AC Review Draft August 29, 2003. This is a draft for discussion purposes only. It has not been approved by DWR or Advisory Committee

Ecosystem restoration

Ecosystem restoration is the activity of improving the condition of our modified natural landscapes and biotic communities in order to provide for the sustainability and for the use and enjoyment of those ecosystems by current and future generations. Healthy aquatic and wetland ecosystems benefit California's native plant and wildlife populations and provide valuable goods and services that support our society and economy as well. Ecosystem restoration can include instream flow changes, habitat restoration, physical modification to water bodies, control of waste discharge in waterways, exotic species control, removal of barriers to anadromous fish migration, land and water acquisitions, and fire management. Ecosystem protection and restoration should be viewed as the proper maintenance in a sustainable manner of California's natural infrastructure, with recognition of the importance of that infrastructure to the future of this state. Ecosystem restoration is included among the water management strategies in Water Plan Update 2003 because it is a proven strategy to improve water supply reliability, and also because it is an important consideration for water managers as they pursue integrated resource management.

Over the last decade, the public has recognized the need to restore California's ecosystems, largely as a result of the public's awareness of the value of healthy rivers and other aquatic ecosystems. The desire to improve the conditions of those ecosystems is demonstrated by the passage of bond issues (Propositions 204, 13 and 50). Local and regional restoration projects have multiplied in number. Hundreds of watershed alliances and regional ecosystem projects are in place throughout the state. Major river restoration projects are underway in every corner of the state, including the Los Angeles, San Joaquin, Truckee, Carmel, Sacramento, and Trinity Rivers, to name a few. Some of these projects are described in the Regional Reports of Volume 2.

The decade prior to publication of this update saw a remarkable transformation in water management in California. In 1993, water management was characterized by lawsuits, policy gridlock, and conflicts between those who sought to improve water supply reliability and those who sought to protect threatened and endangered species. Since that time, development and implementation of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program has demonstrated that integrated resource management – improving water supply reliability while simultaneously restoring ecosystems – is far more likely to succeed than pursuit of single purpose projects.

Water development projects in the past have often had significant

Sources

- *Bednarek, Angela T. 2001. Undamming rivers: a review of the ecological impacts of dam removal. Environmental Management, Vol 27, Pages 803-814.*
- *CALFED, Bay-Delta Program, Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan, Strategic Plan for Ecosystem Restoration, July 2000.*
- *California Rivers—A Public Trust Report. 1993. California State Lands Commission. 334pp.*
- *Environmental Water Caucus, Blueprint for an Environmentally and Economically Sound CALFED Water Supply Reliability Program, November 5, 1998.*
- *Swift, C.C., T.R. Haglund, M. Ruiz, and R.N. Fisher. 1993. The status and distribution of freshwater fishes of Southern California. Bulletin of the Southern California Academy of Sciences 92: 101-167.*
- *Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project Report. U.S. Forest Service. Final Report to Congress, 1996.*

environmental impacts, and have contributed to the decline in the health of California ecosystems. Ecosystem Restoration is often treated as something to be managed in arrears. Instead, planning must include front end investment to prevent damage and long term maintenance costs. Future water management efforts will face conflict and opposition unless these efforts are accompanied by ecosystem restoration actions that mitigate for project impacts and go well beyond mitigation to contribute to the restoration of ecosystem health.

This strategy focuses on restoration of aquatic ecosystems because these are the ecosystems most likely to be affected by the actions of water managers. Furthermore, water managers play a critical role in the restoration of aquatic ecosystems because water managers can help ensure appropriate water supply, flow rate or flow pattern to facilitate restoration actions. Water managers also have an important public trust responsibility to protect waters of the state for their environmental, recreational, and aesthetic values.

Other strategies described in this chapter that relate closely to ecosystem restoration and public trust responsibilities include Floodplain Management, Pollution Prevention, Matching Water Quality to use, and Water-dependent Recreation.

