

1998 ANNUAL REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

SAFE, CLEAN, RELIABLE WATER SUPPLY ACT 1996

PROPOSITION 204

The Resources Agency and Department of Water Resources

Safe, Clean, Reliable Water Supply Act 1996/Proposition 204
1998 Annual Report to the Legislature Summary

	Bond Authorization	*Total Expenditures & Obligations	Remaining Balance
The Delta Improvement Account (\$193,000,000)			
Central Valley Project Improvement Sub-Account (Department of Water Resources and Fish & Game)	93,000,000	61,950,000	31,050,000
Bay-Delta Agreement (CAT. III) Sub-Account (Resources Agency)	60,000,000	47,245,464	12,754,536
Delta Levee Rehabilitation Sub-Account (Water Resources)	25,000,000	25,000,000	0
South Delta Barriers Sub-Account (Water Resources)	10,000,000	10,000,000	0
Delta Recreation Sub-Account (Parks & Recreation)	2,000,000	2,000,000	0
CALFED Sub-Account (Water Resources)	3,000,000	3,000,000	0
Clean Water & Water Recycle Account (\$10,000,000)			
Lake Tahoe Water Quality Sub-Account (Resources Agency)	10,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Water Supply Reliability Account (\$117,000,000)			
Feasibility Projects Sub-Account (Water Resources)	10,000,000	10,000,000	0
Water Conservation & Groundwater Recharge Sub-Account (Water Resources)	30,000,000	30,000,000	0
Local Projects Sub-Account (Water Resources)	25,000,000	1,086,398	23,913,602
Sacramento Valley Water Management & Habitat Protection Measure Sub-Account (Water Resources)	25,000,000	13,341	24,986,659
River Parkway Sub-Account Water Resources and Resources Agency (\$27,000,000)			
River Parkway Program (Water Resources)	700,000	700,000	0
California Tahoe Conservancy Sub-Account (Resources Agency)	1,000,000	1,000,000	0
Wildlife Conservation Board Sub-Account (Resources Agency)	11,143,000	11,143,000	0
State Coastal Conservancy Sub-Account (Resources Agency)	7,000,000	7,000,000	0
Department of Parks and Recreation Sub-Account (Resources Agency)(Parks & Recreation)	2,157,000	1,157,000	1,000,000
Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy Sub-Account (Resources Agency)	5,000,000	5,000,000	0
The Bay-Delta Ecosystem Account (Resources Agency) (\$390,000,000)	390,000,000	0	390,000,000
Flood Control & Prevention Account (Water Resources) (\$60,000,000)	60,000,000	59,442,000	558,000
Totals for DWR, DPR & Resources Agency	770,000,000	280,737,203	489,262,797
*Water Resources Control Board (\$225,000,000)	225,000,000		
Total Authorization	995,000,000		

December 21, 1998
Filename:P204LEG

**CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT IMPROVEMENT SUBACCOUNT
(Water Resources) (Department of Fish and Game)**

Bonds Authorized: \$93,000,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$61,950,000
Remaining Balance: \$31,050,000

1. Proposition 204 Expenditures

a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what was the amount appropriated per project?

1. Contra Costa Canal Fish Screen	\$2,500,000
2. Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District Fish Screen	\$5,000,000
3. Spawning Gravel Restoration (Sacramento, American, & Stanislaus Rivers)	\$ 950,000
4. Clear Creek Restoration	\$1,500,000
5. China Islands Unit Refuge Facility	\$1,000,000
6. Anadromous Fish Screen Projects	\$14,000,000
7. CALFED Projects	\$ 6,000,000
8. Shasta Dam	\$15,000,000
9. Red Bluff Diversion Dam	\$15,000,000
Administrative Expenditures	\$1,000,000

Total \$61,950,000

b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

All fundable projects under this subaccount are mandated by the CVPIA and specified in Section 3406 of the Act. The U. S. Bureau of Reclamation and Fish and Wildlife Service are responsible for scheduling and carrying out the projects.

c. How does each project contribute to objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204?

These projects contribute to Proposition 204 objectives of restoring ecological health for native fish and wildlife and their natural habitats, and developing lasting water solutions that balance the needs of the State's economy and its environment. Indirectly, they contribute to the goal of providing a safe, clean, affordable, and sufficient water supply to meet the needs of California residents, farms, and businesses. All of these projects are CVPIA-mandated environmental restoration actions. Proposition 204 requires that funds from this subaccount be used to pay for the State's share of cost for these projects.

2. Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount and Central Valley Project Improvement Subaccount:

a. How does the project contribute to the health of the Bay-Delta ecosystem in the short-term?

The fish passage and screening projects are intended to reduce the adverse effects of water diversions to fish and other aquatic organisms. These projects will help to reduce losses of aquatic organisms through entrainment and predation in water diversion structures, assist in the recovery of State and federally listed fish species, and improve the Bay-Delta aquatic foodweb. The spawning gravel restoration projects will replace spawning habitats of anadromous fish lost through construction of water and conveyance facilities. These projects will provide short-term solution to the recovery of the species and overall health of the Bay-Delta ecosystem.

- b. How is the project consistent with the CALFED long-term plan (ERPP), and how does the project contribute to the improvement of the Bay-Delta ecosystem in the long-term?

All of these projects will provide long-term solution to the recovery of the species and over all health of the Bay-Delta ecosystem. The selected projects will contribute to CALFED goals for water quality, water supply reliability, and system integrity. These projects will restore the ecological health for native fish and wildlife and their natural habitats, and develop lasting water solutions that contribute to the goals of providing safe, clean, affordable and sufficient water supply.

- c. What is the federal contribution and any local or nonprofit contributions to the project?

The federal contribution for each project shown in (a) is 75% of the total project cost and the non-federal contribution is 25% with the exception of Clear Creek which is evenly split. For the anadromous fish screening projects, the local agency owning the diversion contributes half of the State's share, or 12.5% of the total project cost.

- d. What is the method for evaluating each project or programmatic investment for both short-term or long-term success?

USBR and USFWS are responsible for evaluating project performance. For short-term, the success of the projects are determined by measuring their performance against design criteria. For long-term, success is measured by monitoring the extent of recovery of fish and other aquatic organisms and the overall health of the Central Valley and Bay-Delta ecosystem.

**BAY-DELTA AGREEMENT (CAT.III) SUBACCOUNT
(Resources Agency)**

**Bonds Authorized: \$60,000,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$47,245,464
Remaining Allotment: \$12,754,536**

1.

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what was the amount appropriated per project?

Selected projects are listed in the first column of the table that follows this narrative. The second column identifies amount allocated from the Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount for each project.

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

Applicants and sponsors for selected projects are listed in the third column of the table. Recommendations are not listed because each applicant recommended that its project be approved.

- c. How does each project contribute to the objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204?

Proposition 204 has six explicit objectives (Water Code 78500.4). Among these objectives is "to restore ecological health for native fish and wildlife, and their natural habitats, including wetlands." All projects selected for funding from the Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount contribute to this ecological health objective. The fourth column of the table describes how each selected project contributes to the objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204.

2.

