

BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WATERSHED SUBCOMMITTEE
Meeting Summary

Meeting Date/Location: Friday, June 18, 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 unable to attend the meeting.

Mary Lee Knecht announced that a new California Watershed listserv has been created, and it currently includes all members of the CBDA Watershed Subcommittee (Subcommittee), the California Watershed Council (CWC), and the Natural Resource Projects Inventory (NRPI) database. Subscriptions can be placed at:
<http://www.calwater.ca.gov/listserv/emailsubscriptions.htm>, or by e-mailing Ms. Knecht at mknecht@jsanet.com.

Ms. Knecht then presented Mr. Meacher with a California Watershed Network (CWN) t-shirt on behalf of the CWN for his contributions to the success of the Legislative Education Day on April 15.

WATERSHED PROGRAM GRANT PROJECTS CATALOG

John Lowrie, the Watershed Program Manager, announced that since the last Subcommittee meeting, in April, the Watershed Program Team has completed the *Watershed Program Grant Projects Catalog: Grant Awards FY 2000-2001*. The Catalog contains descriptions of each project funded through the Watershed Program's 2000-2001 grant funding cycle, as well as key information such as legislative districts, contact information, and an explanation of how each project benefits the CALFED Program. Mr. Lowrie passed around four hardcopies and explained that the catalog is available online through the Watershed Program website, www.baydeltawatershed.org, where the catalog in its entirety, or any individual project's summary pages can be downloaded.

Robin Freeman asked if hard copies were available. Mr. Lowrie explained that CALFED has a very limited number of hard copies, but that if someone needs one, to contact him directly. The Program staff is hoping to have another batch of catalogs printed. Fraser Sime volunteered to look into using DWR's internal publishing service, and Mr. Lowrie responded that agency sponsorship would be fabulous for this catalog. Mr. Meacher pointed out that when he and Martha Davis unveiled the Catalog at the last Public Advisory Committee meeting, Patrick Wright complimented it highly and said that he hoped each CALFED program can come close to presenting something similar to demonstrate their progress.

Mr. Lowrie went on to say that as additional rounds of grants are awarded, Program staff will update the Catalog with new project information. Design and data collection for the next catalog, to include information about the grants awarded in fiscal years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003, will begin in July.

Laurel Ames expressed her pleasure that the Watershed Subcommittee has always been first in public participation and first in grant processes, and now is first in reporting progress. She complimented the Subcommittee and program staff for putting the Watershed Program way ahead of the rest of the CBDA programs. Nettie Drake agreed and pointed out that this catalog is a great way to show what the State is getting for its money. Dr. Henry Clark also pointed out that the Catalog shows that the Watershed Program is supporting, in a material way, environmental justice communities and programs. Robin Freeman offered one last kudo to CALFED in general, and reported that the World Resource Institute identified, on an international scale, CALFED as a positive example of public participation and the right to know.

PRIORITIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WATERSHED PROGRAM (YEARS 5-8)

Mr. Lowrie introduced this topic by explaining that the CALFED Record of Decision (ROD) contains a commitment to revisit implementation of the Program Elements in year 4, halfway through the first seven-year implementation phase. The Watershed Program is currently standing back and establishing methods for evaluating its progress, and using this opportunity to work towards new and revised priorities and goals, summarized in the *Implementation Framework for Years 5-8*. To assist in this process, is the Interagency Watershed Advisory Team (IWAT), which consists of representatives from the seven CALFED implementing agencies, as well as several cooperating agencies. Sam Ziegler, from USEPA, and Stefan Lorenzato, from DWR, serve as the co-chairs of the IWAT. Over the past few months, the IWAT has been working with the Watershed Program to propose revised priorities as well as to develop implementation tools to assist in achieving these priorities, and has presented these for the Subcommittee's consideration and input.

