

SB 5 (De Leon) Parks/Water Bond of 2018 Summary

Total: \$3.5 Billion

- \$1.5B for Parks
- \$1.5B for Drought/Water
- \$500M for Flood Protection
- Built and modeled off of SB 317 (De Leon) Park Bond and 2014 Prop 1 Water Bond

General:

- Act shall take effect upon approval by voters
- Act shall be submitted to voters at the June 5, 2018 election
- This act is an urgency statute

Chapter 1. General Provisions

- Up to 5% may be used for administrative costs
- Up to 10% may be used for planning/monitoring (DACs may exceed 10% if determined by agency)
- At least 20% of each chapter, except Chapters 9 and 10, must go to severely disadvantaged communities (below 60% median income)
- At least 15% of Chapters 9 and 10 must go to severely disadvantaged communities
- Up to 5% must be allocated for community access projects
- Preference for projects partnering with a certified conservation corps or similar entity
- Priority for water efficiency, stormwater capture, or carbon sequestration projects

Chapter 2. Investments in Environmental and Social Equity, Enhancing California's Disadvantaged Communities (\$600M)

- \$600M for the creation and expansion of safe neighborhood parks in park-poor neighborhoods (Per Statewide Park Development and Community Revitalization Act of 2008, AB 31)
 - At least 20% shall be for the rehabilitation, repurposing, or substantial improvement of existing infrastructure
 - \$48M for central valley, Inland Empire, gateway, and desert communities

Chapter 3. Investments in Protecting, Enhancing, and Accessing California's Local and Regional Outdoor Spaces (\$30M)

- \$15M for local park rehabilitation and improvement grants to local governments on a per capita basis
- \$15M for grants to cities and districts with less than 200K population within an urbanized county (less than 500K population)
- 20% match required unless a disadvantaged community
- 60% to cities and district that are not regional park districts, on a per capita basis
- 40% to counties and regional park districts, on a per capita basis

Chapter 4. Restoring California's Natural, Historic, and Cultural Legacy (\$100M)

- \$100M for state park restoration and preservation, access, and protection
- Priority for capital improvements that address deferred maintenance

Chapter 5. Trails and Greenway Investment (\$25M)

- \$25M to the NRA for competitive grants to local agencies, state conservancies, Native American tribes, and nonprofits nonmotorized infrastructure that promotes alternative access to parks
- Up to 25% may be for innovative transportation programs that provide outdoor experiences for disadvantaged youth
- 20% match required unless a disadvantaged community

Chapter 6. Rural Recreation, Tourism, and Economic Enrichment Investment (\$20M)

- \$20M for a competitive grant program for cities, counties, and districts in nonurbanized areas (less than 500,000 people and low population densities)
- 20% match required unless a disadvantaged community

Chapter 7. California River Recreation, Creek, and Waterway Improvements Program (\$125M)

- \$125 to the NRA for grants pursuant to the California River Parkway Act of 2004 and the Urban Streams Restoration Program, including projects that protect and enhance urban creeks
 - At least 75M to the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
 - At least 5% to the Santa Ana River Conservancy Program
- 20% match required unless a disadvantaged community
- May give priority to projects that include partnerships with federal, state and local agencies, or projects proposed by nonprofits

Chapter 8. State Conservancy and Authority Funding (\$120M)

- \$40M to the Salton Sea Authority for capital outlay projects that provide air quality and habitat benefits and implement the NRA's Salton Sea Management Program
 - At least \$10M to purposes consistent with the New River Water Quality, Public Health, and River Parkway Development Program
- \$80M to the following conservancies: Baldwin Hills Conservancy, California Tahoe Conservancy, Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy, San Diego River Conservancy, San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy, San Joaquin River Conservancy, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, Sierra Nevada Conservancy
 - Conservancies must develop and adopt a strategic master plan that includes priorities and criteria for selecting projects for funding

Chapter 9. Ocean, Bay, and Coastal Protection (\$80M)

- \$80M to projects that enhance and protect coastal and ocean resources, including:
 - Funding for the California Ocean Protection Trust Fund, priority to projects that conserve, protect, and restore marine wildlife and healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems

- Funding for the State Coastal Conservancy for the protection of beaches, bays, and coastal watershed resources
- 25% for the San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program

Chapter 10. Climate Preparedness, Habitat Resiliency, Resource Enhancement, and Innovation (\$400M)

- \$400M for competitive grants for climate adaptation and resiliency projects. An eligible project must include at least one of the following:
 - Wildlife corridors and open space, including connectivity between habitat areas
 - Promotion of the recovery of threatened and endangered species
 - Improve climate adaptation and resilience of natural systems
 - Improvement of existing open-space corridors and trail linkages related to utility or transportation infrastructure
 - Restoration of rivers and streams in support of fisheries and wildlife
 - Increased implementation of natural community conservation plans adopted pursuant to the Natural Community Conservation Planning Act
 - Operation of wildlife rehabilitation facilities by a nongovernmental entity
 - Wildlife corridors and open space associated with the Pacific Flyway
 - Assistance for coastal communities with adaptation to climate change, including addressing ocean acidification, sea level rise, and protection of habitat associated with the Pacific Flyway
 - Improved agricultural and open-space soil health and improve carbon soil sequestration, erosion control, water quality, and water retention, part of which may go to the DOC
 - Reduced fire risk, improve forest health, and provide feedstock for compost, energy, or alternative fuels facilities
 - A certified conservation corps project
 - Be identified to do one of the following: Protect Native American resources, convert former fossil fuel powerplants, enhance natural resources through improved recreation investments not within the jurisdiction of a state conservancy, develop science centers operated by nonprofits in heavily urbanized communities, or promote various recreation centers
 - Transportation or water resources infrastructure to improve wildlife or fish passage

Chapter 11. Clean Drinking Water and Drought Preparedness (\$1.5B)

- \$375M for drinking water and water quality
- \$375M for Integrated Regional Watershed Plans
- \$375 for recycled water projects
- \$375 for groundwater sustainability

Chapter 11.5. Flood Protection and Repair (\$500M)

- \$300M for flood protection facilities, levee improvements, and related investments; Funding must be matched by local and regional flood protection agencies
- \$100M for Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta levee repairs and restoration
- \$100M for stormwater, mudslide, and other flash-flood-related protections

Chapter 12. Advance Payments for Water Projects

- Procedures for advanced payment for water projects

Chapter 13. Fiscal Provisions

- Fiscal provisions



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Administration Center
25 COUNTY CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 200 - OROVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95965
Telephone: (530) 538-7631

BILL CONNELLY
First District

LARRY WAHL
Second District

MAUREEN KIRK
Third District

STEVE LAMBERT
Fourth District

DOUG TEETER
Fifth District

September 6, 2017

Senator Jim Nielsen
Senate District 4
2635 Forest Avenue
Chico, CA 95928

In Re: Potential 2017 Water Bond

Dear Senator Nielsen,

We would like to take this opportunity to encourage your support for a 2017 Water Bond that includes funding for the continuation of Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM), specifically the Northern Sacramento Valley (NSV) IRWM.

While we understand that the negotiation and conversation regarding the final language of a 2017 Water Bond continues, in our evaluation of the four potential bond measures by our read, only Senate Bill 5 (de Leon) and Assembly Bill 18 (Garcia) contain any funding for IRWMs at this time.

Throughout California, approximately 50 individual IRWMs provide an effective means to coordinate water resource priorities. We have found that the NSV IRWM, which has representation from six Sacramento Valley Counties including, Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Shasta, Sutter and Tehama, has become a valuable tool in response to regional water priorities including the Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan (SGMA). The NSV IRWM provides a monthly forum to discuss regional resource issues and provides an opportunity for educational programs to guide and inform the public on this important law.

The 2017 Butte County state legislative platform supports funding for the NSV IRWM through water bonds and other opportunities. Therefore, the Butte County Board of Supervisors encourage your sponsorship of a 2017 Water Bond only if it includes language that both supports, and funds IRWMs so that we may continue our valuable work through this regional forum.

