

Chapter # Water-dependent Recreation

Water-dependent Recreation in California

- intensity of use - # of people per resource, participation over area – important because plan goes to 2050, so how will accommodate this?
- make distinction between grades of recreational opportunity from Bidwell Park scenario to fish & wildlife reserve to wilderness reserve
- add canoeing, water-skiing and equestrian, and anything else along the trails in the second sentence
 - could also expand to ski industry
- also add Native American/cultural water usage
 - *cultural piece* -- coming in because working with Water Plan Tribal Communication Committee, some discussion of variety of things including dances and other uses dependent on flow, maybe bring in here in more robust way, certainly consistent with State Parks area as well
 - clam gathering, and spear fishing – just two of the activities in a form that falls under “fishing”, cultural and can be (but not always) ceremonial
 - can get advice from Native American Heritage Commission and State Parks’ Office of Historic Preservation

Potential Benefits of Water-dependent Recreation

- numbers in benefits are what’s actually occurring, could move this to the introduction, have some trend information from Parks & Recreation, and other than that need to identify what more should we strive to achieve, what more do we need to do; then costs would be associated with achieving additional level of recreational opportunity and related tourism
- can strengthen water education component, watersheds, water-related environments, primary and secondary schools
- making outdoor areas accessible to EJ communities, taking care of most vulnerable population – children in disadvantaged communities, Children’s Bill of Rights, CA Recreation Roundtable adopted a policy on this (but not sure if adopted by State government)
 - CA Biodiversity Council has taken this up as well – Last Child in the Woods
- benefit is not always associated with use – people that live within the radius of an area, a non-use benefit, e.g., raises land and property values, open space, value for population centers, watershed too -- data exists on that

Potential Costs of Water-dependent Recreation

- will need a pulse of new infrastructure development because of climate change? e.g., moving facilities?
 - could capture under major issues in climate change so as not to forget that
- not clear whether includes costs of ops & maintenance for campsites and other water-related facilities, as well as trail and road maintenance



- Sierra National Forest out of Clovis can give figures on estimated costs, campsites, trails, other recreational things (for the hydro-relicensing for PGE & SoCal Edison, recreation was major topic)
- on FERC relicensing, can also contact Steve Edmondson, NOAA Fisheries, Santa Rosa office -- somewhere around 120 relicensing efforts due in next ten years in CA, and this allows for the inclusion of a commitment to meeting obligations for water-dependent recreational uses
- Ca Land Management could help, too – contract with USFS to take care of campgrounds, they're a vendor
- State Recreation Plan will be complete in a few months, will tie some of that into this

Major Issues Facing Water-dependent Recreation

- invasive species in general, specifically quagga mussel – boat washing and intake pipes; New Zealand mud snail will be next, Susan Ellison at DFG is invasive species expert
 - this is also important for Boating & Waterways
- inadequate capacity and access as topic – few facilities that provide public access, and with demographics and change in population and need and age there will be a capacity issue
- development is not zero sum game – can make more money if talk about ecotourism (which respects private property rights)
- add new heading/section: impacts to cultural resources

Impacts to Natural Resources

- some of natural environment will need to be off limits to access & recreation, there are impacts and overuse issues

Climate Change

- coast will take pounding, infrastructure will cost a lot and might need addressing

Flood Management Control

- remove the word “control”
- levees and trails: creating trails and water trails: levee have opportunities for this because build and managed
- like to add urban design, for ex, Lake Elizabeth in Fremont is critical element of flood control – urban designed environment with huge recreational component
 - common urban development mitigation strategy
 - Sepulveda Flood Control Basin in LA is another good example, and Temecula flood easement paid for because will be parkland and trails
 - theme of integration of other values

Recommendations to Facilitate Water-dependent Recreation

- #1 public needs includes the needs of low-income people, but a specific recommendation to this could be useful
- #3 update that – CALFED merging into Delta Vision
 - could also include Stae Lands Commission, and maybe State or Regional Waterboards because water quality linkages
 - Ocean Protection Council work as well



- need more on what we really want to do to improve recreation for the future, 2050
 - ask more for what want - \$1 billion for climate disruptions, insurance fund for new infrastructure needs, all setback levees should be parks, double the parks, e.g., “We want to be part of FloodSAFE, insurance fund for beaches to rebuild, more land and water”
 - to reduce impacts to water quality, recommend improvements in water recreation vehicles – like no more gasoline driven engines on waterways, or stricter regulation outputs – exploring this concept here
- #4 and #5 – these should be reflected in the costs section, in light of growing population and demands
- #6 split second part out as separate recommendation – research v education, and second can tie back to outreach, Biodiversity Council, see if they have recommendations they’re trying to advance
 - can also mention Stewardship Council <http://www.stewardshipcouncil.org/> which is overseeing bankruptcy of PG&E, one of their main items is outdoor education for youth, have great maps of the urban areas that are most highly affected especially in Central CA, all along the PG&E corridor, lots of documentation online to substantiate what they’re doing
- #7 include “California Tribes” where effective partnerships are mentioned
- if new floodways or facilities, these have built-in recreation opportunities considered in the design
- public safety – injury prevention, drowning prevention, especially for communities of color/low income, teaching to swim
 - can fit in piece that talks about risks earlier in the piece
 - risk is related to access issue, concern for private owners, so can explore this and how might be addressed
- IRWMs grant requirement has recreation component – so not every feature has recreation, but if plan as a whole has a recreational component and gets funding and credit for it

Attendance

Josh Brown, Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum
Melvin Carmen, North Fork Mono Tribe
Woody Elliott, DPR
Ron Goode, North Fork Mono Tribe
Rebecca Kanegawa, MWH
Alex Stehl, DPR
Laura Westrup, DPR

DWR and Facilitation Staff

Lisa Beutler, CCP
Barbara Cross, DWR
Megan Fidell, DWR
Tom Filler, DWR
Ted Frink, DWR
Dorian Fougères, CCP



Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR
Michael Perrone, DWR