Mr. Lowrie explained that it is now time to finalize these revised priorities and incorporate them into the Multi-Year Plan, as the plan will go before the Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) in July, who will recommend it for approval by CBDA in August. The Watershed Program would thus like to collect any final comments from the Subcommittee on the *Draft Implementataion Framework for Years 5-8* (see handout) for incorporation before the BDPAC meeting. Mr. Lowrie thanked the IWAT for the excellent job they have done articulating the priorities of the Watershed Program and remaining highly consistent with the advice of the

Subcommittee.

Sam Ziegler then presented the highlights of the working draft of the implementation framework. For the full draft framework, please see the handouts.

Program Objective

- To further the mission and goals of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program to maintain and restore ecological health and improve watershed management by working in partnership with communities at the watershed level.

Implementation Priorities (Years 5-8)

- Broaden participation in watershed partnerships.
- Encourage more communities to become involved.
- Advance the application of science.
- Ensure long-term sustainability of watershed activities.
- Ensure continued information exchange and collaboration.
- Integrate Program implementation with other CALFED program elements.
- Align activities of agencies and the Watershed Program.

Program Tools: Grant Program/Annual RFP

- Develop specific selection criteria consistent with:
 - Funding assessment, planning & monitoring.
 - Building community capacity, particularly among communities with identified need.
 - Incentives for broadening partnerships.
 - Including monitoring and performance measures.
 - Linking to CALFED Objectives
- Solicitation and Selection Process
 - High level of transparency w/public input.
 - Effective fiscal management.
 - Provide support to grant program applicants.
 - Consider:
 - Continuous solicitation process.
 - Regionalized review/selection.
 - Incentives to address sustainability beyond grants.

Program Tools: Directed Actions

- Watershed Subcommittee Meetings.
- Watershed Partnership Seminars (2/year).
 - Consider session for managers/decision maker
- Watershed Coordinators through DOC.
- Consider & Discuss w/Subcommittee:
 - Watershed assessment guidelines/primer.
 - Social science performance measures workshop.
 - Key education & outreach activities.
 - Key watershed science activities (e.g. gauging stations).
 - Others?

Program Tools: Technical Assistance

- Enhance assistance:
 - ❑ Assessment, planning & monitoring
 - ❑ Regulatory compliance
 - ❑ Program/project/grant management
 - ❑ Data development & management
 - ❑ Organizational development
 - ❑ Long-term organizational sustainability
 - ❑ Environmental justice & community impacts
- How?
 - ❑ More effectively use the internet.
 - ❑ Investigate establishing a watershed assistance team.
 - ❑ Facilitate access to agency experts.
 - ❑ Establish Watershed Program science advisory panel.

Program Tools: Program Management

- Enhance participation and collaboration of implementing and coordinating agencies.
- Integrate other cross-agency watershed efforts
- Better coordination with other CBDA programs.
- Improve program self-evaluation process
 - ❑ Consider development of an external program evaluation process.

Summary/Highlights

- Priorities
 - ❑ Broaden participation in watershed partnerships.
 - ❑ Encourage more communities to become involved.
 - ❑ Ensure long-term sustainability of watershed activities.
 - ❑ Integrate w/other CALFED programs & align w/agencies.
- Program Tools
 - ❑ Annual RFP>>>assessment, planning, monitoring
 - ❑ Watershed Partnership Seminars>>>2/year
 - ❑ Watershed Coordinators>>>DOC grant program
 - ❑ Communication network>>>Watershed Subcommittee & IWAT
 - ❑ Watershed Assistance Teams>>>allocate funds/solicit proposals

Mr. Meacher then opened up the floor for comments and suggestions from the Subcommittee.

- Nettie Drake suggested that the implementation priorities be further articulated to emphasize a commitment on CALFED's part to work better both among program elements, and with outside organizations, like the California Watershed Council (CWC), in order to prevent duplication of efforts.
- Laurel Ames expressed a strong desire to see an implementation priority that addresses the need to improve the funding process and ensure that it is predictable.
- Kristin Carter recommended additions to the Technical Assistance Program Tools to include a standardization of protocols, so results can be compared between watersheds, and a higher level of coordination with colleges and universities.