- a. How does the project contribute to the health of the Bay-Delta ecosystem in the short-term?

The Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount Funds State costs for Category III ecosystem restoration activities. These are near-term restoration projects not related to adjustments of water flow in the Bay-Delta watershed. Because these are near-term restoration projects, each project contributes to the health the ecosystem in the short-term in exactly the same way that each project contributes to Proposition 204 goals.

- b. How is the project consistent with the CALFED long-term plan (ERPP), and how does the project contribute to improvement of the Bay-Delta ecosystem in the long-term?

The fifth column of the table describes how each selected project is consistent with the Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan (ERPP) and

thereby contributes to improvement of the Bay-Delta ecosystem in the long-term. The ERPP uses the term "target" to describe a qualitative or quantitative statement of an implementation objective; targets are tools to guide the effort to restore ecosystem health.

In addition to long-term benefits to the Bay-Delta ecosystem, many of the selected projects also contribute to CALFED goals for water quality, water supply reliability, and levee system integrity. For example, the Twitchell Island's wetlands restoration project also helps reduce subsidence. Reducing subsidence in the Delta is an important component of the levee program, and due to Twitchell Island's location in the Delta, maintaining its levee is vital to protection of Delta water quality and water supplies.

- c. What is the federal contribution and any local or nonprofit contributions to the project?

The sixth column of the table identifies the federal contribution to each project, and the seventh column identifies the local or non-profit contributions to each project funded from the Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount.

An explanation is in order for those projects not receiving matching funding from federal, local, or non-profit sources. Proposition 204 requires the State, to the greatest extent possible, to secure federal and nonfederal matching funds to implement the Category III near-term ecosystem restoration program. However, Proposition 204 does not require matching funding for each individual project. Four separate funding sources are available to finance Category III near-term ecosystem restoration projects through the CALFED process:

- \$ 10 million from the California Urban Water Agencies.
- \$430 million from the Federal Bay-Delta Act (P.L. 104-208).
- \$ 2 million from the US Environmental Protection Agency.
- \$ 60 million from the Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount (Prop. 204)

Of the \$430 million authorized in P.L. 104-280, Congress has appropriated \$160 million: \$85 million in federal fiscal year 1998 and \$75 million in federal fiscal year 1999.

The State and Federal governments have entered into a cost-sharing agreement that commits the State and Federal governments to equal shares of expenses over the life of the cost-sharing agreement that expires in September 2001.

The table reflects information for projects that have received funding from the Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount. Some of these projects are funded exclusively from the Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount, while others are receiving combined funding from the subaccount and from other sources. Projects listed in the table with no matching funds are being funded exclusively from the Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount. The table does not

reflect information for Category III projects funded without a contribution from Proposition 204's Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount.

- d. What is the method for evaluating each project or programmatic investment for both short-term and long-term?

CALFED agencies, with the help of interested parties, are evaluating implementation of each project by reviewing that project's quarterly financial and programmatic or progress reports. For consistency in reporting, each CALFED agency has reviewed its contract reporting requirements to make those requirements compatible with the requirements of other participating agencies. CALFED has established regular reporting and tracking mechanisms to evaluate the progress of each project. In addition, CALFED has established procedures to ensure that the ecological objectives of each project are being met.

Applicants for funding from the Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount have provided CALFED agencies with descriptions of their proposed monitoring and evaluation activities. The CALFED agencies have established a peer review process to evaluate these monitoring plans. Where necessary, CALFED seeks adjustments to applicants' monitoring and evaluation activities to achieve consistency with data reported from other sources and to ensure that reported data is useful in an ecosystem-wide evaluation. This peer review process is part of the larger Comprehensive Monitoring, Research, and Assessment Program (CMARP) being developed by CALFED to track the implementation and effectiveness of all CALFED programs, including the ecosystem restoration program element.

In general, methods for evaluation operate on two levels: 1) evaluation of implementation and 2) evaluation of the effects of implementation. CALFED agencies evaluate implementation by reviewing projects' financial and progress reports. These reports are submitted quarterly.

In addition, CALFED agencies will evaluate the effects of implementation (that is, effects on ecosystem functions) by reviewing two related sets of data: 1) each project's ecosystem reports and 2) overall ecosystem status reports. In addition to quarterly financial and progress reports discussed above, each project is submitting data related to the part of the ecosystem that it is seeking to improve. For example, for fish screen improvements, reportable data include the results of monitoring of the screened water diversion to determine if fish are being screened, monitoring the efficiency of the screen over time, monitoring the number of screens installed, assessing localized changes in species populations, and evaluating the efficiency of different screen designs. To ensure that reported data is useful in evaluating the status of the Bay-Delta ecosystem, CALFED agencies are working with interested parties to refine long-standing evaluation methodologies, such as that used by the Interagency Ecological Program.

Project Description	Amount allocated from Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount	Applicant	Contribution to Prop. 204 objectives	Consistency with ERPP/contribution to long-term improvement of Bay-Delta ecosystem	Federal contribution	Local or non-profit contribution (includes all non-federal govt. agencies)
Sacramento River & Tributary Fish Screens	\$374,850 ¹	Department of Fish and Game	improves fish survival by reducing entrainment from pumps	Addresses 2 ERPP targets for water diversion	\$0	\$151,000
Assessment and implementation of urban use reduction of diazion and chlorpyrifos (Sacramento County)	\$663,500	Sacramento Area Stormwater Permittees	improves fish survival by reducing herbicides and other toxic agents in urban runoff	Addresses 2 ERPP targets for contaminants	\$0	\$193,000
Watershed management planning - Upper Sacramento River	\$200,000	Department of Water Resources	improves survival of multiple species by implementing riparian ecosystem restoration	Addresses 2 ERPP targets for stream meander corridors, 1 for natural floodplain and flood processes, and 3 for riparian and riverine aquatic habitats	\$0	\$0
Sacramento River floodplain acquisition - natural process restoration	\$9,879,800	Wildlife Conservation Board, US Fish & Wildlife Service, the Nature Conservancy	improves survival of multiple species by protecting riparian corridor	Addresses 2 ERPP targets for stream meander corridors, 1 for natural floodplain and flood processes, and 3 for riparian and riverine aquatic habitats	\$0	\$0

¹ project reduced in cost because one fish screen no longer needed.

