



Draft Meeting Minutes

Meeting of the California Water Commission

Wednesday, October 17, 2012

State of California, Resources Building

1416 Ninth Street, First Floor Auditorium

Sacramento, California 95814

Beginning at 9:30 a.m.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chairman Anthony Saracino called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.

2. Roll Call

Executive Officer Sue Sims called roll. Danny Curtin, Joe Del Bosque, Kim Delfino, Luther Hintz, and Anthony Saracino were present, constituting a quorum. Andy Ball and Joe Byrne were absent at the time roll was taken. Mr. Ball arrived at approximately 9:55 a.m.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the draft minutes from the September 19, 2012 meeting. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

4. Executive Officer's Report

Ms. Sims provided the Executive Officer's update. Ms. Sims introduced Maureen King who provided counsel to the Commission at this meeting. Following the September meeting at which Dave Gutierrez from DWR Division of Safety of Dams provided an overview of the Department's Federal Advocacy Program, James Haussener, Executive Director of California Marine Affairs and Navigation Conference, contacted Commission staff. There are many areas of mutual interest including activities to educate and inform federal agencies and elected officials, and financing for infrastructure. Ms. Sims noted that it has been two years since the members of the Commission participated in an ethics training course. Details on the required course are forthcoming. Ms. Sims noted several items on today's meeting agenda have a public finance and investment component. The Commission has opportunities for more engagement in conversations related to public finance in the future.

5. Legislative Update

Kasey Schimke, DWR Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, provided an overview on the 2012 state legislative session. Mr. Schimke noted that there were fewer bills affecting water than in the previous session. He noted several key bills affecting water or DWR. Of particular interest was the Public Pension Reform Bill, which among other things, requires future and present employees to contribute 50% towards their pension. This may have some effect on the State Water Project's recruitment and retention issues. He also noted a bill that established the basic human right to clean water. This is consistent with the state constitution and other bills and policies. The bill is focused on DWR, Water Board, and the Department of Public Health. Currently DWR's Integrated Regional Water Management grant program includes funding for disadvantaged communities. Mr. Saracino asked if there is any practical impact to this bill. Mr. Schimke said the impact will be in how we, as state agencies, implement our programs. Mr. Curtin noted that this law may be used for communities with groundwater problems to bring suits against local agencies to make clean water a high priority. Ms. Delfino said she was pleased to see this bill pass and noted that access to clean drinking water is a critical issue for some communities. She would like an update on how this is being dealt in the future. She stated the Office of Planning and Research could make a presentation. Mr. Curtin asked for an update if any suits are brought about in regards to this law.

AB 1578, Logue, Indian Valley Watermaster District, allows for the formation of a local Watermaster district. This service was previously provided by DWR, the locals will now take on the responsibility to choose who will oversee the allocation of water pursuant to judicial agreements.

AB 1750, Solorio, Rainwater Capture Act of 2012, defines key terms relating to rainwater capture and authorizes the installation of rainwater capture systems for water conservation and water reuse.

SB71, Leno, State Agencies: boards, commissions, and reports, eliminates a number of mandated reports. The second half of Section 162 of the Water Code requiring a written report detailing disagreements between the Commission and DWR's Director, has been deleted. The Commission will make any disagreement between the Commission and DWR's Director available through its discussions at public meetings which are webcast and in minutes which are available online and by request.

SB 200, Wolk, Delta Levee Maintenance, extended the option for the 75% State cost share for levee maintenance grants, which was set to expire at the end of the year. Without this bill, the cost share would revert to 50/50 State-local cost share. This bill extends the 75% option until 2018.

SB 1099, Wright, Regulations, sets four days per year where regulations may take effect. Currently, regulations take effect 30 days after they are filed. This bill does not change the emergency regulations process. However, other approved regulations may now take 60-90 days to go into effect.

Bills that failed passage include AB 1570 and SB 984, both of which deal with CEQA reform.

Another bill which passed was AB 1422 which postponed the water bond to 2014 ballot. Between now and 2014, there will likely be continued discussion in the legislature on the bond amount and the future of long-term infrastructure financing. The bond is currently silent on flood funding; there may be discussion about whether flood funding should be added.

Member Andy Ball arrived at 9:55 am.

