

STATE WATERSHED ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY  
APRIL 16, 2009- CA DEPT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE AUDITORIUM

Attendance:

Co-chairs- Meacher, M. Davis

Members- Arcularius, Gaffney, Henk, Holmes, Knecht, Meyers, Rippey, Todt

Phone-in- Duffy, Faustinos, Frahm, Kirkpatrick, Riley, Rynerson-Rock,

Staff- Bowker, Leahy, Lowrie, Thesell, Wermiel

Meeting agenda adjusted to cover the Watershed Coordinators while awaiting John Lowrie and the Director for discussion of legislation and pending issues.

**ITEM 1: Watershed Coordinator Grants:** Dan Wermiel, Program staff: provided an update (with powerpoint) on the status of the next planned watershed coordinator grant round. The next round will be statewide effort, stressing the importance of coordination as a tool to help achieve goals of the Statewide Watershed Program.

Q and A

TODT– what if coordinators already exist, or existed previously? Is the area still eligible? WERMIEL: preference is to begin programs in areas not previously receiving support from the Program, owing to the exclusive nature of the CALFED Solution Area. Program wishes to generate local/non-state fiscal support to supplant Program support over time.

M DAVIS – identify non-grant support ideas from around the state, and share with all to encourage more sustainable coordination support.

TODT - what scale? WERMIEL – preference is for complete watersheds at 8 digit scale, with flexibility to smaller scale (e.g., 10 digits) where appropriate. To do so would take clear justification for such a change. Preference is for one per HUC8, to encourage joint applications and collaboration, rather than competing ones.

Committee Role(s):

Review level: ARCULARIUS – at what point would Committee involvement become a conflict of interest? M DAVIS – emulate BDAC methods (policy level only).

ARCULARIUS– regional participants participate in only other regions? TODT noted that such a method had worked earlier. FAUSTINOS – important to have regional participation in review panels to ensure local understanding is included. Recognize that resources may not be there for a large, complicated application development.

HOLMES – needs a fully researched and thorough analysis of conflict (both actual and perceived) before detailed role is outlined. RILEY - perhaps have Committee recommend reviewers, and assist with review criteria development. MEYERS – Keep it clean and non-bureaucratic, a role the Committee could assist with.

MEACHER – recommends Committee work on psp development primarily, with only recommended criteria, etc., for reviews. (Such as, how to balance need to expand with the possible lack of resources in disadvantaged regions). WERMIEL –

STATE WATERSHED ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY  
APRIL 16, 2009- CA DEPT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE AUDITORIUM

interested to support WC for three years to attempt to generate sustainability.  
Program will not

require sustainability from the start, but should be developed. Geographic coverage is paramount, regardless of economic condition.

TODT – have the conflict issue dealt with by individual member, rather than a blanket policy. Some members may not have conflicts and may want to participate in review process more directly. HOLMES – staff could more efficiently deal with regional coverage than setting up separate processes for each region (simplify process, rather than complicate it). Context and qualifications are important – should not be solely fundraising work – coordination should be paramount. KAREN – look for existing regional entities that may be able to readily perform proposal reviews directly by the Program. Seek evidence of diversity of funding sources over time.

HOLMES – seek staff recommendations prior to forming a subcommittee to work on the guidelines and process for solicitation. LOWRIE – subcommittee volunteers already exist – perhaps combine their assistance with staff efforts between meetings. M DAVIS – distribute draft ideas to the whole committee for interim comments.

(WERMIEL– timeline will have to begin after the May revise, making June the earliest possible release of psp).

**Follow up Actions:**

DOC to develop written guidelines for committee members regarding Conflict of Interest and involvement with development, review and decision making for program grants.

Grants sub- committee will review draft RFP at policy level.

Sub committee will assist with organizing regional level review of applications as a part of overall proposal review process.

**ITEM 2- Legislation:**

An update on the status of AB 1520 by the Department of Conservation

LOWRIE– NR Committee consultant has asked about CalEPA being included in legislation as MOU partnership. Still under consideration, with note that there could be some conflict in AC role re CalEPA Secretary as well as Natural Resource Agency Secretary. Could be problematic.

Seeking two Committee members to appear at the hearing on 4/20 at 1:30. If letter of support has been sent, add new information, rather than repeat letter content. (HOLMES and RIPPEY volunteered)

Letters of Support:

HOLMES: Important to get support sent in ASAP. Need many, and need wide diversity of support expressed. Also need to begin developing an outreach strategy for the next few months, with commitments to follow through.

STATE WATERSHED ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY  
APRIL 16, 2009- CA DEPT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE AUDITORIUM

HOLMES– who from DOC will be at the hearing? (Marni Weber, and Lisa MaCumber will be there). KIRKPATRICK – will Chris Mowrer be at the hearing to state support? LOWRIE– not sure, and important to note that there is no position statement from the Administration on AB 1520. No noted opposition as yet – member Logue has seen it, with little feedback (other than to note we are *not* part of the Water Bond discussions).

