

**CALFED Bay-Delta Program  
Working Landscapes Subcommittee  
December 5, 2002  
California Department of Food and Agriculture, Room A-477  
1:30 – 5:00 pm**

**Draft Meeting Summary**

*Subcommittee web site:*

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

The meeting summary for the November 7, 2002 meeting were approved.

Co-Chair Report

Ryan Brodrick updated the Subcommittee on the Bay Delta Public Advisory Subcommittee (BDPAC) meeting, which was held the day before. He reported that the BDPAC had officially accepted the Subcommittee's recommended goals and action items that were forwarded to BDPAC by the Subcommittee at its September 2002 meeting.

Brodrick reported that the 50 percent federal cost-share for CALFED is awaiting reauthorization from Congress. He noted that current funding is sufficient for two years (beginning with 2004) with help from Proposition 50. He also reported that the State Water Resources Control Board is working to combine its water quality program Request for Proposals process with CALFED's Ecosystem Restoration Program project solicitation process. Brodrick stressed that it is also important for the Subcommittee to integrate its work with the Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP) and other CALFED programs to accomplish its goals.

Agency Reports

**Department of Fish and Game:** Dave Zezulak offered no report.

**Department of Food and Agriculture:** Shaffer offered no report.

**Department of Conservation:** Dennis O'Bryant offered no report.

**Delta Protection Commission:** Margit Aramburu reported that the Delta Protection Commission's proposal to create a Delta license plate and fund was rejected by the Governor's Office. She noted that interest in the region for such a plate was high.

**CALFED: Proposition 50.** Patrick Wright, Director for CALFED requested the Subcommittee's ideas for use of the Proposition 50 ERP funds. He emphasized that the CALFED Working Landscapes Subcommittee can have an influential role on the development of recommendations for the use of Proposition 50 CALFED ERP funds. He said that it is important to put together a strategy soon in order to influence the administrative and legislative allocation of the funds.

Tom Zuckerman recommended that CDFA be assigned responsibility for administering the agricultural restoration (\$20 million) portion of the Proposition 50 bond funds. Aramburu replied that this may be problematic as Proposition 50 assigns responsibility for administering these

funds to ERP and the Department of Fish and Game is the state lead for implementing CALFED ERP.

Patrick Wright also questioned CDFA's role in administering the bond funds given its lack of a suitable program to do so. He doubted that there would be any support for creating a new program in the current budget climate. Wright suggested Department of Conservation as a better location for new agricultural conservation funds because of its existing conservation programs. O'Bryant responded that while it is true that DOC has agricultural land conservation programs, none are direct landowner assistance type programs.

Dave Zezulak noted that CDFG has landowner programs under the Presley wetlands program, which currently have four staff members working on creating habitat values on agricultural land. Tina Cannon also pointed to the work CDFG is doing on the North Central Valley Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program.

Ben Wallace and Bob Neale emphasized the importance of the funds to leverage Farm Bill funding in California. Wallace noted that NRCS is traditionally understaffed and could be a bottleneck in getting Farm Bill funding on the ground. He felt that the Subcommittee should explore using Proposition 50 funding to match and leverage more Farm Bill Conservation funding. Neale added that RCDs and landowners are going to need permit assistance to take full advantage of the Farm Bill, a form of assistance that could be supported by Proposition 50.

Ryan Broddrick restated that the objective of the Proposition 50 funding is to get working landscape concepts on the ground with projects that contribute to CALFED objectives. He said that the Subcommittee should not replicate existing programs, but attempt to integrate the achievement of multiple CALFED program goals in a way that works for agricultural landowners.

Ken Roberts suggested that the discussion focus on what the highest priorities should be rather than on the administrative vehicle used to achieve them.

Julia Berry, American Farmland Trust, recommended coordination with the Central Valley Habitat Joint Venture.

Bill Geyer suggested taking the approach that was initially taken with AB 1398 last year; i.e. focus conservation assistance programs on Williamson Act lands. He said that it was the strategy to not only invest in conservation on lands where the investment would be protected for at least 10 years, but also to provide an incentive for other landowners to enroll in the Williamson Act in order to take advantage of the conservation assistance. He argued that such funding and technical assistance should support conjunctive agricultural and wildlife uses on an annual income basis (habitat as a crop) rather than in the form of one-time payments.