- Anne Riley proposed decentralizing the grant process in order to strengthen environmental justice and community interest by bringing grant funds closer to home and making them more accessible.
- Jan Lowrey warned against focusing too much grant funding away from implementation projects, as implementation projects pull landowners into the process and allows local understanding of watershed processes to broaden. He pointed out that implementation projects can be a rallying point in an otherwise disinterested watershed.

Mr. Lowrey's comment led to more conversation amongst Subcommittee attendees. Fraser Sime responded that the Watershed Program is the only game in town when it comes to funding for watershed planning projects. The IWAT is receiving a lot of feedback that the Watershed Program needs to step up the funding for planning projects, but have no intention of doing away with funding for implementation projects. Russ Henly pointed out that the original Watershed Program Plan focused on supporting assessment, education, and capacity-building activities, and that other CALFED program elements focus on supporting implementation projects. Dennis Heiman voiced his agreement, stating that he believes implementation is the backbone of any good watershed group, but that the Watershed Program is the only place to come for money to support non-implementation activities.

Dennis Bowker pointed out that the Watershed Program has been looking regionally at the activities of the implementation-focused CALFED program elements, like the Ecosystem Restoration Program, the Water Use Efficiency Program, and the Drinking Water Quality Program, in order to integrate approaches. Mr. Meacher pointed out that increased coordination between elements also presents an opportunity to truly merge the RFPs, similar to how the RFP process was handled during the first grant cycle. Mr. Lowrie agreed that the core of this issue is that CALFED has not fully integrate the various program elements. The Program Plans will not be integrated or closely linked this year, but it remains a goal. Teri Murrison agreed that an official progression for applicants from the Watershed Program's planning and assessment funds to the ERP's implementation funds would be an ideal situation. Bill Crooks pointed out that the program elements will be forced to integrate by year 10, because the separate pots of money will disappear. Ben Wallace added that the Farm Bill also has lots of money set aside for implementation projects.

- Robin Freeman expressed his opinion that the whole draft implementation framework is a good document. He suggested, however, that the framework should also focus on connecting watershed end users and voters with the upstream valley and mountain groups to show the urban users how their actions have upstream effects. It's great when urban users get to learn these lessons in their own local stream—when they get to see how flushing a toilet affects the food on their table.
- Mr. Freeman also cautioned that regionalization of the grant process needs to be done with care—when decisions are made at the local level, existing patterns repeat themselves and it's harder to get away from embedded community interests. There should be some assistance with regional decision-making, as the process tends to get less transparent as the decisions get more local.
- Teri Murrison expressed her support of the watershed circuit-rider program, as well as of the Watershed Partnership Seminars.
- Mark Horne suggested providing an orientation for funded projects to introduce them to

- mentors (not just agency experts), as well as to debrief them on the process.
- Nettie Drake also expressed her support of regionalization—many regions have different issues and need to be written differently. She also suggested that a person with expertise in money management and project administration be added to the watershed circuit-rider roster.
 - Susan Strachan pointed out that the small groups—the “have-nots”—benefit from the availability of planning money, the annual grant cycle, and the watershed coordinator program. The circuit-rider program needs to focus on ensuring that those small groups all have access to the technical experts.
 - Liz Mansfield, as a first-time attendee of Subcommittee meetings, mentioned that she has heard many good things about the Watershed Program. She suggested that the implementation framework include a description of CALFED’s connection to the Delta and a more specific clarification of “long-term sustainability”. She also felt that the circuit-rider program should include someone with the skills to bring together diverse factions and to facilitate.

Laurel Ames summarized the discussion by pointing out that the room seems to be in general consensus about the draft implementation framework; everyone is offering suggestions, but no one is arguing. Sam Zeigler agreed and said that the IWAT will integrate the Subcommittee’s recommendations into the implementation framework before it is presented to BDPAC in July. Mr. Meacher asked if consensus had been reached, and everyone voted yes. Additional comments on the implementation framework can be sent to Sam at Ziegler.Sam@epamail.epa.gov.

