



**ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY POLICY COMMITTEE**  
**Friday, January 24, 2025**  
**10:00am to 2:00pm**  
**Sacramento Convention Center, Meeting Room 10**

**AGENDA**

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

*Speakers: Chair Max Perrey, Vice Mayor, Mill Valley  
Vice Chair Tomas Oliva, Mayor, El Centro  
Cal Cities President Lynne Kennedy, Mayor, Rancho Cucamonga  
Cal Cities Executive Director and CEO Carolyn Coleman*

**II. Public Comment**

**III. Orientation and Parliamentary Procedure** (Attachment A) *Informational*

**IV. General Briefing** (Attachment B) *Informational*

**V. [Cal Cities 2025 Advocacy Priorities](#)** *Informational*

**VI. 2025-26 Budget Update** *Informational*

**VII. State Legislation and Regulatory Update** *Informational*

**VIII. Adoption of 2024 Work Plan** (Review Survey Results) *Action*

*Lunch Break – 12:10pm to 12:25pm*

**IX. Keynote Speaker: CA Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation  
Director Samuel Assefa** (confirmed) *Informational*

**X. Los Angeles Wildfire Update** *Informational*

**XI. Health Rivers and Landscapes Proposal** (Attachment c) *Action*

**XII. Adjourn**

**Next Meeting:** Friday, March 22 (in person in Burbank, CA) 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

*Brown Act Reminder: The League of California Cities' Board of Directors has a policy of complying with the spirit of open meeting laws. Generally, off-agenda items may be taken up only if:*

*1) Two-thirds of the policy committee members find a need for immediate action exists and the need to take action came to the attention of the policy committee after the agenda was prepared (Note: If fewer than two-thirds of policy committee members are present, taking up an off-agenda item requires a unanimous vote); or*

*2) A majority of the policy committee finds an emergency (for example: work stoppage or disaster) exists.*

*A majority of a city council may not, consistent with the Brown Act, discuss specific substantive issues among themselves at League meetings. Any such discussion is subject to the Brown Act and must occur in a meeting that complies with its requirements.*

## HOW CAL CITIES POLICY COMMITTEES WORK

### Policy Committee Subject Matter

Cal Cities has seven policy committees, each with its own subject matter jurisdiction. Please refer to the ["Summary of Existing Policy and Guiding Principles"](#) booklet to find the subject matter for each committee. This document is updated every two years. Policy in the Summary of Existing Policy and Guiding Principles is used to determine Cal Cities legislative and regulatory positions.

### Policy Committee Legislative Agenda Items

Cal Cities policy committees review bills or regulatory proposals on issues for which Cal Cities does not have existing policy, or for which staff members feel a policy discussion needs to occur for greater clarity or background on an issue. Staff will lobby legislation, funding proposals, or regulatory changes where existing policy provides clear direction.

### Committee Recommendations

The committee's actions or positions are a recommendation to Cal Cities Board of Directors (Board) for a formal position. Possible committee recommendations can be:

- Support
- Oppose
- Support-if-amended (as appropriate, specific amendments may be requested)
- Oppose-unless-amended (as appropriate, specific amendments may be requested)
- No position
- Neutral

There are nuanced differences between some of these positions. For example, "support-if-amended" sends a very different message than "oppose-unless-amended." Both positions might seek the same change, but the support-if-amended position means that Cal Cities would be listed with the "supporters" of the bill in most legislative analysis. In addition, "no position" and "neutral" have different meanings and require different actions from staff. Selection of one or the other depends in part upon what type of message or political posture Cal Cities needs to take. Staff will advise the committee about the implications of each on a case-by-case basis.

### Approval by League Board Needed for All Committee Recommendations

All committee actions are recommendations to the Board, which has the final say on all positions. Under no circumstances are individual committee members or the committee itself authorized to speak on behalf of Cal Cities. When a committee action is supported by a large majority (e.g., 32 to 3), the recommendation is placed on the Board's consent calendar. When the committee vote is split (e.g., 15-13), the item will be presented as an action item for the Board's discussion. Staff will also provide information about the reasons behind the committee's recommendation to the Board.

Often, the Board adopts the recommendation of the policy committee. When the Board adopts a different position, staff will notify the committee members of the reason for the different position. This likely will be done in the next regular communication with the committee.

Some issues cut across more than one committee. When this occurs, staff will coordinate and bring a bill to more than one committee for review and recommendation. The recommendations are then forwarded to the Board and if there is a different recommendation, the Board resolves the difference.

### **Role of the Committee Chair**

The chair's role is to balance the often-competing needs of the membership to have a full and thoughtful discussion on the issues. The chair may limit debate, either in the number of speakers or the amount of time each speaker has, in order to ensure that we can move ahead on our agenda and cover the items included. We ask that when you make comments on issues before the committee that you be brief and concise and that you not repeat what has already been stated. Also, if you have already spoken on an issue, the chair may ask you to hold your comments until after new speakers are able to share their comments.

### **Committee Schedule and Process**

Committees generally meet three times a year with the potential for an abbreviated virtual meeting prior to the Cal Cities Annual Conference to review resolutions, if any are assigned to it.

### **Agendas/Disseminating Information**

An agenda packet is emailed about one week before a meeting. Highlights that summarize committee actions are prepared by staff and emailed to committee members approximately two weeks after the meetings.

We encourage you to visit the [Cal Cities website](#). In addition to containing committee materials, the website contains information on Cal Cities priorities and a link to track individual bills and Cal Cities position on them. You should also subscribe to the Cal Cities electronic newsletter [Cal Cities Advocate](#).

### **How to Get an Item on the Agenda**

Staff prepares background material in advance of the meeting and prepares the agenda in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair. If you wish to have the committee discuss an item, contact staff well in advance of the meeting to determine the feasibility of including it on the agenda. This will allow staff time to prepare the appropriate background material. Because of time constraints and a full work program before the committee, it may not always be possible to respond to such requests.

### **Issues Should Have Statewide Impact**

Although committee members may represent divisions, departments, and caucuses, all should be mindful that Cal Cities must address issues of statewide impact and interest. Thus, while an issue or bill may be of interest to a particular city or region, if it does not have broader, statewide implications, Cal Cities likely will not engage in that policy

discussion or take a position. This should be considered in requesting an item for discussion.

