

BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WATERSHED SUBCOMMITTEE
Meeting Summary

Meeting Date/Location: Friday, July 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 by asking for a round of introductions from the group (Attachment A). She then thanked fellow co-chair Robert Meacher for being at the meeting and said that he would be providing an update on the Watershed Program Plan and the California Bay-Delta Authority (Authority) Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) meeting. Ms. Davis also announced that the Chapter 8 Guidelines of Proposition 50 would be released at the end of July and that there would be a more in-depth discussion at the August Subcommittee meeting.

John Lowrie with the Watershed Program announced that a new recurring agenda item had been added to this month's agenda. The Authority's legal counsel had recommended that all subcommittees build a public comment period into all agendas. It was noted that as usual the Subcommittee member should not feel that they have to wait until this period to make public comment.

RECAP OF THE JULY 8, 2004 BDPAC MEETING

Mr. Meacher stated that he would recap the pertinent events of the recent BDPAC meeting he attended at the Authority. At this meeting, he informed the Authority that the co-chairs had received concurrence on the Watershed Program Plan from the Subcommittee and that the Subcommittee had recommended that the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) be in charge of the funding for the next round of grants. He further reported to the Authority that the Subcommittee did not feel that the California State Resources Water Control Board (SWRCB) was the appropriate agency to facilitate this process. He got clear concurrence from BDPAC that they would support the Watershed Programs presentation in making the recommendation to the Authority. BDPAC received Gary Hunt's personal approval on this issue. Mr. Meacher also reported to the Authority that the current amount of \$10 million for the Watershed Program's Finance Plan was too low and that this would need to be worked on. He stated that the Subcommittee was unhappy with the Finance Options Report and that they felt there was a knowledge bias because the numbers were too low.

FINALIZING THE WATERSHED PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK FOR YEARS 5-8

Ms. Davis explained that the Implementation Framework would guide the activity of the Watershed Program for Years 5 to 8. This includes providing for technical assistance, competitive grants, the partnership seminars series, and furthering the goals of the Watershed Program. The strategy has been finalized by Interagency Watershed Advisory Team (IWAT) based on comments received from the Subcommittee and was incorporated in a programmatic document that will be presented at the August 2004 Authority meeting. BDPAC will endorse acceptance of this Multi-Year Plan.

Ms. Davis announced that she would summarize some of the comments that had been received on the Framework since the last Subcommittee meeting and present some of the changes that occurred as a result of these comments. The comments included requests to

- **conduct an annual grants program for the next three years.** There would be about \$9-10 million available per year.
- **decentralize the grants review process** with more of a regionalized direction incorporated into the design of the grant cycle over the next three years.
- **better integrate the Watershed Program with other CBDA Programs.** It was recognized that the Watershed Program is not quite there. Ms. Davis asked where we could find overlap and suggested developing criteria to get at the issue of integration and tease out ways to craft an overlap with the other CALFED Programs, namely the Ecosystem Restoration Program and the Water Quality Program. Mr. Meacher asked if there had been any resistance to this approach and noted that a steering committee was supposed to have been formed to focus on the issue of integration, but that this had never taken place. Ms. Davis responded that the Watershed Program would firmly take the lead on this initiative. Mr. Lowrie suggested that the Watershed Program be more specific in its Request For Proposals (RFP) criteria to clearly reflect the relationship/benefits with the other programs by pulling out specific targets from the other programs.
- **focus grant funding on capacity-building projects** that include assessment/planning/monitoring activities. Do not ignore on-the-ground implementation projects and focus on capacity building.
- **focus on identifying a long-term funding source.**
- **continue to develop performance measures.** Ms. Davis noted that the Watershed Program team was continuing their efforts to develop and refine indicators that we could be used to track and evaluate the Program's progress. A significant effort has been made and continues to find appropriate metrics for this end.
- **provide technical assistance.** IWAT is recommending taking this to the next step by looking outside of the Watershed Program to find a substantial community of funding and also examine the possibility of constructing a focused solicitation to have the public provide technical assistance. It was requested that this technical assistance include how to mediate/facilitate disparate ideas in a group. Many watershed coordinators do not have this skill. Ms. Davis commented that this would be addressed more specifically when the Subcommittee reached the point of working out the content when the plan is

identified.