6. Update on Priority Areas for Delta Levees Special Projects

Dave Mraz, Principal Engineer with DWR's Delta Levees and Environmental Engineering Branch, provided an update on the Delta Levees Special Flood Control Projects Program (Delta Special Projects). Mr. Mraz noted that DWR is responsible for putting together a list of projects and priorities in the Delta which the Commission will approve. DWR has begun working on a policy framework for granting local agencies state funds for levee improvement. The role of the program is to protect discrete and identifiable state benefits including life and property, utilities and transportation. Additionally, the program must include net habitat enhancement. DWR has spent the last year creating the background reference memorandum which provides objective and goals. Information in this document may be used in the policy document. The Delta Special Projects program applies to the legal Delta, as defined in the water code. DWR is protecting many urban areas outside of Delta Special Projects. Delta Special Projects protects rural areas, water supply facilities, utilities, transportation, recreation, and habitat. DWR is currently enumerating those benefits on each island and those will be considered in development of the policy. DWR has created a draft Framework for Investments in Delta Integrated Flood Management, which has been available for review and comment for about a year.

This document established three priorities: urban areas, small communities and infrastructure, and agriculture and working landscapes. Over the next year, DWR will work with public, federal and state agencies and the Commission so that the final policy can be in place by July 2013 and implemented in years following.

Mr. Ball asked if this program is for the Delta only or the entire Bay Area. Mr. Mraz stated that it is for the Delta only.

Mr. Saracino asked about implementation schedule for any projects. Mr. Mraz stated that DWR has implemented projects for last 20 years under the previous guidelines, and is currently implementing projects under interim guidelines.

Ms. Delfino noted that the program is already spending money while the plan is being developed and asked how much funding is left without the bond. Mr. Mraz noted that funding is subject to appropriation by the Legislature. Currently, this program is funded by Propositions 84 and 1E. From that funding, DWR has committed approximately \$560 million and has about another \$200 million left.

Ms. Sims asked when this would come back to the Commission for approval. Mr. Mraz expects to bring this back several times before approval in May or June 2013.

7. Briefing on the California Water Plan Update 2013

Mr. Kamyar Guivetchi, Chief of DWR's Division of Statewide Integrated Water Management (IWM), provided an update on the California Water Plan (CWP) 2013 update process. He stated that he would like to continue to engage with the Commission on that process. Mr. Guivetchi thanked the Commission for including IWM in its Strategic Plan.

The CWP is updated every five years. It includes recommendations, but not mandates nor funding; implementation must be done by the Legislature. The foundation of the CWP Update 2013 is the same as 2009 and topics such as water use efficiency, water quality, and protection of ecosystems have been expanded. Initially, the focus was on the water supply system, but evolved as the need to align the work of water supply, flood management, water quality protection, and environmental stewardship was recognized.

Mr. Guivetchi noted that the CWP has increased venues for collaboration. The California Water Commission is the 29th and newest member of the State Agency Steering

Committee. This group is used to communicate and share the water plan process with other state agencies.

The goal of the Water Plan is to invest in innovation and infrastructure to improve public safety, environmental stewardship, and economic sustainability in California. Innovation activities include improving water governance and planning, information technology, data and tools that support IWM, and investing in new technology. This innovation must be the underpinning for investing in infrastructure on multiple scales and in multiple regions. The State must play a role in bringing about these changes; infrastructure will require billions of dollars in investment. This includes natural and human made infrastructure.

One way the State has done this is through Integrated Regional Water Management. To date, 48 regions have been accepted into the program. The program now covers 87% of California's land mass and 99% of people. The program encourages groups to work together, choose projects that provide multiple benefits, and encourages regional self-sufficiency. Integrated flood management is another important program. It reduces flood risk while improving water quality, water supply reliability and healthy ecosystems. Mr. Guivetchi suggested the Commission coordinate with the Central Valley Flood Protection Board. IWM requires far better communication between organizations to ensure better alignment of policies. The Water Plan includes 27 resource management strategies and is adding three new strategies for 2013: Education and Outreach, Sediment Management, and Water and Culture. He also noted that the Water Plan Update 2013 schedule has been pushed back due to furlough days.

Mr. Saracino asked for clarification on the Water and Culture strategy. Mr. Guivetchi stated that different cultures and communities use water for different purposes, and that will be reflected in the Water Plan.

