

BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WATERSHED SUBCOMMITTEE
Meeting Summary

Meeting Date/Location: Friday, April 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, 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. She apologized on behalf of Robert Meacher, the other Subcommittee Co-chair, who was in Hawaii, but with the Subcommittee in spirit. Ms. Davis then went through the agenda and announced that the prevailing wage discussion would take place immediately before lunch, rather than at the end of the meeting, because Stefan Lorenzato had a prior afternoon commitment.

IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITIES FOR WATERSHED PROGRAM (YEARS 5-7)

John Lowrie, the Watershed Program Manager, said he had hoped to present the revised Watershed Program priorities, targets, and milestones to the Subcommittee for discussion at this meeting, before the annual plan is presented to the Authority in May. Unfortunately, the revised priorities have not been finalized yet. Instead, Sam Ziegler will present the results of the Interagency Watershed Advisory Committee's (IWAT) April 14 discussions regarding revised Watershed Program priorities.

Mr. Lowrie then gave an update on one of the issues from the last meeting. At the March meeting, he presented an analysis comparing the location of program expenditures with the tributaries that provide the largest unimpaired flow to the Bay delta system. The analysis points out that program investment has not been proportional to flow. In response to this, a question was asked to the subcommittee suggesting that perhaps one of the new objectives or targets of the Watershed Program for years five through seven should be to focus investments on those major tributaries. However, after the meeting, he received a good amount of feedback on that idea, and none of the feedback supported the idea of focusing dollars based on geography. Thus, the idea of making extraordinary changes in the focus of Watershed Program investments based on geographic considerations has been thrown out. The Watershed Program is still considering

how program resources can be focused topically; for example, improved support of community efforts, capacity building, and outreach.

Sam Ziegler then gave a short PowerPoint presentation on the IWAT. He prefaced the presentation with the statement that he believes the Watershed Program is at an exciting time—that everyone appreciates the efforts Mr. Lowrie has made to bring stakeholders together to help design the program from the ground up, and that this is another chance to refocus the program according to current needs, including the need to improve implementing agency involvement.

The IWAT was formed through a memorandum of understanding (MOU) after the CALFED ROD was signed as a way for the agencies to work together and facilitate implementation of the Watershed Program. The MOU called for the formation of an oversight committee that would guide implementation of the program through policy level discussions. The members of this oversight committee were:

- California Department of Water Resources (DWR)
- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
- California Department of Fish and Game (DFG)
- California Resources Agency
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)
- US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)
- US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

These agencies became the Watershed Program implementing agencies with the passage of the California Bay-Delta Authority Act of 2003 (SB 1653).

The IWAT is responsible for ensuring that regular communication occurs between the Subcommittee and agency staff, and has been meeting two to three times per year. At the last IWAT meeting, which took place on April 14, 2004, representatives were in attendance from SWRCB, DWR, EPA, DFG, the California Department of Parks and Recreation, the California Resources Agency, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the California Department of Forestry (CDF), the California Association of Resource Conservation Districts (CARCD), California Department of Conservation (DOC), and CBDA. The outcomes were as follows:

- 4 preliminary Program recommendations:
 - Integrate implementation better with the rest of the CBDA program elements.
 - Focus on watershed communities/broaden watershed group partnerships.
 - Enhance role of watershed program implementing agencies.
 - Maintain & enhance Watershed Subcommittee role.
- Increase IWAT meeting frequency.
 - Next meeting May 19, 2004
- Brainstormed 34 additional potential recommendations.

Stefan Lorenzato (co-chair of the IWAT with Mr. Ziegler) added that the members of IWAT

agreed that they should try even harder to collect input from stakeholder groups, and lean more heavily on the Watershed Subcommittee and the California Watershed Council for that guidance. He also said that IWAT would be creating an infrastructure for combined management, which will allow the implementing agencies and cooperating agencies to take a larger role in the management of the Watershed Program as well as to find more options for collaboration and leveraging of funds.

A meeting participant asked how roles in IWAT and management of the Watershed Program differ between implementing agencies and cooperating agencies. Mr. Ziegler responded there is no real answer to that question at the present time. One of the tasks currently facing IWAT is to define the roles and responsibilities of each agency. Dennis Bowker added that part of the role and responsibility definition will include clarifying that the goal, as an implementing or cooperating agency, should be to implement the Watershed Program, and not to use CALFED funds to pursue each individual agency's goals.