M DAVIS – any opposition or concerns in the AC? TODT– Rob Hutsel (SDRPF) expressed opposition, but she talked with him. His concerns are unclear, but apparently are a) no mention of regional considerations; b) worried about lack of detail in the bill; c) felt AC members should function as “lobbyists” for their regions – watershed groups seeking lobbyists to promote their needs; d) wants to ensure that AC meetings be open to public; e) wants an “across the population” representation, with diversity of expertise. She thinks his lack of support may be changing – not necessarily in opposition.

KIRKPATRICK – needs more public interaction, and the committee should reach out soon with process. RYNERSON-ROCK - reaching out soon is important and somewhat urgent. LOWRIE – has heard similar concerns, and can be summarized by saying that public outreach/inclusion must be clearly noted in legislation M DAVIS – we can do this by publishing Plan development process and reaching out to get process underway asap. MEYERS– notes frustration with “lack of transparency” in the process so far. Why has “citizen empowerment” etc., been removed? Some see that inclusion as very important. 5809.6 DOF comments concerned many, as well. Some felt excluded with changes from the original. LEAHY – perception is accurate that, without funding per fiscal year, no Program \$\$ dispersal.

LOWRIE – not all reference to community-based effort has been struck. Desire was to mention it only once. Author removed redundant statements. The intent is to provide support to locally based watershed management. Legislation is structured to provide assistance to local programs, not to replace or duplicate what is happening now. HOLMES – some of the struck language was not from the Advisory Committee in the first place. RIPPEY – notes that the bill does not exclude the concerns expressed by advisory committee members and the public, but in fact by its general approach, allows wider acceptance of these concerns into Plan development.

HOLMES – Advisory Committee members need to actively reach out with personal connections to clarify intent and process for this legislation. It is incumbent on the Committee members to respond to concerns and bring more supporters on board. Most opposition is from folks feeling left out, not so much about any specific inclusion (more about perceived exclusion).

KIRKPATRICK – Perhaps largest concern is “loading up” the bill with details. What steps must be taken to answer the concerns without handicapping the bill? MEACHER – refer to Holmes comments about active intervention and communication among those desiring inclusion in the process. HOLMES – note to folks that putting funding into the bill will kill it on the spot. LEAHY – comments coming in from agencies desiring changes that will need close response and tracking. Ensure that the Plan process will be transparent and active. M DAVIS –

## STATE WATERSHED ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

APRIL 16, 2009- CA DEPT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE AUDITORIUM

agencies are not saying "no way" – a change from prior years. This is positive and encouraging. The bill will be heard by the Assembly Natural Resources Committee on 4/20, and needs testimony. KIRKPATRICK– nominates RIPPEY and HOLMES. RIPPEY asks KIRKPATRICK to contact at least one legislator directly before Monday. M DAVIS suggests sending out the Committee list again and get commitments before the end of the meeting about who will call whom.

MEACHER – Plumas sent letter copy to RCRC and CSAC, who are considering support letters as well. Individual local elected officials can also lend written support. MARC – letters on letterhead plus a signature are "incredibly" important, and should be sent immediately to Skinner, Chesbro and Evans. Thank Evans and Chesbro, and send support, even if simply stated and emailed. M DAVIS – note that! Greatest concerns are feelings of exclusion, rather than any specific inclusion. Great benefit in promptly outlining the outreach/plan development process. HOLMES – keep track of support letters through author's and committee's staff.

M DAVIS- Holmes and Rippey will be available at the hearing for testimony and any necessary interactions with the Committee and/or staff. Marni Weber will attend for DOC.

RYNERSON-ROCK – cannot formally state support for legislation, but can work locally to encourage those who can to provide letters and calls.

### **ITEM 3- Committee Structure:**

Review of several committee vacancies and the discussion on roles of sub committee's

LOWRIE – Advisory Committee member changes need to be addressed. Andrea Mackenzie has formally resigned, and recommended Karen Gaffney as a replacement. The committee agreed with recommendation and will forward it to the Secretary for consideration. Miguel Luna has been serving as alternate to Debbie Davis. Committee recommends to the Secretary to appoint Miguel as a full member of the AC as soon as possible. Next: Teri Murrison has had to step down to accommodate her new role as Chair of Tuolumne Co Board of Supervisors. Seeking ideas of potential replacement. – another supervisor, or city councilperson?

KIRKPATRICK – Alan Short with MID (water district) a possible candidate. M DAVIS– ask Teri for recommendations. Consider Nettie Drake? HOLMES – seek input from San Joaquin Parkway and Conservation Trust? KIRKPATRICK seconds. KNECHT – contact Great Valley Center. ARCULARIUS – May have other suggestions, but wants to speak with potential candidates before suggesting them.

