

Statewide Watershed Program Advisory Committee Meeting Draft Meeting Summary

April 24 – 9:00 am – 4:00 pm

Meeting Location

Holiday Inn
Sacramento, CA

Meeting outcomes – and follow up needed

- Ms. Zinke requested that later reports include further analysis on the areas of the state that have had little state support of coordinators and other approaches – compared to those that have.
- Ms Todt said that as member of the California Water Plan – she carries forward an explicit request to coordinate on outreach for the B-160 State Water Plan process.
- Committee confirmed the July target date of transmitting a draft “Framework Report” to Secretary Chrisman. This will include a “problem statement” - a draft of the problem statement will be circulated to the committee for edit/review and consent.

1. Welcome and announcements

Bob Meacher welcomed everyone and announced that fellow co-chair Martha Davis is unable to attend today’s meeting, but will attend tomorrow.

Director Bridgett Luther announced that the Department of Conservation’s recent budget request of \$10 million for Prop 50 funds and \$10 million of Prop 84 funds have been reviewed and approved by Assembly and Senate budget sub committees; both of which would have 3-year spending authority.

2. Staff Report

John Lowrie announced that the outreach meetings that the committee had been undertaking over the past two months has resulted in a lot of common themes and results – though each region had a different approach to its outreach. Aside from the public meetings – there have been a number of interviews, e-mails, surveys and one-on-one discussions.

There is a continuing need to refine a strategy for discussing the program with state agencies.

Julie Rynerson Rock said that the Land Use Committee of the Climate Action Team has stated that they are coordinating with us – so we will need to ensure that.

Statewide Watershed Program Advisory Committee Meeting Draft Meeting Summary

April 25, 9:00 am – 12:00 pm

Meeting Location

Secretary of State Multipurpose Room
Sacramento, CA

Meeting outcomes –

- Formation of subcommittee to draft framework document (Todt, Holmes, Knecht, Brodie)
- Agreement to include new program principle on Tribal participation

1. Welcome and announcements

Bob Meacher welcomed everyone, thanked DOC Director Bridgett Luther for her hospitality and announced that fellow co-chair Martha Davis is encountering travel difficulties and hopes to attend the afternoon public meeting.

Director Bridgett Luther welcomed Resources Agency Secretary Mike Chrisman and committee members introduced themselves. The committee spent an hour in conversation with the Secretary – who reiterated his strong support for the program and gratitude to the committee members for their time and commitment. He recognizes the importance of this activity – but knows that developing collaborative solutions is as difficult as it gets. His primary points:

- This water year will be very interesting – and challenging – and will lead folks to support watershed management
- Need to look at Delta issues holistically –
- The Administration is teeing up alternate conveyance facilities and water storage – and believe that we can do both – and that watershed work is critical to both as well.
- We will need the Committee's support to ensure this program is successfully launched – especially with the Legislature.
- Cautioned the Committee to be visionary in its recommendations but not to over-reach – and to be clear on definitions so that one can readily understand what this approach means to them personally.
- Recognizes that there will be challenges in funding. The overall state budget has structural issues that the Administration is trying to address –

that said – we should not let that deter us from setting a framework – and that we will need to develop political support for the program at all levels.

- He needs to hear about situations where agencies are in conflict.
2. The committee spent the balance of the morning planning and preparing for the public meeting to be held that afternoon.

New Environmental Justice Principle - The Committee also recognized that the draft statement of program Guiding Principles did not adequately call out support for environmental justice and social equity. The following new principle was drafted. A separate principle on Tribal Relations will be drafted for the Committee's review.

***Inclusiveness** - Integrate social equity and environmental justice throughout the program, and be inclusive of the underserved and disenfranchised communities.*

Program Name - It was also acknowledged that the name of the effort/program in use – “Statewide Watershed Program” is not captivating – and that future work will focus on program labels and names.

Subcommittee Formed - A subcommittee to work on drafting the Framework report was formed - Iovanka Todt, Mary Lee Knecht, Marc Holmes and John Brodie volunteered. Miguel Luna suggested that the report include photographs wherever possible to make it reader-friendly.

Bridgett Luther offered that Secretary Chrisman would be willing to convene a meeting of relevant and appropriate agencies to discuss the effort at an appropriate time.

Next steps and next meeting - It was agreed that the committee would probably need to meet two more times before the report is presented to the Secretary and that the next meeting should occur either late May or early June. Mary Lee Knecht will circulate a Meeting Wizard e-mail to solicit people's availability.

Meeting adjourned – 12:00 pm.