Paul Massera, Program Manager for Water Plan Update 2013, shared information on the CWP Plenary Session. He reviewed key topics discussed at the Plenary Session. He noted that DWR is increasing the emphasis on regional reports and including them in the Water Plan highlights document. Regulatory alignment is a new discussion that continued through the plenary. Regulating agencies and non-governmental organizations are considering developing a white paper on this topic. Near-Coastal Resources is a topic enhancement of the CWP 2013. Water technology is also a new enhancement. The Water Technology Caucus is discussing new ways to invest in technology and the importance of new technology as a State priority. Participants also discussed the economic value of

ecosystem services and how to meaningfully look at the value of ecosystems in terms of financing. There was also a Tribal Advisory Committee meeting as part of the plenary.

A new feature of the plan is the California Water Management Progress Report. It measures progress on implementation of objectives of the previous Water Plan and how these objectives need to be refashioned for this Plan.

There was also a discussion of sustainability indicators. The US Environmental Protection Agency is working on water footprints. DWR is working with UC Davis to develop a California-specific water footprint and sustainability indicators. DWR is working on a strategic plan for the future of IWM. Discussion included future funding, the role of IWM, and the vision, key elements, and schedule for the plan.

Mr. Massera then discussed finance issues in the CWP. The Water Plan will include a water finance framework for the first time in 2013. The purpose is to define the State's future role in IWM. Goals include aligning State IWM funding, prioritizing investments, and guiding future legislation. During the process, DWR has compiled valuable data on current state of funding and sought feedback on its finance recommendations.

Groundwater and flood issues were also discussed, and will be discussed significantly later in the meeting. Overall, the plenary was successful.

Mr. Saracino noted that the CWP has evolved remarkably under Mr. Guivetchi's direction.

Mr. Curtin asked about forest management, and if the Department of Forestry was involved in this process. Mr. Massera said that both the US Forest Service and CalFire are involved the State Agency Steering Committee. Mr. Guivetchi noted that Association of California Water Agencies has initiated a process to come up with policy principles on watershed management.

Ms. Delfino asked if range management is included in the Forest Management Strategy. Mr. Guivetchi stated that it is, and it is also included in the watershed management and agricultural land stewardship strategies.

Mr. Curtin asked about IRWM regions in the desert. Mr. Guivetchi noted that work is underway to get all of California included in regional water management.

8. Briefing on DWR Groundwater Programs and California Water Plan Groundwater Enhancements

Abdul Kahn, DWR Program Manager, provided a brief overview of the groundwater enhancements in the Water Plan. In California, groundwater provides 35% of the water supply, but in dry years this can go up to 40 to 60%. Some regions get as much as 80% of their water supply from groundwater. The objective of this groundwater initiative for the CWP Update 2013 is to start the process of bringing together all groundwater information on a statewide and regional basis. They hope to bring together groundwater information, data, and analysis and update it every five years through the Water Plan update. The scope for Update 2013 is limited to eight deliverables including compiling and summarizing information, developing sustainability indicators, and identifying data gaps. The information gathered will feed into the Water Plan, as well as a standalone groundwater report. He showed a summary of adjudicated groundwater basins and those basins covered by groundwater management plans.

Next Mr. Kahn shared preliminary results in estimating annual change in groundwater storage. DWR has been developing GIS to quantify changes in groundwater storage by monitoring changes in groundwater elevation. The results show significant decreases in storage between 2005 and 2010. Decreases were most severe in the Tulare Lake hydrologic region, with groundwater depletions of up to 25 feet.

DWR has three goals related to conjunctive management and groundwater storage: 1) an inventory of existing conjunctive management projects, 2) determining future potential for conjunctive management and 3) defining program constraints. DWR identified 89 projects in California. The goal of this initiative is to get a comprehensive picture of California's groundwater.

Bulletin 118, DWR's previous groundwater report, was last published in 2003. There is uncertainty as to whether it will be funded in the future. The groundwater content enhancement goes beyond Bulletin 118 and is a part of the overall IWM strategy. If Bulletin 118 is funded in the future it will focus on the static aspects of the groundwater system such as aquifer description and mapping. The water plan will focus on dynamic aspects such as groundwater conditions and management practices. SB 7x-6, part of the 2009 Comprehensive Water Package, requires DWR to collect groundwater elevation data and make it available to the public. The CASGEM program was developed to meet that

mandate. This data is the cornerstone of information on groundwater conditions in the CWP. This program is a significant step forward in groundwater management. Mr. Khan invited the Commission to participate in the Groundwater Caucus meeting next January.

