



## **Meeting Minutes DRAFT**

### **Meeting of the California Water Commission**

**Wednesday, August 20, 2014**

State of California, Resources Building

1416 Ninth Street, First Floor Auditorium

Sacramento, California 95814

9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

#### **1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:33 a.m.

#### **2. Roll Call**

Executive Officer Sue Sims called roll. Commission members Joe Byrne, Danny Curtin, Joe Del Bosque, Kim Delfino, Lu Hintz, David Orth, Armando Quintero, and Anthony Saracino were present, constituting a quorum. Commission member Andy Ball was absent.

#### **3. Approval of July 2014 Meeting Minutes**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the July 16, 2014 meeting minutes. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

#### **4. Executive Officer's Report**

Sue Sims provided the Executive Officer's Report. Commission staff is planning a workshop to be held this fall on water use efficiency and conservation. Representatives of agriculture, urban interests, and non-governmental organizations will be invited to speak. Staff is also continuing work on the near-term water project inventory to include additional information and expand the project list. The inventory now includes over 300 potential projects of varying sizes.

#### **5. Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

#### **6. Legislative Update**

Kasey Schimke, DWR Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, provided an update on legislative measures pertaining to water. A new water bond (AB 1471) has been placed on the ballot for November 2014. If it is passed, the Commission will have a significant role in implementing the \$2.7 billion water storage component of the bond. The bond contains funding for a number of activities and issues, including water quality, rivers, lakes, watersheds, regional water security,

water conservation, water recycling, groundwater, and flood management. The proposed bond is \$7.545 billion. The previous bond was \$11.14 billion.

Chairman Byrne asked if there were any significant changes to the water storage section of the bond. Mr. Schimke said there were not. Commissioner Delfino suggested that the Commission consider some of the bond's findings on groundwater when developing regulations for quantifying the public benefits of water storage. Ms. Sims noted that one of the changes was the date by which the Commission must develop those regulations; regulations must now be completed by 2016. Commissioner Del Bosque asked if the bond contains continuous appropriations for water storage. Mr. Schimke said it does.

Mr. Schimke also discussed legislation that is still moving through the legislature. There is a bill pertaining to Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) and how IRWM plans address contaminants. There are three groundwater bills. AB 1739 (Dickinson) and SB 1168 (Pavley) collectively authorize the establishment of local groundwater sustainability agencies. Agencies in high and medium priority basins would be required to create groundwater sustainability plans. The plans would have a 20 year planning timeline to achieve sustainability. The high and medium priority basins are set based largely on human interaction with groundwater. DWR would then have a role in evaluating and assessing those plans and providing some technical assistance. The State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) would have the authority to declare that a basin is out of compliance and could set standards and restrictions for that basin. The intent is for groundwater management to occur at a local level with a state backstop. Commissioner Orth added several points about the legislation: the prioritization criteria were carried forward from 2009 California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) language; the legislation proposes that the optimal planning unit for sustainable groundwater planning is the basin as defined by Bulletin 118, but there is a provision for the DWR or the local agencies to make adjustments; and there may also be a role for the Commission in the adjustment of basin boundaries. Mr. Schimke said that DWR is directed to set guidelines for altering basin boundaries that would be reviewed at a Commission hearing. Mr. Orth said that basins that fail to meet the requirements would come under review first by DWR, and then a determination would be made by the State Board. The State Board would have the ability to adopt an interim groundwater management plan for the whole basin, not just the area that is out of compliance. The State Board's role is temporary because the goal is to return management back to the local agencies. Mr. Schimke said the development process began this spring and involved input from many stakeholders.

There are also a number of bills related to Urban Water Management planning. AB 2067 (Weber), SB 1036 (Pavley), and SB 1420 (Wolk) all relate directly to implementing previous legislation authored by Secretary Laird. Mr. Byrne asked if all of the bills listed in the handout are still "alive."

Mr. Schimke said they are, but he was unsure if any of them had yet been sent to the Governor for his signature.

