

**CALFED Bay-Delta Program: Working Landscapes Subcommittee**  
**January 9, 2003, 1:30 - 5:00 pm**  
**California Department of Food and Agriculture, Room A-477**  
**Draft Meeting Summary**

Subcommittee web site:

<http://calfed.ca.gov/BDPAC/Subcommittees/WorkingLandscapesSubcommittee.shtml>

### **1. Introductions and Approval of Minutes**

The meeting summary for the December 5, 2002 meeting was reviewed and approved. Meeting participants did self-introductions.

### **2. Chairs Report**

Subcommittee co-chair Ryan Broddrick with Ducks Unlimited reported that with the passage of Proposition 50, there is the potential for at least \$20 million available for projects related to Working Landscapes.

Broddrick announced that the 2-year extension to agricultural waiver to the Waste Discharge Requirements that was adopted by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board is being appealed to the State Water Resource Control Board by the environmental community.

The next Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee meeting will be held sometime in March in the Sacramento Valley region. Co-chair Denny Bungarz will be working with Eugenia Laychak to set a date.

### **3. Agency Reports**

**Department of Fish and Game:** Dave Zezulak reported that the first section of the draft CALFED Delta Regional Ecosystem Restoration Implementation Plan on land use designations has been posted on the CALFED main web site. Comments on the section are being accepted until March 1. The documents will be released in stages as it is more fully developed.

**Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA):** Steve Shaffer reported that the State Board of Agriculture will meet on January 29th at the Cal-EPA Building. The Office of Agriculture and Environmental Stewardship will report on its work to the Board. He invited anyone interested in the Board's work or the presentation to attend.

**Department of Conservation (DOC):** Dennis O'Bryant reported that DOC has recently completed its small grants for assistance to Resource Conservation Districts. He noted that one project in particular may be of interest to this subcommittee; the Monterey County Resource Conservation District will receive

funds to in turn provide small grants for local cost-share to help growers to meet the state and federal water quality requirements.

**Department of Water Resources/Comprehensive Study:** Kevin Elcock updated the Subcommittee on the Sacramento/San Joaquin River Comprehensive Study. The study has been a 5-year effort. The first 2 years involved data collection, problem identification and model development. In year 3, Comp Study analyzed concepts that would provide feasible flood control and ecosystem restoration where benefits outweighed the costs. The starting point master plan (SPMP) was a theoretical comprehensive solution that satisfied the requirements. Public comments on the SPMP were received strongly indicating this was not an acceptable solution or approach. Years 4 and 5 of the effort were spent on incorporating public comments, updating data and models. The models will be the tools used to test various solutions to ensure that no upstream or downstream impacts will result. The public preferred a "bottom-up" approach with broadbased support. In other words, future regional projects would be locally driven to make sure that what was studied would be doable for all concerned. The result was the "Comprehensive Study Interim Report." This report is a guidance document that contains guiding principles, an approach to project development, administrative structure, and how implementation barriers, technical studies and models will be identified/resolved/updated.

Hamilton City is an example of a local project being studied that provides flood protection and ecosystem restoration where benefits outweigh costs.

Currently, Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) is looking at a regional project on the lower Sacramento incorporating flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration and is now meeting with many groups to gather concerns and avoid adverse downstream and upstream impacts.

Bungarz said that he was disappointed that the Comprehensive Study was not more detailed and comprehensive, but understands that that may be the price of a "bottom-up" approach.

For more information please refer to [www.compstudy.org](http://www.compstudy.org)

### **DWR Flood Plain Management Task Force**

Elizabeth Patterson gave a brief update on the DWR Flood Plain Management Task Force and its final report, "California Flood Plain Management." In 2000, Governor Davis signed AB 1147 which directed the creation of a task force to recommend strategies on reducing the impacts of flooding. The Task Force's report includes a number of recommendations grouped according to the following categories: local land use planning information needs; achieving multiple resource management objectives; local assistance; and, barriers, such as funding limits. She said that the Report also made recommendations for changes to the CEQA Guidelines initial study checklist.

Broddrick asked her what was next. She said that as far as agency work is concerned, an interagency floodplain forum might provide a good place for ongoing stakeholder input. Beyond that, the next step for this process is uncertain, the original authority has expired.