### **Brown Act and Roberts Rules of Order**

Cal Cities complies with the spirit of the Brown Act. Thus, when the committee discusses items not already on the agenda (e.g., supplemental legislative agenda), the Chair will ask for a vote of approval to add that item to the agenda. Cal Cities also follows Roberts Rules of Order and provides a brief overview of key procedural steps in Roberts Rules as they apply to committees.

### **Staffing for Committee**

Each committee has a staff lobbyist assigned to it. This individual is your main point of contact for logistics or questions about the agenda and provides information on legislation during the committee meeting.

### **Cal Cities Partners and Other Guests**

Cal Cities Partners have a non-voting representative assigned to each policy committee and are seated at the table with other committee members. In addition, city officials, other members of Cal Cities Partners Program, and interested members of the public are welcome to attend the meetings. We provide an opportunity for Cal Cities Partners and other members of the public to offer comment on items before the committee during the designated public comment period on the agenda.

# Parliamentary Procedure Basics for Policy Committees

*(adapted from Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised<sup>1</sup>)*

*Note: This document is designed to provide practical examples of common procedural matters encountered. It strives to provide guidance to foster productive and efficient meetings; it is not meant to be an exhaustive or comprehensive discussion of Robert's Rules. As always, it is the role and discretion of the chair to provide helpful guidance to individuals that may digress from the appropriate form and substance related to the conduct of meetings and the presentation of motions and other procedural matters set forth below.*

## I. **COMMON MOTIONS**

### 1. **Main Motions**

*Purpose:* To introduce items to the committee for their consideration.

*Example:* "I move to support AB 123."

### 2. **Motion to Amend**

*Purpose:* Retains the main motion under discussion but changes it in some way. *Example:* "I move to amend the (presented main) motion to support AB 123 if amended."

#### **2a. "Friendly" Amendments**

*Purpose:* To offer an amendment to the main motion that is still supportive of the main motion.

*Example:* If there is currently a motion to support AB 123 on the floor and a committee member makes a "friendly" amendment to support AB 123 and also request that staff report back after contacting the sponsor for clarification on specific language.

*Note:* This is commonly mishandled procedurally. Often the individual that seeks to offer the "friendly" amendment will inquire if the maker of the original motion will "accept" the amendment, and if so the chair will treat the motion as amended. This is not the proper way to handle such an amendment. It is not the discretion of the mover of the original motion (or the chair) to accept or decline the amendment, rather it must be adopted by the committee.

If it appears to the chair that an amendment (or any other motion) is uncontroversial, it is proper for the chair to ask if there is "any objection" to adopting the amendment. If no objection is made, the chair may declare the amendment adopted. If even one member objects, however, the amendment is subject to debate and vote like any other, regardless of whether its proposer calls it "friendly" and regardless of whether the maker of the original motion endorses its adoption.

### **3. Substitute Motion**

*Purpose:* Removes the motion under discussion and replaces it with a new motion.

*Example:* When there is a main motion on the floor to support a bill, a substitute motion would be, "I move a substitute motion that the committee oppose AB 123."

#### **Addressing Multiple Motions**

The following examples provide guidance relating to how multiple motions are handled, and the impact failed substitute motions have on original (main motions) and any proposed amendments. The last motion presented should be considered first.

*Note:* Substitute motions commonly occur during meetings, yet Robert's Rules does not make a distinction between motions to amend and substitute motions. However, motions to amend must be considered prior to a main motion. Because the use of "substitute" motions is fairly widespread, the label as it is reflected in practice is used in the examples below. Rosenberg's Rules of Order do reference substitute motions and their impact is also reflected below.

#### **Example 1**

*Committee Member 1:* "I move that we support AB 123."

*Committee Member 2:* "I move that we support AB 123, if

*amended."* *Committee Member 3:* "I move a substitute motion that we oppose AB 123."

#### **Characterizing the Motions:**

In the above example:

Committee Member 1 has made a (main) motion.

Committee Member 2 has made an *amendment* to Committee Member 1's motion. Committee Member 3 has made a *substitute* motion to Committee Member 1's motion.

### **Order for Consideration and the Possible Outcomes**

Committee Member 3's motion is considered first. If Committee Member 3's motion *fails*, Committee Member 2's motion will be considered next. If Committee Member 2's motion *fails*, Committee Member 1's motion will be considered. If Committee Member 2's motion *passes*, there is no need to consider Committee Member 1's motion.

If Committee Member 3's motion *passes*, there is no need to consider Committee Member 1's motions because Committee Member 3's motion replaces Committee Member 1's original motion. There is also no need to consider Committee Member 2's motion since it is an amendment to Committee Member 1's motion that has been replaced by Committee Member 3's substitute motion.

### **Example 2**

*Committee Member 1: "I move that we support AB 123."*

*Committee Member 2: "I move a substitute motion that we oppose AB*

*123." Committee Member 3: "I move that we oppose AB 123 unless amended."*

### **Characterizing the Motions**

In the above example:

Committee Member 1 has made a (main) motion.

Committee Member 2 has made a substitute motion to Committee Member 1's motion. Committee Member 3 has made an amendment to Committee Member 2's substitute motion (sometimes referred to as a substitute to a substitute motion).

### **Reviewing the Possible Outcomes**

Committee Member 3's motion should be considered first. If the motion *fails*, Committee Member 2's motion is considered.

If Committee Member 2's motion *passes*, it is not necessary to consider Committee Member 1's motion because Committee Member 2's motion substitutes for it.

If Committee Member 3's motion *fails*, Committee Member 2's motion is considered. If Committee Member 2's motion *fails*, the substitute motion for Committee Member 1's motion *fails*, and Committee Member 1's motion is considered.

If Committee Member 3's motion *passes*, it is not necessary to consider Committee Member 1's motion because Committee Member 3's motion substitutes for it.

### **Example 3**

*Committee Member 1: "I move that we support AB 123."*

*Committee Member 2: "I move a substitute motion that we oppose AB 123." Committee Member 3: "I move a substitute to the substitute*

*motion that we take no position on AB 123."*

### **Characterizing the Motions**

In the above example:

Committee Member 1 has made a (main) motion.

Committee Member 2 has made a substitute motion to Committee

Member 1's motion Committee Member 3 has attempted to make a substitute to Committee Member 2's substitute motion (sometimes referred to as a substitute to a substitute motion).