#### **7. Update on State Water Project Issues**

Carl Torgersen, DWR Deputy Director for the State Water Project (SWP), briefed the Commission on SWP operations and issues. DWR predicts that there will be 1 million acre-feet of water stored in Lake Oroville at the end of September. The only export releases currently being made are for water transfers. A 5% allocation was announced for State Water Contractors, but that water will not be taken until after September 1. San Luis Reservoir is currently at about 20% of capacity. This time of year would typically be a low point for San Luis, but the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation may still be making withdrawals into September. The Metropolitan Water District will continue to draw from Castaic Lake and Lake Perris. Mr. Torgersen and Deputy Director Gary Bardini are working to integrate SWP operations into an overall drought plan.

DWR commissioned work to repair the river outlet valves at Lake Oroville. A project began in early 2014 to refurbish the valves for temperature control and as a backstop against severe dry conditions. They will be operated next week for temperature control on the Feather River.

In May 2013, DWR started a process with the State Water Contractors to negotiate an extension of existing water supply contracts, most of which are set to expire in 2035. In June, DWR and the contractors tentatively agreed to extend the contracts to 2085 and reached Agreements in Principle that primarily addressed financial issues. DWR addressed the contractors' participation in financial policy discussions and made some changes to the billing process. The SWP billing process is complex and steps were taken to simplify it. The Agreements in Principle have been sent to the boards of directors of the various State Water Contractors and are awaiting their approval. DWR anticipates the amendments will be signed in 2017.

Mr. Torgersen thanked the Commission for their support in negotiating a salary raise for trades and crafts staff. Since then, the SWP has had a high degree of success in recruitment and retention. DWR has filled 113 vacancies in less than one year. As one example, DWR was able to hire water and power dispatchers and reach full staff at the project operations center. Last month, the SWP received over 1,500 applications for its apprentice program. Overtime for SWP staff has been reduced by about 60% since staffing has increased.

There has been an assessment of fire protection systems after the fire at the Thermalito Pumping Generating Plant. DWR assessed all major facilities and engaged the State Fire Marshall in this work. All facilities are in compliance, but the fire protection systems could be modernized and improved. A consultant was hired to develop a plan to modernize SWP fire protection systems. Early implementation of the plan will begin January 2015 at Hyatt Powerplant. There are also significant construction projects underway. DWR is in the process of restoring the Thermalito

plant, which should be completed in roughly a year and a half. A contract for seismic remediation of the dam at Lake Perris was recently signed. It will take several years to complete that work.

DWR is in the second phase of the SWP East Branch Extension. The first phase of extension began in 1996. The East Branch Extension will increase the efficiency of the SWP system. Planning for the second phase began in 2005. DWR anticipates completion in 2016. One of the new facilities is the Citrus Pump Station and Reservoir. The reservoir has a capacity of 560 acre-feet and the pump station has a capacity of roughly 200 cubic feet per second (cfs). Water enters the reservoir through a pipeline from Devil Canyon. The end of the pipeline was left for the potential future installation of a turbine. Water will be pumped to the Crafton Hills Pump Station. Crafton Hills Reservoir is also being expanded. There is a bypass around the dam to keep the system in operation during construction. The Crafton Hills Pump Station is being enlarged to increase the capacity of the system.

Ms. Delfino asked for an explanation of the agreement for the State Water Contractors to participate in financial policy discussions. Mr. Torgersen said a committee of five DWR managers and five SWP contractor representatives was established to discuss financial policy issues. That committee will be charged with making recommendations to the Director for his or her approval, but would not abrogate the authority of the Director. It is a chance for the DWR to review issues with the SWP billing process. Ms. Delfino asked if any of the committee's meeting minutes will be available to the public. Mr. Torgersen said the committee's minutes will be kept and posted online, but the committee will not meet until the contract amendments are signed. DWR also agreed to the establishment of a Chief Financial Manager of the SWP, which will be a position within DWR that will oversee all aspects of SWP funding. Ms. Delfino asked if that position will report to the Director. Mr. Torgersen said that must still be determined.