– *Break for Lunch* –

WATERSHED PRESENTATION: CSU CHICO’S CALIFORNIA WATERSHED FUNDING DATABASE

Kristin Carter, from California State University, Chico, presented a live demonstration of the California Watershed Funding Database (Database), which was developed with the support of a Watershed Program grant. The Database is an interactive site that offers streamlined service for those seeking information about watershed funding opportunities in California, as well as to agency personnel who wish to post such opportunities. It is focused on California, but includes Federal, State, and private foundation funding opportunities. For each funding opportunity, the Database provides a synopsis of the grant, a due date, and information on eligible applicants and contact persons. The Database is self-sustaining; grant managers can upload their own grant information, and as information gets outdated, an automatic notification to update information is sent to the grant manager.

Once the Database is live, CSU Chico will make the code available at no cost. It is being designed using open source tools exclusively, with the intent of making the engine available to any and all individuals and/or agencies that wish to adapt the software to maintain their own research/contract funding databases.

The website is currently under development and temporarily housed at CSU Chico, at www.watershed.ecst.csuchico.edu, and Ms. Cooper is asking for feedback on the field attributes. The Database can be accessed only with a password, which anyone can obtain by e-mailing Ms.

Carter at kcooper-carter@csuchico.edu. They hope to go live with the Database in July, at which point it will be found at www.calwatershedfunds.org. Ms. Cooper mentioned that John Ellison is working to authorize the Database to be permanently housed at the Watershed Portal, the CWC's website.

FINANCE STRATEGY/PLAN FOR THE WATERSHED PROGRAM

Steve Hatchett, the consultant hired by CALFED to prepare the Finance Options Report, presented a summary of the process thus far, with specific emphasis on the Watershed Program. Following is a summary of his PowerPoint presentation.

Finance Options Report

- Reasons for Preparing the Report:
 - Status quo approach of relying on state funding unlikely in the future
 - Existing funding gone after 2006-7
 - Water user fee requirements
 - Benefits-based financing principle in ROD
 - Coordinate financing among Program Elements
- Objective of the Report:
 - Build an understanding of Program costs and benefits
 - Provide reasonable and instructive finance options
 - Provides tools to assist decision-makers, stakeholders, & beneficiaries
- Process & Participants
 - Technical Team
 - BDA staff and consultants develop Finance Options Report
 - Ad Hoc work group
 - 18 member work group (stakeholders, legislative reps, & agency managers) reviews report and serves as sounding board for Technical Team and provides input to Panel
 - Independent Review Panel
 - 8 member panel made up of academics and practitioners who are experts in public financing provide advice on finance analysis and reasonableness of finance options
- Analysis Used to Develop Finance Options
 1. What will it cost?
 2. What are the benefits?
 3. Who are the beneficiaries?
 4. How should costs be allocated?
 5. What are the finance tools?
- General findings
 - Wide range in potential cost of CALFED Program
 - Benefits-based analysis offers mixed potential
 - Divergent views about environmental mitigation responsibilities

	Now	Likely - Near Term	Maybe-Long Term			
Conveyance	X (Supply & DWQ)	X (Flood Protection)	X (Ecosystem)			
ERP			X			
EWA		X (Supply)	X (Ecosystem)			
DWQ			X			
Levees	X (Flood Protection)	X (Supply, DWQ, Recr)				
Storage		X (Supply, DWQ, Flood,	X (Ecosystem)			
		Hydro Recr)	Hydro Recr)			
			Avg (Mil.\$)		2006-2030 (Mil.\$)	
Watersheds Program Element			Low	High	Low	High
Conveyance	X		21	36	25	90
WUE (Supply)			150	240	250	6,000
Ecosystem Restoration					3,750	6,000
Environmental Water Account			30	30	750	750
Drinking Water Quality			21	56	525	1,400
Levees			41	74	1,025	1,850
Storage (only 1 surface project as example)			87	167	2,175	4,175
Watersheds			10	40	250	1,000
WUE (Mostly local; public \$40-\$50 Mil./yr)			170	380	4,250	9,500
Science			43	43	1,075	1,075
Oversight			10	10	250	250
Total			\$583	\$1,076	\$14,575	\$26,900