Mr. Saracino stated that one of the criticisms of previous Water Plan Updates is that groundwater was not considered a part of the overall water balance and it did not reflect that California uses more water than the overall supply. He asked if that would be corrected in this update. Mr. Khan stated they are attempting to address that issue. The long term goal is to have regional groundwater budgets. Mr. Saracino stated that Bulletin 118 has talked about overdraft in the Central Valley of between 2-4 million acre-feet per year. It seems like a number should be included to make clear that we are using more water per year than we are provided by nature; that should be made clear.

Mr. Curtin asked if groundwater quality is part of the process. Mr. Kahn replied that it is not part of this particular process, but will be addressed in the Water Plan.

Ms. Delfino asked for Mr. Khan to come back to the Commission to present the draft report when it is ready. She also asked for more information about the CASGEM program in the future.

9. Briefing on Statewide Flood Planning

Terri Wegener, DWR Program Manager, provided an update on Statewide Flood Planning. There are two components to the program. The first is to develop and expand Statewide Flood Planning as part of the California Water Plan Update 2013. The other is the Flood Future Report. This is the first time that DWR has looked at flood management from a statewide perspective. Currently, DWR knows quite a lot about flood planning in the Central Valley, and certain areas of Southern California, and much less in other places. The report will make recommendations about managing flood risk, and make recommendations about decisions that will guide flood policy and financial investments.

The Flood Future Report is an unprecedented effort. It is a joint effort between DWR and the Army Corps of Engineers. DWR also consulted with over 140 local agencies, the County Engineers Association of California, and FEMA. All of the information has been developed, and it will be delivered in a series of steps. The report itself will come out in spring of 2013. DWR is currently sharing the highlights of the information with the public.

Ms. Wegener then shared some of the findings from the Flood Future Report. The three main points are 1) California is at significant risk for flooding and the potential

consequences are high, 2) flood management is a key component of IWM, and 3) there are seven recommendations to short term and long term solutions. Additionally, flood funding is limited and unreliable.

Solutions include conducting regional flood risk assessments to understand statewide flood risk; encouraging land use planning practices that reduce the consequences of flooding; conducting management from regional, systemwide, and statewide perspectives to provide multiple benefits; increasing collaboration among public agencies to improve flood management planning, policies, and investments; and establishing sufficient and stable funding mechanisms.

10. Update on U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Levee Vegetation Policy

Cassandra Musto, DWR Landscape Architect, provided an update on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Levee Vegetation Policy and DWR's response in the form of their Levee Vegetation Management Strategy.

The Corps recently announced that 17 levee systems in the Central Valley are now ineligible for Corps' assistance. DWR's federal advocacy team has recently returned from a trip to Washington DC. They expect to provide more information about this trip and its results soon.

In March 2012, Ms. Musto briefed the Commission on the Corps' Engineering Technical Letter (ETL), and their Policy Guidance Letters, and DWR's pending response to the latest Policy Guidance Letter. She provided a brief history of events leading up to the current policy. In 2005, Hurricane Katrina caused devastating flooding. In response, the Corps released their Engineering Technical Letter (ETL) in 2007, which mandates that all levee vegetation be removed. In response DWR held its first Levee Vegetation Research Symposium in collaboration with the Corps to improve science supporting the policy. The Corps and DWR developed a framework agreement which allowed levee vegetation until the State developed a comprehensive plan. In 2009, the State and Corps worked together to develop a Levee Vegetation Research program. Also in 2009, the Corps released the ETL which did not allow for any flexibility in working with levee vegetation. While research was still being done, the Corps released their policy guidance letter (PGL) and their system wide improvement framework plans which were meant to provide flexibility. However the State faced challenges that voided these plans as an option. In June 2012 as the framework was getting ready to expire, DWR released the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP), which was adopted by the Central Valley Flood Protection Board.

The plan is meant to coordinate with local and federal entities, with a goal of improving the overall flood system. This means that going forward projects must address multiple benefits. The plan also includes a conservation framework which addresses the State's levee vegetation strategy. The levee vegetation strategy does not consider vegetation to be a high risk unless it is impeding visibility or access during flood fights. Trees larger than four inches in diameter are allowed to remain on the levees. This allows for the maintenance of riparian habitat. The CVFPP calls for continued research on levee vegetation and other habitat issues.

