MEETING SUMMARY

CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN UPDATE 2013
ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP OBJECTIVE
1:30 – 2:30 P.M.
815 S STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA

Meeting Objectives

Discuss and suggest revisions for the Related Actions associated with the Update 2013 Objective relating to Environmental Stewardship:

“Practice, promote, improve, and expand environmental stewardship to protect biological diversity and sustain natural water and flood management systems in watersheds, on floodplains, and in aquatic habitats.”

Document Walk Through

Michael Perrone, DWR, Update 2013 Project Team, Environmental Services Lead, reviewed the Environmental Stewardship objective. Based on feedback from the June 13th session, the objective and related actions have been revised. These focus on goals for expanding habitat, with less emphasis on how to accomplish the goals.

Related Actions

The proposed Related Actions, and the ensuing discussion, are presented below. Please note that the actions below have been abridged from the original text and the sub-actions are not included:

1. Agencies overseeing water and flood management systems should include actions, in their respective natural resource management plans, that restore natural processes of erosion and sedimentation in rivers and streams and increase and improve riverine and floodplain habitats. Local planning activities should include elements to meet these goals.

Discussion:

- Based on June 13 comments, this action will delete specific targets for acreage, as well as timeline dates. Acreage numbers will be considered for a performance measure. There were substantial comments regarding the accounting system for acreage and credits. The item on GHGs was moved.

- This should specifically include wetlands, and a discussion on wetland restoration efforts.

- Where did the one million number come from?
  - This was combined from several Central Valley sources.
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- Consider establishing an ongoing evaluation process for this item, with a dedicated program goal to map out efforts and create a comprehensive assessment for feasible restoration locations and restoration targets. It would make the objective fully defensible. The different sources could be added in there as well.

2. State government should partner to evaluate opportunities to introduce or re-introduce anadromous fish to upper watersheds.

Discussion:
- June 13th suggestions included using the term re-introduce, rather than introduce.

3. By 2015, State government should identify and prioritize lands, within the SF Bay and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, for protection to provide tidal wetlands habitat that can adapt to sea-level rise.

Discussion:
- Were these items integrated with the Delta Plan?
  - These elements are not addressed in the Delta Plan.
  - Look at options to move this item to the Delta Objective.
- Broaden this to address tidal wetlands and marsh, in the context of climate change and sea-level rise. Cross-reference this to the Delta Plan and the Flood Plan.
  - This needs to go more generic, or else create an extensive list of similar habitat.
  - Suggestion: Say, “State government should identify and prioritize protection of lands at the boundaries of, and adjacent to, habitat range for tidal wetlands to adapt to, and shift with, sea-level rise…”

4. By 2015, State government should prioritize and expand Delta islands and Suisun Marsh subsidence reversal and land accretion projects to equalize land-estuary elevations.

Discussion:
- The proposal will reference the SF Estuary Partnership “Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan,” which includes a chapter with this.
  - Look at linking this with the Delta objective.

5. By 2030, State and federal government should encourage, prioritize and financially support actions to protect, enhance, and restore at least 1 million acres of upper watershed forests and meadows.

Discussion:
- Previous suggestions included a desire to make a strong link to water quality. Reducing fuel loads to 1920 levels may be too specific a reference, make it more generic.

6. State and federal government should fund natural resource protection agencies to study and support reallocation of water to protect fish and wildlife and their habitats.

Discussion:
- The authors are willing to withdraw this item.
- It would be helpful to a conversation to try and find language that would work. Issues came up around water rights. Not all streams have minimum in-stream flow standards prescribed.
- This is a good opportunity to have this conversation, it shouldn’t be shut off. We should talk about how we are using this water, and look for efficiency measures. We need to look at outcomes for the input.
- There are two parts of this: allocation of water for purposes of fish and wildlife; the second part looks at re-evaluating environmental water use in the context of climate change.
  - The word “reallocation” is the biggest problem. There is not a problem with the concept of assuring that fish and wildlife have adequate water. That is a constitutional concept, which is understood by all parties. We should not be prescriptive about how CDFW will get the water. There is a concept here that shouldn’t be thrown out – just finessed better. The actions need to be better described.
  - Language for the action might say: “Ensure that CDFW are getting the water necessary to support ecosystem value in California, using the existing water rights process.”
  - State that there is an objective, and several efforts underway – there is an existing water rights program, and a study to establish instream flows across the state.
  - One Water Plan guiding principle states that we work within existing systems and programs, including the current water rights structure.
  - Three things are bundled here: Funding, studies, and how water is provided. Climate change can get added to almost any objective. The goal is to identify how much water is needed, and provide funding to landowners to help meet state needs.
  - In determining environmental water needs, the entire water regime needs to be looked at: supply, timing, quality and temperature. Predation by invasive species also affects habitat and native species populations.
o We should look at incentives for different flow regimes or mechanisms for providing water to CDFW when they need it.

o These items should be captured within instream flow studies. System reoperation studies are another element of looking at the system for efficiencies.

o In Update 2005, there was a section on “Considering WUE for the Environment.” In 2006, we get Managed Water Use Efficiency – as well as materials developed by BDCP and Delta Stewardship Council. These efforts help get at how we can quantify benefits. There is a fiduciary responsibility to report back on how resources are being used.

