CALFED BAY-DELTA WATERSHED PROGRAM

BDAC Watershed Work Group Meeting Summary

Meeting Date: Friday, March 16, 2001

Meeting Location: Jones & Stokes
2125 19th Street
Sacramento, CA

Meeting Attendees: See Attachment A

Introductions

Watershed Work Group (Work Group) Co-Chair Martha Davis began the meeting with introductions. A list of attendees (Attachment A) is included with this summary.

Watershed Updates

Formation of the Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC)

Ms. Davis provided an update on the formation of the BDPAC. The nomination period for BDPAC members closed on March 7, 2001. CALFED received a substantial number of nominations and is now proceeding with an evaluation. Nominations are being processed and analyzed by CALFED staff with the goal of forming an advisory committee for the CALFED Program (CALFED). Recommendations for BDPAC members from CALFED staff will then be forwarded to the Secretary of Natural Resources/Governor and Department of Interior for final approval. Once the process is complete a list of new BDPAC members will be presented to the Work Group. Mary Lee Knecht (Jones & Stokes/CALFED Watershed Program Team) reported that, as discussed at the February Work Group meeting, a letter nominating Ms. Davis and co-chair, Robert Meacher, as BDPAC members was sent to CALFED on behalf of the Watershed Work Group. The letter also recommended that Ms. Davis and Mr. Meacher continue their role of co-chairs of the Watershed Work Group.

Watershed Program Proposal Solicitation

John Lowrie, CALFED Watershed Program Manager, reported on the status of the 2000-2001 Watershed Program proposal solicitation. The Watershed Program received 161 preproposals totaling $89,541,430. Sixteen individuals including CALFED program managers, agency representatives, local government representatives, academia, and others participated on the selection review panel. Over two consecutive days, the selection review panel discussed the preproposals and chose 104 for full proposal development totaling $37,851,162. Mr. Lowrie showed a number of overheads illustrating the geographic distribution of the preproposals as well as the types of projects that were proposed. A large percentage of the preproposals were located in the Sacramento River watershed. Planning and implementation were the most common types of proposed projects in the 161 preproposals.

Mr. Lowrie was asked how those applicants selected for full proposal development would receive technical assistance for full proposal development. He replied that five technical assistance workshops will be conducted throughout the state in early April. Assistance will not be provided one-on-one due to legal constraints.

A meeting participant suggested that the screening criteria for reviewing the preproposals be more stringent. For example, the Watershed Program is anticipating $20 million available to fund proposals and after the narrowing preproposals down to 104 there is still $37,851,162 million being requested. It seems that the screening criteria should have narrowed the number of selected preproposals down even further. Mr. Lowrie stated that some of the preproposals were somewhat duplicative and may be combined with each other, which would lower the amount of funds requested. Furthermore, some of the comments on the preproposals recommended that budgets that seemed high be further analyzed. It is likely that the request for funds will be reduced. Another meeting participant commented on Mr. Lowrie's remark of the duplicative preproposals. This is a sign that there is still a huge need for better coordination of local watershed efforts.

CALFED Funding

Mr. Lowrie provided an update on Senate Bill 23 (SB23). This bill would appropriate $135 million to CALFED for fiscal year 2000-2001. Of the $135 million, $20 million is earmarked for the Watershed Program. The legislation has passed through the Senate Agriculture and Water Resources committee and will be heard by Senate appropriations next week. It may be considered on the Senate floor as early as March 2. Interested parties may track the status of SB23 on the California Legislature's webpage: www.leginfo.ca.gov. Mr. Lowrie was asked if anyone has registered opposition to SB23. He replied that the Regional Council for Rural Counties has expressed some opposition to the legislation.

Watershed Program Memorandum of Understanding

Mr. Lowrie provided a status report of the Watershed Program Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). He reported that the MOU is slowly making progress and engaging a broader set of CALFED agencies. The most notable revision to the MOU is a proposal by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to compile a "management group" which would be responsible for Watershed Program management activities. The proposed management group would be comprised of the SWRCB, Department of Water Resources (DWR), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). Additionally, an oversight committee composed of senior policy representatives from NRCS, EPA, SWRCB, Resources Agency, DWR, and CALFED would be formed. The oversight committee would be responsible for overseeing Watershed Program implementation. Mr. Lowrie informed the Work Group that the original due date for the development of the MOU was February 2001. It is hoped that the MOU will be agreed to by the signatory agencies and presented to the CALFED Management Group within the next 2-3 weeks. He ensured the Work Group that the purpose of the MOU was to develop a framework for the implementation of the Watershed Program Plan, not watershed management in general. The MOU has outlined a significant role for both the Work Group and the Interagency Watershed Advisory Team (IWAT).