- **continue providing the Partnership Seminars.** The current commitment of the Watershed Program is to try to conduct two seminars per year for the next two to three years. Dennis Bowker explained that the seminars are a two-week-long intense workshop covering collaborative skills, science, and organizational and personal development mainly for watershed coordinators. It is a valuable experience as one Subcommittee member testified how it transforms your professional experience. Mr. Lowrie announced that there was \$700,000 remaining in the budget, which would allow for 3 partnerships over the next three years. This amount includes logistics, curriculum and materials development, lodging, and meals. He anticipates there would be 140 students over the 3-year period. Mr. Bowker announced that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) would also be developing partnership classes and that the Watershed Program had made great strides in having the Great Valley Center join as a partner. Mr. Meacher mentioned that Chico State University might also become a partner. It was announced that the program was not in a position to cover lost wages from attending the seminar.

In addition to these comments made by the Subcommittee, Ms. Davis announced that the SWRCB also had some concerns and comments regarding the Implementation Framework. Ken Coulter from SWRCB stated that Barbara Evoy wanted clearer criteria/priorities for the Watershed Program after their experience with the consolidated RFP last year. Mr. Coulter read from a letter addressed to Sam Ziegler from Barbara Evoy stating that there was a lack of agreement between the agencies and that more specific criteria/priorities needed to be set now. These goals should be able to be lifted out of the Watershed Program Plan and placed into the RFP. The letter also stated that the SWRCB wants the Watershed Program Plan goals to be more closely related to CALFED goals.

Mr. Lowrie provided some context by saying that the Program Plan guides all the programmatic activities and that the Program Plan is greater than just the competitive grants process. The competitive grants are not the only goal of the Watershed Program. He stated that a goal of the Watershed Program is to elevate in priority local watershed management, capacity building, assessment, and planning activities. He noted that the SWRCB clearly disagrees with this philosophy. The SWRCB wants to focus on implementing projects that they have previously identified.

A Subcommittee member reported that the past round of grants was not conducted efficiently and that the contracting roles and responsibilities needed to be clarified. He stated that it was at the SWRCB approval phase when things fell apart. He thought that the scope of his project had been approved, but it turned out that it was not. Ms. Davis responded that she appreciated his experience. Ms. Ames endorsed Mr. Lowrie's comment that there is a philosophical disconnect between the Watershed Program and the SWRCB and that this needs to be fixed.

Another Subcommittee member asked what this would mean for capacity-building projects because all of his grants were rejected in the last round. Sam Ziegler responded that there is an ongoing dialogue with project managers regarding the importance of capacity building in relationship to the management of their projects. He stated that they still need to figure out how

capacity building can fit into the problem-solving approach of other programs and that this would take some creativity and not likely be resolved anytime soon.

Another Subcommittee member commented the information that the SWRCB is requesting is in Watershed Program Plan. However, she recommended pulling all of this information together in the form of a fact sheet to get the overall idea across. Mr. Lowrie noted that Mr. Bowker had put together a great handout, but that it was difficult to get it mainstreamed. He said that the Watershed Program is trying to develop its implementation program using the public process and that it had been developed from public input. The Subcommittee member noted that we also want to be careful of being too specific. She cautioned that that was a criticism of the ERP that there was too much bias and that is why everyone participates in the Watershed Program Subcommittee meetings.

A Subcommittee member asked if the co-chairs would formally respond to Ms. Evoy's letter. Ms. Davis responded that she thought that this issue was already resolved since BDPAC had recommended that DWR should be the administering agency. She acknowledged that this was all back up in the air as a result of new letter addressed to Patrick Wright from Celeste Cantú (Attachment B). A copy of the letter was distributed to the Subcommittee. In summary, the letter basically requested that the Authority authorize the SWRCB to administer the remaining Year 2 funds and the \$20 million in funds set aside for the 2005/2006 fiscal year.

Mr. Meacher commented that this letter represents an effort to remove the transparency from the process and to take the public/program managers out of the process. Mr. Lowrie warned that this issue should be resolved because without resolution, the Program Plan cannot be finalized and the Watershed Program cannot move forward.