Committee Members In Attendance

Belinda Faustinos
John Brodie
Iovanka Todt
Julie Rynerson Rock
Tim Frahm
Marc Holmes
Bob Meacher
Mary Lee Knecht
Bill Keene
Jordan Henk
Mike Rippey
Pat Frost
Teri Murrison

Dee Zinke
Miguel Luna

Others
Bridgett Luther

Staff
Brian Leahy
John Lowrie
Dennis Bowker
Dan Wermiel
Casey Walsh Cady

Dennis Bowker presented a summary of the results to date from the 26 public meetings which have occurred from February to April 10, 2008. The outreach report will be made available to the public as soon as the results are completed. Target date is May 23. Teri Murrison suggested that the report include a glossary of defined terms such as “science” and “sustainable”.

Marc Holmes felt that the approach taken in the report was good and the categories reflected what he heard in the public meetings. He suggested that the Committee needs to be very clear about the next steps and need to resist getting into the “weeds” of the various topics – or what a regional program might look like.

Andrea Mackenzie echoed those comments – and said that we need to stay focused on the framework – the essential building blocks of the program.

Bridgett Luther said she wanted to hear how the program would add value. Staff believes that the value is expressed by the nature of all the comments received. Ms. Rynerson Rock said that value added **is** coordination among agencies and their competing programs. – though some expressed concern about how realistic is it to expect the program to deliver agency coordination. Others support the role of coordination but thought that the program might have to evolve into that role over time.

Each region gave a quick update on the outreach efforts in their region – and how they related to the results presented.

BAY – Mike Rippey, who was able to attend multiple meetings across the state as well as the Bay region, supported the broad themes as presented by staff. He reported hearing frustration and confusion with respect to watershed management and assessments – Folks want answers. Concerns about the budget were expressed. Land use and water rights are sticky issues that need to be addressed. People want to make sure that the program has realistic hopes of being implemented in a successful way and that it will be sustained across changing administrations.

SACRAMENTO – Mary Lee Knecht supports the analysis – The Sacramento region tended to focus on their region rather than a statewide perspective. There was a lot of emphasis on watershed coordinators and the “care and feeding” of locals. No real “fears” expressed, though someone did suggest a tax to fund the program!

NORTH LAHONTAN – Sarah Greene reported that the Kings Beach meeting attendees felt that there are many existing efforts in the Tahoe Basin region and a lot of funds going toward improved water quality. People would support the tapping into existing local forums rather than creating new ones. The region may need to improve its connection to state needs and values. The region also supports coordination and the reduction of duplicative efforts. Many also supported making data more accessible and meaningful. To help “prove” the value of watershed management – they support having staff focused on economic analysis. Nikki Riley attended the Susanville meeting - this area has not benefited to date from CALFED watershed program efforts. Important

themes expressed there were financial assistance equity; science and education across all levels.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA – Belinda Faustinos reported that in the southern California region, people expressed concerns over the confusion/ dichotomy between IRWM and watershed management. The Green LA meeting focused on non-traditional partnerships. The primary message was make sure the program is consistent, sustainable over the long term –and accessible to non-traditional audiences. Need to avoid the “bait and switch” mentality. The SCAG meeting focused on the need for coordination and maybe some sort of arbitration role to deal with conflict. Iovanka Todt reported that the Irvine meeting there was a lot of emphasis on science and data – especially at the community level. That particular area has many retired professionals who are eager to lend their expertise and want to engage.

Dee Zinke said that the Ventura meeting affirmed the need for a statewide program with coordination and a way to deal with agency conflict – both horizontal and vertical. A database of technical information in GIS format is desired – as are programs and templates of successful efforts. Many asked whether we could agree on watershed terminology? It was also suggested to use coordination as a requirement for funding.

Iovanka Todt said that San Diego’s local agencies have undertaken a lot of watershed management in this region – and so do the storm water programs. There is some frustration about the state coming in with yet another program. Julie Rynerson Rock said that she has heard concern expressed about upper and source watersheds – She heard many express the need for coordination – local government has to deal with multiple conflicting mandates – a way to coordinate the multiple programs is necessary. Also land use decision-making process relies on technical information – but if the agencies are silent then they are ignored. More mandates will not help – we need tools, as a tool box and other resources.

North Coast – Andrea Mackenzie held multiple meetings with key stakeholders in the Sonoma region. A need for a coordinated framework was evident – and NOT a one-size fits all approach. – capacity building is needed but needs to be sustainable over the long term. Many requested a clearinghouse of information – such as data, funding, and block grants to regions. The concept of “anchor watersheds” came up as well. Need to focus on specific priorities – where and what are they? – and a need to tie into larger conservation strategy.