7. Government and the private sector should develop and support programs that partner with private landowners and managers to protect and improve habitat and ecosystem services, including flood protection, water quality, groundwater recharge and storage, reversal of land subsidence, prevention of large wildfires, shading of rivers and streams, and reduced soil erosion.

Discussion:

• This is about providing incentives to the private sector for biological diversity. There were comments about gauging value for the dollar investment, and that language has been added.

• Part of this relates to the authority of local government to regulate land use, without compensation. We don’t need to spend money on things that government can regulate right now through police powers, unless there is a constitutional taking.

• It’s important to go more towards encouraging people to do things they aren’t required to do. Can require people to not do harm, but can’t require them to do things for the social good.

  o This provides incentives for what goes beyond the business model.

  o There is support for incentive-based efforts, over and above program requirements. Regulation is the blunt instrument to get things done. We also need well-designed, incentive-based and voluntary efforts. Incentives might be more effective in some circumstances than forcing compliance.

  o Those incentives need to be funded. It takes money to start those conversations. Collaboration can yield better outcomes than forcing compliance.
Revisions for Objective 5

Michael Perrone described a new idea taken from the Resource Agency’s Climate Adaptation Strategy, with greater emphasis on water-related aspects. It calls for the establishment of adequate amounts of reserve areas in each of the state’s bioregions. The bioregions are defined by CDFW. These reserves include preserved areas and working lands. This would be added as new action #1, with other actions supporting biodiversity in the state.

New Action:

Governments and the private sector should work together to create and maintain a network of protected reserve areas across the state that builds on existing conservation investments, and provides refuge areas and migration corridors that allow species to adjust to conditions associated with climate change. This network should include river corridors that connect high elevations to valleys and reestablish natural hydrologic connections between rivers and their historic floodplains. (Resources Agency, 2009 Climate Adaptation Strategy, Chapter 5 “Biodiversity and Habitat.”)

- This is new text – crafted as a result of comments from last time.
- Would this be a land overlay? What governance would be involved in making this work?
  - There hasn’t been a discussion of how to manage this. CDFW will take this on in the next update of the State Wildlife Action Plan.
- This item is not ready for release. It may need a Task Force study to tee this up. It is an important idea that needs further development. Perhaps the Task Force could be established as part of the Wildlife Action Plan. This is currently too nebulous. There is a way to move the concept forward, perhaps through the Resources Agency.
- This also is part of the state’s Climate Adaptation Strategy, which is beyond the Wildlife Action Plan. Both are companion plans to the Water Plan.
- How is this different from the Legacy Project?
  - Use existing studies and reports that can inform the effort.
- We can make a recommendation that a process look at doing this and coming up with the details
- CHECK ON THE STATUS of the Update of the Wildlife Action Plan.
Revised Action #10:

- Why is the Salton Sea called out for this item?
  - Talk about the statewide interest being protected here. There are specific Pacific flyway connections. (E.g. Broaden more generally, rather than listing areas such as the Salton Sea.)
  - The State of California has identified it as a state interest. Might not make sense to have local projects called out.

Attendance

In-Room

Dave Bolland, Association of California Water Agencies
Rebecca Crebbin-Coates, Planning and Conservation League
Al Herson, American Planning Association
John Hopkins, Institute for Ecological Health
Valerie Nera, California Chamber of Commerce
Brandon Souza, Farm Water Coalition
Greg Zlotnick, State and Federal Water Contractors
Jose Alarcon, DWR, Water Quality Lead
Emily Alejandro, DWR
Ted Frink, DWR, FESSRO
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, Manager, Statewide Integrated Water Management
Paul Massera, DWR, Water Plan Program Manager
Elizabeth Patterson, DWR, Land Use Lead
Michael Perrone, DWR, Environmental Water Team Lead
Terri Wegener, DWR, Manager, Statewide Flood Management
Lisa Beutler, MWH, Water Plan Executive Facilitator
Judie Talbot, CCP, Facilitator

Webinar

Karen Buhr, California Assn. of Resource Conservation Districts
Brian Campbell, East Bay Municipal Utilities District
Randy Davis, Cal Desal
Ron Davis, Burbank Power and Water
Alicia Eagan, Edelman
Glenn Farrel, San Diego County Water Authority
Bruce Gwynne, Department of Conservation
Carol Hall, Kleinfelder
Mark Horne, Consultant
Ashley Indieri, Family Water Alliance
Alex Kim, UC Davis
Glenn Knapp, City of Fresno
Debbie Liebersbach, Turlock Irrigation District
Karl Longley, California Water Institute, UC Fresno
Kathy Mannion, Regional Council of Rural Counties
Cynthia Naha, Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of Stewarts Point Rancheria
Cindy Paulson, Brown and Caldwell
Bob Siegfried, Carmel Area Wastewater District
Ron Sprague, County Planners Association
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority
Eric Thorburn, Oakdale Irrigation
Iovanka Todt, Floodplain Management Association
Bori Touray, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Douglas Wallace, East Bay Municipal Water Districts
Betty Yee, Central Valley Water Boards
Abby Carevic, DWR
Toni Pezzetti, DWR
Katherine Spanos, DWR