- Significant potential to broaden funding sources.
- Variety of finance tools available.
- Need for strategies for prioritizing public funds

Findings: Expected Costs

Findings: Expected Benefits

- Benefits-based analysis offers mixed potential
- Shortage of quantitative economic data
- Information can support broader group of beneficiaries than currently paying

Findings: Expected Benefits

Findings: Other Allocation Examples When Benefits Could not be Quantified

- Example Allocations based on divergent points of view
 - Public pays allocation
 - Water User pays allocation
- ROD, Status Quo

Finance Tools

- For the Public Share
 - State General Obligation Bonds
 - General Funds
 - Federal appropriations
- For the User Share
 - Self Liquidating GO Bonds
 - State Revenue Bonds

- ❑ SWP contractor charges
- ❑ CVP contractor charges
- ❑ JPA Revenue Bonds
- ❑ Local matching contributions
- ❑ New State Administered Fees

Findings: Programs Suited to Water User Fee

- Fee is best suited to programs with broader water user benefits & not able to identify individual beneficiaries
 - ❑ Ecosystem Restoration
 - ❑ Environmental Water Account
 - ❑ Drinking Water Quality
 - ❑ Delta Levees
 - ❑ Watershed

New State Administered Fees

- Fee versus Tax:
 - ❑ Need a Nexus between level of benefits and amount paid in fees
 - ❑ Each program in CALFED has different set of beneficiaries that would result in varying fee levels among water users

Finance Options Report Future Activities:

- Identify where additional data to quantify benefits is needed and worth the investment
- Revise cost estimates and allocations
- Assist in optimizing investments
- Develop accounting system to track benefits related to costs/investments
- Identify local investments that contribute to CALFED objectives

Summary of Watershed Program Options

- Program Components
 - ❑ Watershed Assessments
 - ❑ Training and Technical Assistance
 - ❑ Local Projects
 - ❑ Program oversight, coordination, and science
- Implementation Examples
 - ❑ High Level of funding – intensive implementation of all activities (\$40 million per year)
 - ❑ Low Level of Funding – emphasize core activities and achieve goals over longer period of time (\$10 million per year)
- Key findings
 - ❑ Benefits difficult to quantify systematically, but analysis suggests broad benefits
 - ❑ Potential to broaden participation in costs
 - ❑ Range of costs reflect different implementation rates
 - ❑ Long-lived benefits can justify bond financing

- Beneficiaries
 - ❑ General Public places value on watershed protection, restoration and associated ecosystem improvement – Local, California, and Federal
 - ❑ Project-specific partners benefit from improved water supply timing and quality, avoided costs – Other Project-Specific Partners
 - ❑ Benefits in water quantity and quality to Bay-Delta water users

10 Year Funding Targets & Unmet Needs

Program Element	Funding Targets	Available Funding	Unmet Needs
Ecosystem Restoration Program	\$1,844.6	\$711.5	\$1,133.1
Environmental Water Account	\$394.4	\$108.0	\$286.4
Water Use Efficiency	\$2,162.5	\$1,348.2	\$814.3
Transfers	\$6.0	\$6.0	\$0.0
Watershed	\$123.0	\$51.6	\$71.4
Drinking Water Quality	\$264.4	\$4.5	\$259.9
Levees	\$500.3	\$109.7	\$390.6
Storage	\$1,062.5	\$979.7	\$82.8
Conveyance	\$345.4	\$179.6	\$165.8
Science	\$368.9	\$22.5	\$346.4
Oversight & Coordination	\$123.0	\$73.6	\$49.4
Subtotal	\$7,195.0	\$3,595.0	\$3,600.1
<i>Potential Capital Projects</i>			
Surface Storage Construction	\$5,863.5	\$0.0	\$5,863.5
Conveyance Construction	\$2,510.7	\$212.5	\$2,298.2
Suisun Marsh Levees	\$101.0	\$0.0	\$101.0
Total, including Uncertain	\$15,670.2	\$3,807.4	\$11,862.8

