

Meeting Minutes
Policy Review Panel Meeting
May 15, 2006 - Redding, CA

Welcome/Introductions (Chairman Smith)

Chairman Smith convened the meeting at 10: 11 am

ATTENDEES

Policy Review Panel

Supervisor Jimmy Smith, Chair – Humboldt County
Councilmember Jake Mackenzie, Vice Chair – Sonoma County
Tom Stokely – Trinity County
Randy Poole, for Supervisor Paul Kelley – Sonoma County
Barry Shiohita – Siskiyou County
Supervisor Bill Hoy – Siskiyou County
Supervisor Dave Bradshaw – Modoc County
Supervisor Hal Wagenet – Mendocino County
Mike Maxwell – Modoc County
Mark Lancaster - Trinity County

Technical Peer Review Committee

Dave Lewis, Chair – Sonoma County
Tom Weseloh – Humboldt County
David VanDenover – Trinity County
Sandra Perez – Trinity County

Project Proponents

Chris Larson, Mattole Restoration Council
Ted Walker, Sonoma County PRMD
Mary-Grace Pawson, Winzler and Kelly/City of Santa Rosa

Project Team

Lisa Renton, Sonoma County Water Agency
Karen Gaffney, West Coast Watershed

Outcomes for today's meetings (Chairman Smith, Vice-Chairman Mackenzie)

Chairman Smith outlined the outcomes for the meeting, including the reduction of the \$50 million Step 1 application to the \$25 million submission maximum for Step 2.

Public Comment

Chairman Smith provided an opportunity for public comment. Ted Walker suggested that criteria for selection be based on project readiness. Chris Larson indicated that he was pleased with either TRPC recommendation from the May 11, 2006 TRPC meeting.

Update on state process/workshops (Project Team)

Karen Gaffney and Lisa Renton provided an overview of information from the May 4th IRWM Workshop in Sacramento, including new information about the relative importance of the readiness criteria.

TPRC Update: summary of evaluation process, recommendations

Dave Lewis, TPRC Chair, provided an overview of the process that the TPRC utilized at the May 11, 2006 meeting, including an evaluation of integrated information from project proponents, project team, and TPRC technical review from Step 1 and Step 2. He reported that the TPRC evaluated projects based on the PRP's direction from the April 13, 2006 meeting, including: a) responding to the PRP's policy direction of

geographic representation and inclusion, b) importance of meeting the needs of small disadvantaged communities with cease and desist orders, c) responsiveness to the Step 2 PSP, and d) adherence to the CA Conflict of Interest Code.

Dave reported that the TPRC evaluated each project to determine:

- Proposal completeness
- Data gaps
- Project scalability
- Level of voluntary budget reductions being proposed,
- Project's integration with NCIRWM Plan and regional proposal, scientific and technical merit of the project,
- Project benefits, and
- Project's ability to meet statewide priorities

Dave outlined the TPRC's alternatives for technically feasible budget reductions from \$50 to approximately \$30 million.

Karen Gaffney provided an overview of summarized data to date and reviewed the TPRC recommendations on a project by project basis.

Future Phases of IRWM Program

There was a brief discussion of issues/concerns with State criteria, the excessive amount of work required to develop the Step 2 application, and future funding allocation. Jimmy noted that he and Jake would bring a list of concerns/suggestions to the State for consideration in developing the criteria and process for future rounds of funding.

Discussion of TPRC recommendations, budget reductions, and project approach to ensure North Coast regional competitiveness

The PRP reviewed the TPRC recommendations and discussed the projects based on the following:

- commitment to the themes and objectives outlined in the NCIRWM Phase I plan (including local autonomy, beneficial uses of water, and salmonid recovery),
- priorities established in step 1 and during the Phase I planning process – including addressing those projects responding to serious public health issues or cease and desist orders

After reviewing each project and making budget reductions based on the above criteria and the recommendations of the TPRC, the PRP agreed on a total regional project amount of \$25 million. The PRP agreed that this amount would be reduced by the administrative percentage once that figure is determined by Humboldt County.

Motion, Lancaster: Chair and Vice-Chair are authorized to re-allocate funds to bring the slate up to the authorized \$25 million, if certain projects are not able to move forward due to lack of responsiveness/technical merit, or are funded from other sources. Second: Maxwell. Motion Approved. **Unanimous.**

Motion, Hoy: Submit the \$25 million slate of projects decided upon by the PRP for the North Coast IRWMP Step 2 application to the State. Second: Mackenzie. Motion Approved. **Unanimous.**

Motion, Hoy: projects that were dropped or received significant budget reductions in this round will receive priority consideration for discussion by the PRP in the next round of funding, pending potential revisions to the State's criteria. Second: Wagenet. Motion Approved. **Unanimous.**

Budget revisions: a) contract administration, b) future re-allocation if step 2 grants receive other funding

Chairman Smith outlined approaches for contract administration, including a percentage that each project proponent would need to include for the regional administration of the contract. Lisa Renton, SCWA, will work with Kirk Girard, County of Humboldt, to determine this amount, and the project team will work individually with project proponents to reflect this cost in their budgets.

Next steps: regional application review and submittal, next meeting

Karen Gaffney provided an overview of the schedule and approach for submitting the regional application by June 8, 2006. *(note: since the meeting, this due date has been extended to June 28, 2006)*

Other items of interest

- Lisa Renton provided an update on legislation affecting the IRWM program
- Tom Weseloh summarized changes in the governor's budget for fisheries restoration from \$4 million to \$10 million
- Mark Lancaster and Tom Weseloh distributed DVD's to all PRP members entitled *Fish Passage Success Stories* – an element of the Five County Program's salmonid recovery efforts.

Next meeting agenda:

- How to address projects that are removed/significantly reduced in Step 2
- Information for Chair/Vice-Chair to bring to the State re: suggested revisions to Round 2.
- Water re-use conference in SR. October 28-29

Next Meeting

August 2006 – Eureka

Meeting adjourned at 2:13 pm