Bob Bugg with UC Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program, asked her if consensus was reached on all Task Force recommendations. Patterson said that all recommendations in the Report had consensus backing. She said that one recommendation of concern to her failed to achieve consensus, that being a recommendation for a floodplain corridor; i.e., the area behind the levee, but still part of the floodplain.

Patterson referenced the Task Force's website, <http://fpmtaskforce.water.ca.gov>.

### **CALFED Update**

Eugenia Laychak with CALFED reported that the Bay Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) will be reviewing the development of Year 4 workplans. The Steering Committee (the chairs of all the subcommittees) will meet at the end of January in Sacramento. They will also be working on the development of a finance plan for CALFED.

Shaffer asked Laychak when BDPAC would need to have the Framework recommendations. She replied that they should be ready to present to the BDPAC by late February.

### **3. Review of Draft Framework for Working Landscapes Approach to CALFED Implementation**

Steve Shaffer presented the draft framework as prepared by staff resulting from a meeting of a small group of subcommittee members. He recognized that, as prepared, the document does not appear as a formal BDPAC recommendation. Shaffer presented a page of draft recommendations and suggested they be inserted in the document after the introduction but before the objectives. He also said that it would be appropriate to have the document edited to read more like a "suggested approach".

Kathy Brunetti asked when Proposition 50 funds are expendable. Shaffer said that it is unclear at this time, but the new CALFED Bay Delta Authority needs to be fully functional, which might not be until the next fiscal year.

Bugg asked whether the approach could be applicable to urban and suburban landscapes as well as agricultural landscapes. Ryan Broddrick responded that the CALFED Watershed Program has looked at native plantings and in some instances were included. Bugg also commented that there are scientific uncertainties regarding species use of wildlife corridors. Dave Zezulak responded that science is the driving force of all CALFED actions, including reviews by the

Independent Science Board, peer review of project proposals, monitoring and science. Dan Ray with CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program agreed that corridors do not have the support of underlying science, but the priority watershed projects that include corridors (e.g., Tuolumne and Deer Creek) have been reviewed by the CALFED Independent Science Board, which has deemed wildlife corridors as worthwhile enough to fund as practical science experiments.

Bob Neale with Sustainable Conservation questioned whether the Framework document reflects where we want to go with this effort. He suggested that the Framework select regional priority areas and ask for proposals within them.

Chris Beale, CALFED consultant, agreed but cautioned that there is a fine line between targeting actual areas and selecting projects for funding without a PSP process. Nevertheless, he suggested that the framework identify three to five general project areas. Dan Ray felt that that was consistent with the intent of the drafters of the Framework.

Luana Kiger with NRCS expressed concern that there may be mixed visions of what Patrick Wright suggested to the Subcommittee at the previous meeting. She thought that the document as presented reflects his suggestions. Kiger also said that Farm Bill funding is not secured, and many questions remain regarding implementation of the programs, but that the Framework would be appropriate, as is, to submit to NRCS for Conservation Innovation Grants (a new program in the 2002 Farm Bill).

Broddrick spoke in support of the prepared document and felt that it gave ERP staff sufficient direction. He also said that the recommendations from this subcommittee need to be timely, either this month or next, to be effective.

Dan Ray suggested that the document could solicit for one project in each of the ERP areas, Bay, Sacramento Valley, the Delta and the San Joaquin. He also said that the ERP Program is thinking about doing a number of smaller, staggered solicitations, within which this Framework proposal could fit.

Introduction: Bugg suggested that the document's introduction seemed rather wordy to him and that verbiage be reduced.

Margit Aramburu with the Delta Protection Commission questioned whether a problem statement in the beginning of the document should be added, where the issues and challenges are identified. Shaffer did not feel such a statement was needed.

Brunetti suggested breaking the introduction into two parts: A definition of what we are trying to achieve (i.e., a working landscapes approach to restoration), and the existing funding motivation for the proposal.

*Objectives:* Neale asked if the notion was that a successful project would meet all of the objectives listed. Brodrick replied that the lead-in to the objectives section should make it clear that "one or more" of the objectives should be met for the project to be considered.

Tina Cannon, CDF&G, suggested moving bullet #6 under objectives up to be the first bullet listed, and incorporating the current first bullet into the introduction for the objectives section.