Watershed Legislation

Ken Coulter (SWRCB) reported on the status of Assembly Bill 2117 (AB2117). He announced that the SWRCB received 90 - 100 letters from interested parties to participate in the pilot watershed study. Of the 90 - 100 parties, 30 have completed the required detailed questionnaire. The SWRCB and the Resources Agency will now assess the 30 questionnaires and select a number of pilot watersheds. The selected pilot watersheds will be examined by the SWRCB and Resources Agency to determine what processes worked and did not work for their particular watershed. The results will be presented in a report to the Legislature in February 2002. Mr. Coulter stated that it is likely that the SWRCB will be responsible for the development of the report; however, the legislature will ultimately have the last say with regard to the contents of the report.

It was also reported that a new watershed bill has been drafted, AB1192, sponsored by Assembly Member Pavley of Southern California. However, it was noted that the legislature is currently dominated by energy issues and the bill is not receiving much attention at this point. Laurel Ames (Sierra Nevada Alliance) volunteered to track the bill and report back to the Work Group.

California Biodiversity Council Meeting

Mr. Lowrie informed the Work Group that the California Biodiversity Council (CBC) met recently in Chico. The theme of the meeting was watersheds. The meeting included a panel discussing streamlining the permit process for watershed restoration work. It also included a brief overview of the Sacramento River Watershed Program and the Watershed Program proposal solicitation process.

Other Watershed Announcements

The California Coordinated Resource Management and Planning (CCRMP) is hosting a permitting workshop on April 27, 2001. Contact the CCRMP or their website for additional information.

Mr. Coulter announced that the 205(j) and 319(h) grant proposal applications for watershed management are available. Additional information may be found at the SWRCB website.

Sam Zeigler (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) announced that the EPA, SWRCB, and Regional Water Quality Boards are organizing a conference October 23 - 25, 2001, in Sacramento to assess past and current 319(h) projects to see what has worked well and areas for improvement.

The National Watershed Institute is holding a conference in Costa Mesa on October 16 – 17, 2001.

Local Watershed Presentation

Ms. Davis introduced Laurel Ames as the meeting's local watershed presenter. Ms. Ames provided an overview of watershed activities in the Sierra. Ms. Ames is the Executive Director for the Sierra Nevada Alliance. The Alliance has been working for four years on policy

issues and encouraging watershed restoration activities. She mentioned that with the combative battles occurring in the Sierra, addressing issues with a watershed perspective is a positive vehicle to solutions.

The first effort of the Sierra Nevada Alliance was with the South Yuba River watershed. The South Yuba River watershed group struggled with a decision-making process, but ultimately created an ad hoc watershed group with all interests represented. They have received over $1,300,000 to date and have developed a monitoring program and have a number of restoration projects on the ground. The Sierra Nevada Alliance also works with the Mokelumne Resource Conservation District (RCD), Mariposa RCD, Cherokeee Watershed, East Walker Watershed, Upper Owens Watershed, and Truckee River. Collectively, the Sierra Nevada Alliance has 73 member groups. With the success of many of the Sierra watershed groups, Ms. Ames was asked what she thought the greatest needs of watershed groups are. She replied that funding for coordination activities is the single most important impetus. Grant writers and technical assistance are two other imperative needs for watershed groups.

Developing Performance Measures for the Watershed Program

Mr. Lowrie began a discussion of performance measures for the Watershed Program. He explained that Patrick Wright has asked all CALFED program managers to develop performance measures/success criteria. These measures will serve as tools to determine if the Watershed Program is achieving its goals and objectives. Mr. Lowrie reminded the Work Group that performance measures were briefly discussed at the February Work Group meeting. A handout of draft performance measures developed by Sam Luoma of the CALFED Science Program was distributed to the Work Group.

Dennis Bowker (Sacramento River Watershed Program/CALFED Watershed Program) then facilitated a brainstorming discussion with the meeting participants. The discussion was framed around the five desired outcomes of the Watershed Program (as identified in the Watershed Program Plan):

- Improved Coordination and Assistance;
- Development of Monitoring Protocols and Application of Adaptive Management Process;
- Improved and Expanded Watershed Education and Public Outreach;
- Maximization of the Multiple Benefits of CALFED Programs; and
- Improved Watershed Stewardship.