Project Description	Amount allocated from Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount	Applicant	Contribution to Prop. 204 objectives	Consistency with ERPP/contribution to long-term improvement of Bay-Delta ecosystem	Federal contribution	Local or non-profit contribution (includes all non-federal govt. agencies)
Sacramento River floodplain acquisition - active riparian forest restoration	\$1,292,500	Wildlife Conservation Board, US Fish & Wildlife Service, the Nature Conservancy	improves survival of multiple species by restoring native riparian forest	Addresses 1 ERPP target for riparian and riverine aquatic habitats	\$0	\$2,000,000
Sacramento River meander restoration project	\$898,700	The Nature Conservancy	improves survival of multiple species by restoring riparian habitat	Addresses 2 ERPP targets for stream meander corridors, 1 for natural floodplain and flood processes, and 3 for riparian and riverine aquatic habitats	\$0	\$0
Watershed Restoration planning (Placer County)	\$222,530	County of Placer	improves survival of steelhead and other species by planning restoration of aquatic habitats	Addresses 1 ERPP target for upper watershed processes	\$0	\$0
Butte Creek acquisition and riparian restoration	\$186,128	CSU, Chico	improves survival of spring run salmon and steelhead by restoring riparian habitat	Addresses 1 ERPP target for natural sediment supply, stream meander corridor, and riparian and riverine aquatic habitats	\$125,000	\$135,000
Cottonwood Creek channel restoration	\$61,000	Graham Matthews & Associates	improves survival of anadromous fish by planning restoration of riparian habitat	Addresses 1 ERPP target for natural sediment supply, stream meander corridor, and riparian and riverine aquatic habitats	\$0	\$10,000
Mill Creek riparian restoration - Phase II	\$69,000	Mill Creek Conservancy, The Nature Conservancy	improves survival of spring run salmon and steelhead by restoring riparian belt	Addresses 1 ERPP target for riparian and riverine aquatic habitats	\$169,400	\$0

Project Description	Amount allocated from Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount	Applicant	Contribution to Prop. 204 objectives	Consistency with ERPP/contribution to long-term improvement of Bay-Delta ecosystem	Federal contribution	Local or non-profit contribution (includes all non-federal govt. agencies)
Monitoring of Delta contaminants	\$100,000	San Francisco Baykeeper	improves survival of Delta resident and anadromous fish by monitoring toxicity in Delta and east side tributaries	Addresses 2 ERPP targets for contaminants	\$0	\$20,000
Effects of wetlands restoration on methyl mercury levels	\$546,171 ²	UC Davis	provides benefits to species affected by bioaccumulation of methyl mercury	Addresses 1 ERPP target for contaminants	\$0	\$0
Contaminant effects on smelt	\$437,000	UC Davis	improves survival of delta smelt	Addresses 1 ERPP target for contaminants and 1 for Delta smelt	\$0	\$0
Jepson Prairie restoration	\$244,000	Solano County Farmlands, Open Space Foundation	improves survival of all native Delta fish by restoring riverine aquatic habitat	Addresses 2 ERPP targets for riparian and riverine aquatic habitats and 1 for perennial grassland	\$0	\$0
In Channel Island demonstration project	\$270,270	Association of Bay Area Governments	improves survival of Delta native fishes by restoring habitat	Addresses 1 ERPP target for midchannel islands and shoals	\$0	\$91,000
Franks Tract wetlands habitat restoration	\$231,500	Moffatt and Nichol Engineers, Department of Parks and Recreation, Department of Water Resources	improves survival of Delta native fishes by restoring tidal perennial aquatic habitat	Addresses 1 ERPP target for midchannel islands and shoals, for riparian and riverine aquatic habitats, and for tidal perennial aquatic habitat	\$0	\$370,000

² minor project amendment for additional equipment cost.

Project Description	Amount allocated from Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount	Applicant	Contribution to Prop. 204 objectives	Consistency with ERPP/contribution to long-term improvement of Bay-Delta ecosystem	Federal contribution	Local or non-profit contribution (includes all non-federal govt. agencies)
Tyler Island levee protection and habitat restoration pilot project	\$885,202	Habitat Assessment & Restoration Team, Inc.	improves survival of salmon and steelhead and other Delta native fishes by restoring riverine aquatic habitat	Addresses 1 ERPP target for riparian and riverine aquatic habitats, and for tidal perennial aquatic habitat	\$0	\$0
Cosumnes floodplain acquisition and restoration	\$7,185,100 ³	Wildlife Conservation Board, The Nature Conservancy	improves survival of San Joaquin fall run salmon, splittail, and migratory birds by restoring riparian and wetlands habitat	Addresses 1 ERPP target for greater sandhill cranes, for natural floodplain and flood processes, and for riparian and riverine aquatic habitats	\$3,500,000	\$7,800,000
Mokelumne River setback levee and habitat restoration	\$365,000	Reclamation District 2110	improves survival of salmon and steelhead by restoring riparian habitat	Addresses 2 ERPP targets for riparian and riverine aquatic habitat and 1 for levees	\$0	\$0
Bay Point Shoreline Restoration Plan	\$185,000	East Bay Regional Park District	improves survival of multiple species by restoring saline tidal wetlands	Addresses 1 ERPP target for saline wetlands	\$0	\$53,900
Martinez Regional shoreline restoration	\$325,000	East Bay Regional Park District	improves survival of multiple species by restoring saline tidal wetlands	Addresses 1 ERPP target for saline wetlands	\$0	\$67,375
Preventing exotic introductions from ballast water	\$222,830	UC Sea Grant Extension Program	improves survival of multiple species by educating the maritime industry and others on negative effects of exotic species introductions	Addresses 1 ERPP target for invasive aquatic organisms	\$0	\$63,885

³ amount reduced; federal funds covered part of project cost.

G-002992
G-002992

Project Description	Amount allocated from Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount	Applicant	Contribution to Prop. 204 objectives	Consistency with ERPP/contribution to long-term improvement of Bay-Delta ecosystem	Federal contribution	Local or non-profit contribution (includes all non-federal govt. agencies)
Cullinan Ranch restoration	\$368,500	Ducks Unlimited, Inc.	improves survival of multiple species by restoring saline emergent wetland habitat	Addresses 1 ERPP target for saline wetlands	\$0	\$662,000
Tolay Creek restoration	\$283,000	Ducks Unlimited, Inc.	improves survival of migratory birds by restoring saline emergent wetlands	Addresses 1 ERPP target for saline wetlands	\$0	\$422,000
Biologically Integrated Orchard Systems (BIOS) - pesticide and fertilizer reduction/Sacramento and San Joaquin watersheds	\$1,680,631	Community Alliance with Family Farmers	improves water quality through reduction of pesticides and fertilizers	Addresses 1 ERPP target for contaminants	\$0	\$0
San Joaquin River Real-time Water Quality Management Program	\$932,000	Department of Water Resources	improves survival of San Joaquin fall run salmon and other fish species by monitoring water quality conditions in the lower San Joaquin River	Addresses 1 ERPP target for contaminants	\$0	\$0
Developing a genetic baseline for San Joaquin salmon	\$387,003	Department of Fish and Game	improves survival of San Joaquin fall run salmon	Addresses 1 ERPP target for chinook salmon	\$0	\$600,000
Stanislaus River channel restoration	\$1,037,899	Department of Fish and Game, Department of Water Resources	improves survival of outmigrating San Joaquin fall run salmon juveniles	Addresses 1 ERPP target for predation and competition and for natural floodplain and flood processes	\$1,337,899	\$262,200
Knights Ferry gravel replenishment	\$536,410	Carl Mesick Consultants	improves survival of San Joaquin fall run salmon by improving spawning habitat	Addresses 1 ERPP target for chinook salmon and 1 for natural sediment supply	\$0	\$90,000