LOWRIE – Clifford Marshall has been unable to serve and needs to be replaced, to provide liaison with tribal interests. Difficult to find a single representative for tribes, as well as for the large Klamath/North Coast region. TODT – Randy Yonemura from San Diego is a good candidate to consider. GAFFNEY – has a list of recognized tribes in North Coast. Difficult to find a single representative for "tribes," but could be addressed as "tribal issues" – see Water Plan rep. (MARY LEE – suggested Marc Franco- Winnemum Wintu Headman). MARY BENNINGTON from Sierra Nevada Alliance – could forward names.

STATE WATERSHED ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY  
APRIL 16, 2009- CA DEPT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE AUDITORIUM

FRAHM– still concerned about Central Coast representation, and feels he may not be the best choice. Also, he will meet with Jerry Hill tomorrow re AB1520. RILEY suggests she be replaced for the North Lahontan (perhaps Lisa Wallace?). M DAVIS suggests Lowrie and Riley talk off line to discuss possible adjustments.

MEYERS – what is the schedule ahead, in order that she can assess her ability to continue. LOWRIE – implied commitment was for 18 mos., which has passed. Likely will readdress structure and membership in October, after leg has passed and draft plan is finalized. Time to move on implementation will be the right time to revisit AC structure and role.

**Follow Up Actions:**

Forward Gaffney and Luna appointment recommendations to Secretary.

Lowrie to contact Riley; discuss recommendation for north Lahontan liaison position replacement

Active search for San Joaquin Valley liaison to replace Teri Murrison. Follow up on suggestions by committee.

Active search for North coast, Tribal liaison position to replace Clifford Marshall. Follow up on suggestions by committee.

**ITEM 4- Subcommittee structure and participation**

LOWRIE – need to clarify and validate subcommittee roles of existing 4 subcommittees (policy, information, guidelines, outreach). MARY LEE would like to be added to outreach committee.

M DAVIS– went over subcommittee roles/membership briefly. DONNA wants to be included in outreach, as well as KAREN.

LOWRIE – part of need for information group was to assistance with possible SWRCB training activities planned over the next year or two. Bond freeze has slowed the need for the subcommittee to function and urgency has dropped.

**ITEM 2- Deferred discussion; Legislature Contacts:**

Chairs requested spending a few minutes connecting Committee members contacting and informing members of Assembly Natural resources committee about AB 1520.

FRAHM will meet with Member Hill; KIRKPATRICK will contact Members Gilmore and De Leon; GAFFNEY will contact Chesbro, Huffman; FAUSTINOS to contact Brownley and De Leon; DUFFY and RIPPEY will contact Chesbro; MEACHER will contact Logue; HOLMES can contact Huffman;

MEACHER – can staff write a draft support letter for chairs to send? LOWRIE will follow up. MEACHER- Need to verify that all Advisory Committee members want to be named? Based on committee discussion the support letter will be sent out this

STATE WATERSHED ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY  
APRIL 16, 2009- CA DEPT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE AUDITORIUM

time with only co-chairs listed. Support letters from each individual may/should be sent to each member of the NR Committee. HOLMES – two letters only are necessary – one to chair, one to author, possibility a third to coauthor. RIPPEY– if sent to NR Committee instead, it will go into a packet for each member.

KIRKPATRICK – what is the strategy to address the entire Assembly? LEAHY – each letter should be sent to local reps who have connections with entity writing the letter.

**ITEM 5- Program Budget Discussion:**

Update the Advisory committee on the status of Program Funding.

LOWRIE – presented a short outline of existing program funds by source. Largely bond money, and largely subject to the AB55 loan freeze. Appropriations are in place, but expenditures cannot be made because of the cash shortage at the State. Prop 84 funds are not available for the foreseeable future, pending the State sorting out its cash management shortfalls. As a result the Watershed Coordinator RFP is on hold. Again appropriations have been made, but use is not possible until the accounts once again become liquid. High levels of uncertainty will persist, with greater clarity possibly coming after the May revise.

LEAHY – has DOC involved itself in private bond bundling? LOWRIE – not yet, but could possibly be done, if legal and feasible. Not likely to work through DOC, since finding funders to purchase the bond would be problematic. PCL, CALT are leading the effort to form private placement bond purchase arrangements.

**ITEM 6- Discussion on Program Delivery and Governance:**

LOWRIE - Regional Implementation ideas and issues. Address means by which the Statewide Program can respond to differences locally and regionally around the state. This discussion is introductory, meant to begin definition of alternatives to consider for Program implementation. DOC does not have a decentralized structure to readily support cross-scale integration. Ideas heard during our outreach efforts include:

- Use existing structures (such as IRWM in the North Coast)

- Emulate OWEB process of “sanctioning” local groups

- Research other state’s successful programs

- Integrate through existing agencies or organizations with local presence

Question 1 – should we consider proposing formal delivery structure? – create, adopt, adapt, or allow existing structure? Or – are we better off staying with central structure?