Ms. Davis noted that it had been made exquisitely clear that the Subcommittee supports the legislature's approval of DWR administering the funds. Several Subcommittee members expressed their frustration and discontent with how the SWRCB had handled the Year 2 grants to date and stated that there was now an issue of a lack of trust between the Subcommittee members and the SWRCB. One Subcommittee member commented that there had been no accountability as to how the SWRCB had handled the process. By comparison, the first round of grants administered by DWR had gone very smoothly. Problems began in Year 2 with the SWRCB workshops, which made it seem like the SWRCB was only interested in large consolidated grants.

One Subcommittee member announced that she had heard that the decision had already been made to have the SWRCB administer the grant process. Ms. Davis responded that she had not heard this and that there would be many unhappy people in the watershed community if this were true. She promised to call Patrick Wright at the Authority to find out what was going on regarding this issue. Mr. Coulter also responded that he did not believe that this decision had been made.

Ms. Davis noted that the Watershed Program could partner with the SWRCB, but that they needed to respect the Program's goals. Ms. Davis also said in addition to requiring that no substantive changes be made to an accepted proposal, we also need to make sure that the accepted applicant pool is larger. The Watershed Program recommended that a larger initial

group be accepted based on past experience that not all of these projects would receive funding. However, the SWRCB accepted a smaller pool, which resulted in non-committed funds and several otherwise good proposals not being funded. A Subcommittee member asked that it be required that whoever administered the funds have sufficient staffing because she did not want there to be money left over because of understaffing.

Another member commented that the big issue was the last page of the letter, the signatory page, which basically goes beyond the legislation, the governor's office, the Department of Finance, the Public Subcommittees, and the Program Managers to make a decision about the funding. The central message should be that we should not let control go to just one or two people. Another member said that there is a clear philosophical difference and asked if perhaps there was a need for an outside facilitator. Overall, the Subcommittee as a whole was adamantly opposed to the SWRCB administering the Watershed Program's grant funding.

Several Subcommittee members asked what they could do to continue to be involved and provide their feedback on this issue. Ms. Davis responded that she would keep the group informed.

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. Lorenzato announced that bill AB2690, which deals with exemption of paying volunteers the prevailing wage, had made it through the Assembly and the Senate and was waiting for final approval. This bill allows volunteers to work on public works projects without having to be paid the prevailing labor wage. It provides amnesty three years back for those who have used volunteers in the past. It does not provide amnesty to groups that have paid contractors less than the prevailing wage. Mr. Lorenzato thanked everyone for his or her support and Ms. Ames seconded the sentiment.

LOCAL WATERSHED PRESENTATION: "PARTNERSHIP FOR SUBREGIONAL WATERSHED FORUMS AND A WATERSHED CENTER" (MERRITT COLLEGE ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM)

Robin Freeman of the East Bay Watershed Center (EBWC) thanked everyone for attending the meeting and mentioned that he had brought several handouts for the Subcommittee (Attachment B). He reported that the main intent of his presentation was to get feedback from the group on what the EBWC was doing. He stated that he would share with the group what was going on at the EBWC, what his plans were for the upcoming year, and then solicit feedback.

The EBWC is hosted by the Environmental Program at Merritt College in Oakland. The area includes 20 watersheds and approximately 800,000 people. The EBWC is in its final year of a DWR capacity building grant and is using CALFED Watershed Program elements to nurture the capacity for locally driven projects, which enhance water quality, water quantity, habitat, and beneficial uses. The intent of the EBWC's program is to bridge the gap in scale from state and regional resources for whole watershed system enhancements by delivering support to a diverse array of local citizen groups.

The idea is to choose a social geography of a sub-region that one can know personally, a region at the scale of one's local neighborhood, where folks live and where they go for coffee, a "coffeeshed". The next step was to assemble resources to increase the probability for watershed residents to participate in managing their own, shared landscapes. These resources include:

- Library resources – regional, state, and federal reports and manuals
- Local resources – producing locally focused manuals and directories (see Attachment B), involving interviews of stakeholders from diverse sectors
- Introduction to Watershed Assessment and Watershed Planning concepts
- Web site directory
- Directory of every watershed in the sub-region
- Resources review and how local funding decisions are made
- Meta-analysis of recent local surveys
- Staff support direct to groups
- Education programs, assessment protocols, training and equipment

The EBWC has also provided regional forums for capturing data and reflecting back to the community for action. The notion of a coffeeeshed has worked better than expected. Each sub-region and local community group and agency is quite distinct and requires local knowledge of culture, gatekeepers, and appropriate opportunities to provide support.