- Preliminary Finance Strategies
 - ❑ Watershed
 - ❑ Public \$
 - ❑ Local funding
 - ❑ Other project-specific partners
 - ❑ Water User fee possible

- User Fee Status:
 - ❑ Governor’s May Revise language
 - ❑ Senate Trailer Bill Language
 - ❑ Administration Proposed Trailer Bill Language
 - ❑ Conference Committee Action

Finance Options Report & Ten Year Finance Plan Next Steps

- Public outreach thru BDPAC Subcommittees
- BDPAC Meeting – July 8th
- Options Report comments by end of July
- Finalize Options Report, Fall, 2004
- Finalize 10 Year Plan – late 2004
- Possible User Fee – 2005

Mr. Lowrie explained how the low and high expected annual costs for the Watershed Program were derived. \$40 million (high) is the approximate average cost per year that was projected for the Watershed Program for the first seven years of implementation. \$10 million (low) was just

conceived of as a starting point for discussion. Many in the Subcommittee warned that the Watershed Program should be careful in how it presents the “low” funding option, because as it currently is presented, it appears that the program can indeed succeed on \$10 million per year, and that it is a streamlined option. The report clearly needs to articulate that under the low funding scenario, it would take the Watershed Program 120 years to accomplish the goals it could achieve in 20 under the high funding scenario. Laurel Ames suggested raising the low funding scenario from \$10 million to \$25 million. Steve Hatchett mentioned that all of the CALFED subcommittees are worried that they came in too low for the low funding scenario. The Subcommittee then charged the Watershed Program staff and Co-Chairs to rework the numbers presented in the Finance Options Report to show a more realistic representation of available funding and funding needs.

Regarding the “expected benefits” of the Watershed Program to users, Mr. Meacher observed that there could be a potential knowledge bias amongst the review team; that perhaps the reviewers may not have the knowledge necessary to fully analyze benefits of the program. Mr. Lowrie pointed out that cost-benefit analysis is the norm, yet it is hard to apply to watershed benefits because many of the benefits result in *cost avoidance*. Nettie Drake expressed her concern that this report may be too technical and may go over the heads of most lay people, leaving them unable to give adequate input. She also mentioned that she has performed her own watershed cost-benefit analysis and will send that information to Mr. Lowrie to share with Mr. Hatchett. Mr. Meacher expressed his desire to see a resource economist on the review team.

Mr. Hatchett explained that the process of identifying beneficiaries has begun, and that some of the identified beneficiaries (those that could be subject to a beneficiary/user fee) are the public, including California and the nation, project-specific beneficiaries, like a company undergoing FERC relicensing, as well as local interests, which are mostly comprised of local agencies. Mr. Meacher pointed out that as planned, the Finance Options Report does not include a lot of money for watersheds in user fees. He cited a recent decision by the Public Utilities Commission of Plumas County to allow up to a \$3 per month fee on telephone bills to support local sheriff’s departments and 911 services. He suggested taking the idea of utilities fees for watersheds to counties.

Any technical, on-point comments on the Finance Options Report can be sent directly to Kate Hansel, and political comments can be sent to Watershed Program staff.

FUTURE WATERSHED SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS

Nettie Drake proposed the idea of merging the CWC Funding and Economics Subcommittee with the Watershed Program Subcommittee meetings, in order to reduce duplicative efforts and combine forces. The CWC has been emulating the Watershed Program Subcommittee since its inception. She felt this was an especially good idea, since people have limited time that they can spend in these types of meetings, and the CWC would like to capitalize on the feistiness of the Watershed Program Subcommittee to advance the interests of the entire state.

