

## State Watershed Program Advisory Committee Meeting

January 25, 9:30am – 2:30 pm

Draft Meeting Summary

### Meeting Location

John Muir Room  
801 K Street, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA

### Action Items/Key Decisions

1. Committee members agreed upon the following draft program principles
  - Public involvement
  - Multi-objective approach
  - Transparency
  - Goal oriented
  - Scientifically valid
  - Performance-based
  - Integrate relevant state, regional and local goals
2. Committee members agreed upon the following program purpose statement –  
*To advance sustainable watershed-based management of California's natural resources through community-based strategies.*
3. Committee members continue to formulate an outreach plan for their areas, and to consult with at-large representatives and staff. Staff will develop key outreach materials and a press kit for Committee members to use.
4. The next meeting of the committee will take place in April, a conference call in March will be held for a check-in on the status and progress of regional outreach efforts.

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions

Allen Goldstein, DOC consultant welcomed everyone and a round of introductions was made.

John Lowrie elaborated that one of the goals of the meeting was to develop a draft program purpose statement and guiding principles that will be used to guide program development and implementation. The draft principles will be discussed during the regional outreach to be conducted by committee members and staff this in Feb-March 2008.

#### 2. Discussion and agreement on set of draft guiding principles

Mr. Lowrie presented a list of draft Principles developed by staff with guidance from a subcommittee including Mike Rippey, Andrea Mackenzie, Belinda Faustinos, Mary Lee Knecht and Marc Holmes.

Dennis Bowker presented the draft principles, stating that at this time they are concepts and that language that more fully describes them needs to be developed. We will also seek to get further input on the above principles in regional outreach meetings:

Some members of the subcommittee advised; including many of the principles statements in the purpose statement; restating the principles as more action-oriented; and more directly importing previous statements of principle from other past efforts. It was suggested that an incentive-based program be considered as one of the principles. Mr. Bowker commented that incentives might be better placed as a tool to achieve program goals. The committee elected to make incentives a method of implementation

DOC Director Bridget Luther recommended that addressing state goals should be added as an additional principle. Ms. Luther expressed concern she hears when talking to the legislature about the relevance to the

state of the watershed coordinator program. We will need to articulate why the state should support our efforts if they and how they benefit state goals.

Some wanted to know how to determine the state's goals, others thought that this idea could be embedded in the collaborative, multi-objective principle. Others felt that it was important for the program to be in line with state goals. Mr. Lowrie said that we can identify which interests are relevant to this program – for example, water supply and management, restoration of fish, protection of habitat, protection of water quality come to mind. It was also mentioned that the new program might offer coordination and conflict resolution so the state and local communities can better meet multiple mutual goals. Others suggested that connecting with state interests is more a “goal” than a “principle”.

The committee ultimately agreed to add a principle stated as - ***“Integrate relevant state, regional and local goals”***.

Mr. Goldstein asked if an advocacy principle/element needed to be added – which could address long-term sustainability. This was not deemed necessary.

#### **Other Comments**

- Hope that a statewide watershed program could function as a “bridge gapper” – so state goals can be achieved as local communities achieve their goals as well, in a way that works for them, as opposed to just one more program that locals must accomplish in order to receive or get state funding.
- Watershed management should include helping to manage conflict.
- In regional meetings we need to encourage conversations about specifically money would help accomplish, instead of merely receiving funds as the end objective.
- Montana Consensus Council may be something to look at for function within the State.

### **3. Program Purpose Statement**

The Committee then reviewed two draft program purpose statements, understanding that it would be further defined by the development of goals, objectives and methods. The committee also considered whether supporting community-based watershed management is a purpose or a method. And if it is a purpose is it co-equal with improving natural resources?

Upon discussion, the committee agreed that natural resource management was the primary purpose, with community-based solutions as a key strategy. The committee agreed upon the following draft program purpose statement

*To advance sustainable watershed-based management of California's natural resources through community-based strategies.*

### **4. Creating a Common Thread - Common questions discussion**

The Committee also reviewed a set of draft common questions developed by staff. These were suggested as core questions to be asked in all regions of the state during regional outreach sessions, although they could be asked differently depending on the type of meeting.

The questions reviewed include:

- 1) What is the ultimate purpose of a Statewide Watershed Program? (*Purpose Statement*)
- 2) How will the Program apply the basic principles in the context of: a) Program development, and b) Program implementation?
- 3) How and to what extent will that Program add value to the existing array of State programs?

- 4) What would the major functions of a Statewide Program look like?
- 5) What would those functions likely accomplish?
- 6) What are the best ways to execute those functions?
- 7) What is the best method to illustrate how local accomplishments contribute to the State's interests regarding overall well-being?
- 8) What steps should be taken to ensure longevity of the Program?