The strategy of the EBWC is to embed ongoing watershed support services into existing institutional budgets where possible. For example, this includes putting training and education functions into schools and colleges rather than repeatedly diverting agency or non-profit resources into educational workshops (for a course list see Attachment B). This method benefits from using trained educators who know how to deliver information to diverse audiences.

Another example of lessons learned includes the experience of Friends of Two Creeks (FO2C). Mr. Freeman presented an overhead that showed the chronology of the development of FO2C and demonstrated how linking college, agency, and Watershed Center staff resources worked very well. He did acknowledge that this process took longer than anticipated. In the previous five years he stated that there had been 3 short-lived efforts to establish watershed organizations solely on volunteer efforts on these two creeks.

Mr. Freeman then showed several slides of the overall geographic area and various projects ongoing in the region. He mentioned that it might be possible to tease out a return on investment on paid community involvement staff that could correlate to outcomes.

Mr. Freeman stated that whole watershed thinking develops slowly because learning how to participate in decision-making develops slowly for community organization members. He also noted that volunteers are most eager to learn and participate when an issue motivates them. Government agencies and to some extent large NGOs learn slowly that they need to invite and actually use public participation. He noted that the Watershed Subcommittee and the Site Stewardship Program at Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) are two exceptions. By default, East Bay restoration support service distribution has been agency driven by scientifically logical decisions to protect least damaged streams. However, he noted that this process might overlook equally valuable active citizen interests on other watersheds, thus missing public participation opportunities and needed votes for funding and legislation.

Mr. Freeman said that agencies do not typically request or think of paying for stakeholder involvement in actively designing spending and policy programs. He also mentioned that they often do not think of community members hefting rock and plants in the craft of project

installation, but that there is a need to design more projects to include small scale hands on work supporting a tactile relationship to our own landscapes and the skills to analyze them. He also said that making common causes across watersheds or with agencies also seems to come slowly and only after enough experience for a group to feel secure and for trust to be built. He noted that these findings are consistent with the learning theory and teaching experience.

Mr. Freeman then presented the next steps for the coming year, beginning June 2005. The EBWC wants to consider more sophisticated social metrics for their efforts. Their goal is to deliver resources to each watershed in their sub-region with a focus on under-served areas. The EBWC also wants to hold regional forums. A forum entitled, "Conversations About Watersheds and Volunteer Stewardship" is planned for January 2005 and another on legislative and funding policy is planned for March 2005. The EBWC will continue to offer their Field Training program year round and to develop science assessment training resource documents and forms. They are looking at making these materials available statewide to Community Colleges as a low cost delivery system for CALFED and other agency-related training. The EBWC will also develop collaborative funding proposals linking watersheds and resources. As a secondary priority, the EBWC would also like to develop actual physical centers.

Mr. Freeman asked for feedback from the group on a variety of topics including what information would be helpful for the EBWC to report back to the Subcommittee and suggestions about funding/fundraising, what measurements to take and how, and how to make published resources available. Mr. Freeman also asked the group if they had any suggestions on how to engage groups in watershed scale planning versus piecemeal activities and how to engage local agencies and government in transparent participatory planning.

A Subcommittee member noted that it would be an ideal situation to provide training opportunities to local land use planners. Mr. Freeman responded that it has been very difficult to get planners to the table, but that the EBWC is working on it and will continue to focus on that issue.

Another Subcommittee member asked if Mr. Freeman worked with K-12 programs. Mr. Freeman responded that the EBWC has helped to set up some environmental academies and will be working on a regional project where there will be some overlap.

Ms. Davis commented that Contra Costa County made a presentation earlier this year about their Watershed Atlas. Ms. Davis mentioned that perhaps one could leverage community capacity in that area for a demonstration project and bring back the information to Alameda County to encourage their participation.