Project Description	Amount allocated from Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount	Applicant	Contribution to Prop. 204 objectives	Consistency with ERPP/contribution to long-term improvement of Bay-Delta ecosystem	Federal contribution	Local or non-profit contribution (includes all non-federal govt. agencies)
Gravel Replacement (Tuolumne River)	\$250,975	Department of Fish and Game	improves survival of San Joaquin fall run salmon by supplementing spawning gravels	Addresses 1 ERPP target for chinook salmon and 1 for natural sediment supply	\$0	\$22,000
Evaluation of alternative pesticide use reduction practices	\$957,781	UC Davis	improves survival of multiple species by reducing effects of pesticides	Addresses 4 ERPP targets for contaminants	\$0	\$746,827
RD 108 fish screen at Wilkins Slough Pumping Plant	\$2,500,000	Reclamation District 108	improves fish survival by reducing entrainment from pumps	Addresses 1 ERPP target for water diversion	\$1,300,000	\$1,300,000
Princeton fish screen (RD 1004)	\$1,750,000	Reclamation District 1004	improves fish survival by reducing entrainment from pumps	Addresses 1 ERPP target for water diversion	\$880,000	\$880,000
Selected fish screens - Suisun Marsh	\$2,761,520 ⁴	Department of Fish and Game	improves fish survival by reducing entrainment from pumps	Addresses 1 ERPP target for water diversion	\$0	\$0
Culture of Delta Smelt	\$194,870	UC Davis	improves survival of delta smelt	Addresses 1 ERPP target for Delta smelt	\$0	\$45,500
Merced River Ranch acquisition and restoration	\$658,000	Department of Fish and Game	improves survival of multiple species by restoring native riparian forest	Addresses 1 ERPP target for riparian and riverine aquatic habitats	\$0	\$1,324,000

⁴ minor reduction in cost.

Project Description	Amount allocated from Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount	Applicant	Contribution to Prop. 204 objectives	Consistency with ERPP/contribution to long-term improvement of Bay-Delta ecosystem	Federal contribution	Local or non-profit contribution (includes all non-federal govt. agencies)
Hamilton wetlands restoration	\$1,000,000	California Coastal Conservancy	improves survival of multiple species by restoring wetland habitat	Addresses 1 ERPP target for natural floodplain and flood processes	\$0	\$0
Twitchell Island restoration	\$3,583,000 ⁵	Department of Water Resources	improves survival of anadromous fish by restoring wetland habitat	Addresses 1 ERPP target for natural floodplain and flood processes	\$0	\$0
Basso Bridge acquisition	\$172,500	Department of Fish and Game	improves survival of salmon by securing riparian and spawning habitats	Addresses 2 ERPP targets for stream meander corridor, and riparian and riverine aquatic habitats	\$0	\$0
Adult Fall-run Chinook Salmon movement, Lower San Joaquin and So Delta	\$285,000	Department of Fish and Game	improves survival of salmon by evaluating migration how flow and water quality affect migration	Address 1 ERPP target for Delta channel hydraulics	\$0	\$63,875
Reclamation District 2035 fish screen	\$100,000	Reclamation District 2035	improves survival of multiple species by reducing entrainment	Addresses 1 ERPP target for water diversion	\$0	\$15,000
Expanding Calif. Salmon habitat through non-governmental and nonregulatory mechanisms	\$49,000	Institute for Fisheries Resources	improves survival of anadromous fish by removing barriers and improving streamflow	Addresses multiple ERPP targets for dams and other structures and for water diversion	\$0	\$70,000
Genetic comparison of stocks considered for re-establishing steelhead in Clear Creek	\$45,493	US Fish and Wildlife Service	identifies steelhead stocks to be reintroduced into Clear Creek	Addresses 2 ERPP targets for steelhead trout	\$0	\$0

⁵ major amendment to cover full project cost.

Project Description	Amount allocated from Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount	Applicant	Contribution to Prop. 204 objectives	Consistency with ERPP/contribution to long-term improvement of Bay-Delta ecosystem	Federal contribution	Local or non-profit contribution (includes all non-federal govt. agencies)
Spawning areas of green sturgeon in the upper Sacramento River	\$60,801	US Fish and Wildlife Service	improves spawning success for green sturgeon by inventorying their habitats	Address ERPP vision for green sturgeon	\$0	\$0
Monitoring adult and juvenile spring and winter chinook salmon and steelhead in Battle Creek	\$150,000	US Fish and Wildlife Service	improves survival of winter and spring-run chinook salmon by assessing suitability of new habitat	Addresses ERPP targets for water diversion and dams and structures	\$0	\$0
Life history and stock composition of steelhead trout	\$120,000	Yuba County Water Agency	improves steelhead survival by increasing understanding of life history	Addresses 2 ERPP targets for artificial propagation of fish	\$120,000	\$60,000
Biological assessment of green sturgeon in the Sacramento-San Joaquin watershed	\$241,000	Joseph Cecl/ University of California	improves green sturgeon survival by identifying biological requirements	Addresses ERPP vision for green sturgeon	\$0	\$0
Developing a methodology to accurately simulate the entrainment of fish	\$200,000	Dept of Fish and Game	improves survival of multiple species by reducing entrainment	Addresses ERPP targets for water diversion	\$0	\$63,000
Pelger Mutual Water Company, small fish screen evaluation	\$95,000	Pelger Mutual Water Company	improves survival of anadromous fish by reducing entrainment	Addresses ERPP targets for water diversion	\$0	\$5,000
Fathead minnow toxicity in the Sacramento River	\$400,000	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	improves survival of multiple species by reducing toxicity in Sacramento River	Addresses 1 ERPP target for contaminants	\$0	\$0
Algal toxicity	\$500,000	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	improves health of estuary by reducing toxicity at primary level	Addresses 1 ERPP target for contaminants	\$0	\$0

Project Description	Amount allocated from Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount	Applicant	Contribution to Prop. 204 objectives	Consistency with ERPP/contribution to long-term improvement of Bay-Delta ecosystem	Federal contribution	Local or non-profit contribution (includes all non-federal govt. agencies)
Water quality criteria for chlorpyrifos	\$100,000	Department of Fish and Game	improves health of estuary by reducing toxicity from pesticides	Addresses 1 ERPP target for contaminants	\$0	\$0
TOTAL	\$46,245,464				(1)\$7,432,299	(1)\$17,586,562

(1) This table does not reflect information for Category III projects funded without a contribution from Proposition 204's Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount.

G:\MAIL\GCHONG\ATTACH\TAB_WRK.WPD

**THE DELTA LEVEE REHABILITATION SUBACCOUNT
(Water Resources)**

Bonds Authorized: \$25,000,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$25,000,000
Remaining Balance: \$0

1. Proposition 204 Expenditures:

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what was the amount appropriated per project?

The Delta Levee Rehabilitation Subaccount of \$25 million is divided between two programs. Twelve million five hundred thousand dollars (\$12,500,000) was appropriated for local assistance under the Delta Levee Maintenance Subventions Program under Part 9 (commencing with Section 12980) of Division 6, and for the administration of that assistance. The subventions program reimburses eligible reclamation districts that include local non-project levees in the Delta and federal project levees in the Primary Zone (as defined by the Delta Protection Commission) have applied for participation in the Program. To date, 58 districts have applied under the Program.