### **Reviewing the Possible Outcomes**

While procedurally permissible, in an effort to avoid confusion

Committee Member 3's motion should *not* be entertained by the chair until Committee Member 1 and Committee Member 2's motions have been discussed and voted upon.

Committee Member 2's motion should be considered first. If the motion *fails* Committee Member 1's motion is considered. If Committee Member 1's motion *fails*, then Committee Member 3's may make the motion to "take no position on AB 123."

If Committee Member 2's motion *passes*, it is not necessary to consider Committee Member 1's motion because Committee Member 2's motion substitutes for it.

## **4. Motion to Withdraw**

*Purpose:* To withdraw an item from discussion.

*Making the Motion to Reconsider:* Only the individual that made the initial motion can make a motion to withdraw an item from discussion. The individual may interrupt a speaker (after being recognized by the chair) to withdraw the motion under discussion at any time.

*Note:* This type of motion typically occurs following some debate by the committee that may provide additional information that influences the mover to reconsider continued debate on the original motion presented. Another member may subsequently make the same motion after it has been properly withdrawn.

*Example:* "Madame Chair, I move to withdraw my motion to support AB 123."

## **5. Motion to Reconsider**

*Purpose:* To revisit discussion of an issue.

*Making the Motion to Reconsider:* A motion to reconsider must be made by an individual that previously voted in the majority of the



original motion. A motion to reconsider made by an individual that previously voted in the minority must be characterized as out of order.

*Timing:* A motion to reconsider must be made at the same meeting where the original motion was discussed, or the next meeting of the body. Motions for reconsideration following the next meeting are out of order.

*Example:* "I move to reconsider the committee's position to support AB 123."

## **6. Motion to Table**

*Purpose:* This motion is often used in the attempt to "kill" a motion by setting it aside. The option is always present, however, to "take from the table," for reconsideration by the committee.

*Note:* This type of motion should be reserved to temporarily set an item aside if agreed upon by a majority of the committee to take up an item of immediate urgency.

However, in practice it is sometimes used as an option to end debate and prevent a vote, and not typically to take up an item of immediate urgency. This is technically improper procedure (or out of order) under Robert's Rules.

*Example:* "I move that the committee table the motion to support AB 123."

## **7. Call for the Question**

*Purpose:* To refocus the committee on the agenda in the event there is sentiment that the discussion has drifted. The individual seeking to end debate must first be recognized by the Chair, make the motion and the motion must receive a second. The motion must be adopted by a 2/3 vote or unanimous consent.

*Example:* "I move the previous question."

## **8. Motion to Appeal**

*Purpose:* To appeal a ruling made by the chair. A committee member may move to appeal a ruling by the Chair, but it must be seconded and receive a majority vote to be reversed.

*Example:* "I move to appeal the Chair's ruling that the committee approved support of AB 123."

## II. OTHER ITEMS

### 1. Point of Privilege

*Purpose:* To draw attention to an item that interferes with the comfort of the meeting.

*Example:*

*Committee Member: "Point of privilege." Chair: "State your point."*

*Committee Member: "Madame Chair, may we inform the hotel staff that the room is uncomfortably hot and request that the air conditioning be adjusted."*

### 2. Point of Order

*Purpose:* To draw attention to inappropriate conduct at the meeting.

*Example:*

*Committee Member: "Point of order." Chair: "State your point."*

*Committee Member: "Madame Chair, the motion was approved without opportunity for debate."*

### 3. Public Comment

In the spirit of the Brown Act an opportunity for public comment is included on all agendas. The chair should exercise discretion in determining the appropriateness and extent of public comment during committee meetings setting reasonable limits as needed.

## III. HOW TO PRESENT A MOTION

1. Obtain the floor by raising your voting card and wait to be recognized by the chair.
2. Make your motion.
  - a. Always state a motion affirmatively. For example, "I move that we support AB 123..." rather than, "I move that we do not take a position ...".
  - b. Avoid comments unrelated to the subject of the motion.
  - c. Avoid making any arguments supporting your motion at this time, simply state the motion.
3. Wait for someone to second your motion.
4. If there is no second to your motion it is lost and no vote will be taken by the committee.
5. If there is a second to your motion the chair should re-state the motion.
  - a. The chair will say, "it has been moved and seconded that we ..." This places the motion before the committee for consideration and action.

- b. The committee then either debates the motion or may move directly to a vote.
  - c. Once a motion is presented to the committee by the chair it becomes "committee property," and cannot be changed by the maker of the motion without the consent of the committee.
- 6. At this point the individual making the initial motion (the mover) may elect to expand on the motion. For example, this would be the appropriate time for the mover to present an argument in support of the motion.
- 7. The chair should always recognize the mover first.
  - a. All comments and debate must be directed to the chair.
  - b. Keep to the time limit (if any) for speaking that has been established.
  - c. The mover may speak again only after other speakers are finished, unless called upon by the chair.
- 8. Putting the Question to the Committee
  - a. The chair asks, "Are you ready to vote on the question?"
  - b. If there is no more discussion, a vote is taken on the motion.
  - c. If the motion passes, the committee moves on to the next item on the agenda.
  - d. If the motion fails, and no other motion is on the floor, then a new motion is in order.

*Note: If a motion to support AB 123 fails, this does not mean that there is opposition to AB 123 by default. A separate motion to oppose AB 123 or some other formal motion must be made and voted on by the committee.*

#### **IV. VOTING ON A MOTION**

##### **1. Voting is Conducted by Voice**

The chair asks those in favor to say, "aye," those opposed to say "no." If the outcome is unclear by voice, a hand vote may be taken. Any member may move for an exact count. Following the vote, the chair should announce the outcome.

## The January 23-24, 2025, Policy Committees General Briefing

### **Cal Cities 2025 Wildfire Resources:**

The fires raging in Southern California have put even some of the most seasoned public officials firmly in uncharted territory. [Misinformation campaigns](#), [artificial intelligence-fueled scams](#), and [federal brinksmanship](#) are worsening what will likely be two of the most destructive wildfires in California's history. We've compiled a list of trusted resources to help officials cut through the noise and focus on response and recovery.

What website should I go to for updates and resources?

[Ca.gov/LAfires/](https://www.ca.gov/LAfires/) is a one-stop shop for essential resources and information. The website includes links to disaster assistance, real-time updates and safety tips, information on consumer protections, and other resources.

What other government resources are out there?

