



Meeting Minutes

Meeting of the California Water Commission

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Warren-Alquist State Energy Building

1516 9th Street, Rosenfeld Hearing Room

Sacramento, California 95814

Beginning at 9:30 a.m.

1. Call to Order

Chair Matt Swanson called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

2. Roll Call

Commissioners Curtin, Gallagher, Makler, Solorio, Steiner, and Swanson were present, constituting a quorum.

3. Closed Session

The Commission did not hold a closed session.

4. Acknowledgement of California Native American Tribal Governments

This is an opportunity for elected Tribal leaders and formally designated Tribal representatives to identify themselves and to specify the agenda item(s) on which they will comment, as described in the Commission's California Native American Tribal Leadership Comment Policy. No Tribal Leaders were identified.

5. Approval May 17, 2023, Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Steiner motioned to approve the May 17, 2023, meeting minutes. Commissioner Curtin seconded motion. Commissioner Matsumoto joined the meeting at 9:36. All Commissioners voted to approve the minutes.

6. Executive Officer's Report

Executive Officer Joe Yun reminded the Commission there will be no July meeting, the September meeting is an in-person tour of the Oroville Dam, and there will be a November meeting. Registration is now open for the three virtual public workshops on drought. Commissioners are encouraged to join the workshops.

7. Commission Member Report

Commissioner Curtin said he needed to leave the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

8. Public Testimony

There was no public testimony.

9. Water Storage Investment Program: Harvest Water Final Funding Hearing (Action Item)

Proposition 1, the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014, Chapter 8, requires Water Storage Investment Program (WSIP) applicants to complete several requirements before receiving final funding, including contracts for non-program cost share,

contracts for the administration of public benefits (CAPBs), completed feasibility studies, final environmental documentation, and all required federal, state, and local approvals, certifications, and agreements. Representatives of the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (Regional San), project proponent for the Harvest Water Program, discussed completion of the WSIP requirements. The Commission then considered awarding final funding to the program, up to its Maximum Conditional Eligibility Determination (MCED) of \$291,841,209.

Terrie Mitchell, Regional San Manager of Legislative and Regulatory Affairs, gave an overview of the Harvest Water Program, including a summary of its public benefits, the program's schedule, and the updated capital cost and value of the benefits in 2022 dollars. The project will deliver up to 50,000 acre-feet per year of recycled water to irrigate more than 16,000 acres of agricultural and habitat lands. Public benefits the project will produce include groundwater restoration, ecosystem and water quality improvements, and drought and climate change resiliency. As a conjunctive use project, it qualifies for full WSIP funding. The project designs are almost complete, construction bids are expected this summer, with construction estimated to begin in the fall. The project and its benefits are fundamentally the same as they were during the application process. There has been significant inflation and cost escalation impacts to land values, construction costs, labor, materials, and service, which have significantly affected both the project's cost and the value of public benefits.

WSIP Program Manager Amy Young described how Regional San has met the requirements for a final award hearing. Commission staff reviewed documentation and made adjustments to the value of the public benefits of the project based on inflation, a North of Delta water value adjustment, and changes in physical benefits and realization of benefits in the CAPBs. As a funding agency, the Commission is a responsible party under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Staff is not recommending any further mitigation measures and has drafted findings for the significant impacts identified in the CEQA documents. Staff found the value of public benefits did exceed the MCED and recommended funding Regional San the full MCED.

Public comment by Amber McDowell from the Sacramento County Farm Bureau, who said the Harvest Water Program would provide multiple benefits to their community, including groundwater basin sustainability, sustainable agriculture production, improved water quality, and drought resiliency. It will also reduce dependence on pumping groundwater and increase groundwater elevations with the additional recharge. The Farm Bureau and the farmers in the project area are very supportive of the project and the protection of our natural resources: water, agricultural land, and the environment.

Commissioner Curtin asked what caused the cost of the project to double in five years, and was told in addition to construction, materials, and labor, it was having to upsize their pump station and diameter of pipelines to meet delivery demands. David Richardson, consultant with Woodard and Curran, said they have contingencies in case there are additional cost increases. Commissioner Makler asked if there were any surprises, such as costs not originally identified. Mr. Richardson said they had an extremely efficient and effective permitting and environmental process and would not attribute any significant cost increases to that. Working with the City of Elk Grove to go under Franklin Boulevard increased the cost of the first pipeline segment. Commissioner Makler asked Commission Legal Counsel Holly Stout whether Regional San, after

signing the funding agreement, would be precluded from receiving any additional WSIP funding, should it become available. He was told the funding agreement only governs the amount from the decision made at this meeting. Should other funds become available, they would amend the agreement.