Commissioner Curtin asked about the energy potential at Citrus Reservoir. Mr. Torgersen said a pipe was installed that could accommodate a turbine in the future. Mr. Curtin asked if there is potential for small energy gains that could be made throughout the system. Mr. Torgersen said that has been occurring and there are a few main projects, such as installing a pump storage facility at the Los Banos Detention Dam. Mr. Curtin asked if any technology developed since the SWP systems were built could contribute to small energy gains. Mr. Torgersen said the equipment has become more efficient, such as more hydrodynamic valves. There are opportunities that DWR is examining. Mr. Curtin asked if there is any coordination between the SWP and the California ISO or other energy bodies. Mr. Torgersen said there is ongoing coordination with the ISO.

Ms. Delfino asked if there is a connection between the finalization of the contract extension and the ability of the contractors to pay for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP). Mr. Torgersen said there were no discussions about the BDCP during the recent contract negotiations. There will be another public negotiation in December that will address BDCP cost shares. Ms. Delfino asked

if the contract extensions would allow the contractors to issue bonds for BDCP. Mr. Torgersen said the extension allows DWR to issue revenue bonds for SWP activities. How the contractors will pay for BDCP conservation measure one is still undecided.

**8. Panel Discussion on Upper Watershed Management Effects on Water Supply and the Water-Forest Management Nexus**

George Gentry, Executive Officer of the California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (BOF), said water has been a dominant issue for the Board for the past 30 years. Water dominates discussion because 80 to 85% of water in California originates on a forested landscape. The Board's Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP) conducts an assessment of California's forests every five years. The assessment informs the Board's strategies and actions. In 2010, the FRAP assessment used assets and threats to identify priority landscapes for water supply and water quality. The high priority landscapes for water supply are in the Sierra Nevada and Cascades. The high priority landscapes for water quality are primarily in coastal areas. High intensity, large scale fires have the largest impact on water quality. Sheet erosion and gullying from fires result in downstream deposition, which reduces water storage.

Mr. Gentry discussed a number of forest management activities as they relate to water quality and supply. Meadow restoration is important for groundwater preservation. The BOF considered regulations to enable landowners to remove meadow conifers for restoration. California has incredibly comprehensive riparian management regulations. Most studies show that landowners do well restoring and maintaining riparian vegetation. Large wood placement is also a major issue. It was previously believed that removing large wood debris from creeks was beneficial for fish. Large wood debris is actually important for fish habitat and to help meter sediment downstream, so it is being replaced. Defensible space around structures allows for the management of water resources in responding to fires.

Mr. Gentry also outlined several BOF regulations. The BOF is currently reviewing its vegetation treatment program. One method is to lower the intensity of fires through controlled burns. Air quality regulations make controlled burns difficult, but they are effective. Thinning can be used to reduce stand density. Stands are far denser now than prior to settlement in California. Fire suppression allows for the encroachment of additional trees and fuel, which lead to higher intensity fires. The BOF has recently revised its rules for forest roads to improve road crossing practices. Generally speaking, the rules are effective where they are implemented correctly. The BOF formed an effectiveness monitoring committee as part of adaptive management to improve upon issues in real time. The Board also recently adopted emergency regulations for water drafting in light of the drought and is currently reviewing the impacts of illegal marijuana cultivation. Illegal marijuana cultivation has recently become a major problem. Water diversions destroy habitats and dewater streams, and fertilizer and rodenticides impact water quality and animal health. Impacts are even more severe during a drought.

Dr. Martha Conklin, Founding Professor of Engineering and Director of Natural Reserves at UC Merced, discussed water and the Sierra Nevada forests. Sixty percent of the state's consumable water originates in the Sierra Nevada. The majority of snow that becomes runoff falls at elevations above 9,000 feet. Most precipitation comes as snow, which equals the amount of water that is lost to evapotranspiration and runoff. It is important to understand the impact of forest management on water in California. There is increased forest density all over the landscape. There are now about four times as many stems as there were 100 years ago, but only about twice as much biomass. This means there are many small stems, which cause the most fire danger. Returning forests to their pre-fire suppression state should increase water yield. Trees absorb heat and block low angle sunlight to shade the snow so it stays on the ground. California depends on this mountain water storage for about 6 months of each year. Trees also intercept snowfall, so overly dense canopies stop the snow from reaching the ground. There will be more snow on the ground if the forest is thinned, and if the gaps are the correct size the snow will still stay on the ground for the ideal amount of time. A study was done to compare the impacts of various forest treatments on snow accumulation, but it began in 2012 so the results were obscured by the drought. More snow gathering in larger spaces should result in higher water yield. If canopy cover is reduced about 30%, water yield can be increased by about 9%. Forest cover reduction will increase water yield, but studies are needed to determine the ideal treatment.