Cal Cities has compiled a comprehensive list of [federal, state, and local resources](#) and activated a peer network of city managers to help cities in affected areas. For more information about the network, please contact your [regional public affairs manager](#).

### **Governor's Proposed Budget Highlights:**

One of Gov. Gavin Newsom's favorite budget truisms usually takes some form of "values are reflected in our investments." But his budget proposal today calls into question what those values are and how deep his commitment runs when it comes to resolving some of the state's most intractable problems.

Earlier this week, Newsom eschewed his normal annual budget presentation to give what he described as a preview on Monday. That left Department of Finance Director Joe Stephenshaw in the hot seat on Friday, as he unveiled a \$322.2 billion spending proposal for the upcoming fiscal year.

The budget maintains or increases commitments made in last year's budget for major climate change and infrastructure initiatives, thanks in part to a modest budget surplus of \$363 million and a voter-approved \$10 billion climate bond. But the budget falls noticeably and dramatically short on housing and homelessness.

"Time and time again, surveys show that homelessness and housing costs are a top concern for residents throughout California," said Cal Cities Executive Director and CEO Carolyn Coleman in a statement. "In addition, recent federal and state reports demonstrate that targeted and sustained funding reduces homelessness. That's why it is disappointing that the Governor's 2025-26 budget proposal fails to include any new funding for the Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention Grant Program and affordable housing programs.

For new budget watchers, a sudden surplus might sound surprising after two years of deficits. But California's progressive tax system depends heavily on stock market gains, which have increased due to a bullish outlook on chipmakers and large tech companies. Newsom has pointed out that could change in the coming months if the incoming federal administration delivers on campaign promises, such as new tariffs. Newsom and others are also already figuring out how to fund what is likely to be another round of bruising legal fights, many centered on the state's environmental policies.

Then there's the matter of the wildfires raging in Southern California. The Federal Emergency Management Agency has agreed to cover much of the costs. However, the process for securing such reimbursements can be lengthy even under friendly federal administrations. And many of those affected communities are covered by the state's last-resort FAIR Plan.

Figuring out what your values are can be hard in flush years. It's even harder during uncertain years. For additional information, please read our in-depth [budget highlights](#).

## **Policy Committee Information:**

### **Community Services**

*Caroline Grinder, Lobbyist*

Looking to the year ahead, the Community Services Policy Committee will remain committed to advancing Cal Cities' [advocacy priority](#) of securing investments to prevent and reduce homelessness. The committee will also continue to focus on other pressing issues, such as addressing the substance use and mental health crisis, supporting early learning and childcare programs, increasing access to open space, and bolstering cities' efforts to support seniors and the aging community.

### *Budget Update:*

When it comes to homelessness funding in the state budget, cities are experiencing déjà vu. Just like [last January](#), the Governor's proposed budget maintains funding committed in previous budgets but does not include any new funding to address homelessness. This comes as [recent counts](#) show homelessness continues to rise in California, reaching record highs last year. Rather than providing new funding to stem the tide of this crisis, the budget instead focuses on accountability policies targeting local governments' use of state funds.

While the budget does not commit to funding round seven of the state's flagship homelessness services grant program, the Homeless Housing, Assistance, and Prevention (HHAP) grant program, the budget signals that the administration is open to working with the Legislature on additional funding for this program. Cal Cities will turn its attention to the Legislature in the coming weeks to advocate for continued funding of this key program. The proposed budget reinforces the Governor's commitment to increased accountability for existing homelessness funding. This includes increased scrutiny of local governments' reporting, regional convenings led by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and increased enforcement through the Housing and Homelessness Accountability, Results, and Partnership Unit. The administration has also proposed

creating a new California Housing and Homelessness Agency to provide a more integrated and effective response to the housing and homelessness crisis. This agency will consist of the existing HCD and the California Interagency Council on Homelessness, which are currently under the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency.

### **Environmental Quality**

*Melissa Sparks-Kranz, Lobbyist*

The Governor's budget proposes \$2.7 billion for the first year of a multi-year expenditure plan to implement a \$10 billion [climate bond \(Proposition 4\)](#), following its passage on the ballot last November. The proposed budget will infuse significant Prop. 4 funding into various climate and environmental programs in the following areas: Safe drinking water, drought, flood and water resilience, coastal resilience, biodiversity and nature-based solutions, clean energy, wildfire and forest resilience, outdoor access and extreme heat mitigation, and dam infrastructure safety.

The proposed budget also acknowledges that policymakers need to continue to prioritize extending the cap-and-trade program beyond 2030 to support the state's carbon neutrality goals, as well as address energy affordability through a suite of actions to meaningfully reduce electric bills. Cal Cities anticipates that with the Los Angeles County wildfires additional legislation will be introduced to cover a wide array of issues that intersect climate change and wildfire preparedness, including areas such as water supply, energy grid operations, CEQA, and Coastal Act. Additionally, housing and coastal legislation, potential CEQA reform, and the clean-up legislation related to the [unfortunate signing](#) of AB 98 (Carrillo, Reyes), the [jam-job](#) warehouse bill from last year, are all slated for this session.

The Environmental Quality Policy Committee will remain committed to advancing Cal Cities' [advocacy priority](#) of strengthening climate change resilience and disaster preparedness, as well as strengthening and modernizing critical infrastructure, including water supply and grid reliability.

### **Governance, Transparency, and Labor Relations**

*Johnnie Piña, Lobbyist*

The Governor's January budget includes a payment of \$9.1 billion to pay down the state's pension obligations. The budget also includes continued reductions in government operations and cuts to approximately 6,500 vacant positions, along with one-time investments in workforce development programs and upgrades to state technology systems.

Legislatively, this year will be another year full of bills related to governance, transparency, and labor relations. We will likely see repeated attempts at measures that previously failed, particularly in the labor relations space. We will see legislation related to challenges cities continue to face including Ralph M. Brown Act modernizations, increased Public Records Act requests, district-based elections, campaign contribution limitations, managing

elections, grappling with emerging technology such as artificial intelligence, managing disruptions in public meetings, and grappling with public sector vacancy rates.