KNECHT – regional entities in many ways filled the breach when the loan freeze was imposed. Demonstrated the benefits of regionally responsive entity. MEYERS – The program should conduct further outreach to ask for ideas and needs (assessment) and what will be necessary to meet the need. HOLMES– Program is best implemented regionally, with many options available. Don’t rely on new funds

STATE WATERSHED ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY  
APRIL 16, 2009- CA DEPT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE AUDITORIUM

coming in. Establish statewide assessment and management monitoring program, with performance tracking.

GAFFNEY – build capacity, diversify funding, and encourage state agencies to play better together. Advisory Committee participating in criteria selection for expending funds will help consolidate and integrate across agency programs by virtue of expanding knowledgeable communication from diversity of perspectives represented on the Advisory Committee.

LOWRIE – BOWKER – outcomes most important, with adjustments of structure to increase effectiveness (rather than having structure drive actions). May be that supporting greater (comfort with) cooperation among agencies, and across scales would be a significant improvement.

LEAHY– “regional” is a relative term. TODT – Central communication point has value; implementation with regional cognizance may work as well as an actual regional structure. Advisory Committee may well serve in that role, and may work as first phase of regional implementation. Track it – ask “is this enough” from time to time, and assess progress periodically.

LOWRIE – danger in having a structure that appears to (or actually does) produce “advocates”, would result in a short lived program. Outcomes and culture of the effort needs to be more substantive to persist. LINDA – finding out why agencies don’t work well together; why red tape and complications exist; identify areas for improving process and encouraging cooperation - would demonstrate value.

M DAVIS– action items necessary now. . . “what do we do next?” “develop criteria about what Regional Approach” means; “phasing in” – “flexibility” – where in each region could we implement via existing structures; evaluate lessons learned from other states and package them with recommendations. Begin developing a draft plan in preparation for an outreach process. JOHN – staff can begin construction, with response from AC as draft progresses in-house. KAREN – noted positive feelings and good will, and good Program reputation locally. Should tap into that reputation and reinforce it locally by demonstrating inclusion.

MEYERS – the original panel idea (for this meeting) is a good one, and should be pursued as a larger effort that would demonstrate active inclusion of local interests. LOWRIE – “what is our desired outcome” for an outreach effort such as a series of panel discussions. HENK – hard to provide advice without greater knowledge of local conditions. Perhaps either have people come to the Committee meetings, or the Committee go out to learn more about the State’s watersheds and who/what is happening and not happening in them. RIPPEY – at what level should the Program engage the regions relative to Statewide objectives (policy level only, or at implementation level?)

RYNERSON – how can the Program assist with avoiding/diminishing conflicts and overlaps in jurisdictional and regulatory policies and actions? Success in doing so will be quite demonstrative of value and productive for a wide range of interests.

**Follow Up Actions:**

Develop criteria defining what Regional Approach to program delivery” means;

STATE WATERSHED ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY  
APRIL 16, 2009- CA DEPT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE AUDITORIUM

Develop plan with "phasing in" – "flexibility" in mind–

- where in each region could we implement via existing structures;
- evaluate lessons learned from other states and package them with recommendations.
- Begin developing a draft plan in preparation for an outreach process.

**ITEM 7- Periodic Assessment, etc.**

MARC – perhaps other questions should be included – "what is our overall goal?" "how do we define a healthy watershed?" "improvement" "enhancement" "how does

the Program assist in improving the watersheds?" Where is the place to include the multitude of existing models, etc." "public outreach and education" "building a management plan" – (the whole program wrapped in the presentation)

Develop clear road map of what we will support, and provide the necessary assistance to get it done. Provide clarity, desired outcomes, technical background, ongoing consistency and predictability. "How do we develop a program by combining state resources and local resources to accomplish the stated Program desired end points. What format, system, etc., would work best to support overall watershed improvement actions.

TODT – issues related to identifying what to track includes a desire to avoid a set standard way of pursuing watershed management.

GAFFNEY– to build capacity, we should provide good information (gis, web based, etc.). Mapping, data availability, training in use, feedback among users.

LEAHY– have a watershed approach become the basis for the State Water Plan. DM revisit outreach report re science comments.

**Follow Up Actions:**

Charge from M DAVIS: Write a summary (clear) report to the Committee regarding the purpose and structure of the basin tracking effort – include reference to overall Program purpose, etc. Look over the program development outline (early versions) and the original memo to Chrisman.

**ITEM 8- WRAP UP**

Committee agreed to meet again in late June. Charged Lowrie with polling members on their availability to meet in late June

Meeting adjourned- 3:00 PM