Many Subcommittee members expressed concern that a commingling with the CWC would dilute the Subcommittee’s political effectiveness, and cautioned to start this process carefully. The Subcommittee agreed to include a regular update from CWC representatives in future

Subcommittee agendas.

WATERSHED UPDATES

Laurel Ames reminded everyone to support Assembly Bill 2690, the Hancock Bill, that will resolve the volunteer labor issue.

NEXT MEETING

The next Watershed Subcommittee meeting will be held on **Friday, July 16, 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
Berntsen, Eric	El Dorado County Resource Conservation District
Bodensteiner, Scott	MEC–Weston Solutions
Bowker, Dennis	Bay-Delta Authority Watershed Program
Bratcher, Tricia	CA Department of Fish and Game
Bryan, Leslie	Western Shasta Resource Conservation District
Buttermore, Roger	US Fish and Wildlife Service, Stockton
Cady, Casey Walsh	CA Department of Food and Agriculture
Carter, Kristin	Chico State University Research Foundation
Clark, Henry	Environmental Justice Coalition for Water/West County Toxics
Coalition	
Coulter, Ken	State Water Resources Control Board
Crooks, Bill	City of Sacramento
Dills, Greg	Lake County East Lake and West Lake Resource Conservation District
DiStefano, Jenny	CA Department of Conservation
Drake, Nettie	MFG, Inc. and California Watershed Council Funding & Economics
Francis, Pamela	Lake County Water Resources Department
Freeman, Robin	East Bay Watershed Center/Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
Gould, Randy	US Forest Service
Gresham, Rich	Placer County Resource Conservation District
Hatchett, Steve	CBDA Consultant
Haze, Steve	Millerton Area Watershed Coalition
Heiman, Dennis	CA Regional Water Quality Control Board
Henly, Russ	CA Department of Forestry
Hopkins, Dale	CA Regional Water Quality Control Board – San Francisco
Horne, Mark	EIP Associates
Jacobsen, Peter	Metropolitan Water District
Kier, Bill	Kier Associates
King, Audrey	CA Bay-Delta Authority
Knecht, Mary Lee	Jones & Stokes
Loeffler, Rebecca	City of Sacramento Stormwater Management Program
Lowrey, Jan	Cache Creek Conservancy
Lowrie, John	CA Bay-Delta Authority
Lunt, Tina	Cosumnes River Task Force & Sloughhouse RCD
Mansfield, Liz	El Dorado Irrigation District
Martin, Sara	Jones & Stokes
McCaul, John	American Farmland Trust
Meacher, Robert	Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee
Moller, James	Western Shasta Resource Conservation District
Murrison, Teri	Lower Merced River Watershed
Ohlson, John	Yolo County Democratic Central Committee
Robins, Paul	Yolo County Resource Conservation District
Russick, Kathy	Sacramento River Watershed Program
Shortridge, Doug	LCS, Inc.

Sime, Fraser
Strachan, Susan
Suarez, Megan
Thomas, Lenore
Washburn, Barbara
Wermiel, Dan
Williams, Erin
Yee, Betty
Wallace, Ben
Ward, Kevin
Warner, Holly
Ziegler, Sam

CA Department of Water Resources Watershed Program
Chico State University Research Foundation
Sierra Nevada Alliance
US Bureau of Land Management
CA Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
CA Bay-Delta Authority
US Fish and Wildlife Service
CA Regional Water Quality Control Board
California Association of Resource Conservation Districts
UC Davis
Upper Merced River Watershed
US Environmental Protection Agency

MEETING MATERIALS

- Meeting agenda
- Implementation Framework for Years 5-8 Working Draft
- CALFED Bay-Delta Program 10 Year Funding Targets and Unmet Needs
- Excerpts from the Draft Finance Options Report