### **Housing, Community, and Economic Development**

*Brady Guertin, Lobbyist*

Last year, more than 100 housing related measures were introduced in the legislature. We anticipate a similar number this year. In 2024, the Legislature focused on giving tools to the Attorney General's Office to "hold cities accountable" for the housing shortage as seen by the numerous bills signed by the Governor that codified the builder's remedy, fines for local governments, and other punishments for cities that fail to comply with housing element law. This year, the Governor continues to insist that local governments are not doing enough to promote housing and need to be held "accountable" for a lack of construction, without providing any new funding in this year's budget for affordable housing programs.

#### *2025 Legislative Outlook*

The major trend to keep an eye on this year is how the legislature will respond to the Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) [2040 Regional Housing Needs Allocation \(RHNA\) Report](#), released last May. The HCD report discusses the department's policy recommendations for the upcoming 7<sup>th</sup> RHNA Cycle and could spark new legislation this year. In addition, the California State Auditor's Office is expected to release its highly anticipated audit results of HCD's housing element review process during the 6<sup>th</sup> RHNA Cycle this summer. For more information on how your city can participate and what the audit entails please click [here](#). Finally, the legislature is expected to introduce a variety of legislation on RHNA reform, Density Bonus Law, building codes as it pertains to fire safety, adaptive reuse projects, and a variety of other issues impacting housing affordability. Both the Legislature and the Governor have highlighted the cost of living, housing, and promoting economic development as priorities for this year's legislative session, so a heavy focus on these issues is expected for 2025.

### **Public Safety**

*Jolena Voorhis, Lobbyist*

The Governor's proposed budget includes significant wildfire mitigation and preparedness funding from the climate bond, including forest health, local fire prevention, wildfire mitigation and additional major capital projects.

With the passage of Proposition 36 and a retail theft legislative package in 2024, the Governor's budget proposal does not include any major investments toward reducing retail theft, fentanyl, or other related issues. The Governor's proposed budget does note the impact Proposition 36 will have on the prison and parole populations.

Due to the recent Los Angeles County Fires there are several legislative proposals expected for recovery including early financial support from the State through the special session.

*Regarding the outlook for 2025, please see the issues noted below:*

#### *Emergency Preparedness and Disaster Response*

Due to the recent wildfire in Southern California, and with the Governor expanding the emergency session to include response to these fires, we anticipate that there will be several legislative proposals in the 2025-26 session.

#### *Fire Insurance/Home Insurance*

*Cal Cities expects several pieces of legislation on the home insurance issue with about 10 measures introduced to date. Along with emergency preparedness, this issue could be part of the emergency response due to the recent wildfires.*

#### *Proposition 36 Implementation*

*With the passage of Proposition 36, the main focus in 2025 will be the implementation of the new laws regarding retail theft and fentanyl. We anticipate budget proposals or legislation to help to implement these new laws.*

### **Revenue and Taxation**

*Ben Triffo, Lobbyist*

Compared to previous years, this year's budget should be significantly easier for the Governor and Legislature to tackle. The Governor's proposed FY 2025-26 budget comes in at \$322.3 billion, which is a noticeable increase from last year's \$297 billion budget which had the herculean task of addressing nearly a \$47 billion deficit. Of note is that the 2025-26 budget maintains \$16.9 billion in reserves and boasts a modest surplus of \$363 million.

The Governor's proposal is in slight contrast with the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), which projected a deficit of approximately \$2 billion and ongoing out-year deficits of \$20-\$30 billion. The LAO has also warned that the state has no capacity to expand existing programs.

The budget proposal avoids drastic budgetary solutions (cuts, delays, and deferrals), as last year's budget was a de facto two-year budget with already enacted budgetary solutions that sought to balance the 25-26 budget. However, caution is warranted, as California's progressive, but volatile tax structure relies on the top 1% of earners, resulting in unpredictable revenue swings. Additionally, natural disasters could lead to tax filing delays, like the ones from two years ago that resulted in significant revenue estimate misses and budget deficits.

The Governor has also emphasized that he will refrain from passing any new taxes, barring any seismic change or action from the federal government that has a significant impact on the state.

#### *Fiscal Reform*

Governor Newsom has also called for fiscal reforms that will need to be approved by the voters — specifically changes to 2014's Proposition 2 and 1979's Proposition 4, both of which deal with the state's budget reserves. He wants to double the budget reserve cap from 10% of General Fund dollars to 20% and make reserve contributions not considered



an expense under the Gann Limit. This begs the question, if this flexibility is good for the state, should it not also be the same for cities?

#### *Going Forward*

In 2025 the Revenue and Taxation Policy Committee will promote Cal Cities' advocacy priority of protecting local revenues and expanding economic development tools. The committee will also continue to support the work of the City Managers Sales Tax Working Group and the Cal Cities wide education campaign around the working group's recommendation.

### **Transportation, Communications, and Public Works**

*Damon Conklin, Lobbyist*

#### *Transportation*

The 2025-26 State Budget maintains the entirety of the transportation funding included in recent budgets. This includes \$7.7 billion for high-priority transit and rail infrastructure projects to improve rail and transit connectivity between state and local/regional services that help ease traffic congestion and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. There is an additional \$1.1 billion for the Zero Emission Transit Capital Program.

The last budget cut two-thirds of the Active Transportation Program's budget, giving the California Transportation Commission (CTC) only enough funding to approve the top 13 projects out of dozens of applications for grants. This budget proposal modestly restores ATP grant funding to Reconnecting Communities Highways to Boulevards Pilot program, and climate adaptation projects to advance equity and health outcomes.

#### *Broadband*

The state budget continues to delay investments for last-mile projects, which connect the broadband network to homes until the 2027 budget year. The lack of augmentations or fund shifts indicates the Administration is focusing on constructing the state's Middle-Mile network and spending previously provided federal funds.

#### *Infrastructure*

In addition to providing transportation funding for local streets and roads, bridges, and the state highway system, the Governor's proposed budget contains a five-year infrastructure plan that includes approximately \$55.4 billion in state infrastructure investments over the next five years.

The budget also proposes \$231.5 million to the Dam Safety and Climate Resilience Local Assistance Program for competitive grants for projects that support dam safety and reservoir operations, such as funding for repairs, rehabilitation, and enhancements. Additionally, the budget proposes \$8.5 million to remove obsolete dams and modifications to related infrastructure to increase habitat connectivity, build climate resilience for culturally and economically important fisheries, and improve coastal sediment supply for beaches and shorelines.