Vice chair Steiner was impressed with the farmer and landowner participation in the program.

Commissioner Solorio said it was good that the project would not be precluded from any potential additional funding.

Commissioner Matsumoto confirmed with Ms. Young that what they were deciding at the meeting was whether to award the MCED, and how much, and was told yes. She asked, if more funding was to come from the legislature, how would the Commission decide how much each project gets? Executive Officer Yun said it depends on how the money became available, and that staff would provide the Commission with options. She asked about the valuation of the Sandhill crane habitat, and how the land-versus-water cost was determined. Staff Economist Roger Mann said the water was valued based on a variety of models used in the past, and for habitat lands, they look at the cost of acquiring comparable mitigation lands. She asked about the window of time or duration of the increased connectivity on the Cosumnes River and how that overlaps with the salmon migration period. Kristal Davis-Fadtke, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Water Branch Environmental Program Manager, said the models show there is a continuous source of water to the Cosumnes River, but the CAPBs focus on the period from October to December as the main migration period for Chinook salmon. She asked if those flows are protected from someone pumping that water out, and if not, is it possible to protect them. Ms. Davis-Fadtke said they are not, but that gets into water rights. On the Cosumnes River there are a variety of projects all trying to contribute to greater flow. The GSP will be looking at the connection of groundwater and surface water, which would be a key measure to protect the flows. She asked under what conditions would re-charged groundwater be taken out of the system and what can they do to make sure it stays there. Ms. Mitchell said the CAPB includes requirements that they cannot export any of that groundwater until they reach specified thresholds and targets with water rights and the GSP. Mr. Richardson said the main contributor to the flow in that stretch of the Cosumnes River flow is the elevated groundwater level, and there are measurable objectives in the GSP that must be met. Commissioner Matsumoto said this program helps us think about water as a connected system, and the project's benefits do not happen absent the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). The combination of regulatory with the incentive-based program is really where we need to get.

Commissioner Gallagher asked whether, as a groundwater project, Harvest Water would be eligible for 100 percent funding, if future money were to appear. Ms. Stout said because it is a conjunctive use project it is eligible for full funding, but it still needs to meet the 50 percent ecosystem benefit. The MCED covered the original cost of the project.

Commissioner Steiner motioned to award the Harvest Water Program its full MCED and to adopt findings and a notice of determination under CEQA. Commissioner Solorio seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

Chair Swanson thanked Commission staff, Regional San, CDFW, and State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for the work they have done. He said this is a partnership, and it took everybody coming together.

10. Water Storage Investment Program: Project Update

WSIP Manager Amy Young provided an update on the progress of projects being considered for funding. The Los Vaqueros Reservoir Expansion Project Joint Powers Authority is updating their schedule, moving the final award date from October 2023 to June 2024. The Commission will hear from the Southern California Water Bank Authority, project proponent for the Willow Springs Water Bank (WSWB), after this item. The Sites water rights application has been publicly noticed and the 60-day protest period has started. The preliminary design report for the Chino Basin Program should be finished this summer and will help identify the project's permit pathway.

11. Water Storage Investment Program: Willow Springs Project Update

In March 2023 the Commission asked representatives of the Southern California Water Bank Authority, the project proponent for the WSWB Conjunctive Use Project, to update them on the status of the project and their progress toward completing the WSIP requirements.

John A. Perez, managing director of CIM Group, a real estate and infrastructure development company, shared the progress made to date on their collaboration with a State Water Project (SWP) contractor to deliver on the public benefits outlined in their MCED. Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency (AVEK) is the incumbent SWP contractor, and the natural agency for them to partner with on this project. They have re-engaged with AVEK to finalize an agreement that would deliver the public benefits in the pre-identified timeline. While aligning with a SWP contractor has taken longer than they would have preferred, they are confident they can come to an agreement and start drawing funds for construction in alignment with the projected timelines.