Pat Frost wondered how to document silence. From his perspective, there is fear on a lot of levels in his region and concern about diluting existing efforts. New programs can create diversions and “suck power away”. The north Coast actually does not experience much agency conflict – so if the program focused on that topic it might not add value. Coordination should be done in Sacramento while funds should be spent in regions. One idea is to promote the exchange of people from one region to another to promote learning and understanding.

Central Coast – Tim Frahm reported that the central coast meetings focused on Calfed/non-Calfed opportunities – including maintenance support, as well as training of agency staff. Technical Advisory Groups need funding support too – oral historians and socio-economic experts are needed too. He also heard a lot about permitting processes – and ways to encourage local approaches to the challenges that permitting presents. Would like to have a watershed “Vatican” where locals could turn when they hear “no”.

John Lowrie reported that the Santa Barbara meeting discussed the failure to communicate our basic values – and that a savvy public relations marketing effort should be included. Ms. Zinke supported this comment.

San Joaquin – Four meetings were held, Teri Murrison and John Brodie sensed some meeting fatigue in the valley floor with respect to water meetings – yet they saw good attendance in the foothills. Also good attendance from local Boards of Supervisors was seen. Questions about voluntary vs. mandatory approaches were raised. Some engagement with municipalities occurred too, yet they see the Regional Board as key. There is some general skepticism about a voluntary program’s ability to deliver what is needed. People are proud of their local efforts and believe they are providing important contributions to resource concerns.

Tulare – Greg Kirkpatrick reported regional equity was a theme in the Tulare region as was the need for watershed coordinators. The region also discussed watersheds as a planning unit. Concerns about the IRWMP process and relating that to the State Water Planning Process (B-160) were expressed. In this area – agriculture; water balance; supply and groundwater banking are big issues. Water rights and the need for GIS - and technical data were also discussed.

Colorado Region – Jordan Henk reported that this region has extremes – on the one hand extensive populations and rapidly growing desert areas. He echoes much of what has been reported from the other regions – locals say we are doing watershed management – we just need help. Consult with us, train us and then come back to see how we’re doing. In addition this region has the nations’ most urbanized national forest – and many housing units are in application process. Planning officials have difficulty getting water agency experts to provide them feedback on the adequacy of local drinking water supplies.

Surprisingly, the Bishop meeting had a surprisingly high turnout – with many local government folks; planners, environmental groups and farmers, and a lively discussion ensued.

Iovanka Todt also said that as member of the California Water Plan – she carries forward an explicit request to coordinate on outreach for the B-160 process.

After lunch the committee took another look at the Program draft purpose statement – and decided that no changes were needed at this time; though it was acknowledged

that we will need to define terms like “sustainability” and ”community-based strategies” later. However the committee felt that the drafting of a “problem statement” for the framework report was necessary. Dee Zinke and Marc Holmes prepared a draft. It was decided that this would be circulated to the entire committee over e-mail for refinement and consent.

Marc Holmes also proposed the following outline for the framework report to be delivered to Secretary Chrisman.

1. Background/History
2. Program Purpose (1 –2 short sentences)
3. Defining of the problem
 - a. Describe methods/assessments
 - b. <missed this>**
4. Proposed solution – A statewide program to facilitate watershed management.
5. Description of the Program – Roughly 8 items with a list of sub-elements.

The committee discussed and debated the potential approaches – which resulted in supporting the above outline for the report and the need for a compelling problem statement. Marc Holmes and Dee Zinke drafted one and this will be circulated to the entire committee for review, edits and consent.

Pat Frost also requested that interpretation of numbers of responses be exercised with caution. The north coast has a relatively small population. – so be careful how the nature of the outreach is characterized.

Bridgett Luther requested that the committee include priorities – the proposed program should take a realistic look at what can we do.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm after a review and discussion of the next day’s agenda.

Committee Members In Attendance

Belinda Faustinos
John Brodie
Iovanka Todt
Julie Rynerson Rock
Tim Frahm
Marc Holmes
Bob Meacher
Mary Lee Knecht
Jordan Henk
Mike Rippey
Andrea Mackenzie
Pat Frost
Greg Kirkpatrick

Teri Murrison
Sarah Greene
Dee Zinke
Miguel Luna

Others

Bridgett Luther

Staff

Brian Leahy
John Lowrie
Dennis Bowker
Dan Wermiel
Casey Walsh Cady