The Committee agreed that Questions 3-8 should be included, but that questions 1 and 2 should be presented as draft statements on which to receive comments.

Marc Holmes felt that Question #3 should be the last question asked and re-worded as: "Would this program add value?"

Ms. Todt suggested that it is important to solicit information about what is not working, - and that we have an opportunity to collect very specific information to clarify a need for the program. Mr. Holmes felt that the Bay Area watershed community was relatively well developed and that a needs assessment approach would not generate new information. Ms. Arcularius commented that she hopes we can fulfill an expectation that is not being met now – just looking at needs will be too limited. Our goal should be to provide tools to help accomplish what needs to be done.

Dr. Henk developed Figure 1 outlining potential goals and outcomes, provided below.

Ms. Luther reiterated that the Resources Agency is strongly committed to developing a statewide watershed program, and she does not suggest opening this up as a needs assessment. Brian Leahy reminded the committee that the Secretary needs a package he can promote in time to address Prop 84 funds that might be able to be used for the new program.

Mike Rippey suggested that if at all possible, committee members should attend meetings in other regions in order to develop a greater understanding of what other regions need.

### **5. Discussion of Watershed Program Core Functions**

The Committee also brainstormed potential key program functions, including:

- Coordination and integration of existing state programs
- Eliminate duplication and isolation of programs
- Provide science and tools – compilation of best practices
- Identify overlap areas
- Identify economic benefits of coordination
- Tools for watershed planning and management
- List of state watershed management goals
- List of watershed case studies
- Grants
- Legislation more specific mandate at state level (not just through bonds)
- Promotion collaboration – provide leadership Political Support – state and local districts -
- Interface meaningful information into State Water Plan.
- Leadership - a balanced approach for watershed management

Ms. Luther apologized for having to leave to attend another meeting, she reiterated support, and will be meeting with Secretary Chrisman next week to discuss progress.

### **6. Regional Meeting Schedule/Approach**

The committee reviewed their progress to date on planning and scheduling regional outreach meetings.

**Bay Area** (Mike Rippey – Marc Holmes)

They have identified contacts groups; have had a few conf calls – in middle of process. Have some interest already, no specific time for meeting yet. He anticipates that conversations could be done in a month. Mr. Holmes - Bay Area is well organized, but want to how many people do you want us to engage?– Timeline will drive extent of conversation. We don't want to start from scratch – a lot of this has been done already. Currently speaking to folks in local govt, grassroots, such as Open Space Council, Urban Creeks Council among others.

**South Coast Region** (Belinda Faustinos (At large), Martha Davis, Iovanka Todt, Dee Zinke, Julie Rynerson Rock)

The region has identified the Water Dialogue as a good starting venue, potential for contact with several groups underway ( local govt, IRWMP, Watershed Council, LA and San Gabriel Rivers, Green LA as well) Expect about 2 months to get all this done. Estimate 60-80 people will be contacted. San Diego and high desert regions are more problematic.

**North Coast** (Andrea Mackenzie, Jill Geist)

Haven't drafted plan except to acknowledge the challenges of a widely divergent region. Have spoken with key staff on North Coast IRWMP and the Klamath negotiation stakeholders; and expect; expect to consult with Coastal Conservancy as they are active. Also 3 RCD's and 1 North bay Watershed group are active in the region. Pat Frost added that part of his region is in North Coast – there are a few active groups in the area already – along the Trinity River. He prefers to use existing structure for meetings.

**Tulare Basin** (Henry Hash, Greg Kirkpatrick)

Have not begun planning yet – this region is generally behind the curve – expect that we should have one day meeting. Will probably need to present some of the foundational watershed management. Will need some background information.

**LA - South Lahontan** (Jordan Henk, Julie Rynerson Rock, Linda Arcularius)

Haven't had extensive discussions yet– pending this meeting to develop more coherent messages – this area presents challenges because it does not think of itself as a watershed basin – Will probably need two meetings, divide region. Ms. Rynerson Rock and Dr. Henk said they have overlaps in 3 hydrologic regions, and would like to get info out first and see what kind of interest is generated and then hold meetings. It was suggested Web-based conference calling from Redlands Institute may have capacity to assist.

**Central Coast** (Tim Frahm, Donna Meyers)

Have had conference calls – but now have better idea on how to proceed. Mr. Frahm can organize meeting with ag watershed groups and Monterey Bay Sanctuary. He suggests holding a meeting in one month's time in Monterey/Salinas, with roughly 20 people. Need contacts for folks in southern part of the region. Will make cold calls, conf calls. Dennis Bowker offered to provide contacts with the Coast and Ocean Regional Council. Martha Davis also offered to provide contacts.

