDPAC and the Authority approve the PSP).

He explained that they will be looking for projects in the \$50,000 to \$350,000 range, and should be releasing about \$9 million for the grants.

Mr. Benson asked if there would be a limit to the number of grants awarded for each individual watershed or HUC. Mr. Lorenzato answered that the decision has not yet been made, but they will definitely not award grants to two competing groups in a single watershed. Mr. Sime added that they are encouraging groups in the same watershed to collaborate and find common goals, both for the purposes of the grant applications and in general.

A meeting attendee suggested that one way to discover opportunities for partnerships would be through regional GIS collaboratives. Along the lines of digital data, Mr. Lorenzato encouraged project managers and grant applicants to make an effort to put together information on their projects and programs that meets web library protocols. He believes that the more information the watershed community can disseminate about their projects, the better they will be able to communicate the benefits of their efforts.

Gail Chen returned to the topic of how to handle the actual grant selection process. She believes that all prospective grantees should be treated equally and fairly and suggested recording every question asked at all of the proposal workshops and posting those on a website so all applicants could have the benefit of the workshop even if they are unable to attend.

WATERSHED UPDATES AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Local watershed updates and public comment included the following:

Westside Resource Conservation District

Linda Ballentine announced that the Westside Resource Conservation District will be introducing new watershed assessments as well as holding watershed tours and a barbecue in celebration of Watershed Awareness Month.

Sierra Nevada Alliance (SNA)

Megan Suarez announced that the SNA would be hosting a “Sierra Watershed Restoration Workshop and Field Tour” May 19-21. Megan encouraged folks to sign up for this free workshop to learn about basic restoration planning, to tour large and small restoration projects in Sierra watersheds, and to discover ways to design successful restoration efforts. There are still some open spaces on the tour. To sign up, contact Ms. Suarez at (530) 542-4546 or megan@sierranevadaalliance.org with your name, watershed group, phone, e-mail, and fax number.

Cache Creek Conservancy

Jan Lowrey announced that the Cache Creek Conservancy has published their Landowner’s Guide to Streambank Management on Cache Creek. The handbook was written at the suggestion of landowners who wanted information on streambank care that focused specifically on Cache Creek, and it focuses on local examples and solutions. It presents background on erosion along the creek and gives case studies of specific problems and their resolution. It makes suggestions for bank maintenance, including locally tried bioengineering techniques, ideas for removal of non-native exotic plants and revegetation with native species, and a discussion of long-term maintenance issues. The handbook suggests a format for landowners to plan their own streambank improvement projects and provides a reference section with contact information on local experts and where to purchase materials.

American River Watershed Group

Bill Templin encouraged folks to come to the American River Watershed Conference at Sacramento State University on Saturday, April 23. The conference will be held from April 21 to the 23rd, but Saturday is free to the public. Mr. Lowrie extended his complements to the conference organizers—it's great on science and the agenda looks very interesting.

UC Davis Information Center for the Environment's Natural Resource Projects Inventory

Mary Lee Knecht, on behalf of Kevin Ward, announced that the Natural Resource Projects Inventory (NRPI) is celebrating "Ten Years of Watershed Success Stories in California" with the production of a color brochure highlighting actual project data and photos. NRPI is now the most comprehensive statewide database of natural resource projects, with over 5,300 projects listed, and is searchable on the internet. It gets over 1,000 hits a day from resource managers, private citizens, students, folks looking for volunteer opportunities, and other states and countries. The projects include watershed conservation, restoration and noxious weed eradication, assessment, planning, and scientific studies, all funded by federal, state, and private grants.

Ms. Knecht handed out a flyer detailing how project managers can add their projects to the database and submit photos and success stories for possible inclusion in the brochure. Questions can be directed to Kevin Ward at kcward@ucdavis.edu or (530) 752-2378.

NEXT MEETING

The next Watershed Subcommittee meeting will be a special gathering in celebration of Watershed Awareness Month and the accomplishments of the Subcommittee. It will be held on **Friday, May 20, 2005**. The location will be announced over the listserv.

Attachment A

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Name	Affiliation
Alcott, Rob	East Bay Municipal Utility District/Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
Alvis, Julie	California Bay-Delta Authority Watershed Program
Ames, Laurel	California Watershed Network
Ballentine, Linda	Westside Resource Conservation District
Benson, Craig	Sutter County
Bowker, Dennis	California Bay-Delta Authority Watershed Program
Bratcher, Tricia	California Department of Fish and Game
Chen, Gail	California Department of Conservation
Cornelius, James	HDR
Cross, Barbara	California Department of Water Resources
Dallman, Suzanne	Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council
Francis, Pamela	Lake County Department of Water Resources
Freeman, Robin	East Bay Watershed Center/Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
Gould, Randy	US Forest Service
Gouveia, Patricia	California State Water Resources Control Board
Harder, Kathy	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Holford, Dwight	Upper Putah Creek Stewardship
Hopkins, Dale	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
Hughes, Ben	Sacramento River Discovery Center
Knecht, Mary Lee	Jones & Stokes
Lavelle, Jane	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Lorenzato, Stefan	California Department of Water Resources
Lowrey, Jan	Cache Creek Conservancy
Lowrie, John	California Bay-Delta Authority Watershed Program
Lunt, Tina	Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District
Martin, Sara	Jones & Stokes
McCubbins, Tom	Tehama County Resource Conservation District
McLaughlin, Lia	US Fish and Wildlife Service/CALFED Nonnative Invasive Species
Meacher, Robert	California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee
Moller, James	Western Shasta Resource Conservation District
Ragazzi, Erin	California State Water Resources Control Board
Robins, Kathleen	Solano County Resource Conservation District
Sime, Fraser	California Department of Water Resources
Suarez, Megan	Sierra Nevada Alliance
Templin, Bill	American River Watershed Group
Van Skike, Kristyne	California Department of Water Resources
Veisze, Paul	California Department of Fish and Game
Ward, Kevin	UC Davis Information Center for the Environment
Wermiel, Dan	California Bay-Delta Authority Watershed Program
Wright, Carol	Sacramento River Preservation Trust
Yee, Betty	Regional Water Quality Control Board

Attachment B

HANDOUTS

- Meeting Agenda
- Watershed Program Multi-Year Program Plan (Years 6–9)
- California Agency Watershed Management Strategic Plan: Draft 18 Month Action Plan
- One-page summary of the California Agency Watershed Management Strategic Plan: Draft 18 Month Action Plan
- CALFED Watershed Grant PSP Proposed Schedule