### *Permitting*

It is forecasted that the legislature will consider legislation to reform the permitting process involved in building new infrastructure projects. While the focus could be on green and clean energy projects, Cal Cities remains vigilant that efforts should target the lengthy, costly, and duplicative state and federal permitting processes.

### *Bridges*

Cal Cities is sponsoring legislation to ensure local governments receive enough funding to prevent further deterioration and replace bridges that are in poor condition. The federal government previously maintained a dedicated bridge repair and replacement program as a core highway trust fund program and prior federal transportation authorization bills. Legislation is required to compel the state to provide equity in local bridge funding under the federal Highway Infrastructure Program.

### *Advance Clean Fleet*

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) withdrew its request for an EPA waiver to enforce its Advanced Clean Fleets rule. The withdrawal means CARB is now no longer seeking to enforce its ZEV mandate on drayage and private fleets. While CARB is still able to enforce their regs and direct the AG to seek civil penalties against local agencies because they only have that authority, Cal Cities is looking at sponsoring and advancing legislation in 2024 to provide greater flexibility for cities compliance to the ACF regulations.

*To find a list of relevant bills for each policy committee, please visit our [bill search webpage](#).*



## **Environmental Quality Policy Committee Legislative Agenda**

**Staff:** Melissa Sparks-Kranz, Legislative Affairs Lobbyist  
Zack Cefalu, Policy and Legislative Affairs Analyst

### **1. Healthy Rivers and Landscapes Program proposed as part of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan Update**

#### **Program Summary:**

The Healthy Rivers and Landscapes Program, previously named the Voluntary Agreements and Agreements to Support Healthy River and Landscapes, is a collaborative approach to water management and habitat restoration by local, state, and federal agencies. Its objectives are to restore aquatic habitats to reverse declining native fish populations, enhance the surrounding floodplains, protect instream flows, and enhance water supply reliability.

#### **Program Description:**

This program is designed to restore watershed habitats along key waterways in California specifically in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta), the San Francisco Bay (Bay), and the major tributaries that feed these areas. Two distinct river systems join to form the Bay-Delta: the Sacramento River in the north that runs south and the San Joaquin River in the south that flows south to north. Each of these systems is fed by snowmelt from differing geographic regions and can vary significantly in terms of precipitation, topography, and native fish and wildlife. The program aims to restore the aquatic habitats of native fish species such as Delta Smelt and salmonoids, improve water flows, and strengthen water supply reliability across the state.

The Healthy Rivers and Landscapes Program is currently being proposed by 25 local, state, and federal agencies to the State Water Resources Control Board, who is the state agency responsible for updating and approving the Sacramento-San Joaquin Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan (Bay-Delta Plan). The Bay-Delta Plan establishes water quality control measures (called water quality objectives) and flow requirements needed to provide reasonable protection of beneficial uses in the watershed and establishes a framework to implement those objectives. The Bay Delta Plan is currently being amended in phases; the most recent amendments started in 2018 with the Lower San Joaquin River and its three major tributaries (the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers). The current proceedings to the Bay-Delta Plan are focused on the Sacramento River and its tributaries. These 25 agencies, including the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the California Environmental Protection Agency, the California Natural Resources Agency, the California Department of Water Resources, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife as well as local water agencies, are now signatories to a formal memorandum of understanding with their commitment to 8 years of implementation efforts to improve the Sacramento-San Joaquin Bay Delta watershed, if approved as part of the Bay Delta Plan by the State

Water Resources Control Board. The signatories are voluntarily contributing three components: 1) offering available water supplies to remain in Delta (instream flow), 2) habitat restoration projects covering 45,000 acres within the watershed (non-flow measures), and 3) funding to support scientific monitoring and implementation efforts (non-flow measures). In addition, the program includes a Governance Program, Science Plan, and Funding Plan that are prepared for implementation.

These agencies have agreed to sequester available water supplies from major key tributaries in the state to be added to the Delta, dedicating that supply to improving instream flows and Delta outflow (water dedicated to flowing through the Delta to the Bay). These tributaries such as the Sacramento River, the Feather River, the Stanislaus River, as well as many more receive their water from the snow-melt runoffs of the Sierra Nevada mountains. Because of this, the amount of water in the tributaries and the amount of water supply that local water agencies are proposing to voluntarily commit as water available for the Delta is now up to 825,000 acre-feet, where depending on the type of water year the amount could vary between 155,000 acre-feet up to the 825,000 acre-foot (water year types include: critically dry, dry, below normal, above normal, or wet). The amount taken will be dependent on how dry or wet a year is as designated by the conditions of snowpack and precipitation in the state.

Further, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife will partner with the Department of Water Resources to fund, permit, and implement habitat restoration projects to achieve these goals. These projects would provide more than 45,000 acres of instream habitat to benefit new spawning habitats and fish passage projects, would reactivate floodplains and tidal ecosystems, address flood-risk reduction, and increase fish food production. The proposed projects would help to reverse the declining numbers of native fish species such as steelhead, salmon, and Delta and longfin smelt.

This program also outlines an all-hands approach for robust governance to ensure adaptive management approaches are successfully implemented across water agencies, including local, state, and federal agencies, as well as tribal governments and non-governmental organizations who would like to participate. The benefit of such an approach includes high levels of coordination to ensure effective implementation of projects as well as abilities to leverage funding sources among partners.

The current 2023 draft staff report for Bay-Delta Plan update includes a required inflow from the Sacramento River, its tributaries, and Delta eastside tributaries (the Cosumnes, Mokelumne, and Calaveras Rivers) of 55 percent unimpaired flow, with an adaptive range from 45 percent to 65 percent unimpaired flow to support salmonids and other native species within streams and contribute to Delta outflows (water flowing to the Bay). Unimpaired flow is the flow that would occur without water diversions with existing channel configurations and is an indication of the amount of water available within a stream system to support all the uses for water within that system.

The proposed adaptative range allows for “flow shaping” or managing the quantity, velocity, and variability of water flow within a river system. This can be done by storing water and releasing it at different times to manage the system. The Healthy Rivers and

Landscapes Program as proposed could be managed in a dual implementation pathway with the unimpaired flow and adaptive range proposed in the Bay-Delta Plan update, if approved by the State Water Resources Control Board.

The proposed Bay-Delta Plan update and proposed Healthy Rivers and Landscapes Program are intended to inform the State Water Resources Control Board and the public on a range of possible actions and approaches that could be adopted to update the Bay-Delta Plan.