In August 2012, DWR and the Corps held another Levee Vegetation Research Symposium. The focus of the symposium was to share new research that could influence levee management. The take-away points of the symposium include: vegetation poses a relatively low risk to levee stability; there is a need to develop regionally and locally relevant science and expertise; and the presence of trees tends to reduce the number of rodent burrows which pose a large risk for levees. Finally, of the 384 levee failures studied in the last 100 years, none of them were attributed to vegetation. California is in the lead in the nation for research in this area. The CVFPP will help guide the maintenance and operation practices in floodplain areas and in prioritization.

Ms. Delfino said the science symposium had useful information and showed why the "one size fits all" approach is not the best. She asked what the next steps will be for DWR in response to the Corps' announcement in August of PL 84-99 assistance being revoked. Ms. Musto said DWR's Federal Advocacy program will provide information recently obtained during their trip to Washington. Congresswoman Matsui is putting forth legislation to resolve the "one size fits all" policy with the Corps. Also, the research planning team is working to distill results obtained from the research symposium and identify the information gaps.

Ms. Delfino stated DWR's current position is that trees larger than four inches in diameter will remain on levees to live out their lives naturally. There will be no apparent effort to put trees on levees in the future. She asked how other efforts, such as that to restore riparian habitats in the State, will be impacted. Ms. Musto said the State feels vegetation in the lower water-side slope of the levee doesn't pose a risk and will be allowed to remain as is. Discussions with resource agencies have begun in regards to eventual vegetation removal on the upper slope and land side of the levees.

Ms. Delfino asked if the DWR advocacy team has spoke to other states facing similar challenges. Ms. Musto stated at this time California is the only state in this position. Washington state is working on a memorandum of understanding with the Corps. We are sharing information on the progress but are working independently. Mr. Curtin stated the only potential damage from trees that was mentioned is tree roots penetrating the cut off walls. He asked if there was any involvement of native trees in that study. Ms. Musto said there were cottonwood trees in the study.

11. Update on Commission Workplan

Rachel Ballanti, Commission Policy Analyst, presented a revised version of the draft workplan, which is an extension of the strategic plan that was approved last month. The goal of the workplan is to present actions the Commission may wish to take in order to achieve the goals of the strategic plan. The workplan is divided into two sections. The first lists potential actions aligned with various strategies and is more general. The second section is more specific and lists monthly actions. The plan will be continually updated as the Commission receives new information.

Goal 1 is to “serve as a primary public forum for the dissemination of information and discussion of statewide water issues and solutions.” The types of actions to fall under this goal include holding public hearings, participating in conferences, providing recommendations to DWR on water storage and publishing information on the Commission website. Planned activities include participating in the ACWA conference this December, hosting a State of the State Water Project (SWP) workshop in May, hosting a public forum in October on a topic to be determined, and publishing our summary of activities on the website every December.

Goal 2 is to “Ensure DWR decisions on key programs and activities are sound and sustainable by providing strategic advice, recommendations, and oversight.” The types of actions to fall under this goal include approving DWR regulations, reviewing and inspecting the SWP and being involved with Delta levee priorities. Planned activities include SWP encroachment regulations, on which the Commission has already been briefed, the annual tours of SWP facilities, and approval of the annual SWP report in January.

Goal 3 is to “Develop and support integrated water management policies that result in sustainable water resources and a healthy environment statewide.” The types of actions

to fall under this goal include being briefed on DWR programs, participation in various caucuses and advisory committees of the California Water Plan, coordinating with other state, federal, and local agencies and advocating for federal funding. Planned activities include California Water Plan meetings including the State Agency Steering Committee meeting, the public advisory committee meeting, and the tribal advisory committee meetings in November, December, and January. There is a presentation on ecosystem services scheduled for November and presentations on additional work that DWR is doing on the public and private benefits of water projects. There is a meeting of Marine Affairs and Navigation Conference in January. This is a group that works with ports and has historically coordinated with the Commission for federal advocacy. There will be a meeting with the Deputy Director of Integrated Water Management (IWM) and an IWM workshop in March in which the Commission may participate. Lastly, staff will identify topics in need of additional research and hope to release a white paper next year.

The intention of the document is to continually update the plan. Staff recommended incorporating Commission member input and putting the workplan on the website for public input and checking back with the Commission.

