

October 2 2008 Watershed Advisory Committee Meeting  
*Meeting summary*

In attendance:

Brian Leahy, Mike Rippey, Dee Zinke, Julie Rynerson-Rock, Iovanka Todt, Andrea McKenzie, Bill Keane, Pat Frost, Jordan Henk, Dan Wermiel, Tim Frahm, Linda Arcularius, Belinda Faustino, Bridgett Luther, Martha Davis, Bob Meacher, Dennis Bowker.

Committee Process, Status and Near Term Activities

The meeting began with a discussion about process and Committee commitments over the next 12-18 months. It included discussion of necessary CALFED follow-through projects, particularly with two initiatives underway with the State Water Resources Control Board

The group noted that, as the Committee functions evolve, they should examine membership to ensure spatial diversity; discipline diversity; point of view diversity; and chairmanship membership and distribution. There was agreement that the role of the Committee should be clarified and updated to accommodate the emerging Program responsibilities. They agreed that now is the time to begin working on Program details, in preparation for after legislation is passed.

Several members questioned the absence of the actual legislation for comment. A discussion of Administration internal policy regarding sponsored legislation ensued. While the bill could be discussed generally, present policy restricts the distribution of actual language and content. John assured the group that the language as last reviewed tracked Committee recommendations closely. He also committed to distribute the final draft at the earliest possible time, once it had been reviewed by the Governor's office. A more extended discussion of the legislation and the process was to follow in the afternoon session. The legislation authorizes the extension of the CALFED Watershed Program to a Statewide Program, and the appointment of a Public Advisory Committee.

Further discussion of the Committee's role followed. It was clarified that the Committee has authorization to continue as is through June 2009. During that time, in conjunction with the next public outreach (to vet the legislative package), the Committee and the Program will define its emerging role and responsibilities. The group agreed that they wanted a substantive role in Program development and implementation, rather than as a generic committee that only reviews and comments on policies and programs. They agreed that the present Committee should be kept basically intact, with some adjustments to accommodate new duties. They agreed to hold a minimum of 3-4 meetings in the ensuing year.

Some adjustments for consideration over the next six months discussed included:

- Strengthening connections with Environmental Justice and Tribal interests.
- Reviewing existing membership and commitments, and generate a summary of individual member's expertise and interests for distribution among the group
- Seeking stronger active representation from the North Coast
- Revisit the chairmanship, with attention to diversity and geographic representation
- Ensure that the process is open and transparent, with meetings open to the public

- Develop working subcommittees (see below) to help with continuing work between meetings
- Find a means to promote watershed management as a policy basis for managing natural resources at multiple scales
- Develop a clear statement for the public of how the Committee were selected, and what their roles and responsibilities will be
- Each member should define their specific strengths and areas of involvement with the Committee's work

#### Committee Role in Present Ongoing Grant Processes

The Committee discussed their role in two existing grant expenditure processes from the CALFED Watershed Program, and one from the new Statewide Program (Watershed Coordinator support). The programs include a focused directed action to examine the effectiveness of watershed plan implementation and a training and technical assistance support program from the State Board, in addition to the upcoming Proposition 84 Watershed Coordinator support.

The conversation centered largely on the Prop. 84 process, and the role of the Committee in implementing the solicitation. The group agreed that it was comfortable with helping to generate recommended guidelines and criteria for selection and performance measurement, but would not be involved in project selection. The Committee could also make recommendations of selection panel members from their respective regions. The Committee also suggested reviewing existing Coordinator Program guidelines to align them with the emerging Statewide Program needs.

In further support, the group recommended extending contacts with other agencies in an effort to more closely align the various grant programs. The idea is to generate larger benefit and less confusion arising from multiple state and federal funding sources being used in local watersheds. Committee members also suggested they could use their familiarity with the Program to help generate recommendations of local members to serve on project review and selection committees. They also noted an interest to keep their involvement at the Program design and implementation policy development, but not to become involved directly in implementation. There was some concern voiced that getting directly involved with implementation of the Program may create a conflict that would jeopardize the ability of their regions to receive grant funds.

John and Dan gave an update on the directed action grant process with the State Board. The Committee recognized that it would have minimal involvement in that process, but acknowledged the need to stay connected with it. The projects selected, once underway, would provide additional material for the illustrations of effectiveness in promoting the Program. They also agreed to provide advice and recommendations regarding the technical assistance and training process underway also at the State Board. They indicated that, once the topics and timing were known, they would be interested to help recruit attendees and recipients, potential class sites, and to recommend topics for follow-up training.

#### Legislation Update

Martha Davis summarized the meeting with Secretary Chrisman, and noted his support for the Statewide Program. She outlined his recommendations regarding the three recommendations developed by the Committee. The recommendations were to: a) include mention of the Program in bond development underway; b) set up a meeting or forum among Department heads to discuss coordination around

watersheds, and; c) develop legislation that would provide strong authorization for the Program. The Secretary suggested that the Program first pursue legislation, with his and the Governor's backing. Following that, he agreed to hold a meeting of Department heads to encourage cooperation. He recommended that any funding discussion take place following Program establishment and agreement among the Departments on direction and role. The Committee agreed that the funding issue, especially regarding the water bond, was problematic and should be shelved for later discussion.