Another meeting participant inquired about one of IWAT's four preliminary Program recommendations, asking how IWAT wants the Watershed Program to go about focusing on watershed communities and broadening watershed group partnerships. Mr. Bowker responded that the Watershed Program would like to facilitate more recognition, in a regional context, among those making decisions about land use at all levels—from a landowner with a rose garden to a cattle rancher to SAFCA. Barbara Washburn asked how the Watershed Program plans to reach out to private landowners and local agencies and ensure that partnerships are expanding. Mr. Lorenzato answered that as far as IWAT is concerned, how that goal will be achieved is still up for debate. Mr. Lowrie mentioned that giving bonus points to grant applicants who demonstrate that they are expanding partnerships and sharing data would be one likely approach.

A question was raised regarding what the Watershed Program is hoping to achieve by broadening partnerships. Mr. Lowrie answered that the ultimate goals are long-term sustainability of watershed groups and efforts, and making a watershed perspective a part of everybody's everyday life.

Laurel Ames asked how the Watershed Program intends to gain the cooperation of the land management agencies that already have decision-making power over land use—what does the Watershed Program intend to offer them? Kathy Russick, of the Sacramento River Watershed Program (SRWP), pointed out that land management agencies would cooperate if it was in their best interests—the SRWP was recently approached by a developer who said that if the SRWP could help him navigate the Endangered Species Act, that his company would participate in the SRWP.

Rick Harter, looking at the broader topic of Watershed Program implementation priorities, suggested that IWAT and the Program focus on defining the Program's role in relation to the other CALFED elements, outlining the mutually supportive roles played by the Program. He also advised the Program that the new California administration prefers strategic thinking and is less concerned with process—and that the Program should also bring that kind of thinking into the planning process to be able to sell the Program. Ms. Davis agreed, reiterating that the Program needs to be sure to communicate *what* we're doing that's good, and what we're *achieving* as a program. She then outlined three items for IWAT's consideration:

1. Perform a gap analysis (what is working in the Watershed Program and what is not), and be explicit about the results.
2. Return to the CALFED lens—what does the Watershed Program need to accomplish over the next four years?
3. Clarify the roles, responsibilities, and areas of expertise of the implementing agencies.

Mr. Bowker also pointed out that over the years, the attendance of the Watershed Subcommittee has changed, and most of the founding members no longer attend. He stressed how difficult it was to start the Watershed Program and to prove that it was necessary. The Program is still tasked with proving its worth, and for that reason he feels that emphasis belongs on the goal of integrating Watershed Program implementation better with the rest of the CBDA program elements.

Mr. Ziegler agreed, and reinforced that IWAT would play a key role in the creation of the upcoming Program Plan—that it wouldn't just be written by staff and "approved by IWAT".

A final comment urged IWAT to include tribal governments as a part of watershed communities. Ms. Davis assured the Subcommittee that tribal governments would be explicitly included in the Program Plan.

LONG-TERM FINANCE STRATEGY FOR THE WATERSHED PROGRAM

Mr. Lowrie reminded the subcommittee that each CALFED program had been asked to devise some scenarios relating to how it would prioritize spending given a range of funding levels (the low funding level was \$10 million per year and the high was \$40 million per year). In addition, this long-term finance strategy is looking at how the beneficiaries of Watershed Program funds could help support the program. A significant presentation on Finance Options Report was given at the March Subcommittee meeting, and after the meeting, many attendees expressed concern over how the Program's spending priorities were characterized. Mr. Lowrie clarified that the Finance Options Report is not a declaration of the Watershed Program's intentions—that the scenarios were purely hypothetical. However, due to the expressed concern, some adjustments have been made to the description of low funding level goals (which were previously focused mainly on upper watersheds) to a simple, scaled-back version of the bigger goals. These include support for capacity building, assessment, and planning activities. It will also look further into opportunities to partner with hydropower relicensing projects and Drinking Water Quality Program activities. The report will be posted on the Watershed Program website (www.baydeltawatershed.org) on April 23, 2004 in order to solicit broad public input for the final version that will be published in July.

One of the issues that needs serious consideration is how to establish a clear relationship between the benefits of the Watershed Program and who the beneficiaries actually are. Sungnome Madrone suggested attempting to unleash private sector funds by helping change tax and permit laws to make it easier for private landowners to do watershed restoration and other projects.