Finding information

Information on restoration projects, biological resources, and organizations involved in restoration can be found for many parts of the state. The Information Center for the Environment (ICE) is a cooperative effort of environmental scientists at the University of California, Da,vis and collaborators at over thirty private, state, federal, and international organizations interested in environmental protection. ICE has developed the Natural Resources Projects Inventory, a database of information on thousands of conservation, mitigation and restoration projects being developed and implemented throughout California. Also, the California Environmental Resources Evaluation System (CERES) is an information system developed by the Resources Agency to facilitate access to a variety of electronic data describing California's rich and diverse environments. The California Legacy Project, a part of CERES, aims to support conservation investment decisions in numerous ways, including: (1) identify a long-range strategy to conserve the most important natural resources in California; (20 assemble a digital atlas of key resources and stressors; and (3) report on the status and trends of those resources.

Current status

California Rivers, A Public Trust Report (1993) concluded that the health of California's rivers is stressed and their viability as sustainable ecosystems is in peril. The report urged state agencies to undertake a comprehensive program of river basin and watershed protection and restoration. The same conclusions apply to many of California's other aquatic ecosystems, including bays, estuaries, and lakes. The condition of California's fisheries reveals the unintended consequences of past water management actions. A total of 34 fish species are currently listed as threatened or endangered in California.

California's ecosystems, particularly aquatic ecosystems, have been significantly modified over time. Hydraulic mining and gold extraction in the 1800's, dam construction and operation, pollution, flood control, urbanization, increases in Delta exports, and introduction of exotic species have all contributed to the decline in ecosystem health. (See Chapter 2 for a more complete description of the factors that have led to ecosystem decline.) California's ecosystems cannot possibly be restored to conditions that existed before the gold rush of 1849. Instead, ecosystem restoration

AC Review Draft August 29, 2003. This is a draft for discussion purposes only. It has not been approved by DWR or Advisory Committee

AC Review Draft August 29, 2003. This is a draft for discussion purposes only. It has not been approved by DWR or Advisory Committee

focuses on the rehabilitation of ecosystems so that they supply important elements of their original structure and function in a sustainable manner.

Modification of California ecosystems has caused a sharp decline in the abundance of things that society values, such as native and some non-native fish species. Ability to sustain various life stages of fish is an example of a function that California rivers no longer provide as well as they once did. Human activities have also affected the structure of ecosystems. For example, rivers downstream of dams are deprived of the gravel supply from upstream that provides spawning habitat for species such as Chinook salmon.

One significant ecosystem stressor is the unintended impact of actions that we intentionally take. The California Environmental Quality Act recognizes that human activity may have unintended environmental impacts, and outlines procedures for project proponents to avoid, minimize, and mitigate these impacts. Mitigation for environmental impacts has become a common practice in California. Mitigation is similar to ecosystem restoration, but mitigation is intended to bring the level of ecosystem health back to what it was before impacts of a project occurred. By contrast, ecosystem restoration is intended to raise the level of ecosystem health.

Water projects often fall into this category of ecosystem stressors, and are usually controversial because of their unintended environmental impacts. It may not be possible to fully mitigate for the impacts of these projects. When the impacts would occur in aquatic ecosystems that are already severely degraded, it may be difficult if not impossible for single-purpose projects to avoid endangered species conflicts and nearly impossible to build societal consensus that the project should be implemented. Unlike other stressors whose impacts cannot be avoided (past damage from hydraulic mining, urbanization or introduced species), water projects can be stopped if society deems the environmental impacts to be unacceptably high. This is the situation that has often faced water managers in California over the last several decades. Water projects, including both large-scale projects such as the construction of major dams or increased exports through the Delta, as well as small local projects, have become the focus for opposition based on the projects' potential for environmental impacts.

More recently, resource managers have concluded that the most successful way to pursue either aquatic ecosystem restoration or water management is to integrate the two. This integration of project goals has the potential to reduce the conflict over water management actions, increase

the support for ecosystem restoration and provide a more cost effective solution. The result is also a more resource-efficient way to implement projects, such as the CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program.

Beyond the pragmatic consideration of incorporating ecosystem restoration into water projects in order to increase the chance of success, water managers face a responsibility to protect waters of the state under the public trust doctrine. The public trust is a concept rooted in common law, stating that government has the responsibility to hold certain resources in trust for the people and to protect these resources permanently. Thus, it may not suffice to protect a natural resource in its current condition, if that condition represents a state of decline. Courts have upheld the public trust doctrine and affirmed the responsibility of resource managers to protect public trust values.