A small group of Committee members developed the first draft of legislation to present to the DOC legislation staff. Once delivered to the staff, the policy of the Resources Agency (and other state agencies) is to withhold distribution of potential administration sponsored legislation to protect the integrity of the proposed bill, and to minimize conflict at this early stage. The process involves three initial steps: 1) the DOC drafts the bill and 2) submits it to the Resources Agency for review and approval, and the Agency 3) forwards the bill to the Governor's office for their review and approval. The present draft has been delivered to the Agency and is pending their approval and forwarding.

Some important points regarding the legislation:

- The internal process used to move the legislation along has been intra-agency policy for several years, and is standard procedure
- The proposed bill restructures an existing program, and does not create a new one
- It authorizes a Statewide Program, an Advisory Committee, and a technical assistance function
- It consolidates existing programs
- It uses existing funds
- It does not provide details of Program implementation, but states its purpose and principles to guide detail development
- Once introduced, there will be opportunity to fine-tune it in conjunction with the bill's sponsors/authors

Recognizing the awkwardness of discussing the legislation in detail without a copy to refer to, the Committee did determine some steps that would help the proposal succeed. One is to informally suggest potential author/sponsors in the legislature. The group agreed that a bipartisan sponsorship (with potential geographic diversity) would be best.

The Committee agreed to resume meeting in January, in anticipation of having a distributable document. Likely agenda items will include discussion of: a) an outreach effort to seek input on the proposal; b) a meeting schedule for the remainder of the year; c) discussion of if, when and how to open Committee meetings to the public, and a plan to open the way for greater public involvement, and; d) discussion of outreach to other agencies to promote collaboration and greater coordination. No date in January was set.

## Flip Chart Summary From the Afternoon Session

There is a need to “sell” the Program and obtain support, both within the Committee and their individual connections, and with interested and potential partners who are external to the Committee’s direct constituency. The purpose of outreach is to obtain commitments of support for the “watershed approach” as promoted by and through the Program.

The Committee and Program need to develop a communication strategy to guide the upcoming outreach efforts as the Program formation moves ahead. “Talking points” will have to be developed in order for the group to deliver a comprehensive and consistent message when talking with potential partners and supporters. Five or six main points should focus around describing three basic elements of Program development.

- Creating official authority (legislation) for the Program, and outlining its major functions, responsibilities and duties
- Describing the types of technical and financial assistance to be delivered; the main target audiences for that assistance; criteria to define who will receive the assistance, and under what circumstances, and; various logistical methods likely to be effective in carrying out the Program
- Authorizing the Advisory Committee, and defining its “charter” of responsibilities and areas of involvement with the Agency, Department and Program

## Internal Connections

- 1) Examine the existing make-up of the Committee and make recommendations for changes, including strengthening representation from the North Coast (especially upper Klamath), and tribal involvement and connections.
- 2) Establish specified subcommittees, or working groups, to develop draft ideas for full Committee discussion and adoption. Areas include:
  - a. Communications: *Linda Arcularius, Andrea MacKenzie*
  - b. Policy (including further legislation work): *Marc Holmes, Mike Rippey, Dee Zinke; Julie Rynerson-Rock; Teri Murrison; John Brodie*
  - c. Grant funding criteria development (including Proposition 84): *Iovanka Todt, Belinda Faustinos, Tim Frahm*
  - d. Program development (to be added later, after the legislation has become more secure and distinct): *to be determined in early 2009*
  - e. Data and information management; training and technical assistance (to be added later, as well): *Jordan Henk;*

## External Connections

The communications strategy should clarify the following:

- Who meets with whom?
- What message will be delivered?
- When, and in what manner will it be delivered?

Some initial contacts recommended by the Committee:

Association of California Water Agencies  
California Urban Water Agencies  
The Watershed Network  
California Association of Conservation Districts  
The Nature Conservancy  
Planning and Conservation League  
Trust for Public Lands  
Building Industry Association  
League of California Cities  
Agriculture and the Environment Roundtable(s)  
California Chapter, American Planning Association  
Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council  
Regional Council of Rural Counties  
Waterkeepers / Baykeepers  
California State Association of Counties  
Environmental Justice Coalition for Water  
California Chamber of Commerce

Other suggestions will be forwarded via email, and added to the list. Some areas in which to seek connections included:

- Agricultural organizations, including marketing orders, etc.
- Municipal governments
- Business associations and organizations
- Environmental organizations
- Professional organizations
- Tribes
- Agencies, including local, state, federal and tribal

Suggested Actions:

Build a strong track record of success by 2010 and make it available for Program and Committee use in outreach

Develop long term, or permanent working subcommittees to design communication strategies; identify targets for outreach; help to maintain accurate inventory of desired technical assistance; and to describe information and data management targets, needs and methods.

Questions to investigate:

How far will the existing Committee continue – both in terms of time and type of involvement?

Does the existing Committee need official authorization in order to continue to work past the spring end of the 18 month timeline mentioned in the Secretary's invitation letter?