John Whitt, acting general manager for the WSWB, said the project is located south of the Tehachapi Mountains near Lancaster and Palmdale and is permitted for up to one million acre-feet of storage capacity. The ecosystem benefit would provide pulse flows of 28,600 acre-feet during dry and below normal years to benefit juvenile Chinook salmon, and 215,000 acre-feet of emergency water storage for communities along the California Aqueduct for use during future Delta water supply failures. The final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) addendum was completed in 2019. 2022 saw the most recent water quality report, completion of the project operations and water supply plan, and the draft emergency response operations plan. Next steps are refining operations and the configuration of project components in collaboration with AVEK, whose partnership agreement should be complete by third quarter of this year.

Jennifer Gandin, principal of investment for CIM, said in 2018, the scope of the project was to build everything within the WSWB footprint. In 2021 AVEK signed a letter in support of their feasibility study. Negotiations on how their partnership would work led to a development far beyond what was contemplated to meet the Prop. 1 requirements. Those negotiations stalled on points unrelated to Prop. 1. They are now working toward joint project implementation and operations, developing facilities within banks controlled by AVEK and WSWB. Early funding will be used to support AVEK's negotiations with state agencies on public benefits.

Vice-chair Steiner asked what the timeline was for their agreement with AVEK. Mr. Perez said they are still on track for quarter three of this year and confident they can reach that timeline. She asked for them return in October or November with an update.

Commissioner Solorio said they should not create a hindrance by requesting another update, and he is more interested in seeing progress.

Commissioner Makler asked, if an agreement with AVEK is reached, how long before the start of construction. Kwabena Asante, senior hydrologist from GEI Consultants, said all of the facilities can be constructed within the timeline that has been laid out. Commissioner Makler asked for confirmation that the original application was for a broader project, but the scope now is narrowed to what fits within the parameters of the MCED. Mr. Perez said they are focused on making sure they can deliver on the public benefits within the timeline identified. Commissioner Makler suggested the applicant provide a five-page written description on where they are taking the project, and asked Ms. Stout if it will be problematic down the road from a funding perspective because they narrowed the project's scope. He was told that since this is a conjunctive use project, the 50-percent cost share requirement does not apply, so it would probably be okay.

Commissioner Curtin said he did not see the need for an October update.

Mr. Perez said coming back in October or November would allow them time to make significant progress and provide the written documents requested. If they are close, but not quite there, they would appreciate the opportunity to move the date.

Commissioner Matsumoto asked them to explain the pulse flow numbers. Mr. Asante said the pulse flows will happen in all dry years and half of the below-normal years. 28,600 acre-feet averages out to 8,880 acre-feet per year. She asked them to explain the operations, and was told it begins by capturing excess San Luis Reservoir water to store in the WSWB, and make it available to deliver for ecosystem benefits. In a dry year, the SWP contractor will take water from the WSWB in lieu of water from Lake Oroville. The Oroville water is then released as pulse flows. She asked if there were any other contractor options besides AVEK. Mr. Perez said in a theoretical sense there could be others, but from a practical and operational sense, AVEK is the ideal contractor. She asked if their early funding will be used to help AVEK engage with the state agencies, and was told they have been very conservative in drawing down funds, and want to use it to facilitate those discussions. She thinks the October update is necessary. Vice-chair Steiner asked that Commission staff work with the project proponent to schedule an update in November. She asked if they have been in contact with the state agencies on the CAPBs, and Mr. Perez said their consultants have been involved in those conversations.

12. State Water Project Briefing: Annual Budget, Operations and Maintenance, and Renewable Energy

Staff from the Department of Water Resources (DWR) briefed the Commission on the SWP annual budget, the Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Management Program, Senate Bill 1020, and the Energy Roadmap.

SWP Financial Manager Hong Lin explained the SWP budget process and annual planning, as well as implementation of the contract extension amendment. SWP's annual revenue is \$1

billion, not counting revenue from power generation. Funding comes from the 29 SWP contractors, the Bureau of Reclamation for facilities that are jointly operated, revenue from power generation, and the Davis-Dolwig Fund for fish and wildlife enhancement. Funds are used for O&M, debt service, capital projects, and future SWP programs. DWR and 27 of the SWP contractors have approved and executed a contract extension amendment agreement that took effect on January 1, 2023. The amendment will extend the term in each contract from 2035 to 2085, which will increase the SWP's operating reserves. The 2023 budget is \$958 million: \$652 million for O&M, and \$306 million for capital projects. Historically, they are seeing a steady increase in O&M costs due to inflation and rising cost of labor. The top dollar capital projects include the Perris Dam Remediation Project and the Big Notch Project. SWP maintenance management and asset management programs will provide valuable data to improve capital planning and financing.