Twelve million five hundred thousand dollars (\$12,500,000) was appropriated for special flood protection under Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 12310) of Part 4.8 of Division 6, subsidence studies and monitoring, and for the administration of the subdivision. Allocation of these funds shall be for flood protection on Bethel, Bradford, Holland, Hotchkiss, Jersey, Sherman, Twitchell, and Webb Islands, and at other locations in the Delta. A total of \$6.2 million from this program is being used to fund five habitat improvement projects.

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

The Department of Water Resources, Department of Fish and Game, Reclamation Board and Local Reclamation Districts manage and administer the projects within this program.

- c. How does each project contribute to the objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204?

The San Francisco Bay/Sacramento San Joaquin Delta Estuary (the Bay-Delta) is of statewide and national importance. Without the Delta levees, much habitat for more than 120 species of fish and wildlife would be lost. The levees also protect our water delivery system for statewide businesses, farms and more than 22 million residents. This program contributes to the objectives, goals and requirements of Proposition 204 by protecting the integrity of the State's water supply system from catastrophic failure due to earthquakes and flooding. Furthermore, projects funded will meet the Proposition 204 objective of a net long-term habitat improvement and a net benefit for aquatic species in the Delta. For example, the Sherman Island project will provide approximately seven acres of shallow water and shaded riverine aquatic habitat. These two habitat types are highly critical for fish and wildlife viability in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta.

The Decker Island project will restore tidal system function and create a diversity of aquatic wetland, riparian, and upland habitat. The project will create a total of approximately 10 acres of habitat to include the following needed habitat types:

- Tidal shallow water
- Intertidal
- Emergent marsh
- Mudflats
- Open-water channels
- Riparian scrub
- Riparian forest
- Shaded riverine aquatic
- Perennial aquatic
- Seasonal wetland and aquatic
- Instream aquatic
- Mid-channel island
- Shoals

**SOUTH DELTA BARRIERS SUBACCOUNT
(Water Resources)**

Bonds Authorized: \$10,000,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$10,000,000
Remaining Balance: \$0

1. Proposition 204 Expenditures:

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what was the amount appropriated per project?

The South Delta Barriers Subaccount funds the South Delta Barriers Program (Article 5, Chapter 4, Section 1 of Proposition 204). The barriers, when complete, will be located at the head of Old River, Middle River near Victoria Canal, and Old River near Tracy Pumping Plant. The amount funded is \$10,000,000.

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

The Department of Water Resources and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation applied for the project. Their recommendation was that the barriers be included in the water bond bill since they are mandated in the Central Valley Project Improvement Act.

- c. How does each project contribute to the objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204?

Proposition 204's objectives include developing lasting water solutions that balance the needs of the State's economy and environment, and restoring ecological health for native fish and wildlife, natural habitats, and wetlands. The South Delta Barriers Program helps to meet these objectives by mitigating for non-State Water Project or non-Central Valley Project impacts and providing environmental enhancement in the Delta.

2. Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount and Central Valley Project Improvement Subaccount:

- a. How does the project contribute to the health of the Bay Delta ecosystem in the short-term?

The south Delta barriers will provide operational flexibility to ensure that local agricultural interests have adequate water supply, that the SWP and CVP can divert Delta water without harming local diverters, and that Delta conditions for San Joaquin River salmon are improved.

- b. How is the project consistent with the CALFED long-term plan (ERPP), and how does the project contribute to the improvement of the Bay-Delta ecosystem in the long-term?

The south Delta barriers are included as a component of all three alternatives currently being considered by CALFED. The long-term benefits of the barriers are the same as the short-term benefits previously described.

**SOUTH DELTA BARRIERS SUBACCOUNT
(Water Resources)**

Bonds Authorized: \$10,000,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$10,000,000
Remaining Balance: \$0

1. Proposition 204 Expenditures:

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what was the amount appropriated per project?

The South Delta Barriers Subaccount funds the South Delta Barriers Program (Article 5, Chapter 4, Section 1 of Proposition 204). The barriers, when complete, will be located at the head of Old River, Middle River near Victoria Canal, and Old River near Tracy Pumping Plant. The amount funded is \$10,000,000.

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

The Department of Water Resources and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation applied for the project. Their recommendation was that the barriers be included in the water bond bill since they are mandated in the Central Valley Project Improvement Act.

- c. How does each project contribute to the objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204?

Proposition 204's objectives include developing lasting water solutions that balance the needs of the State's economy and environment, and restoring ecological health for native fish and wildlife, natural habitats, and wetlands. The South Delta Barriers Program helps to meet these objectives by mitigating for non-State Water Project or non-Central Valley Project impacts and providing environmental enhancement in the Delta.

2. Bay-Delta Agreement Subaccount and Central Valley Project Improvement Subaccount:

- a. How does the project contribute to the health of the Bay Delta ecosystem in the short-term?

The south Delta barriers will provide operational flexibility to ensure that local agricultural interests have adequate water supply, that the SWP and CVP can divert Delta water without harming local diverters, and that Delta conditions for San Joaquin River salmon are improved.

- b. How is the project consistent with the CALFED long-term plan (ERPP), and how does the project contribute to the improvement of the Bay-Delta ecosystem in the long-term?

The south Delta barriers are included as a component of all three alternatives currently being considered by CALFED. The long-term benefits of the barriers are the same as the short-term benefits previously described.

**DELTA RECREATION SUBACCOUNT
(Resources Agency)**

**Bonds Authorized: \$2,000,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$2,000,000
Remaining Balance: \$0**

1. a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what was the amount appropriated per project?

Brannan Island SRA, Windy Cove Access	\$ 166,000
Local Assistance Grants	\$1,000,000
Development Projects	\$ 834,000
Total	\$2,000,000

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

Department of Parks and Recreation sponsored these projects and the recommendation is to fully fund.

- c. How does each project contribute to the objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204?

Matching funds for EEMP grant; Improve public recreation access to Sacramento River through provision of parking, restrooms, and river access facilities.

**CALFED SUBACCOUNT
(Water Resources)**

Bonds Authorized: \$3,000,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$3,000,000
Remaining Balance: \$0

The sum of \$3.0 million under Article 7. 78570 subaccount has been fully expended for the purpose of paying for part of the state's share of costs incurred in connection with the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

**LAKE TAHOE WATER QUALITY SUBACCOUNT
(Resources Agency)**

Bonds Authorized: \$10,000,000

Expenditures & Obligation: \$5,000,000

Remaining Balance: \$5,000,000

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what was the amount appropriated per project?

A total of \$5 million for the Conservancy's programs promoting the preservation of water quality in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, what was their recommendation?

The Conservancy anticipates award of soil erosion control site improvement from this funding source. Eligible grantees include the City of South Lake Tahoe; the Counties of Placer and El Dorado; and the North Tahoe, South Tahoe, and Tahoe City Public Utility Districts. Individual projects and actual amounts are still under review. The approved projects will involve installation of roadside drainage, revegetation and other erosion control measures along road rights-of-way to control erosion and improve and protect the water quality of the Tahoe Basin.