Ray suggested that the objectives section should clearly state that we want to develop three to five landscape-scale "umbrella" project areas. Shaffer agreed.

*Signature Opportunities:* There was confusion about the whether the focus of the Framework is on multiple benefits beyond ERP, whether the focus is on groups or individual landowners, and whether the effort should focus exclusively on "signature opportunities". CALFED ERP uses this term to denote areas where significant investments in ecosystem restoration have already been made. It was suggested that either the term be more clearly defined or omitted from the document.

Ben Wallace, with the Wilderness Coalition, asked if the Framework was focused on Proposition 50 only. Shaffer said that that was the primary focus, but that the Framework should be applicable to other funding sources, as well, and be useful for promoting integration of CALFED programs. Wallace agreed, saying that there are many other programs for individual landowners; this may be an opportunity for multiple programs, not just CALFED ERP "signature opportunity" projects, to work cooperatively towards multiple objectives.

Brunetti requested a definition of "signature opportunities" without the specific list of watershed project examples. Paul Robbins, Yolo County RCD Executive Director, agreed and suggested using a broader definition rather than the term itself; e.g., "areas where there are already success." Jay Chamberlain, Resources Agency Legacy Project, agreed with Robbins and suggested not limiting funded projects to CALFED "signature opportunities" at all.

Shaffer said that the Subcommittee needs to focus on ERP projects because of Proposition 50 language, but at the same time keep the Framework broad enough to be widely applicable to other CALFED programs and other provisions of Proposition 50.

Brodrick suggested eliminating the use of the term, "signature opportunities" altogether and, instead, list a definition of the term in the list of project funding criteria. He agreed with Brunetti, Robbins and Chamberlain that targeted project areas should include prior investments from a variety of sources, not just ERP. He also suggested eliminating the list of "signature opportunities" examples in any event.

*Planning Grants:* Bob Neale questioned whether it was necessary to provide grants to support proposal writing. Jeannie Blakeslee, Department of Conservation wondered what the funding amount might be for proposal preparation; Dan Ray suggested that it might be in the \$10,000 - \$20,000 range. Ray said that CALFED is not currently receiving many quality proposals from landowners; small grants for proposal preparation would go a long way.

Kathy Brunetti with Department of Pesticide Regulation offered that DPR has done a two-stage process for some grants a DPR and it has worked well.

Luana Kiger supported the \$10,000 - \$20,000 amount for planning grants and suggested that a feasibility study component be added to the planning and implementation components of the grant program. She expressed concern about the ability to quickly get funds out the door to support this activity and suggested that the Subcommittee consider an interagency agreement between ERP and DOC to enable DOC to administer the planning grants along with their existing RCD grant programs. She noted that DOC has gained a reputation at processing grants quickly.

Ben Wallace suggested that some groups may not need support for planning and for those that do, they should justify their need.

Chris Beale supported the planning grant concept; he felt that such grants could help with other CALFED grant programs. He also supported the two-stage process, but suggested that it be clear that there are two paths; i.e., planning grants that do not necessarily guarantee full implementation funding, and implementation grants that may or may not be preceded by planning grants.

*Approach:* O'Bryant said that the Framework should be clear on its audience; i.e., is it individual farmers or local groups. Beale responded that the objectives should make this clear, but in his mind the ultimate recipients of the funds should be private landowners, even though it may be local groups who actually apply for, and manage the grant funds on behalf of growers.

*Co-Funding:* Brunetti asked what "Co-funding" meant. Brodrick and Ray explained that that was really referring to the leveraging of other funds, including cash, technical assistance and in-kind contributions. It was agreed to change "co-funding" to "leveraging."

*Examples of Potential Local or Landowner Actions\*:* Neale asked what this heading intended. Shaffer said that the list of practices and actions was intended to be illustrative of the kind of work landowners would participate in as a result of the grants. Patterson suggested that SB 231 projects be included in this list of examples. Neale asked that the purpose of the list be made clear.

Broddrick said that a revised draft will be circulated to the subcommittee in advance of the next meeting, which was set for Thursday, February 6, 2003, from 1:00 - 4:00 pm. Shaffer said that he would be unable to attend, but would ask one of the other CDFA or DOC staff members to fill in for him.

**Public Comment**

None were received.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.