

Minutes – April 28, 2005 NCIRWMP Meeting

Policy Review Committee Members:

Jimmy Smith, Chair	County of Humboldt
Jill Geist	County of Humboldt
Jay Sarina	County of Del Norte
Mark Lancaster	County of Trinity
Tom Stokely	County of Trinity
Michael Delbar	County of Mendocino
Hal Wagenet	County of Mendocino
Mike Maxwell	County of Modoc
Renee Webber	County of Sonoma

Technical Peer Review Committee Members:

Kirk Girard	County of Humboldt
Tom Weseloh	County of Humboldt
Jim Barntz	County of Del Norte
Zack Larson	County of Del Norte
Sandra Perez	County of Trinity
David Van Denover	County of Trinity
Roland Sanford	County of Mendocino
Mike Maxwell	County of Modoc
Damien O'Bid	County of Sonoma

Staff and Interested Parties:

Karen Gaffney, Circuit Rider Productions, Inc.
Kim Hilsmann, Circuit Rider Productions, Inc.
Lisa Renton, Sonoma County Water Agency
Greg Bundros, Redwood National Park
Darci Short, Redwood National Park
Jennifer Durkin, City of Santa Rosa
Rebecca Price-Hall, Student, Humboldt State University
Tony Shen, County of Humboldt
Mark, Lovelace, Humboldt Watershed Council

The meeting was convened at 9:15 and introductions were made. Chairman Smith set the context for the meeting, provided an overview of the objectives of the meeting: team building, process and policy issues, review and evaluation.

Agenda revisions: Chair Smith suggested adding the planning grant process to the agenda

Karen Gaffney provided overview of meeting with DWR/SWRCB.

There was general discussion regarding philosophy and approach for the NCIRWMP, as well as issues related to project prioritization. Discussion regarding watersheds as the basis for planning, and the long-term nature of the NCIRWMP planning process. Prop 50, several future options for funding the NCIRWMP and associated projects – including future bonds, legislation, other grant programs. Importance of setting up a fair unbiased process at the beginning.

Supervisor Wagenet made a motion to adopt the three themes for the region: a) salmonid recovery, b) beneficial uses, c) regional autonomy.

Seconded: Supervisor Geist, Mike Maxwell.

Discussion regarding relative priority of each of the themes.

Motion passed unanimously.

It was agreed that project integration can be evaluated by the TPRC and recommended to the Policy Review Panel.

Motion, Mike Maxwell: TPRC reviews projects, meets to define a process, come back for guidance from the Policy Review Panel. Set a Policy Review Committee meeting at end of TPRC process.

Second: Mark Lancaster. Unanimously approved.

Memo handed out from Jim DePree, Siskiyou County.

Supervisor/Chair Smith asked for guidance from the Policy Review Panel re: concerns from Siskiyou county perspective.

Kirk Girard relayed a conversation with Jim DePree. Siskiyou is concerned about “top down” approach to the NCIRWMP. Does not want to participate in the TPRC. Want to see in phase II an opportunity for Siskiyou to identify their most important themes and projects.

Chair Smith indicated that the Policy Review Panel had voted to have two Policy members and two TPRC members from each county. There was discussion and strong support for Siskiyou County remaining part of the NCIRWMP, but agreement that a separate process for Siskiyou is not warranted. Chair Smith suggested that the Policy Review Panel consider writing a letter to Siskiyou that outlines the NCIRWMP approach and process, and welcomes their continued participation. Policy Review Panel members agreed with this approach. Chair

Smith will develop a draft for review by the Policy Review Panel, and will contact Jim DePree and encourage them to remain in the regional planning process.

PLANNING GRANT APPLICATION

Karen Gaffney gave an overview of the state requirements and deadlines, as well as the subcommittee framework, and stated the need for a planning grant applicant. Humboldt County has volunteered to be considered for this role.

Kirk Girard provided an overview of the structure and philosophy for ongoing local, watershed and category-based planning.

The Policy Review Panel and TPRC members articulated some of the issues and strategies that could be evaluated via additional planning – both regionally and locally.

Motion, Tom Stokely: Humboldt county is authorized to take lead as planning grant applicant. Second – Supervisor Delbar. Unanimous.

Chairman Smith adjourned the meeting at 12:30.

TPRC MEETING

The agenda was reviewed, and introductions were made. Each TPRC member provided a brief overview of their relevant experience related to the NCIRWMP. Kim Hilsmann (CRP) will send list and contact information for all members.

Conflict of Interest

The TPRC discussed conflict of interest issues, and made the following recommendations to be reviewed and considered for adoption by the Policy Review Panel:

- a) If the TPRC member is a project proponent or a representative thereof, stands to gain financially or personally from the project, or has a close relative who is project proponent or stands to gain from the project, the TPRC member will recuse him/herself from ranking, scoring and from discussion of the project and will leave the room during discussion/ranking of the project.
- b) The above will be augmented with relevant requirements from the State of California Conflict of Interest Code as it applies to elected officials.

Project Review And Ranking

CRP provided an overview of project data available to the TPRC via the website. Projects will be made available immediately for TPRC member review. The draft score sheet will be reviewed and approved by the TPRC.

Proposed detailed screening process:

Step 1: TPRC members read every project. Individual score sheet will be filled out for each project. CRP to summarize the quantitative information for each project. Assign a points column to the score sheet that is reflective of the state's IRWM evaluation criteria.

Step 2: meet on May 17-18 to review and rank projects as a group. Second meeting on June 2-3. Finalize ranking criteria at the May 17 meeting.

The TPRC requested that CRP send out a memo to all project proponents with the following questions:

- a) is your project scaleable/can it be completed in phases? Check box: yes, not, can not say at this time
- b) if your project is scaleable, will you accept less than the full amount requested?

Schedule

May 17-18 – TPRC meeting
Location to be determined

June 2, 3 - TPRC meeting, determine if Policy Review Panel can attend one day
Location to be determined

June 20 – latest date for final project approval by the Policy Review Panel

Eligibility Issues

The TPRC discussed the eligibility issues associated with planning projects that are not clearly linked to an implementation projects. Agreed that CRP is to ask for clarification from the State.

TPRC suggested that the planning grant include tasks that allow for monitoring the effectiveness of the implementation plan.