

**MEETING OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE**  
(ALL MEETINGS OPEN TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC)

**Location:** CA Department of Food and Agriculture  
1220 N Street – Main Auditorium  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Contact:** Joshua Eddy, Executive Director  
**Office:** (916) 654-0462

**MEETING MINUTES OCTOBER 26, 2011**

Item  
No.

**(1) CALL TO ORDER**

- (a) The meeting was called to order on Wednesday, October 26, 2011 at approximately 10:10 a.m. Craig McNamara, President of the State Board of Food and Agriculture presiding.
- (b) Welcoming remarks provided by President McNamara.
- (c) Pledge of Allegiance.

**(2) ROLL CALL**

Roll call taken by Joshua Eddy, Executive Director.

**Present:**

Craig McNamara	Ben Drake	Luawanna Hallstrom
Kerry Tucker	Arlan Van Leeuwen	Donald Bransford
Kiran Black	Ashley Boren	Sean McNally
Adan Ortega, Jr.	Marvin Meyers	

**Absent:**

David Wehner	Daniel Dooley
--------------	---------------

**(3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – September 28, 2011**

Board member Ben Drake moved to approve the minutes of the September 28, 2011 meeting. Board member Kiran Black seconded the motion and a unanimous vote carried the motion.

**(4) DEPARTMENTAL UPDATE**

Secretary Ross provided a brief departmental update to the Board. The updated focused on the California Agricultural Education License Plate Campaign (CalAgPlate), the departmental budget process and fair consortium meeting, and California’s recommendations concerning the Farm Bill.

Secretary Ross also introduced, Dr. Amrith Gunasekara, CDFA science adviser, who provided a brief update to the board concerning the Cannella Environmental Farming Act Science Advisory Panel and the department’s Fertilizer, Research and Education Program.

**(5) PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD – California Water Policy Update**

The Board heard from a representative from the University of California, Davis who provided an overview of California water transfers.

Speaker:

- Dr. Richard Howitt, University of California, Davis

The presentation concluded without formal action by the Board.

**(6) PANEL DISCUSSION – Water Transfers (Current Status/Framework)**

The Board heard from two governmental representatives who provided an update to the Board on the current status of federal/state water transfers and exchanges.

Speakers included:

- Pablo Arroyave, Deputy Regional Director, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
- Paula Landis, California Department of Water Resources

The discussion concluded without formal action by the Board.

**(7) PANEL DISCUSSION – Water Transfers (Framework for the Future)**

The Board heard from six representatives from various water agencies and authorities concerning the actions needed to improve California’s water transfer system.

Speakers included:

- Lewis Bair, Reclamation District 108
- Steve Hirsch, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
- Ed Smith, Palo Verde Irrigation District
- William Luce, Friant Water Users Authority
- Tom Glover, Westlands Water District
- Dante Nomellino, Central Delta Water Agency

The presentation concluded without formal action by the Board.

**(8) PANEL DISCUSSION – Water Transfers (Environmental Perspective)**

The Board heard from three representatives from environmental organizations and other stakeholder communities concerning water transfers.

Speakers included:

- Carol Perkins, Butte Environmental Council
- Spreck Rosekrans, Environmental Defense Fund
- Katy Mamen, California Roundtable for Water and Food Supply

The presentation concluded without formal action by the Board.

**(9) BOARD DISCUSSION**

Following the presentations and panel discussions, the Board considered next steps concerning water policy and water transfers. The Board recommended that the Water Subcommittee convene a meeting to discuss priorities for consideration at the next Board meeting.

The discussion concluded without formal action by the Board.

**(10) OTHER BUSINESS**

The Board conducted the following business:

Board member Kerry Tucker updated the Board on food access issues and initiatives. The updated included referencing the passage of Assembly Bill 6 and Assembly Bill 152 which eliminated fingerprint imaging for food stamp recipients and allows for tax credits associated with food

donations by farmers. In addition, Mr. Tucker reminded the Board of its commitment to assist in doubling food donations by 2015.