Division of O&M Manager Behzad Soltanzadeh talked about the O&M Maintenance Management Program, which is part of their Asset Management Program. The 2019 Maintenance Management Strategy established centralized leadership, created asset engineering positions in headquarters and field divisions, realigned priorities to include preventative maintenance, balanced maintenance approaches, engineered development of maintenance plans (MPs) for all assets, used SAP as a system of record, and developed Project O&M Directives. Standard MPs are prepared by engineers and approved by managers. Asset engineers look at industry best practices and internal staff knowledge. Each standard MP is converted and adjusted as needed in each applicable field division. Tablets are examples of new technology used in the field.

Mr. Soltanzadeh then briefed the Commission on Senate Bill 1020, and SWP's pathway to 100-percent clean and renewable energy. The bill was signed by the governor in September 2022 and requires a renewable and zero-carbon portfolio by December 31, 2035, for state agencies and the SWP. The SWP currently has 179 megawatts of renewable capacity in its portfolio, and will need about 700-900 megawatts of additional clean energy resources capacity to meet the 2035 target. By 2035 the goal is to be 50 percent large hydro and 50 percent small hydro and contracted renewables. Potential challenges include a continuing labor shortage and supply chain disruption, and a delay with the California Independent System Operator's (CAISO) interconnection queue, as requests have tripled since 2021. SWP load is operated, when feasible, to consume energy when renewable energy is abundant, and away from hours when higher fossil fuel generation is dispatched.

Cheryl Luu, Power Planning Branch Manager in the Power and Risk Office gave an overview of the SWP's Energy Roadmap, whose mission is to ensure water supply reliability and affordable energy rates, respond to market evolution, and make prudent investments to achieve California's clean energy goals. The roadmap discusses challenges and includes a wide variety of short-, medium-, and long-term opportunities intended to advance its mission, such as working with CAISO, investigating solar and battery storage integration at pumping plants, coordinating with the SWP contractors on demand side flexibility. Proposed changes to SWP operations to provide more flexible services to the grid shall not increase the cost of delivering water.

Public comment by SWP Contractor Energy Manager Jonathan Young, who said the transition to 100-percent clean energy will be a complicated and costly affair. The SWP is unique from a

traditional utility, with wild swings in how much power they need to move water around the state. With that comes a lot of variability, such as how many resources you need to procure and when to procure them. All of the costs incorporated into meeting these clean energy goals will end up on the retail water bills of Californians. They have to be very mindful as they make this transition, to ensure those cost impacts are minimized. The Energy Roadmap is a proactive and visionary document on transitioning this unique project to do so. They fully support the direction of the roadmap, the opportunities and challenges identified in it and the interim action plan, and look forward to working with DWR to make it a reality.

Vice-chair Steiner asked Mr. Soltanzadeh if pumped storage and the charging of electric state vehicles was part of the power portfolio. He said pumped storage was part of the Flexible Resources Study, and they are in the process of building out their infrastructure and adding charging stations every year, purchasing electric cars as they become available.

Commissioner Makler asked Ms. Lin how much of the overall budget goes to cover debt service, and was told about \$300 million on average annually between now and the end of 2035. He asked if there was an escalating factor embedded in the contract extensions through 2085, and was told they do not have a rate, the terms of payment are collected under different cost components for a full cost recovery from all the beneficiaries. He asked Mr. Soltanzadeh how the SAP implementation correlates to improved safety, and was told they have safety metrics that will tell them how effective and efficient the program will be. He asked Ms. Luu, since the SWP provides critical reliability services, like it did in September 2021, is there a metric in which they get compensated for swinging the system, or incentivize further investment by DWR to make available a system that can be even more flexible. She said it would be good to develop a metric to work with California Public Utilities Commission for demand response services, and with CAISO to see if they can be compensated for some of the reliability services they provide.