Mr. Lowrie pointed out another funding hurdle that needs to be overcome—the perspective that

many in charge of allocating funds to the Watershed Program have regarding the meaning of “program implementation”. Originally, \$300 million was the estimated public cost to implement the Watershed Program over the first seven years—to assist and enhance local efforts. However, accounting methods include the monetary value to existing local efforts and fundraising activities (which have been conducted independently from the Watershed Program) and are counted as part of Watershed Program implementation, leading them to argue that the Watershed Program has come closer to meeting the estimated \$300 million need than State and/or federal appropriations specifically to the program would suggest. The Watershed Program needs to work on changing this perspective.

SUPPORT FOR VOLUNTEERS INVOLVED WITH COMMUNITY BASED WATERSHED MANAGEMENT

Stefan Lorenzato and Laurel Ames gave a short update on the current prevailing wage issue that is hindering local groups from using volunteer labor. Mr. Lorenzato announced that the State government is certainly aware that there is a problem, but that the administration believes it needs to be addressed through a legislative fix, and that the legislature believes it needs to be addressed through an administrative fix. Assembly Bill 2690 (Hancock) is scheduled to be heard in the labor committee, and would change the statutes in the labor code to allow organizations to pay workers the prevailing wage, as well as to utilize volunteer labor. Laurel Ames encouraged everyone to keep the pressure on the governor by writing letters—he could fix this problem immediately—and to write to the labor committee in support of AB 2690, as it needs to pass out of the labor committee the week of April 19 or it will die. She also suggested that everyone write to their legislators and let them know how many projects rely on the support of volunteers and how the current prevailing wage legislation is adversely affecting their legislative districts.

One of the attendees asked if anyone could offer advice for grantees who need to file relevant prevailing wage paperwork soon. Sungnome Madrone stated that the Redwood Community Action Agency will be publishing a white paper (funded by the Ford Foundation) by April 30 with guidelines on working with the new prevailing wage requirements. Mr. Madrone can be reached via e-mail at sungnome@rcaa.org, or by telephone at (707) 269-2065.

– *Break for Lunch* –

LOCAL WATERSHED PRESENTATION: WESTERN SHASTA RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Chris Glover, from the Western Shasta Resource Conservation District (WSRCD), gave a presentation on the Watershed Information Model (WIM), a project that was funded by the Watershed Program during the first year of grant solicitations. The WIM was funded to be an information development and exchange project. It enables anyone interested in watersheds and watershed activities to access watershed information through a web site. WIM is designed to be a resource information exchange center, an educational web site containing interactive mapping, and a data collection system linked to real-time updates.

WSRCD’s prototype WIM, which covers all the watersheds in Shasta County, is housed locally at Shasta College. The WIM website offers a data catalog of GIS files with metadata, GIS databases, documents, and photographs, which can all be viewed using a simple web browser

interface. The available data are from a variety of sources, including agencies, watershed groups and other GIS users. It also offers users real-time data updates, education support, an online library of relevant documents, and a collaborative environment for exchange, integration, and analysis of data. To facilitate the data collection process, and to advise the development of the WIM, a technical advisory committee was formed, which includes the following key participating organizations:

- Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy
- Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group
- City of Redding
- CDF
- US Bureau of Reclamation
- Whiskeytown Environmental School
- Upper Clear Creek-FG Watershed Mgmt Group
- Shasta West Watershed Group
- Shasta College
- DWR
- FWS
- BLM
- Lower Clear Creek CRMP
- Bear Creek Watershed Group
- McConnell Foundation
- DFG
- NRCS
- National Parks Service
- Cow Creek Watershed Mgmt. Group

Mr. Glover took the Subcommittee on a tour of the website, <http://wim.shastacollege.edu>, which included demonstrations of the interactive maps, the data catalog, the watershed activities matrix, and the “Did You Know” educational section of the website. He pointed out that the site is also connected to the Geographic Names Information System.

Mr. Glover then described the ways in which the WIM is helping the Watershed Program achieve its goals and objectives:

- The diverse technical advisory committee representation from local agency personnel, watershed groups and educators has increased collaboration and understanding among groups;
- WIM provides a means to share watershed data and information in a central location: a 24-hour accessible, “one-stop” resource;
- WIM is watershed-based and watershed-driven;
- The WIM is easy to share and to demonstrate live with schools, watershed groups, and others;
- WIM is supported by an organization (WSRCD) with a successful track record for integrating the needs of agencies and the needs of watershed stakeholders and landowners;
- WIM requires minimal maintenance for the general functionality of the site: many features are query-driven and rely on easily manageable databases;
- WIM is hosted by Shasta College, enhanced with watershed-based map services by SC GIS students, and supports data sharing by students at the local Whiskeytown Environmental School; and
- The WIM can easily adapt to new areas with minimal alteration.