**Background:**

The State Water Resource Control Board's mission is to preserve and enhance the quality of drinking water and water resources in the state to the benefit of both public and environmental health. The board is responsible for proper water resource allocation, the efficient use and stewardship of water resources, and water supply and water quality protections for beneficial uses and users of water, including ecosystem, species, and anthropogenic uses (human consumption and agricultural purposes). The State Water Board is responsible for adopting and routinely updating a water management plan called the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. This plan outlines actions to be taken to protect the quality and beneficial use of water resources and habitats in the Bay Area and Delta regions of California. This includes managing levels of water supply diversions from the region, protecting water flows, and managing water quality, including salinity.

California currently faces issues directly affecting the health of the Bay-Delta and its aquatic ecosystems, as well as more dramatic swings in water supply availability that necessitate a response. It is important for Cal Cities to consider aquatic ecosystem and water supply availability considerations.

The Bay-Delta's aquatic ecosystems have seen declines in native aquatic species of fish, such as salmon, Delta smelt, steelhead, and the vitality of their ecosystems that they depend on. Aquatic ecosystem stressors such as flow alterations, habitat loss, and decline in water quality have affected the native fish populations of these waterways. In the Sacramento River alone, a major spawning destination for Chinook Salmon, annual fall return dropped below 4,000 in 2022 down from an average of 60,000 from 1990 to 2009.

The importance of habitat and the need for more floodplain restoration to provide enhanced feeding and refuge habitat for smaller fish such as juvenile salmon and Delta Smelt is recognized as part of fisheries population restoration. Other considerations include water quantity and water temperature, which are key to successfully restoring fish populations. This is what has initiated the discussions and the proposed Health Rivers and Landscapes Program for the State Water Resources Control Board to consider as part of the update to the Bay-Delta Plan, to account for both instream flow as well as non-flow measures.

The minimum of 55 percent unimpaired flows would add approximately an additional 1.5 million acre-feet of water flowing through the Delta and into the Bay. A flow-only approach at 55 percent unimpaired flows would add water quantity for native fish species to support instream flow needs. However, the Healthy Rivers and Landscapes Program

provides both flow and non-flow measures that could further support aquatic and fisheries in the Bay-Delta Watershed.

Additionally, over two-thirds of California's fresh water comes from the Sierra Nevada Mountain range and travels through key tributaries and through the Bay-Delta. This is also what makes the Bay-Delta the backbone to California's water supply distribution system for the entire state. The water from the Bay-Delta region is key to providing drinking water to over 35 million Californians and providing water for 8 million acres of agricultural operations.

The 55 percent unimpaired flow approach could lead to potential shortages in water supplies for certain regions. For example, under the unimpaired flow only model, Solano County may need to reduce municipal and agricultural use of the Putah Creek by 75 percent. Additionally, under this model, 40 percent of the time Solano County's annual water allocations from Lake Berryessa would be zero. In critically dry years, Vallejo, Fairfield, Suisun City, and Benicia would not have an alternate water source under the unimpaired flow model. The county consequentially anticipates an overall 75 percent reduction in municipal water available under the unimpaired flow only model, which could have multiple compounding effects on its cities. Vallejo, Fairfield, Vacaville, Benicia, and Suisun City would likely need to enforce a building moratorium due to the lack of available water to meet population demands, putting them at risk of failing to meet their city's housing needs and in direct conflict with state mandates for housing.

The Healthy Rivers and Landscapes Program was designed to achieve the same goals of habitat protection and restoration and would include an unimpaired flow percentage that could be adaptive based on conditions and monitoring. The intention of this voluntary approach is to provide several means of achieving habitat restoration, ensuring water flows, and increasing flexibility in water supply reliability throughout the state rather than focusing solely on flow-only approaches. This program will employ multiple means to achieve the same goals of flow-only in the hopes that this can allow for greater flexibility in unimpaired flows of these vital watersheds to allow for the continuation of water diversion from the Bay-Delta to areas in need of water. It is noted by the agencies in support of the Program that there are other permitting restrictions on water supply that apply in the Bay-Delta beyond the water quality control plan objectives, which is why one of the Program's central tenet is adaptive management.

### **Existing Cal Cities Policy:**

Cal Cities has existing policies related to this topic which include the following:

#### **General Water Quality:**

- Cal Cities supports the development of objectives and standards to assure high-quality water throughout California. Surface and groundwater should be protected from contamination.
- Cal Cities encourages all state offices, departments, and boards to comply with state policy for water quality control, including compliance with the Basin Plans.

#### General Water Quality Guidelines:

- Protection and maintenance of objectives and standards to assure high-quality water throughout California is essential. Beneficial uses of surface and groundwater should be protected from contamination, even when treatment methods are available to meet drinking water standards.
- The importance of water quality of bays, estuaries, groundwater, and other bodies of water important to municipalities, including the problem of saltwater intrusion, should be recognized.

#### Statewide Conveyance Systems:

- Conveyance facilities including, but not limited to, the Sacramento River, whether man-made or natural, should be constructed and/or operated to minimize seepage and erosion problems and, where practicable, to restore or maintain river functions and to protect previously existing riparian habitats. They should be constructed to mitigate these problems and other adverse impacts on adjacent lands.

#### Delta Conveyance System:

- Construction of Delta transfer facilities should not proceed until the Department of Fish and Game and the Department of Water Resources have entered into an agreement to implement measures to offset the State Water Project's impacts on the Delta fisheries and other ecological concerns in the Bay-Delta estuary, which are shown to be adversely affected by the proposed transfer facilities.
- Protection, as well as enhancement where practicable, of Delta water quality, while providing adequate future supplies for all segments of the state, should be required.
- Standards balancing the protection of all beneficial uses of Bay-Delta waters, including water flowing into or exported from the Delta, must be adopted by the SWRCB and enforced to protect the environmental health of the Bay-Delta system.
- Pollution from point and non-point sources into the Bay and Delta shall be controlled as stringently as practicable.

#### Groundwater:

- The importation of additional supplemental water, consistent with Section VI Conveyance Systems, as one means of eliminating groundwater overdraft in the critically over drafted basins should be supported.