Vice-chair Steiner said the barcoding program is fabulous, and liked that they are exporting it to the private sector as well as other public sectors.

Commissioner Curtin said the challenges the SWP faces because of the age of the system is now compounded by an extraordinarily complex turn on energy. All water agencies and energy providers are facing an extraordinary challenge.

Chair Swanson congratulated them on implementing and going live with SAP technology. He said he has done it himself and it is not for the faint of heart.

The Commission took a one-hour lunch break. Commissioner Curtin left the meeting.

13. Groundwater Trading and SGMA Update

Paul Gosselin, DWR's Deputy Director of Sustainable Groundwater Management, gave an update on state activities related to the Commission's May 2022 white paper on groundwater trading, as well as on implementation of SGMA. Out of 515 basins, 94 are subject to SGMA and must form Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) and submit Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs). There are 30 basins with approved plans and nine approved alternative plans. Six basin plans were found inadequate and do not sufficiently address the deficiencies, and one is incomplete and has 180 days to address the deficiencies. The next step for all local agencies is to continue the plan implementation, on a 20-year timeline, which includes addressing

corrective actions, filling data gaps and improvements, building local agency capacity, and advancing projects and management actions. The Commission's white paper on groundwater trading pointed to a lot of issues on unintended consequences that must be considered as they evaluate basin plan implementation. Recent activities that support groundwater trading include evaluating how GSPs are managing toward sustainability, supporting the development of the Water Accounting Platform, cataloging existing groundwater trading market activities, and beginning to implement the white paper actions, starting with interagency alignment and engagement of vulnerable users.

Commissioner Solorio asked what type of governance bodies approve GSPs, and was told that any local public agency that has water supply or management or land use authority could be eligible to form a GSA. There were more than 250 local agencies that elected to be a GSA.

Commissioner Gallagher asked how DWR provides data to GSAs in useful and meaningful ways, and was told the more unified data sets they provide to local agencies makes for consistency statewide, and alleviates local agencies from having to recreate and develop data.

Chair Swanson asked if Madera was the most difficult basin to find a solution for right now, and was told when they came in, they had more than one plan, and one of the requirements is to have a coordination agreement on how they are using the same data and methodology. They did not have a fully signed agreement, putting them behind by about six months. He then asked how they felt it was going overall, and was told they were surprised at the progress and how the agencies are embracing going down this path, and encouraged they will have all the basins achieve the sustainability that was intended under the law. Every deadline that has been set, even difficult ones, have been met. Chair Swanson said he has found that a lot of people in agriculture now understand that this needs to happen.

Vice-chair Steiner asked if GSAs with a non-approved plan can still engage in groundwater trading, and was told that, as long as they are going in the right direction, they want them to continue to implement.

Commissioner Matsumoto asked his observations on the huge reliance on recharge and the supply side of the equation, and how does he see demand reduction phase in over time. He said demand reduction is in play, but looking at what GSAs can maximize for recharge is important: see what they can do first before going down a more harmful pathway. They are looking at working with SWRCB and CDFW to streamline groundwater recharge projects, which will vet out ones that may not come to fruition. She asked if DWR is planning to update the water available for recharge report, given climate change and new modeling and all the data that came in from the GSPs, and was told no, but they will be looking to what the climate change team develops regarding water supply reliability and advance that to the local agencies for consideration in their water budgets. She asked which beneficial users were less represented in the process, and was told domestic wells, which resulted in them coming out with a guidance document on how to address drinking water. She asked what they would do with the \$900,000 line item for groundwater trading, and was told they will wait for the Governor to sign the budget.

14. Groundwater Trading Practitioner Update

Two groundwater trading practitioners discussed on-the-ground examples of and experiences with groundwater trading, including challenges and lessons learned.

Sarah Heard, Director of MarketLab at The Nature Conservancy, said Fox Canyon is the first groundwater market to arrive under SGMA. Located in Ventura County, the 2019-20 water year was its first year of trading. Because of the flexibility the market affords there was robust participation among growers. An area that has experienced extreme overdraft over the decades saw a net reduction in pumping. Several elements from the Commission's white paper match up with Fox Canyon. The white paper identifies market power as a threat, and it has shown up from the beginning, with large growers/packers/shippers influencing the design of the market to their benefit. Because Fox Canyon has made it very difficult to manipulate the market, they are seeing a workaround where unregulated transfers are happening outside of Fox Canyon where it is easier to evade rules. It is a real threat that disables participation in the market, but an even bigger threat to SGMA compliance.