Another Subcommittee member asked if the EBWC had done an analysis or comparison of rural and urban watersheds. Mr. Freeman answered that he had not, but that he would be very interested in this. It was mentioned that the Alameda Consortium had an enormous database, but that there had been some difficulty associated with data sharing. Mr. Freeman thanked the group for their time.

JOINT DISCUSSION WITH CALIFORNIA WATERSHED COUNCIL (CWC) FUNDING AND ECONOMICS WORK GROUP REGARDING PROPOSITION 50 CHAPTER 8 FUNDS

Ms. Davis started the discussion by noting that the Integrated Regional Watershed Management (IRWM) Program provides for \$500 million in funds. She noted that some of the money has already been allocated to DWR and the SWRCB. She mentioned that the Chapter 8 Guidelines would be available for public review later this month. Ms. Davis asked the group what key issues they wanted to see addressed in the criteria. She said that at the August Subcommittee meeting, the group should be prepared to make comments on DWR's draft guidelines

Shahla Farahnud of the SWRCB noted that the SWRCB would be running the IRWM Program jointly with DWR. DWR is the lead for Proposition 50, Chapter 8 funds. Within the agencies, they would decide who would manage each contract. Of the \$500 million, \$100 million would be for conjunctive use management and groundwater monitoring. A small portion of that amount would be for administrative costs. Ms. Farahnud said that the SWRCB is looking at two cycles. The first would be a combination of implementation/planning grants and then 18 to 20 months later would be a second round that would be for implementation only. She reported that the guidelines were being put together by DWR with help from the Regional Board Water Quality Control Board. A draft would be available in the first week of August.

Ms. Farahnud said that there would be two public workshops to comment on the guidelines. The first would be in Ontario on August 31, 2004 and the second would be at the California EPA Headquarters on September 9, 2004. She mentioned that there would be a briefing on the guidelines at the next Agency Coordination meeting, taking place in the coming week. The guidelines would also be on the agenda at the September BDPAC meeting and at the Authority meeting in October.

Ms. Davis asked how could we encourage better integrated planning among agencies and include a watershed perspective. She mentioned that there are several questions everyone is thinking about. For example, what are the various definitions? What is integrated watershed planning? What scale is meaningful? Pia Sevelius responded that Butte County has an Integrated Watershed Management Plan (IWMP) that is currently out for public review. Butte County is working with Glenn, Tehama, and Colusa counties and is trying to partner with urban organizations to give water users an idea of where their water comes from. Ms. Sevelius mentioned that information on the IWMP was available on the Butte County Web site. Ms. Sevelius continued to say that Butte County needs to work with lower watershed groups to partner and create solutions that will actually work so that city planners can understand upper watershed supply issues and upper watershed growth issues. Ms. Davis noted that it might be possible to bring together different scales and different combinations of funding sources. She went on to say that we need to manage resources with the outcome of watersheds in mind.

Based on comments from the Subcommittee, Ms. Farahnud clarified that the SWRCB is working to clarify in the guidelines what the intent of integration is. She said that the SWRCB is looking for a lot of input during the public comment period especially because they are testing a new paradigm of integration.

Mary Lee Knecht asked what percentage of money does the SWRCB and DWR plan to set aside in the first cycle. Ms. Farahnud responded that it might be around \$10 million. DWR and the SWRCB need to decide between them who will fund which projects. Ms. Knecht asked what the anticipated schedule of events would be. Ms. Farahnud replied that they hoped to release the

RFP in November with the intent of getting planning done as soon as possible. Ms. Davis hoped that there would be a reasonable schedule so that any deadlines did not conflict with the holidays. She said there would be a more complete discussion at next month's Subcommittee meeting once the guidelines were available. Ms. Farahnuh said that she hoped there would be a great deal of public involvement in the development of the guidelines because the hope was that once the guidelines were adopted, there would be enough information to go ahead and immediately develop the RFP.

Ms. Davis summarized the upcoming comment period on the guidelines stating that there would be SWRCB hearings on August 31 and September 9. There would also be a BDPAC meeting on September 8/9 and an Authority meeting on October 13/14. The comment period will close after 30 days. Ms. Farahnuh stated that the guidelines would be available on the Web site soon.