Within state government, several departments and boards share public trust responsibilities. The Department of Fish and Game (DFG) coordinates, oversees, funds, and carries out restoration activities and plays a central role in carrying out public trust responsibilities. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) regulates water rights and establishes standards for minimum stream flows. The Department of Water Resources, as the operator of the State Water Project, can propose, design, build, and operate water management facilities in ways that improve water supply reliability while restoring ecosystem health and protecting public trust values. No one of these agencies can be completely successful unless there is collaboration among all. See Chapters 2 and 4 for details on the public trust doctrine and values.

Benefits

Maintaining the Natural Infrastructure and its Services – The state's ecosystems, from mountain watersheds to coastal beaches, are California's natural infrastructure, and support our population and economic growth. Ecosystem restoration is an investment in improving the condition of California's natural infrastructure. As our understanding of the linkage between water management and the health of the natural infrastructure grows, the benefits of restoration to water supply reliability and water quality improvements are increasingly evident. As ecosystem restoration actions help increase the health and abundance of species currently protected under the state and federal Endangered Species Acts, there will be fewer ESA conflicts. As ecosystems such as wetlands and sloughs are restored, their natural pollutant filtering capabilities will improve water quality. As floodplains and seasonal lakes and ponds are restored, ground-

AC Review Draft August 29, 2003. This is a draft for discussion purposes only. It has not been approved by DWR or Advisory Committee

AC Review Draft August 29, 2003. This is a draft for discussion purposes only. It has not been approved by DWR or Advisory Committee

water recharge can increase. The result will be a more reliable, higher quality water supply supported by a sustainable ecosystem.

Economic Benefits – The economic benefits that improved rivers, estuaries, wetlands, wildlife, beaches, and their surrounding habitats can have in the state may far exceed the investments that are being made for restoring ecosystems. When looked at from an economic point of view and considering California lifestyle trends and travel and tourism as the major growth industry for the state, investments in ecosystem restoration actions may provide a high return on investment. This is in contrast with land development investments for urban growth, for example, which can result in a negative return on investment to the public as the infrastructure needs to service the added population strains local and regional government services such as road development, fire and police protection.

California's recreation and tourism industry – at $75 billion a year – is one of the state's largest industries. Next to the state's beaches, rivers are the second biggest attraction for California's recreation industry. Similarly, managed wetlands and wildlife refuges provide bird watching and hunting opportunities that contribute hundreds of millions of dollars annually to California's economy.

Improved Native Species Populations and Communities – The benefits from ecosystem restoration to native species and communities has been well documented Restoration can result in improved flora and fauna condition, increased diversity and connectivity of habitat, recovery of endangered species, and improved watershed condition and trends. Restoration efforts can rehabilitate natural processes to support native communities with minimal ongoing human intervention. Restored functional habitats are likely to sustain reproduction, foraging, shelter, and other life history needs of a suite of fish and wildlife species. By setting our goals high – at the ecosystem level, rather than recovery of a handful of species – we improve our chances for long-term success by incorporating species relationships (such as between predators and prey), physical processes, genetic variability, and other factors that we don't fully understand.

Costs

Predicting costs – A statewide summary of ecosystem needs and their costs does not exist. However, it is likely that the costs of restoration are higher than the costs of protecting existing healthy ecosystems. Costs of restoration can include research and monitoring, acquisition of land and water, cultivation and planting of native vegetation, and physical alteration

of the landscape. The costs of river restoration can increase dramatically when channel alteration is required, such as filling in gravel pits or re-grading incised banks.

Public investment – California voters have recently approved three bond issues that obligate billions of dollars to correct some of the damage from our development and infrastructure projects. As of the end of 2002, CALFED has funded 379 projects at a cost of $398 million, and has committed $150 million per year toward the recovery of endangered species.

Water supply costs – Supplying water for ecosystem needs is often viewed as competing with supplying water for human needs, or responsible for bringing up the costs of supplying human needs. While there are limits to the amount of water that can be withdrawn from a river ecosystem before its health and productivity are compromised, experience with integrating ecosystem restoration and water supply management is demonstrating their compatibility in many cases. An important way to reduce the need for—and the cost of—restoration is to incorporate ecosystem protection into water projects at the outset. This can reduce or eliminate the need for retrofits and mitigation.