Sincerely,

Bill Connelly, Chair
Butte County Board of Supervisors

cc:

Assemblyman Eduardo Garcia
Senator Kevin de León
Paul Yoder



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Administration Center
25 COUNTY CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 200 - OROVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95965
Telephone: (530) 538-7631

BILL CONNELLY
First District

LARRY WAHL
Second District

MAUREEN KIRK
Third District

STEVE LAMBERT
Fourth District

DOUG TEETER
Fifth District

September 6, 2017

Assemblyman Brian Dahle
Assembly District 1
P.O. Box 942849
Sacramento, CA 94249-0001

In Re: Potential 2017 Water Bond

Dear Assemblyman Dahle,

We would like to take this opportunity to encourage your support for a 2017 Water Bond that includes funding for the continuation of Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM), specifically the Northern Sacramento Valley (NSV) IRWM.

While we understand that the negotiation and conversation regarding the final language of a 2017 Water Bond continues, in our evaluation of the four potential bond measures by our read, only Senate Bill 5 (de Leon) and Assembly Bill 18 (Garcia) contain any funding for IRWMs at this time.

Throughout California, approximately 50 individual IRWMs provide an effective means to coordinate water resource priorities. We have found that the NSV IRWM, which has representation from six Sacramento Valley Counties including, Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Shasta, Sutter and Tehama, has become a valuable tool in response to regional water priorities including the Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan (SGMA). The NSV IRWM provides a monthly forum to discuss regional resource issues and provides an opportunity for educational programs to guide and inform the public on this important law.

The 2017 Butte County state legislative platform supports funding for the NSV IRWM through water bonds and other opportunities. Therefore, the Butte County Board of Supervisors encourage your sponsorship of a 2017 Water Bond only if it includes language that both supports, and funds IRWMs so that we may continue our valuable work through this regional forum.

Sincerely,

Bill Connelly, Chair
Butte County Board of Supervisors

cc:

Assemblyman Eduardo Garcia
Senator Kevin de León
Paul Yoder



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Administration Center
25 COUNTY CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 200 - OROVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95965
Telephone: (530) 538-7631

BILL CONNELLY
First District

LARRY WAHL
Second District

MAUREEN KIRK
Third District

STEVE LAMBERT
Fourth District

DOUG TEETER
Fifth District

September 6, 2017

Assemblyman James Gallagher
Assembly District 3
P.O. Box 942849
Sacramento, CA 94249-0003

In Re: Potential 2017 Water Bond

Dear Assemblyman Gallagher,

We would like to take this opportunity to encourage your support for a 2017 Water Bond that includes funding for the continuation of Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM), specifically the Northern Sacramento Valley (NSV) IRWM.

While we understand that the negotiation and conversation regarding the final language of a 2017 Water Bond continues, in our evaluation of the four potential bond measures by our read, only Senate Bill 5 (de Leon) and Assembly Bill 18 (Garcia) contain any funding for IRWMs at this time.

Throughout California, approximately 50 individual IRWMs provide an effective means to coordinate water resource priorities. We have found that the NSV IRWM, which has representation from six Sacramento Valley Counties including, Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Shasta, Sutter and Tehama, has become a valuable tool in response to regional water priorities including the Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan (SGMA). The NSV IRWM provides a monthly forum to discuss regional resource issues and provides an opportunity for educational programs to guide and inform the public on this important law.

The 2017 Butte County state legislative platform supports funding for the NSV IRWM through water bonds and other opportunities. Therefore, the Butte County Board of Supervisors encourage your sponsorship of a 2017 Water Bond only if it includes language that both supports, and funds IRWMs so that we may continue our valuable work through this regional forum.

Sincerely,

Bill Connelly, Chair
Butte County Board of Supervisors

cc:

Assemblyman Eduardo Garcia
Senator Kevin de León
Paul Yoder

Short Summary of major programs in Water Supply and Water Quality Bond Act of 2018

Safe drinking water and wastewater treatment for disadvantaged communities. \$750 million.

Provides safe drinking water and wastewater treatment for disadvantaged communities, especially in the Central Valley.