Matthew Fienup, Executive Director of the Center for Economic Research and Forecasting at California Lutheran University, said prior to the market, Fox Canyon had an existing provision that allowed the owner of a parcel of land to designate an operator as the authorized representative who would report on the well. In recent years the operators have filed registration papers to aggregate large numbers of wells into single accounts, or CombCodes, whose allocations can then be pooled, and the entire allocation pumped among any of the wells in any amount as long as the sum does not exceed the allocation. Transfer between wells within the un-sanctioned market have resulted in a net increase in pumping of eight percent in the agency-designated sensitive area, in stark contrast to the formal water market, where voluntary transfers of water have resulted in a net reduction in pumping. This has become a tremendous burden to the agency to do the administrative work necessary to determine eligibility, and it has reduced the number of participants in the formal water market. There is also significant evidence of coercion in the formation of CombCodes. The Kaweah Subbasin is a water market that builds on the success demonstrated by Fox Canyon. Stakeholders include three GSAs, urban, agriculture, and disadvantaged communities (DACs). They agreed on a clear set of goals that align with the GSP: flexibility, adaptability, transparency, do no harm, equity and inclusion, and one basin-wide strategy. Rather than using metering and telemetry, Kaweah accounting is based around satellite remote sensing. This data arrives once a month, instead of in real time. Two separate triggers result in restrictions: if levels fall below the threshold minimum, and if declines in water levels affect DACs. Challenges include un-regulated transfers, market power, and threats to sustainability. There is a role for state agencies. Transfers require oversight, and state agencies should ensure that transfers of pumping comply with the intent of SGMA, and follow through on the Next Steps identified in the white paper.

Commissioner Gallagher asked what they thought drove people to un-regulated markets. Mr. Fienup said the formal market designed in Fox Canyon is a real success and a model for how transfers can be conducted, and Kaweah is headed in the same direction. Water users in Fox Canyon, in particular a couple of large packer/shippers, have been looking for an advantage all along, looking for how to extract as much of the gain as possible and looking for ways to impact other people's access to the market. In doing so, they learned there was some ambiguity in the

way the accounting rules were written. It is a basic regulatory failure as opposed to a market failure. Ms. Heard said the thing that would keep this from happening would be if the agency did not allow transfers to happen outside of the formal market or made a change to the CombCode.

Vice-chair Steiner asked if the wells are also allocated as part of the GSA. Mr. Fienup said every well is given an allocation based on a 10-year pre-SGMA historical period. In the water market, you are not allowed to transfer pumping from the healthy part of the basin into the vulnerable part of the basin. If you join wells from the healthy and vulnerable parts into a single unit, you can take all the pumping from the well in the healthy part of the basin and pump it in the vulnerable part. This is an example of where the rules on transfers within CombCodes are unregulated, whereas market transfers have a thoughtful approach to identify what are the vulnerable parts of the basin and how do they make sure they do not make them worse.

Commissioner Matsumoto said SGMA is creating a new environment for people to figure out new ways to get around the system, and the market is another layer of people trying to get the upper hand. If big ag operators figure this out in one space they will apply the strategy in other basins. This speaks to the role of the state. Ms. Heard said the state could convene an advisory board, and leverage others who can help. Mr. Fienup said there is a carrot and stick approach. The stick approach would be attention paid to non-market types of transfers, all subject to the same scrutiny. The carrot approach would be financial incentives for well-designed formal markets that may tip the balance and encourage agencies to do the right thing.

Vice-chair Steiner said staff should be very proud of the fact that the white paper clearly had an impact. It was heartening to know that it was read, paid attention to, and put into action.

15. Consideration of Items for Next California Water Commission Meeting

The Commission will not meet in July. The next meeting of the Water Commission is currently scheduled for Wednesday, August 16, 2023, when the Commission will hear a recap of the expert panels they have hosted on the topic of drought, as well as a report-out on the recent drought workshops, receive a briefing on the Lake Perris Outlet RON, get an update on conveyance projects in the state, and hear about DWR's and the Commission's reports on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.

16. Adjourn

The Commission adjourned at 3:01 p.m.