MOTION: Board member Kerry Tucker moved that Board members report on the number of donation referrals and commitments they have facilitated in connection to the initiative to double food bank donations by 2015. Board member Don Bransford seconded the motion and a unanimous vote carried the motion.

No further business was brought before the Board

**(11) PUBLIC COMMENT**

One individual provided public comment.

Robin Huffman submitted public comments prior to the Board meeting – comments attached.

**(12) CLOSING COMMENTS AND ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:30p.m.



Submitted Public Comments  
October 26, 2011 Meeting

October 22, 2011

To the California State Board of Food and Agriculture for the October 26, 2011 meeting:

The agenda's language is troubling, with 6 panelists from powerful water districts/agencies/authorities discussing the "framework for the future". Then 3 panelists give the "environmental perspective". The "framework for the future" discussion should be presented after panels on the environment, agricultural/economic needs (which isn't part of the meeting), and energy availability (which is not part of the discussion). This meeting appears to be primarily about the water districts/agencies/authorities facilitating transfers north to south and east to west.

Where are the people who represent the fish and water ecosystems? Were C-WIN, CSPA, and AquAlliance invited to the panel discussion on the environment? There appear to be too many holes on the agenda to have a well-rounded discussion. How else is the Board of Food and Agriculture getting public comment for consideration at this meeting?

Someone should be speaking about the use of water for new industry other than agriculture; how inappropriate a use it is to divert increasingly large quantities of water to process Tar Oil and natural gas. How is this issue being taken into consideration? It is another industry that is taking more and more water in California, other than agriculture. The energy returns from the energy and water put in do not add up to a beneficial use of water resources for processing Tar Oil and natural gas. It will take an act of the legislature to get this misuse to stop, and a recommendation from the California State Board of Food and Agriculture for the State Governor and Legislature to take action would be powerful.

The energy of the October 26 meeting is misdirected at increasing water transfers from the north to meet increasing energy needs in the south, when it should be directed at water use that industry is being allowed and whether or not those are beneficial uses for the State's water resources. **The State needs to take initiative to figure out how to take real limits on environmental resources into account in the current "free market" economic system (that is about to collapse), rather than trying to squeeze more out of the environment.** The issue is food and water or oil. The obvious answer is that food and water are more important. Discuss this and take action please.

There should be zero infrastructure built that has the capacity to increase north-south water transfers at any time of the year. I emphasize the economic benefits of the natural system, that the natural system provides clean water and balanced ecosystems for free – and that human engineering is costly and has a proven record of being both expensive and detrimental to the natural system and fish and water resources. Nature knows what she is doing. Let the water flow in large part naturally, with seasonal fluctuations. The State water system should very carefully take from water resources, respecting the natural order.

1. As far as increasing north-south water transfers, there are no options available. Maximum take north-south has been achieved. Decreased transfers south of the Delta would benefit the Delta ecosystem. Seasonal flushing from natural flows of the toxic waste coming from wastewater treatment facilities, urban areas, and industry is beneficial, not a waste of water. This statement will not make anyone popular, but it is an obvious fact that needs to be aired and discussed at the meeting.

2. It is not an option to increase the use of the Lower Tuscan aquifer for Statewide purposes. There are existing known gaps in scientific data and research, however, what is known is that the groundwater holds up the surface water and that the lower aquifer is very old water that is not easily replaced.
3. The Precautionary Principle must preside with the use of water supplies in California, especially the Tuscan aquifer which is in pretty good shape and should not be ruined.
4. Depletion of water north of the Delta would result from increased water transfers south. Increased water transfers south will deplete the agricultural economy north of the Delta.
5. Practical steps/fixes taken would not involve increasing the capacity for north/south water transfers.

Thank you all for considering the above comments for the October 26 meeting of the California State Board of Food and Agriculture

Respectfully submitted,

Robin Huffman  
6239 Himmel St.  
Paradise, California