Wastewater recycling. \$400 million. Recycles wastewater mainly for landscaping and industrial uses

Groundwater desalination. \$400 million. Converts salty groundwater to usable water supply.

Urban water conservation. \$300 million. Leak detection, toilet replacement, landscape conversion.

Agricultural water conservation. \$50 million. Improves inefficient irrigation systems, increasing river flows

Central valley flood management, including flood plain restoration. \$100 million. Makes farms and communities more flood safe, and makes flood plains for habitat friendly. Additional \$50 million for retrofit of a reservoir (probably Bullard's Bar) for better flood management.

San Francisco Bay Wetlands and flood improvements. \$200 million. Improves wetlands in San Francisco Bay to provide flood protection and mitigate sea level rise.

Data management. \$60 million. Better data collection and management: streamflow, etc.

Stormwater management \$600 million for a variety of state agencies. Capture and treatment of stormwater flows improved river and ocean water quality and increasing water supplies

Watershed Improvement \$2355 million to a wide variety of state agencies. Pays for better management of watersheds throughout the state to improve water quality and water supply. Includes \$150 million for the Los Angeles River, as well as \$100 million for the Delta Conservancy, which helps fund the governor's Eco-Restore program. Includes \$80 million for the removal of Matilija Dam, a silted-in dam in Ventura County. \$200 million for ecological restoration and dust control at the Salton Sea. Watershed restoration after fires in the Sierra Nevada and elsewhere receives \$100 million. Funds state conservancies and state parks to better manage watersheds.

Land Management for Water Yield. \$100 million. Removal of invasive weeds which use excessive amounts of surface and groundwater such as tamarisk, yellow starthistle, and Arundo. Estimates of water savings are in excess of one million acre feet per year.

Fisheries restoration. \$400 million. Restoring fish habitat. Supplements necessary streamflows.

Groundwater. \$675 million. Implements the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act., stabilizing groundwater levels in overdraft groundwater basins.

Water and specific habitat improvements for fisheries. \$500 million. Purchase of water for fish and waterfowl.

Completion of fish screens in Central Valley. \$100 million. Will prevent baby fish from being diverted into irrigation systems.

San Joaquin River fisheries Restoration. \$100 million. Restoration of Spring Run Chinook Salmon downstream of Friant dam.

Waterfowl habitat. \$280 million. Helps meet waterfowl obligations under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, and other waterfowl habitat improvement programs.

Bay Area Regional Reliability. \$250 million. Improves interconnections between Bay Area water agencies, making it easier to survive droughts.

Improvement to Friant Kern Canal and other Friant water interconnections. \$750 million. Restores lost capacity to Friant Kern Canal, pays for groundwater recharge programs, water conservation and possibly new water conveyance in the Friant area.

Oroville Dam Spillway Repair. \$200 million. Makes Oroville Dam more flood safe.

The initiative also allows state and federal water contractors to recover the funds they pay in climate change charges due to implementation of AB 32, and use those funds in their own systems for water and energy conservation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Why is funding for repair of Oroville Dam included in the Water Supply and Water Quality Initiative?

The Corps of Engineers paid for the flood control elements of Oroville Dam in the 1960's. Including flood control at Oroville was detrimental to the State Water Project (SWP). From the point of view of the SWP, keeping Oroville full (no flood reservation) would improve water supply, energy production, recreation and fish and wildlife preservation (improved cold water pool). Including flood control was something Pat Brown insisted on, after his experience with the Feather River flood of 1955.

The State Water Project contractors were never responsible for flood control, since they are actually harmed by its inclusion in the Oroville project. There is no logical reason they should have to pay for flood control at Oroville.

The state's failure to properly design and maintain the flood control features (spillway and auxiliary spillway) should not impose costs on the State Water Project contractors. The Federal Emergency Management Agency will pay for part of these costs, but the rest will be state costs. The final cost of flood control repairs will be around one billion dollars. The State Contractors will be forced to bear part of these costs, but it is certainly reasonable for the state general fund to share some of these costs. In many previous bond acts, the state general fund has always been the source of state flood control money.