Ms. Delfino asked that a clear articulation of the Commission's activities in relation to water conservation, groundwater piece, and public financing be incorporated into the workplan.

Mr. Saracino said the workplan was very comprehensive and noted the plan included submitting comments on BDCP in November. Ms. Ballanti stated that would be removed unless the Commission would like to submit comments on the topic. Mr. Saracino directed staff to consider timing and develop a plan for the Commission to consider commenting on the BDCP. He would like the commission to consider approving a revised draft of the workplan in November.

12. Discussion of Issues Regarding Public Benefits of Water Projects

Ajay Goyal presented a revised version of questions related to the public benefits of water projects for the Commission's consideration. As the Commission requested last month, staff categorized the questions into policy and procedural considerations. Mr. Goyal reviewed the procedural questions which were related to the regulation. There are three subcategories: definitions of public benefits, assurances for public benefits, and quantification of cost shares. Mr. Goyal noted that some aspects of the definition of

public benefits in the legislation are unclear and he requested the Commission give input and provide clarity on the definition of water quality, ecosystem, and recreation benefits.

Mr. Curtin asked about Delta Smelt as a public benefit and why the recovery of Delta Smelt, an endangered species, might not qualify as a public benefit. Mr. Goyal clarified that the species recovery does qualify; however, the recovery would result in fewer restrictions in the Delta. Fewer restrictions would lead to a water supply benefit. The question is whether the increase in water supply would be considered a public benefit in this scenario.

Mr. Saracino said the proposal is for staff to propose specific questions for subsequent meetings that will be addressed by the Commission. Mr. Ball asked if the benefits which accrue downstream would be considered. It seems more logical to look at the benefit category in which the benefit occurs otherwise an endless flow of questions may result. Mr. Saracino agreed and suggested that judgment be reserved for answering the questions.

Mr. Saracino stated the proposal before the Commission is to have staff choose specific questions which would be addressed at subsequent meetings. He asked the Commission if, in addition to proposing questions, staff should also provide a recommendation to simplify the process; or if the Commission should study the questions in advance and then deliberate with hopes of arriving at a resolution. Mr. Ball suggested the staff provide a recommendation. Mr. Saracino agreed and directed staff to choose two questions and provide recommendations and their reasoning. The Commission would then consider the recommendation and deliberate with intent to answer the proposed questions.

Ms. Delfino confirmed the staff would frame a question, give a presentation and give their recommendation and thought process. Next the Commission would take public comment and finally deliberate. Mr. Curtin stated if staff does not feel compelled to make a recommendation they could explain why they feel that way.

Mr. Goyal agreed he would provide the Commission with a write-up regarding the selected questions prior to the next meeting.

Kamyar Guivetchi stated that answering these questions depends on legislative intent and he does not want DWR staff to interpret legislative intent. Another option would be to ask the authors if they would provide additional input and feedback that can help with interpretation. Asking staff to answer legislative intent is not appropriate, according to Mr. Guivetchi. Mr. Saracino stated that option may be a challenging as some authors have

since retired and the timing may be difficult and not every question is related to legislative intent.

Ms. Delfino stated public input would be useful in addressing this issue so that people may add their thoughts as to what was being considered at the time. The authors' input would be just as useful as that of the other parties who were involved. The staff could still provide background and thoughts on the implications of one option versus another, which would still be helpful. Mr. Guivetchi agreed.

Mr. Saracino stated that would be a good compromise. An alternative approach has already been provided with the questions. If the staff does not provide a recommendation, they can provide a path forward which the Commission could support. That information can be useful when contemplating each question. Mr. Curtin stated this legislation is to be interpreted by the Commission regardless of the intent of the authors or legislature. It is not fair to have staff interpret the legislation and it is helpful to have them identify points where the legislative intent is unclear. Mr. Guivetchi agreed that would be appropriate.

Mr. Del Bosque stated a former Commission member was involved in the process and it would be valuable to have that person on the expert panel.

Mr. Saracino requested the consideration of initial questions be on the November agenda.

13. Consideration of items for next California Water Commission meeting

Topics for the November meeting include ecosystem services, California Water Plan forest management strategy, additional discussion on public benefits, State Water Project power and energy issues, and an update on the Commission workplan.

14. Public Comments

None.

Mr. Saracino adjourned the meeting at 12:38 p.m.