**San Joaquin** (John Brodie, Teri Murrison)

John and Teri have developed a rough outline and agenda for 4 public meetings – one in Modesto, and would like to hold the others in areas with little representation, eg Oakhurst/Angels Camp and the west side of valley – Los Banos. Since this is largely an agricultural region, they plan on finishing meetings in February, before the spring busy season. They are planning on having 2 hour meetings/distill info and analysis.

**Sacramento** (Mary Lee Knecht, Bob Meacher)

Ms. Knecht reported that they have offers from 3 organizations to host meetings and expect to hold them in Redding or Chico; Davis or Sacramento and one mountain location. They prefer to build from existing knowledge. They have extensive list serve as well and will ensure outreach to local govt, environmental justice, and tribal representatives.

**North Lahontan** – Dan Wermiel reported that concerns with winter weather’s potential to disrupt meetings – they will use focused approach like – and rely more on personal contacts, phone and conference calls, they may have one meeting

#### **COMMENTS**

- The program may be able to assist with meeting room rental if required, but providing funds for refreshments will be difficult. Contact Mr. Lowrie well in advance of committing to request assistance with room rental.
- Committee members can get reimbursed for expenses related to attending regional meetings too.
- Regional outreach meetings are public. It is also expected that future meetings of this committee will be open to the public, now that the Committee has generated general operating methods.
- Joan Clayburgh with the Sierra Nevada Alliance is willing to help with outreach and contacts in mountain regions.
- A master schedule of meetings will be developed and shared in order to avoid double scheduling.
- Land trusts and watershed groups should be reached out to as well.
- Staff will work with Committee members to develop materials for meetings. They will provide PowerPoint projectors/computers; assistance with agendas, etc. as possible
- Staff will be present at as many meetings as possible to capture conversation. However providing substantial analysis of the conversations is likely not possible.
- Staff/ DOC will develop a basic press kit to assist in getting information into local papers
- Forest Service and State and Federal Parks should be included as well.

#### **DRAFT SCHEDULE**

John Lowrie – we have set June 30, 2008 as draft report date to the Resources Secretary – but given conversations and 2-month period for outreach he wondered whether this was doable. He is concerned that if we miss critical information in the outreach process like overlooking some folks, there is risk that it will leave some feeling left out of the process.

Mr. Holmes commented that we will also need to manage expectations and realistic timelines. He envisions that the subcommittee/staff will develop an administrative draft for approach to state watershed plan - danger is in misrepresenting to folks that this is a final product. We will need to let people know that there is an opportunity to comment further. Mr. Lowrie said that he is expecting that the draft would not have an extreme level of detail but will clearly lay out a solid framework for the new program – and there will be opportunities for comprehensive review and comment.

Staff will assemble an information packet in the next week to ten days that all regions can use as a starting point. A press kit that local newspapers can use may take longer.

Committee agreed that a conference call in March might be necessary for a check-in to see how the outreach effort is proceeding.

Jordan Henk has developed a web mapping service – layers with supplemental data can be turned on/off, check it out at: <http://institute.redlands.edu/calwatershed>

**Figure 1. – Some suggested program functions (chart developed by Jordan Henk).**

| <b>(4) Major Function</b>                                     |  | <b>(5) Function Outcome</b>                                    |  | <b>(6) Function Execution</b>   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| ID Community Needs  |  | Communication to State   |  | Resolve Needs   |
| Coordination of Gov Programs                                  |  | Integrate, eliminate duplication and isolation                 |  |   |
| Provide Best Practices  |  | Tools  |  |   |
| Science   |  | Methods  |  |   |
| Economic Benefits   |  | \$\$   |  |   |
| Defined State goals for watershed management                  |  | Mandate Authority  |  |   |
| Watershed Plan Templates                                      |  |  |  |   |
| Provide Case studies  |  | Resources, collaboration w/local communities: state leadership |  |   |
| Grant Support   |  |  |  |   |
| Legislative support   |  |  |  |   |
| Political support   |  |  |  |   |
| Incorporate local plans into State planning                   |  |  |  | Policy manadate to State agencies for multi-benefit management. AB32 APP? Requirement |
| Process for achieving Balance in implementation – sustainable |  |  |  | Decision making happens that maintains local control                                  |

**Committee Members In Attendance**

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

Martha Davis

**Others**

Sara Martin

Bridgett Luther- Director Dept of Conservation

Allen Goldstein, Results Group

**Staff**

Brian Leahy

John Lowrie

Dennis Bowker

Dan Wermiel

Casey Walsh Cady