#### Fish and Wildlife:

- Protection, maintenance, and restoration of fish and wildlife habitats, resources, and their beneficial uses, including recreational and commercial uses, should be supported. Where feasible, enhancement of fish and wildlife habitats should be provided.
- Water projects shall mitigate adverse impacts on fish and wildlife resources. Mitigation measures shall be onsite, if feasible; otherwise, as close as practicable to the area of adverse impact. Where practicable, such projects should incorporate programs designed to eliminate unnecessary barriers or impediments to fish migration, stabilize areas of streambank erosion, increase spawning and rearing

habitat for fish, and maintain riparian vegetation for cover and temperature control.

- Protection and restoration of documented fish habitats should be supported.

#### Financial Consideration:

- Since most facilities have widespread benefits, it has become traditional for federal, state, and local governments to share their costs.

#### **Fiscal Impact:**

Over \$2.9 billion of funding commitments have been identified to support the Program:

- Public water agencies: \$522 million for water budgets, science programming, and governance.
- State of California: \$1.4 billion through bonds and General Funds.
- Federal Government: \$740 million to assist with habitat restoration and programming.

The State Water Resources Control Board is still assessing its decision on how to best update the Bay-Delta Plan, including considering the adoption of the Healthy River and Landscapes Program as part of the update, making the true fiscal impact unknown.

However, assessments of the fiscal impacts for the flow-only approach have been conducted. According to a UC Davis study finalized in 2022, a 55 percent unimpaired flow approach would have similar effects on the economy of the Sacramento Valley as it experienced during the drought in 2022. The drought resulted in \$1.3 billion loss in economic value, 14,300 jobs lost, \$732 million in lost labor income, and disrupted supply chains. Sacramento Valley under a 55 percent unimpaired flow approach would result in an anticipated 330,000 acres fallowed among rice, field crops, grain and hay, pasture, and truck and berry.

Impacts to the San Francisco Bay Area would also be anticipated from a flow-only approach as over 50 percent of the Bay Area's water supply stems from tributaries and the Bay Delta region. The State Water Board estimates a 25 percent reduction in Bay Area water supply under the unimpaired flow approach resulting in costly investments in alternative supplies and rate increases.

The San Joaquin Valley will also see water supply reductions of an average of 22 percent to urban users that could have compounding fiscal impacts. Limited alternative water sources are available in the San Joaquin Valley requiring significant costs to develop alternative supplies and increased groundwater pumping pressure and may have economic implications on the agricultural sector.

Lastly, Southern California water supply could have significant impacts, where the State Water Board anticipates a 25% reduction in overall water supply, equivalent to building nine new desalination plants to replace that water supply, under the unimpaired flow approach. Costs for alternative water supplies would increase ratepayers costs.



**Staff Comments:**

The committee should be aware that in the absence of Cal Cities' taking a formal position on the Healthy Rivers and Landscapes Program to-date, some cities could have already weighed in. A comprehensive list of support and opposition is challenging to find since this has been a multi-year regulatory proceeding. Cal Cities staff prepared the support and opposition list based on public comments at State Water Resources Control Board public hearings, which may not capture all interested parties with positions on this Program.

Cal Cities staff anticipate the Draft Bay-Delta Plan to be updated in Quarter 2 of 2025, with another public comment period prior to formal adoption by the State Water Resources Control Board.

**Support (\*MOU Signatories):**

US Bureau of Reclamation\*  
CA Natural Resources Agency\*  
CA Environmental Protection Agency\*  
CA Department of Water Resources\*  
CA Department of Fish and Wildlife\*  
Garden Highway Mutual Water Company\*  
River Garden Farms\*  
Sutter Mutual Water Company\*  
Friant Water Authority\*  
Glenn Colusa Irrigation District\*  
Reclamation District 108\*  
Zone 7 Water Agency  
Yuba Water Agency\*  
Western Canal Water District\*  
Regional Water Authority\*  
East Bay Municipal Utility District\*  
Turlock Irrigation District\*  
Modesto Irrigation District\*  
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission\*  
Solano County Water Agency\*  
State Water Contractors\*  
Contra Costa Water District \*  
Kern County Water Agency\*  
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California\*  
Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority\*  
Crescenta Valley Water District  
Eastside Water District  
Palmdale Water District  
Bella Vista Water District  
Rancho California Water District  
Solano Irrigation District

Eastern Municipal Water District  
Valley Center Municipal Water District  
San Juan Water District  
Kings River Conservation District  
Irvine Ranch Water District  
Inland Empire Utilities Agency  
City of Lakewood  
Camrosa Water District  
City of Benicia  
Tri-County Water Authority  
Woodland-Davis Clean Water Agency  
City of Fairfield  
Upper San Gabriel Valley MWD  
San Luis-Delta Mendota Water Authority  
CA Chamber of Commerce  
Agricultural Council of California  
CalCIMA  
CA Building Industry Association  
California Farm Bureau  
California Food Producers  
CA Manufacturers & Technology Association  
CA Municipal Utilities Association  
Dairy Institute of California  
Western Growers  
Sacramento Water Forum  
California Dairy Campaign  
Placer County Water Agency  
Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce  
Modesto Irrigation District  
El Toro Water District  
Valley Ag Water Coalition  
City of Vacaville

Georgetown Divide Public Utility District  
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District  
Agricultural Council of California  
Coachella Valley Water District  
Santa Clara Valley Water District  
Alameda County Water District  
Desert Water Agency  
Nevada Irrigation District  
Western Municipal Water District  
Association of California Water  
Agencies  
Foothill Municipal Water District  
Suisun-Solano Water Authority

Amador Water Agency  
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District  
Rowland Water District  
Three Valleys Municipal Water District  
West Stanislaus Irrigation District  
Southern California Water Coalition  
Stockton East Water District  
Fresno Irrigation District  
Westlands Water District\*  
California Groundwater Association  
El Dorado Water Agency  
Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency

**Opposition:**

Tuolumne River Trust  
Golden State Salmon Association  
San Francisco Bay Sierra Club  
Sierra Club California  
Yuba River Water Keeper  
California Sport Fishing Protection  
Alliance

Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's  
Associations  
Winnemem Wintu Tribe  
Defenders of Wildlife  
Save California Salmon  
Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians  
Wilton Rancheria  
San Francisco Baykeeper

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the analysis be reviewed by the Environmental Quality Policy Committee to decide a position to recommend to the Cal Cities Board of Directors for action.

**Committee Recommendation:**

**Board Action:**