UPDATES FROM THE CWC INTEGRATED PLANNING WORK GROUP, EDUCATION AND OUTREACH WORK GROUP AND DATA AND INFORMATION WORK GROUP

The CWC is constructed of several work groups, one of which is the Integrated Planning Work Group. This group has been working on a set of principles that defined what integrated planning was (Attachment B). This paper was used by DWR for input on their Proposition 50 Guidelines. The focus of Proposition 50 funds is for integration. The comments on the first draft of the principles went to John Woodling who addressed the public's comments. The Work Group is hoping for one more draft because they are intending to publish a white paper out of this process. Some of the issues that were raised were whether the bar being raised to high for watershed groups to apply and what would be the role of watershed planning in integrated regional planning. There was a general concern that there are different scales of planning and that we need to make sure that the criteria apply to the appropriate scale/level.

A Subcommittee member asked whom this report would advise and what the effects would be. Cathy Bleier responded that the Integrated Planning Work Group thought that it would be appropriate for internal funding program guidance and reported that Mr. Lowrie had said he would consider these. The principles have also influenced the Proposition 50 Guidelines.

Ms. Bleier mentioned that the California Biodiversity Council is working to see if agencies can come together on finance management issues. They are looking at what is the prime value of the CWC, what the CWC has accomplished, and what still needs to be done. The CWC has been promised at least one more full meeting. They were asked by the current administration to produce within 60 days some products so that an evaluation of the CWC could be made.

Ms. Bleier provided a summary of what each work group was working on:

- Integrated Planning – was developing the report mentioned earlier
- Funding and Economics – was responsible for having the SWRCB go to grants instead of contracts
- Information Sharing – developed a survey for agencies to link up their data to the portal
- Education, Outreach, and Capacity Building – produced two products. The first included a white paper on integrated watershed management and formal educational processes. The state has to establish an environmental education framework so the work group developed the paper to inform the process. The second product included developing some capacity building proposals.

The work groups also tailored certain recommendations to the secretaries' requests. Mr. Lowrie asked if the secretaries were waiting on the final products from the CWC before changing the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Ms. Bleier replied that this was the case and that the secretaries wanted to see what comes out of the process. It was announced that the secretaries agreed to send out a draft of the MOU before it was signed.

Mr. Lorenzato noted that a fifth work group, Internal Administration and Coordination, had also been developed, but that they only had one meeting.

Ms. Davis noted that the CWC has 60 days to come up with the final work products and assumed that the CWC meetings will be scheduled around presentation of those materials. Ms. Bleier responded that this would be the case and that it would be decided where the CWC would go after that. Mr. Davis commented that it appeared that the current administration had committed to downsizing the government.

Ms. Bleier feels that the Funding and Economics Work Group got a lot accomplished and thinks that there are a lot of people with contracts now that probably would not have had them if not for the effort of this work group. The Watershed Program and the CWC are working on the same goal to move forward to get the watershed perspective out there. Mr. Lowrie extended an invitation to Ms. Bleier to come to the August 20, 2004 Subcommittee meeting to discuss the Chapter 8 Guidelines.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Ms. Davis informed the Subcommittee that she talked during the break with Patrick Wright at the Authority and that he was not aware of any resolution regarding the earlier memo from Celeste Cantú regarding administration of the Watershed Program Grants Program. He agreed that there is a process in place to address this type of question in a public forum and responded that he would invite Gary Hunt to the July 30th Authority meeting. He stated that to make decisions regarding the Watershed Program requires a public process that should include the program managers and that it is inappropriate to take it to a sidebar conversation outside of the public process. This issue will be resolved at the August 11-12 Authority meeting.

Mr. Meacher asked the Subcommittee if they thought it would be appropriate to plan a roadshow in October since there were so many important political issues going on right now. The general consensus was that we should continue to look into this possibility. Several options were announced regarding ideas for transportation and lodging. It was decided that a decision would be made by the September Subcommittee meeting.

Mr. Lowrie raised the questions of whether an open mike concept might be beneficial to include in the Subcommittee agendas. He stated that there is always a concern that the public is not afforded an opportunity to talk back to the agencies. He wondered if it would be a good idea to provide time in the agenda for the public to raise issues for discussion. One Subcommittee member responded that he had wondered how to get on the agenda. Several topics for possible open forum discussion were brought up: shortcomings of community top-down agency approaches, cross-agency training on topics of mutual concern, and educational workshops. Another Subcommittee member mentioned that she had participated in many public work groups

and that the Watershed Subcommittee was by far the best.