- c. How does each project contribute to the objectives, goals, and requirements Proposition 204?

The remainder of the funds will be used, either directly or through grants, under the Conservancy's other water quality related programs (i.e., the stream environment zone and watershed restoration program, and its acquisition program for environment). Individual projects and actual amounts are under review.

**FEASIBILITY PROJECTS SUBACCOUNT
(Water Resources)**

**Bonds Authorized: \$10,000,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$10,000,000
Remaining Balance: \$0**

1. Proposition 204 Expenditures:

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what was the amount appropriated per project?

Bay Area Regional Water Recycling Program	\$ 310,500
Southern California Comprehensive Water Reclamation & Reuse Study	\$ 319,000
Border of the California Water Recycling Feasibility Study	\$ 160,000
Innovative Technology & Project Implementation	\$ 180,000
Desalination/Salinity Management	\$ 107,000
Northern CA., Southern CA., & California/Mexico border	\$5,000,000
* Offstream Storage Upstream of the Delta	\$3,923,500
TOTAL	\$10,000,000

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and local participating agencies contribute to the Bay Area Regional Water Recycling Program, the Southern California Comprehensive Water Reclamation and Reuse Study, and the Border of the California's Water Recycling Feasibility Study. DWR partners with local public agencies on desalination/salinity management studies and innovative technology/project implementation demonstration projects. All programs listed above are cost-share programs not grant or loan programs.

- c. How does each project contribute to the objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204?

DWR's water recycling and desalination/salinity management activities contribute to the Proposition 204 objective of enhancing water supply reliability by helping local and regional agencies determine viable regional water recycling and desalination/salinity management projects. In addition, assisting public agencies with implementation of cost-effective water recycling and desalting projects helps achieve the Proposition 204 objectives of protecting and improving water quality. If identified projects are implemented, the improved supply reliability and water quality will help maintain or augment stream flows and enhance wetlands.

**Discussion of the OFF-STREAM STORAGE UPSTREAM OF THE DELTA portion of this subaccount:*

1. Proposition 204 Expenditures:

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what was the amount appropriated per project?

The Department will expend \$3,923,500 for the Offstream Storage, Upstream of the Delta project under the Water Supply Feasibility subaccount.

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

This investigation, funded by Proposition 204, The Safe, Clean, Reliable Water Supply Act, directed DWR to investigate Offstream storage upstream of the Delta that will provide storage and flood control benefits in an environmentally sensitive and cost-effective manner. DWR, in coordination with CALFED staff, compiled a comprehensive list of potential reservoir sites and selected four of the most promising reservoir sites for engineering and environmental investigation. Future studies may involve additional sites as required by the regulatory process. This investigation is divided into individual studies. Environmental studies focus on identifying major issues that could potentially stop a project from being constructed. Engineering studies focus on identifying major project features and cost estimates.

DWR initiated several biological studies to identify endangered, threatened, or sensitive plant and wildlife species that exist within the reservoir inundation areas, along with cultural resources studies. Most of these studies are incomplete, as they require two seasons of field surveys. To date, these studies indicate that no single species or resources present an issue of such magnitude that it could not be addressed through appropriate design, mitigation, and enhancement for any of these proposed projects. However, the cumulative cost of environmental mitigation for each project is an important element in determining the comparative feasibility of each project.

Engineering investigations have focused on the major features of each of the potential projects. Water supply studies, geological exploration of damsites and faults, and initial design of dams, spillways, canals, stream diversions, pumping plants, and power generation facilities have been the main activities. For the most part, these activities are continuing. Cost estimates are not yet complete. Studies have not found any insurmountable conditions.

- c. How does each project contribute to the objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204?

Until specific projects are identified, it is impossible to describe specifically how each project might contribute. However, in general, projects funded under this Article are expected to help develop lasting water solutions that balance the needs of the State's economy and its environment and to restore ecological health for native fish and wildlife, and their natural habitats, including wetlands (Proposition 204, Division 78500.4). These projects will also assist in the implementation of the Water Quality Control Plan for the Bay-Delta adopted by the State Water Quality Board in Resolution no. 95-25 (Proposition 204, Division 78681.4). The Board is required to provide adequate public review for proposed projects and determine that they are consistent with the Water Quality Control Plan.

**WATER CONSERVATION AND GROUNDWATER RECHARGE SUBACCOUNT
(Water Resources)**

Bonds Authorized: \$30,000,000
Expenditures and Obligations: \$30,000,000
Remaining Balance: \$0

1. Proposition 204 Expenditures

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what is the amount appropriated per project?

Groundwater recharge construction projects in the following areas have been selected for funding under the Water Conservation and Groundwater Recharge Subaccount:

1. Mojave River Pipeline (San Bernardino)	\$5 million
2. Arvin-Edison Water Storage District (Kern Co.)	\$5 million
3. Buttonwillow Improvement District (Kern Co.)	\$5 million
4. Kern County Water Agency (Kern Co.)	\$5 million
5. Kern Water Bank Authority (Kern Co.)	\$5 million
6. Pond Poso Improvement District (Kern Co.)	\$5 million

Total \$30 million

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

Department of Water Resources sponsored these projects and the recommendation is to fully fund.

- c. How does each project contribute to the objective, goals and requirements of Proposition 204?

The above projects under this subaccount, are expected to help address the water supply goal specified under Section 78500.2 (d) – The State should plan to meet the water supply needs of all beneficial uses of water utilizing a wide range of strategies:.. To meet the growing water needs of the state, and the objective listed under Section 78500.4 (a) – To provide a safe, clean, affordable, and sufficient water supply to meet the needs of California residents, farms, and businesses. Depending on the nature of any given project, other objectives listed under Section 78500.4 could be addressed as well. All construction projects funded under this subaccount must be cost-effective.

**LOCAL PROJECTS SUBACCOUNT
(Water Resources)**

**Bonds Authorized: \$25,000,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$1,086,392
Remaining Balance: \$23,913,602**

1. Proposition 204 Expenditures

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what is the amount appropriated per project?

Feasibility Studies in the following areas have been selected for funding under the Locals Projects Subaccount:

1. Lower Tule River Lake (Kings Co.)	\$150,000
2. McKinleyville Community Services District (Humboldt Co.)	\$145,200
3. Squaw Valley Public Service District (Placer Co.)	\$300,000
4. City of Trinidad (Humboldt Co.)	\$206,284
5. Trinity County Waterworks Dist.#1 (Trinity Co.)	\$184,340
6. Volcano Community Services District (Amador Co.)	\$ 37,530

Total \$1,023,353

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

The Department of Water Resources sponsored these projects and the recommendation is to fully fund.

- c. How does each project contribute to the objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204?

All projects to be funded under this subaccount are expected to primarily help address the water supply goal specified under Section 78500.2 (d), and the water supply objective listed under Section 78500.4 (a). Depending on the nature of any given project, other objectives listed under Section 78500.4 could be addressed as well. All construction projects funded under this subaccount must be cost-effective.