Research and Technology Funds in the Water Supply and Water Quality Bond Act for November 2018

The bond act promotes scientific research to discover new ways of using water more efficiently.

DWR, State Water Board and University research

86048. The sum of sixty million dollars (\$60,000,000) is appropriated from the Fund for water measurement and information systems, as follows:

(a) The sum of twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) is appropriated to the department for development of methods and installation of water measuring equipment to improve estimates of water balance, water budgets, diversions and water use to support water allocations, drought management, groundwater management, water quality management and water rights.

(b) The sum of ten million dollars (\$10,000,000) is appropriated to the State board for development of information systems, technologies, and data that improve the State board's ability to manage water rights. These systems will include, but not be limited to, digitizing and making available the 10 million pages of paper records on water rights within the State board and in other repositories and the creation of a digital repository for water diversion and use data.

(c) The sum of ten million dollars (\$10,000,000) is appropriated to the Water Data Administration Fund established pursuant to Section 12420, to be used by the department in consultation with the State board for the purpose of making California water information interoperable, consistent with Part 4.9 of Division 6 of the Water Code.

(d) The sum of twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) is appropriated as follows:

(1) Five million dollars (\$5,000,000) is appropriated to the University of California for its multi-campus Water Security and Sustainability Research Initiative to develop core elements of a water resources information system, in cooperation with the department and the State board.

(2) Five million dollars (\$5,000,000) is appropriated to the California Water Institute at California State University, Fresno to undertake research leading to improvement and conservation of water supplies and improved water quality in California.

(3) Five million dollars (\$5,000,000) is appropriated to the Irrigation Training and Research Center at California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo to undertake research leading to improvement and conservation of water supplies and improved water quality in California.

(4) Five million dollars (\$5,000,000) is appropriated to the Office of Water Programs at California State University, Sacramento to undertake research leading to improvement and conservation of water supplies and improved water quality in California.

(5) The institutions of higher education receiving funds pursuant to this paragraph shall work together to assure that their efforts do not conflict or overlap, but are complementary to each other.

Watershed restoration research

86080 (a) Two hundred million dollars (\$200,000,000) to the Sierra Nevada Conservancy for the protection, restoration and improvement of Sierra Nevada watersheds, pursuant to Division 23.3 (commencing with Section 33300) of the Public Resources Code and including the purposes outlined in Section 33320 of the Public Resources Code. Funds shall also be spent for the implementation and to further the goals and purposes of the Sierra Nevada Watershed Improvement Program. **Projects eligible for funding under the Sierra Nevada Watershed Improvement Program may include research and monitoring to measure the impact of forest restoration work on water supply, climate and other benefits, including long-term air quality, water quality and quantity, greenhouse gas emissions, carbon storage, habitat, recreational uses, and community vitality.** Projects funded under the Sierra Nevada watershed Improvement Program shall be based on the best available science regarding forest restoration and must be undertaken to improve water supply and quality, protect and restore ecological values and to promote forest conditions that are more resilient to wildfire, climate change, and other disturbances. The Sierra Nevada Conservancy may make grants to federal agencies if it determines such grants are the most efficient way to implement the intent of this division on federally managed lands.

UC Natural Reserve research

86080 (w) The sum of twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000) to the University of California for the Natural Reserve System for matching grants for land acquisition and for the construction and development of facilities that will be used for research and training to improve the management of aquatic ecosystems, natural lands and the preservation or conservation of California's wildlife resources. Priority shall be given to projects that advance research on the impacts of climate change, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and adaptation of natural systems to the impacts of climate change.

Groundwater sustainability research by DWR

86111 (b) Of the funds authorized by this section, the sum of five million dollars (\$5,000,000) shall be available for research to guide investments made pursuant to this section. Research activities may include, but are not limited to, geophysical surveys, system-level modeling and analysis, development of novel methods and tools that can be applicable to local decision-making, cross-sector economic and policy analysis of novel recharge methods, and development of new approaches to significantly enhance groundwater recharge and fit-for-purpose water treatment and reuse.