It was announced that the Contra Costa County Watershed Atlas was now available on CD. Contra Costa County has received two awards for their work on the watershed atlas, one from the National Association of Environmental Professionals for education excellence and one from the American Planning Association for a state of California award. Please contact the County if you would like to purchase a CD. Ms. Davis suggested that the County set up a cottage industry to advise other watershed groups who are interested on how to create a similar assessment.

There was another announcement to provide nominations and vote for the POWER California Water Policy Conference Awards. The deadline is September 15, 2004. There will be an awards dinner to honor public/non-profit agencies that are furthering the "California Dream" through pursuing environmental justice. For more information, contact Ms. Knecht.

In closing, Mr. Lowrie reminded the Subcommittee members that the Finance Plan would be an item of discussion for the August Subcommittee meeting. He said that it would be very important for the Subcommittee members to attend the meeting to provide comment on this issue because it may be the opportunity for public comment. He reported that the Watershed Program funding was still very low.

Attachment A

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Name	Organization
Alcott, Rob	East Bay Municipal Utilities District/Upper Mokelumne RWA
Ames, Laurel	California Watershed Institute
Anderson, Mike	University of California, Davis
Ballentine, Linda	Arroyo Pasajero CRMP/Westside Resource Conservation District
Bergstrom, Josh	East Bay Watershed Center
Bryan, Leslie	Western Shasta Resource Conservation District
Cornelius, James	CWD
Coulter, Kevin	State Water Resources Control Board
Crooks, Bill	City of Sacramento
Davis, Martha	CALFED Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Dills, Greg	EL & WL Resource Conservation District
Distefano, Jenny	Department of Conservation
Douglas, Bruce	East Bay Watershed Center
Farahnuh, Shahla	State Water Resources Control Board
Fatema, Abby	California Conservation Corps
Garver, Lyn	Kings River Conservation District
Gresham, Rich	PC Resource Conservation District
Hansen, Davis	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Haze, Steve	Millerton Watershed
Holford, Dwight	Upper Putah Creek Stewardship
Hopkins, Dale	Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 2
Horney	GC Resource Conservation District
Huff, Linda	City of Sacramento Utilities Stormwater
Jones, D.C.	Western Shasta Resource Conservation District
Klasson, Mick	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
Knecht, Mary Lee	Jones & Stokes
Laycheck, Eugenia	EJC & Associates
Loeffler, Rebecca	City of Sacramento Utilities Stormwater
Luce, Darcie	East Bay Watershed Center
Mansfield, Liz	EID
Marcotte, Kim	Jones & Stokes
Martin, Sara	Jones & Stokes
McGhee, Ken	California Bay-Delta Authority
McIntire, Angela	California Bay-Delta Authority
Meacher, Robert	CALFED Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee Regional Council for Rural Counties
Murrison, Teri	Merced River
Newlin, Vicki	California Bay-Delta Authority
Newman, Tasha	Conservation Strategy Group

Ono, Kae Name	California Conservation Corps Organization
Patterson, Jim	Colusa City Resource Conservation District
Rooks, Heidi	California Bay-Delta Authority
Ruelas, Josh	Butte County
Sevelius, Pia	Napa Resource Conservation District
Sharp, Leigh	Department of Water Resources, Watershed Program
Sime, Fraser	Sierra Nevada Alliance
Suarez, Megan	North Fork American Watershed
Templin, Bill	ICE, UC Davis
Ward, Kevin	Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley
Yee, Betty	

Attachment B

MEETING MATERIALS

- Meeting Agenda
- Letter from Celeste Cantu to Patrick Wright Regarding Coordination and Consolidation of California Bay-Delta Authority (CALFED) Watershed Program Grant Funds
- Information Regarding the East Bay Watershed Center at Merritt College, Including the PowerPoint Presentation Slides
- Draft List of Activities and Objectives of CWC Work Groups as Summarized by Work Group Co-Leads
- Suggested Criteria and Performance Measures for “Integrated Planning”