**SACRAMENTO VALLEY WATER MANAGEMENT AND HABITAT PROTECTION
MEASURES SUBACCOUNT (Water Resources)**

Bonds Authorized: \$25,000,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$13,341
Remaining Balance: \$24,986,659

1. Proposition 204 Expenditures:

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what was the amount appropriated per project?

To date no projects have been selected, and no funds have been appropriated for any project.

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

To date there have been no specific projects applied for or sponsored. Negotiations are underway with various counties, water districts, and other organizations that may apply for or sponsor projects in the near future. A total of \$13,341 has been expended to date for ongoing administrative negotiations with various organizations for future projects.

- c. How does each project contribute to the objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204?

Until specific projects are identified it is impossible to describe specifically how each project might contribute. However, in general, projects funded under this Article are expected to help "develop lasting water solutions that balance the needs of the State's economy and its environment," and "to restore ecological health for native fish and wildlife, and their natural habitats, including wetlands." (Proposition 204, Division 78500.4) These projects will also "assist in the implementation of the Water Quality Control Plan for the Bay-Delta adopted by the State Water Quality Board in Resolution no. 95-25." (Proposition 204, Division 78681.4). The Board is required to provide adequate public review for proposed projects and determine that they are consistent with the Water Quality Control Plan.

The Sacramento Valley Water Management and Habitat Restoration Measures program is linked to the continuing water rights negotiations for the Sacramento – San Joaquin Delta being conducted by the State Water Resources Control Board. These negotiations have been on-going for the past year and a half, and as yet, they have not reached conclusion, until they do, this program will not reflect expenditures for projects.

**RIVER PARKWAY SUBACCOUNT
(Water Resources)**

**Bonds Authorized: \$700,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$700,000
Remaining Balance: \$0**

1. Proposition 204 Expenditures

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected and what was the amount appropriated per project?

Projects on the following waterways were selected for funding through the Urban Streams Restoration Program under the River Parkway Subaccount:

1. Murrieta Creek, Riverside County	\$100,000
2. San Pedro Creek, San Mateo County	\$150,000
3. Fresno River / China Creek, Madera County	\$ 75,000
4. Dry Creek, Placer County	\$100,000
5. Wildcat Creek, San Pablo, Contra Costa County	\$ 75,000
6. Wildcat Creek, North Richmond, Contra Costa County	\$ 95,000
7. Laguna Creek, Santa Barbara County	\$ 40,000
8. Napa River, Napa County	\$ 65,000

Total \$700,000

Note: The list reflects reduced funding for two projects and inclusion of three projects from the approved reserve list.

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

1. Union for a River Greenbelt Environment, City of Temecula, Murrieta County Water District, City of Murrieta
2. City of Pacifica, San Pedro Creek Flood Control Committee
3. Oakhurst River Parkway Committee, Madera County
4. City of Roseville, Dry Creek Conservancy
5. Coalition to Restore Urban Waters, Contra Costa County Flood Control District
6. Coalition to Restore Urban Waters, City of San Pablo
7. Santa Barbara County Redevelopment Agency, Urban Creeks Council of Santa Barbara
8. Napa County, Friends of the Napa River

- c. How does each project contribute to the objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204?

These grants provide funds to local communities for restoring streams and establishing or improving river parkways in urban areas. Projects include a variety of activities, such as stream clean ups, bank stabilization and sediment reduction work, riparian revegetation, riverine aquatic habitat restoration, and creek side trail development. They contribute to the Proposition 204 goals of improving water

quality, increasing groundwater recharge, restoring riparian and aquatic habitats, and protecting the quality of life in our communities.

**RIVER PARKWAY
CALIFORNIA TAHOE CONSERVANCY SUBACCOUNT
(Resources Agency)**

**Bonds Authorized: \$1,000,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$1,000,000
Remaining Balance: 0**

A total of \$1 million in River Parkway funds was appropriated to the conservancy. The funds will be used for trail and other public access improvements at the mouth and along the Truckee River. Potential project activities are under review.

**RIVER PARKWAY
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD SUBACCOUNT
(Resources Agency)**

Bonds Authorized: \$11,143,000

Expenditures & Obligations: \$11,143,000

Remaining Balance: \$0

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what was the amount appropriated per project?

Santa Margarita River (Ecological Reserve) (San Diego Co.)	\$300,000
San Jacinto River (Wildlife Area Expansion) (Riverside Co.)	\$2,000,000
Bakersfield-Kern River Parkway (Kern Co.)	\$500,000
Firebaugh Park & River Restoration (Fresno Co.)	\$500,000
South Fork American River (El Dorado Co.)	\$555,000
San Joaquin River Wildlife Area (San Joaquin Co.)	\$5,585
San Joaquin River Parkway (Fresno Co.)	\$5,000,000
Cosumnes River Preserve (Sacramento Co.)	\$843,000
Anza Borrego State Park (Imperial Co.)	\$500,000
Total	\$10,203,895

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

Santa Margarita River sponsored by San Diego State of California
San Jacinto River sponsored by Trust for Public Lands
Bakerfield-Kern River Parkway sponsored by City of Bakersfield
Firebaugh Park & River Restoration sponsored by City of Firebaugh
South Fork American River sponsored by Bureau of Land Management
San Joaquin River Wildlife Area sponsored by San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust; Trust for Public Land
San Joaquin River Parkway sponsored by San Joaquin Conservancy
Cosumnes River Preserve sponsored by Department of Fish and Game
Anza Borrego State Park sponsored by Department of Parks and Recreation

Recommendation – Fully Fund

- c. How does each project contribute to the objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204?

The projects meet the goals of the River Parkway Program of acquiring riparian habitat, consistent with Section 78682.2 (a) of the Safe, Clean, Reliable Water Supply Act; being in accordance with the Wildlife Conservation Law of 1947. More specifically, the acquisition protects riparian habitat pursuant to the California Riparian Habitat Conservation Program.

**RIVER PARKWAY SUBACCOUNT
STATE COASTAL CONSERVANCY SUBACCOUNT
(Resources Agency)**

**Bonds Authorized: \$7,000,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$7,000,000
Remaining Balance: \$0**

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what was the amount appropriated per project?

Russian River	\$1 million
Napa River	\$1 million
Los Angeles River	\$2 million
Otay	\$3 million
Total	\$7 million

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

Russian River – The Conservancy has been engaged in a process of developing specific project proposals for possible expenditure. The Conservancy has been in contact with local government officials in both Sonoma and Mendocino Counties and various interest groups. In this effort we have identified approximately ten separate projects which are consistent with the intent of the River Parkway Program, including both access and enhancement work.

Napa River – The Conservancy has been working on both the Napa River and the related Napa marsh complex for the past two years. Since the appropriation of Proposition 204 funds, the conservancy has allocated \$200,000 to the Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Geological Survey for studies of water flows at the mouth of the river. This information will help to determine appropriate enhancement actions.

Los Angeles – The Conservancy has been working with citizen groups, the County of Los Angeles, the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy and various cities along the Los Angeles River to determine appropriate projects for expenditure of the Proposition 204 funds. The Conservancy expects the first project grant by the end of 1998.