The presentation was then opened up to questions from the Subcommittee. Laurel Ames asked if the model is available to other groups, and if so, what the cost would be to develop it for another area. Mr. Glover answered that since the project was funded by CALFED, the model itself is available to anyone who wants it. Development cost could vary, but the Sacramento River Watershed Program had expressed interest in adopting the WIM, and came up with the estimate of \$100,000 to develop the WIM for the entire Sacramento River watershed, and \$12,000 per year in maintenance costs. For more information about developing the WIM for another region, contact Stefan Lorenzato at DWR.

An attendee noted that the WIM is similar in concept to another data management platform called KRIS (Klamath Resource Information System) and asked how WIM is different. Mr. Glover explained that KRIS is certainly eye-catching, but it lacks GIS capabilities. The biggest draw for users of the WIM is the interactive maps.

Rick Harter inquired as to whether the documents in the database can actually be accessed over the WIM website. Mr. Glover answered that yes, the documents can all be accessed as PDF files.

Stefan Lorenzato asked how feasible it is to use the WIM from a dial-up connection. Mr. Glover explained that since all of the thinking takes place at the server's end, that it's very feasible to use it from a dial-up. The maps are translated into JPEG files, which are easily viewed in a normal browser, and can even be downloaded and printed.

Dennis Heiman asked what will happen to WSRCD's WIM after June, 2004 when the Watershed Program grant money runs out. Mr. Glover answered that WIM updates and maintenance costs are built into each new proposal put out by WSRCD.

UPDATE ON PHASE 2 GRANT FUNDS

Mr. Lowrie apologized on behalf of Barbara Evoy (SWRCB), who could not make it to the Subcommittee meeting. However, she did give Mr. Lowrie some information to share with the Subcommittee. Mr. Lowrie read from a memo sent to him by Ms. Evoy that the Phase Two grant contracting process is right on track—the only problems are those that need local resolution. She does caution, however, that everyone needs to make these contracts their number one priority to get all Phase Two projects executed by June 30. Of the 29 Phase Two Watershed Program grants, only six have been executed so far.

Martha then warned the grantees that June 30 is a real deadline as far as encumbering the funds goes. She advised all grantees to be proactive and to get to Sacramento for a meeting with Ms. Evoy if there isn't a clear path to the signatures. Betty Yee also mentioned that with the switch from contracts to grant agreements, a new step on the grantee's part was added: that of providing a grant resolution. Ken Coulter volunteered to send e-mails out to the grantees with a step-by-step process guide to getting their grants executed on time.

One of the meeting attendees asked how the problems with the Phase Two contracting will be avoided in future grant rounds. Martha Davis said that the current grant round (Phase Three) has already undergone some changes as a result of the Phase Two problems, and the process promises to run smoother this time. SWRCB has taken some lessons learned from the Phase Two process.

PHASE 3 GRANT RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Lowrie announced that the Bay-Delta Authority is recommending to the SWRCB that 33 Watershed Program proposals receive awards. The specific recommendations can be viewed at <http://www.calwater.ca.gov/CBDA/CBDAMeetingMaterials.shtml> under the April 7-8, 2004

meeting. Some of the projects will be funded with Prop. 13 funds, and the others will be funded with Prop. 50 funds, but the funding sources for each individual project has not been finalized.

Mr. Lowrie then showed some charts showing the general distribution of grants, and made the following observations:

- There has been an increase in projects located in the Delta and San Joaquin regions.
- There is a much more even distribution of project types than in previous years.
- The Program was able to make connections between the grants and the DOC watershed coordinator program both geographically and administratively.
- Cost-sharing has decreased dramatically. Mr. Lowrie felt that this occurred because applicants were afraid they wouldn't get their full funding request if it looked like they had other funding options—the competitive advantage of cost-sharing was not stressed enough during this PSP.

A meeting participant asked why no State agencies received Watershed Program grants, and Fraser Sime responded that state agencies were discouraged from applying. Another meeting participant asked what would happen to the \$10 million in funding that was available for Watershed Program grants, but not used. Mr. Lowrie answered that the SWRCB was appropriated the money, and discussions regarding the actual disposition of funds still need to happen—he is assuming that the money will roll forward to a future year and be made available for future program implementation. Ms. Davis suggested that disposition of that \$10 million would be a good topic for IWAT to discuss at their next meeting.