Major issues

The major causes of aquatic and riparian habitat degradation and declines in freshwater biodiversity in California stem from physical changes associated with on-stream dams, diversions, levees and bank armoring; deterioration of water quality, including temperature, dissolved oxygen levels and pollutants; and the introduction of non-native invasive species. These issues are outlined further in Chapter 2 and in the strategies for Floodplain Management, Pollution Prevention and Watershed Management in this chapter. Beyond those direct physical changes, this section describes other issues and challenges facing restoration efforts.

Single-purpose planning - Water managers incline toward single-purpose projects because they seem most expedient. Project designs that incorporate diverse interests can take longer, cost more and require knowledge of key ecological elements and processes. This issue is discussed further in the strategies for Floodplain Management, Watershed Management and Working Lands Management in this chapter.

Assessment of environmental flows- Knowledge of effects of different flows on the health of aquatic and riparian ecosystems is incomplete. Data and analytical tools to measure the adequacy of flows are insufficient.

AC Review Draft August 29, 2003. This is a draft for discussion purposes only. It has not been approved by DWR or Advisory Committee

AC Review Draft August 29, 2003. This is a draft for discussion purposes only. It has not been approved by DWR or Advisory Committee

Scientific uncertainty- Restoration science is a work in progress. Rarely do we have all the scientific information on a species, much less an ecosystem, to identify an exact course of action that will restore natural communities and processes. When precious resources and endangered species are involved, we often do not have the time or money to fully develop our scientific understanding before action is needed. Yet, the uncertainty can lead to hesitation and delay.

Funding uncertainty – Ecosystem restoration efforts are often long-term and need long-term financing. Although public funds are available, they may be sporadic and thus unreliable, and are subject to intense competition. In contrast, water supply projects ordinarily can rely on user fees to recover costs.

Sound, accessible data - There is no complete inventory of ecosystems and their health. Key criteria to prioritize conservation actions are lacking, scattered or incompatible for comparison. There is also no reporting system for the outcome of various restoration and management strategies. This is necessary for the more efficient investment of public funds.

Recommendations

- Integrated resources planning - DWR will incorporate ecosystem restoration as a co-equal objective in water management projects, or will partner with restoration projects, to achieve net environmental benefit from water management actions. This is consistent with the commitments that DWR has made in the CALFED Bay-Delta Program. DWR will develop guidelines for helping local water managers and planners pursue the same multiple-objective approach, including incorporation of fish and wildlife benefits into projects. See Chapter 4 for more recommendations to promote integrated resource planning.
- Assessment of environmental flows - DWR, DFG and SWRCB should work together to publish comprehensive assessments of in-stream flow needs on California rivers, similar in scope to studies on the Feather and American rivers. The assessments should identify bodies of water that need improved flows, in terms of volume, timing, duration, etc., to meet the healthy river requirements of the public trust doctrine.
- Scientific uncertainty - The Resources Agency should establish an independent science review process, available to all Agency departments, to help chart out the best available science with

stakeholder participation.

- Funding uncertainty - As part of the FY 03-04 Budget, the Department of Finance proposed and the legislature adopted the following Budget Bill text: "It is the intent of the Legislature that the California Bay-Delta Authority submit a broad-based Bay-Delta user fee proposal as part of the 2004-05 Governor's Budget, consistent with the beneficiary-pays principle specified in the CALFED Record of Decision." Such a fee was described in the Implementation Plan appendix to the CALFED Record of Decision (ROD). The user fee is intended for restoration projects over and above project-specific mitigation. The ROD anticipated that ecosystem restoration could be funded by a mix of user fees and public funds. To the extent that other funding sources remain, the user fee should free them for use outside the CALFED solution area.
- Sound, accessible data - The Resources Agency should continue to support development and use of statewide databases, analytical tools and evaluation criteria, such as the Natural Resource Project Inventory and the Legacy project, that can provide information to planners and decision-makers and identify priorities for restoration. This investment should provide a coordinated and comprehensive statewide implementation plan for restoration actions in each region.

AC Review Draft August 29, 2003. This is a draft for discussion purposes only. It has not been approved by DWR or Advisory Committee