Otay – The Conservancy is working with the Trust for Public Land to acquire this property which would provide both habitat and public access.

- c. How does each project contribute to the objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204?

Russian River – The Conservancy is participating with the Resources Agency and other State and Federal agencies in the possible development of a watershed management plan for the Russian River.

Napa River – The Conservancy is working with the County of Napa Flood Control District to develop a multiple-objective flood control project which would provide protection as well as habitat and public access. Stemming from this work, the conservancy can identify key properties which can be used to expand the flood plain. The Conservancy is expected to authorize the expenditure of the remaining Proposition 204 funds on these properties during 1998/99.

Los Angeles River – Studying the habitat values along the river and the potential for resource enhancement.

Otay River – The focus of the Otay River project is single ownership to the east of Highway 5. The property is a critical wildlife corridor, which is related to the Natural Communities Conservation Program for San Diego County.

**RIVER PARKWAY
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION SUBACCOUNT
(Resources Agency)**

**Bonds Authorized: \$2,157,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$1,157,000
Remaining Balance: \$1,000,000**

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what was the amount appropriated per project?

Anza-Borrogo Desert SP	\$500,000
Richardson Grove SP	\$150,000
Humboldt Lagoons SP	\$ 45,000
Russian Gulch SP	\$140,000
Humboldt Redwoods SP	\$322,000
Total	\$1,157,000

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

Department of Parks and Recreation sponsored these projects and the recommendation is to fully fund.

- c. How does each project contribute to the objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204?

Anza-Borrogo Desert SP – Acquisition of critical marsh wetland habitat on the margin of a desert environment which is home to a number of endangered/threatened plants and animals.

Richardson Grove SP – Remove creek constrictions to improve coho salmon, chinook salmon, and steelhead trout habitat.

Humboldt Lagoons SP – Restore natural meanders and stabilize banks to reestablish cutthroat trout spawning and rearing habitat.

Russian Gulch SP – Correct trail drainage and erosion problems that adversely affect riparian habitat.

Humboldt Redwoods SP – Correct trail drainage and erosion problems that adversely affect redwood riverine habitat and salmon and steelhead spawning/rearing habitat.

**RIVER PARKWAY
SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS CONSERVANCY SUBACCOUNT
(Resources Agency)**

**Bonds Authorized: \$5,000,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$5,000,000
Remaining Balance: \$0**

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what was the amount appropriated per project?

Expenditures in the amount of \$4,700,000 were made under the River Parkway Subaccount Section 78682 (d) of the Los Angeles River Parkway program for acquisition and restoration, and trail projects.

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

The projects were applied for by the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority and approved by the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy.

- c. How does each project contribute to the objectives, goals, and requirements of Proposition 204?

Each of the projects undertaken by this grant is located in the highly urbanized and major metropolitan center of Los Angeles and used for acquisition and restoration consistent with the provisions of the Act.

**THE BAY-DELTA ECOSYSTEM ACCOUNT
(Resources Agency)**

**Bonds Authorized: \$390,000,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$0
Remaining Balance: \$390,000,000**

The Legislature found and declared the following:

- a. CALFED must prepare a programmatic EIS/EIR for a long-term comprehensive plan that will resolve problems related to ecosystem restoration, water quality, water supply, and water management for beneficial uses of the bay-delta ecosystem, and system integrity.
- b. The CALFED Bay-Delta Program, to the extent that it relates to restoration in the bay-delta ecosystem, is of statewide and national importance. The state should participate in the funding of eligible projects as a part of its ongoing program to improve environmental conditions in the bay-delta ecosystem.
- c. The programmatic EIS/EIR will include a schedule for funding and implementing all elements of the long-term comprehensive plan.
- d. The CALFED Bay-Delta program elements will achieve balance solutions in all identified problems areas, including the ecosystem, water supply, water quality, and system integrity.

No funds in this account may be expended until all the above conditions have been met. CALFED continues to work toward fulfilling these conditions.

A CALFED report that sets the stage for a plan to investment \$4.4 billion in an effort to reshape California's water policy was released December 18, 1998, at the Sacramento Convention Center by Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt and Governor Pete Wilson. It calls for spending the money over the next seven years for ecosystem and fishery restoration, conservation and recycling, watershed management and water quality, repairing Delta levees and surface water storage.

The plan presented estimates that the cost of the CALFED program over the next seven years will be shared by the agencies and their members that actually apply and consume water developed by the state and federal water projects. The estimate is that users will pay \$1.935 billion and that the federal, state shares will be \$1.27 billion and \$1.23 billion.

The plan allocates \$1.8 billion to conservation and recycling, \$965 million to ecosystem restoration for improving fish and wildlife habitat, \$250 million for repairing Delta levees and water quality and \$270 million for watershed management. It also allocates \$230 million for studies of storage. The CALFED report is the basis of more detailed environmental studies to be completed in late 1999.

**FLOOD CONTROL AND PREVENTION ACCOUNT
(Water Resources)**

**Bonds Authorized: \$60,000,000
Expenditures & Obligations: \$59,442,000
Remaining Balance \$558,000**

- a. What projects by subaccount were selected, and what was the amount appropriated by project?

Money in this subaccount may only be used for costs for which valid written claims have been submitted to DWR on or before June 30, 1996. Projects in Contra Costa, Fresno, Kern, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, and Santa Clara counties receive funds allocated on a pro rata basis. See Flood Control Subventions Program table on the following page for allocations.

- b. Who sponsored or applied for the project, and what was their recommendation?

Sponsors for each project have been identified on the table.

- c. How does each project contribute to the goals, objectives, and requirements of Proposition 204?

Fifty-four (\$59.5) million of the \$60 million paid the State's share of the nonfederal costs of flood control and prevention projects adopted and authorized in accordance with Article 2, Section 78686.12, subparts (b), (A), (B), (C), and (2). The remaining amount will be disbursed in fiscal year (1998-99).

FLOOD CONTROL SUBVENTIONS PROGRAM
Distribution of Proposition 204 Funds
(Amounts in \$1,000s)

Sponsor	Project	Expended FY 96/97
Contra Costa County Water District	Wildcat – San Pablo Creeks	\$864
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District	Redbank – Fancher Creeks FCP	949
<u>Kern County</u> Tehachapi-Cummings Co. WD	Tehachapi Watershed	108
L.A. County Dept. of Public Works	Los Angeles River Los Angeles River Watershed	0 0
Orange County Public Facilities and Resouces Dept.	Santa Ana Mainstem	39,870
Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conserv Dist.	Santa Ana Mainstem Lake Elsinore Outlet	3,448 2,299
San Bernardino Co. FC & WCD.	Santa Ana Mainstem	0
<u>San Diego County</u> City of Oceanside San Diego FCD City of Chula Vista	San Luis Rey River FCP Sweetwater River Telegraph Canyon Creek	325 74 108
Santa Clara Valley Water District	Coyote/Berryessa Creeks Guadalupe River FCP Pajaro River Lower Llagus Creek Lower Silver Creek Upper Llagas Creek	1,517 4,849
	Totals	\$54,411*

- The remaining amount will be disbursed this fiscal year (1998-99)