All programs can spend up to 1% of the funds allocated to research

86161. (c) Up to one percent (1%) of funds allocated for each program funded by this division may be expended for research into methods to improve water supply, water related habitat, and water quality relevant to that program, in addition to any other amounts provided for in this division.

All programs must promote advanced technology

86178. Agencies implementing this division shall give special consideration to projects that employ new or innovative technology or practices, including decision support tools that support the integration of multiple strategies and jurisdictions, including, but not limited to, water supply, wildfire reduction, habitat improvement, invasive weed control, flood control, land use, and sanitation.

Wastewater recycling advanced technology

86020. The sum of four hundred million dollars (\$400,000,000) is appropriated from the Fund to the State board to award grants and loans to eligible entities as defined in subdivision (a) of Section 86166 on a competitive basis for wastewater recycling projects. Grants pursuant to this section may be made for all of the following:

(a) Water recycling projects, including, but not limited to, treatment, storage, conveyance, brine disposal, and distribution facilities for potable and nonpotable recycling projects.

(b) Dedicated distribution infrastructure to serve residential, commercial, agricultural, fish and wildlife habitat, and industrial end-user retrofit projects to allow use of recycled water.

(c) Pilot projects for new potable reuse and contaminant removal technology.

(d) Multi-benefit recycled water projects that improve water quality.

(e) Multi-benefit recycled water projects that protect, conserve and restore wetland and other wildlife habitat.

(f) Technical assistance and grant writing assistance related to specific projects for disadvantaged communities and economically distressed areas.

Water conservation technology research

86031. The sum of fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000) is appropriated from the Fund to the California Energy Commission for the Water Energy Technology Program to accelerate the deployment of innovative water and energy saving technologies and help continue to make water conservation a California way of life.

Promotion of advanced technology

86178. Agencies implementing this division shall give special consideration to projects that employ new or innovative technology or practices, including decision support tools that support the integration of multiple strategies and jurisdictions, including, but not limited to, water supply, wildfire reduction, habitat improvement, invasive weed control, flood control, land use, and sanitation.

Climate resiliency benefits of Water Supply and Water Quality Bond Act of 2018

The bond act responds to the challenges of climate change in three important ways

- A. Providing a water supply which is minimally impacted by climate change
- B. Providing flood management programs which can respond to sea level rise and change precipitation patterns.
- C. Protecting and creating fish and wildlife habitat which will survive the impacts of a changed climate.

Water supply

The bond acts funds water supply projects which can withstand changed precipitation patterns caused by climate change. They include

1. Wastewater recycling. Wastewater is a water supply which changes little from year to year, regardless of how much it rains or snows.
2. Desalting saline groundwater. This supply is not affected by climate change.
3. Water Conservation. Reducing demand makes all water supplies go further in dry years, which may increase with climate change.
4. Restoring capacity of flood control dams and allowing them to be used for water supply. This will increase water supply in all types of years: wet or dry.
5. Reducing water use by getting rid of invasive plants like Giant Reed, Tamarisk, and Yellow Starthistle. These benefits will even increase in warmer years, since otherwise these plants will use even more water in warmer years, and will invade new habitats as the climate warms
6. Capturing stormwater for beneficial use. As storm frequency and intensity increases, these projects will provide more and more benefits.
7. Better watershed management will improve the quantity and quality of water running off the Sierra Nevada and other watersheds. These watersheds provide much of California's water supply. This is especially important in a warmer and more variable climate.

Flood management

By providing funding for expansion of flood plains in several categories, the higher flows (especially in winter) expected to result from climate change will be more easily accommodated. Altering flood control dams to better capture and control high flood flows will improve flood control, and also respond to expected higher flood flows. The San Francisco Bay allocation will build wetlands which can buffer the effects of rising sea level.

Fish and Wildlife resiliency

The bond act provides funding for a wide variety of categories which can be used for fish and wildlife habitat protection, restoration, and enhancement. Wildlife will have a difficult time dealing with warmer temperatures, a more variable precipitation regime, and habitat conversion resulting from climate change. By providing money in many categories for fish and wildlife enhancement, the bond act will protect, create, and restore the types of habitat which fish and wildlife need to adapt to a warmer and more variable climate.