Mr. Bowker asked the Work Group to suggest a measure that could be used to assess the performance and some possible tools to use in the assessment. He also recommended that an appropriate timeframe be identified. The following are the results of the brainstorming exercise:

Improved Coordination and Assistance		
Performance Measure	**Time**	**Tool**
Number of new watershed groups	1/7 years	PSPs

Relevance of the Watershed Program to other watershed programs		
Collaborative elements	1 year	Survey form
Saved money through partnerships	1 year	Performance audit
Longevity of watershed groups		
Number of implementation parties in Watershed Program MOU	1 year	MOU
Dollars/year provided for watershed management	1 year	Specified funding/year
Local agency collaboration with watershed organizations	1 year	PSPs
Diversity in watershed groups	1 year	PSPs
Diversity in cost sharing		PSPs
Funded capacity		
Improved permit processes	1/7 years	
Geographic distribution of watershed groups		
Intra-watershed coordination		
Percentage of matching funds	1 year	PSP
Level of watershed dedicated effort	1 year	
Amount of interagency coordination		
Diversity of funding sources		
Mixed ownership watershed collaboration		

Development of Monitoring Protocols and Application of Adaptive Management Process		
Measure	**Time**	**Tool**
Watersheds with monitoring programs		
Geographic completeness	1/7 years	Clearinghouse
Completing loop of information flow	As necessary	
Define suite of protocols	1 year	Work with CALFED Science Program
Degree of use in decision making		
Regularity of assumption checking		
Accuracy (perceived) of protocol data		
Spatial use of monitoring/adaptive management procedures		
Ability to stay on track	7 years	
Level of monitoring coordination intra/interwatersheds		

Effective monitoring plans		Tied to local/CALFED needs
Support of monitoring through PSPS		Reports

Improved and Expanded Watershed Education and Public Outreach		
Measure	**Time**	**Tool**
Percentage of schools with active watershed programs		
New watershed programs as a result of CALFED		
Survival/continuity		
State scholastic standards	1 year	
Workshops sponsored by the Watershed Program	1 year	
Size of the Watershed Program's mailing list		
Variety/number of workshops		
Level of awareness	7 years	Surveys
Education for agency personnel, teachers, NGOs		
Legislative support addressing watershed issues		
Number of watershed websites and use		
School participation in assessment and monitoring		
Affordability for educational programs		
Availability of publications		
Local knowledge of watershed issues		

Maximization of the Multiple Benefits of CALFED Programs		
Measure	**Time**	**Tool**
Number of cost shares among programs	1 year	
Multiple objective proposals		
Use of common processes		
Amount of communication between programs		
Diverse processes		
Technical assistance integration		
Degree of mutual project review		
Percentage of CALFED effort carried out through community-based programs		
Improved schedule of funding effort		
Clarity/conciseness of reporting		

Improved Watershed Stewardship (Environmental Indicators)		
Measure	**Time**	**Tool**
Effectiveness of watershed groups		
Longevity of watershed groups		
Diversity of watershed groups		
Use of Best Management Practices		
Number of conservation plans developed	1 year	
Number of conservation easements acquired	1 year	
Number of projects implemented	1 year	
Local government organizations./general plans, institutional evolution		
Perceived progress	1 year	Survey/self-assessment
Gap between local need and available resources		
Sustained activity		
Time to self-sufficiency		
Degree of reliance on external funds/resources		
Mixed ownership's/partnerships		PSPs
Number of definable efforts		
Economic/fiscal indicators		
Multiple/mixed/connected diverse land uses		

Planning for the Next Watershed Work Group Meeting

The date for the April Work Group meeting was set for the usual third Friday of the month, April 20, in Sacramento. Ms. Davis stated that she is interested in moving the Work Group meetings out of Sacramento. This topic should be discussed at the April meeting.

Meeting Participant	Affiliation
Ames, Laurel	Sierra Nevada Alliance
Barris, Lynn	Sacramento River Watershed Program
Birdseye, Erik	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Bowker, Dennis	Sacramento River Watershed Program
Brown, Dave	CA State University Chico
Byron, Bruce	Sonoma County Organic Waste Management
Buzzard, Diane	US Bureau of Reclamation
Christensen, Doug	New Fields
Cornelia, James	Calaveras County Water District
Coulter, Ken	State Water Resources Control Board
Danielson, Gary	Sierra Land Use Group
Davis, Martha	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Flach, Helen	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Flores, Kesnew	Wintun EPA Cortina Indian Racheria
Jacobs, Selene	Jones & Stokes/CALFED Watershed Program Team
Keller, Mary	Sutter County
Knecht, Mary Lee	Jones & Stokes/CALFED Watershed Program Team.
Lavelle, Jane	City and County of San Francisco
Leininger, Chris	Ducks Unlimited
Lowrie, John	CALFED
Lucas, Ronda	California Farm Bureau
Lunt, Tina	Cosumnes River Task Force
McDougal, Leigh	US Forest Service
Newlin, Vickie	Butte County
O'Bryant, Dennis	Department of Conservation
Ohlson, John	Yolo County Democratic Central Committee
Oldland, Susan	Department of Water Resources
Prange, Paul	City of San Jose
Sime, Fraser	Department of Water Resources
Shilling, Fraser	UC Davis
Thomas, Lenore	Bureau of Land Management
Troyan, Jerry	Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District
Turner, Martha	Salmonid Restoration Federation
Voege, Hal	Consultant
Watson, C.	ARWG
Wermiel, Dan	CALFED
Wessman, George	Wessman Industries