Shaffer agreed that funds should be targeted to individual landowners to demonstrate how they can earn a living by integrating normal farming operations with actions that further CALFED goals. Zuckerman concurred, emphasizing that the funds must get conservation on the ground.

Chris Beale said that there is a CALFED-funded project with the Yolo County RCD that is attempting to demonstrate the income approach suggested by Geyer and Shaffer to conservation.

Geyer proposed demonstrating the use of SB 231 to provide “safe harbor” for participating landowners. He noted that he was told that USFWS would find a way to make SB 231 work. Beale agreed and felt that there will be opportunities to demonstrate Geyer’s ideas.

Zuckerman recommended that the Subcommittee direct its participating CALFED agencies to return to the next meeting with its ideas for the use of Proposition 50 funds.

Wright proposed that the Subcommittee consider using the \$20 million from Proposition 50 to make the Subcommittee’s Goal 1 (i.e., supporting projects that demonstrate a working landscape approach) a reality by focusing on specific project areas, such as the Sacramento, Delta and San Joaquin. He mentioned the Sacramento River Conservation Area as an example of local entity that could respond to a call for project ideas.

Broddrick suggested that a small workgroup meet with Subcommittee staff to formulate an approach in response the Wright’s challenge. Ben Wallace, Bob Neale, Julia Berry, Dave Zezulak, Dan Ray, Bill Geyer, and Jeannie Blakeslee volunteered to serve on the small group, which agreed to meet within the next two weeks to develop a draft proposed strategy to capitalize on available funding in response to Wright’s call

Shaffer said that he would work with his staff to set up an e-mail reflector list for the work of the small group.

Wright encouraged the small group not to limit their thinking to just the \$20 million in Proposition 50, but to focus on what is needed -- what the Subcommittee wants -- regardless of funding.

#### Working Landscape Subcommittee Description

Shaffer noted that the latest draft of the description was sent out prior to the meeting. He asked for comments on the Subcommittee background, *working landscape* definition and vision statements.

Henry Rodegerdts offered a number of edits to wording, which were accepted. Wallace, Neale and Geyer expressed concerns that the vision statement and definition overlapped. Wallace asked if the *working landscape* definition was intended to be a “dictionary” definition or a definition specific to the Subcommittee’s work. Shaffer said it was intended to be the latter, and that the definition introduction would be changed to make clear its intended application. Wallace suggested that the vision be edited so that it read consistently in the present rather than future tense.

The vision, mission, objectives, Subcommittee background and *working landscape* definition were adopted by consensus. Eugenia Laychak, CALFED, said that these items of the Subcommittee description could now be circulated to the CALFED e-mail list for program managers and their staff to review.

O’Bryant introduced the Subcommittee performance measures, noting that the measures circulated prior to the meeting were not proposed as actual measures for adoption, but only as examples of the level of detail and kind of measures that could be adopted that would conform to a notion of measures that are outcomes, not outputs. He said that the important point was that the measures include timeframes and numbers to define success. He said that whatever measures and numbers are considered, they should be able to pass the “so what” test.

Shaffer said that the performance measures should be discussed and adopted as an integral part of the Subcommittee's action plan. He suggested that given the short time left of the meeting, work on the performance measures and action plan should be deferred to the next meeting with immediate efforts dedicated to fleshing out a draft proposal for Proposition 50 funding, per Wright's request. It was agreed that discussion of performance measures and the action plan would be taken up at the January 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Subcommittee, along with the draft proposal for working landscape project identification and funding.

Rodegerdts requested that the action plan attached to the Subcommittee description needed to be folded into the two-page action plan summary so that there is only one action plan document from which to work. Shaffer said that that would be done for the next meeting.

Shaffer said that CDFA would convene the identified small group to work on specific funding proposals in response to Wright's request.

The next meeting was scheduled for January 9<sup>th</sup>. In addition to the action plan, performance measures and draft funding proposal, Shaffer said that there would be a presentation on the CALFED Science Board, and another by John Passerello on the Comprehensive Flood Management Plan.

#### Public Comment

John Passerello announced that the Comprehensive Study's Lower Sacramento regional planning was underway with the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency providing part of the funding.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:45 P.M.