Discussion ensued regarding the need for a “lessons learned” session about the Phase Two and Three processes, and ended with the decision that it would be a good task for the CWC to undertake. Mr. Lowrie also pointed out that part of the resolution adopted by CBDA includes a review of the consolidated grant process.

INDEPENDENT SCIENCE PANEL

The Subcommittee then revisited the ongoing discussion regarding the request from the Working Landscapes Subcommittee for Watershed Subcommittee support of a resolution that would add a socioeconomic expert to the CALFED Independent Science Board. The general consensus of the Watershed Subcommittee was that the Working Landscapes Subcommittee request focuses too narrowly on irrigated agricultural land and rural economies. The Watershed Subcommittee would support the addition of a more general resource economist to the Independent Science Board, one that would consider urban economies, forested land issues, etc. A representative from the Working Landscapes Subcommittee offered to take that input back to the Working Landscapes Subcommittee and develop a revised proposal for the Watershed Subcommittee.

OTHER WATERSHED UPDATES

Laurel Ames announced that the **Watershed Education Day** on April 15 at the legislature was a big success, although many Subcommittee members were not there. Laurel stressed that for change to happen, everyone must lobby every year. She also encouraged everyone to look into the new **Assembly Bill 2631**, which is focused on exotics and invasives.

NEXT MEETING

The next Watershed Subcommittee meeting will be held on **Friday, May 21, 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
Ames, Laurel	California Watershed Network
Anderson, Michael	UC Davis
Bowker, Dennis	Bay-Delta Authority Watershed Program
Bray, Dennis	Alameda County Agriculture Commissioner
Bratcher, Tricia	CA Department of Fish and Game
Buttermore, Roger	US Fish and Wildlife Service, Stockton
Coulter, Ken	State Water Resources Control Board
Crooks, Bill	City of Sacramento
Davis, Martha	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Dills, Greg	Lake County West Lake Resource Conservation District
Francis, Pamela	Lake County Department of Public Works
Glover, Chris	Western Shasta Resource Conservation District
Gustafson, Lori	CA Department of Forestry – Fire and Resource Assessment Program
Harter, Rick	Los Angeles & San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council
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
Jacobsen, Peter	Metropolitan Water District
King, Audrey	CA Bay-Delta Authority
Knecht, Mary Lee	Jones & Stokes
Lamont, Juliet	Urban Creeks Council
Lockwood, Jeremy	CA Department of Forestry – Fire and Resource Assessment Program
Loeffler, Rebecca	City of Sacramento Department of Utilities
Lorenzato, Stefan	CA Department of Water Resources
Lowrey, Jan	Cache Creek Conservancy
Lowrie, John	CA Bay-Delta Authority
Lunt, Tina	Cosumnes River Task Force & Sloughhouse RCD
Madrone, Sungnome	Redwood Community Action Agency
Martin, Sara	Jones & Stokes
McConnell, Nancy	Upper Merced River Watershed
McCubbins, Tom	Tehama County Resource Conservation District
Meyer, Ed	Contra Costa County Agriculture Commissioner
Murrison, Teri	Lower Merced River Watershed
Newlin, Vickie	CA Bay-Delta Authority
Ohlson, John	Yolo County Democratic Central Committee
Quitiquit, Irenia	CA Bay-Delta Authority
Rush, Andrew	CA Department of Conservation
Russick, Kathy	Sacramento River Watershed Program
Sanger, Patrick	City of Sacramento Stormwater Management
Sime, Fraser	CA Department of Water Resources Watershed Program
Snowden, Vicky	US Environmental Protection Agency
Thomas, Lenore	US Bureau of Land Management
Washburn, Barbara	CA Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment

Wermiel, Dan
Williams, Erin
Yee, Betty
Yin, Tina
Ziegler, Sam

CA Bay-Delta Authority
US Fish and Wildlife Service
CA Regional Water Quality Control Board
US Environmental Protection Agency
US Environmental Protection Agency

MEETING MATERIALS

- Meeting agenda
- April 2004 draft Watershed Program Multi-Year Program Plan (Years 5-8)
- IWAT informational handout
- Grant Funding Recommendations – Watershed Program 2003
- Prevailing wage informational handouts