The Sierra Nevada Research Institute (SNRI) at UC Merced received a National Science Foundation grant which it uses to gather a variety of data within the Southern Sierra Critical Zone Observatory (SSCZO). The study is concerned with the forest, the resiliency of the landscape, and how much water is captured in groundwater. There are deeper soils and eroded bedrock in 6,000 foot watersheds and 4,000 foot watersheds and shallower soil depths at high elevations. Soil depth impacts how much water filters into the ground. Preliminary estimates show that the amount of water below ground is about equal to the amount of snow sitting above ground. This below ground storage contributes to forest resilience. Flux towers were installed to measure the impacts of precipitation on tree evapotranspiration. The highest precipitation occurs in subalpine forests above 9000 feet. Trees between 3,000 and 7,000 feet use the most water. Trees at lower elevations use less water because they are dormant during the summer. Trees at higher elevations are dormant during the winter. Data shows that mid-elevation trees have not substantially reduced transpiration during the drought. These mid-elevation trees are resilient to drought because of the water stored underground. The drought caused immediate water stress in lower elevation trees. Vegetation removal can result in more runoff, but more studies are needed to determine how it can be done best. Cleared vegetation will regrow in about 30 years, so it is a reoccurring management problem. There are still many knowledge gaps, including how much water is used by vegetation and how vegetation impacts runoff.

Dr. Roger Bales, Founding Professor of Engineering and Director of UC Merced's Sierra Nevada Research Institute (SNRI), discussed water security and improved water information. California needs infrastructure, stronger institutions, and better and more accessible information to achieve water security. Water security is crucial to climate change adaptation. Storage capacity must be expanded, but storage is more than simply dams and reservoirs. Incorporating ecosystem services is also vital to water management. Accurate, transparent, and timely water accounting can transform the operation of infrastructure and the response to change. There is a need to better understand how water flows through the system. Information must get to water institutions for decision making. This information could improve seasonal forecasts for the Sierra Nevada. Monthly manual measurements are still used, but satellite data wireless sensor networks can improve measurement. Cyber infrastructure can easily turn data into useful information.

A \$2 million grant from the National Science Foundation allowed SNRI to build a large scale hydrologic observatory in the American River basin. Spatially distributed sensors can be used to determine how much snow and soil moisture is on a widespread landscape. The goals of this basin-scale observatory are to demonstrate real time water information, reduce uncertainty of water supply forecasting, and use data to enable flexible operation of Folsom Dam. Spatially distributed information is necessary to document the impacts of forest management. Sustained forest management will need investment, verification, and maintenance. The next step is to do a scalable demonstration project in the Sierra Nevada. Better information is the critical foundation of water security. The American River basin is a valuable core element for research. With better-informed management, California's water supply could go further in meeting the needs of the state.

Mr. Curtin asked how much large-scale information collection might cost. Dr. Bales said that expanding the system in the American River basin would require \$2-4 million in investment, which includes research verification. Commissioner Saracino asked if that would also include the cost of groundwater monitoring. Dr. Bales said groundwater monitoring would increase the cost. Dr. Conklin added that good stream gauging would also increase the cost. Commissioner Del Bosque asked how the lower density of forests was maintained before widespread settlement and how that density can be achieved now. Mr. Gentry said Native Americans burned lands because it improved grass output and it allowed wildlife to move through. Also, there were lower intensity fires that prevented overgrowth. Due to climate change, many types of trees are moving to higher elevations. The BOF should to review stocking level (or forest density) requirements based on these changes. It is also key to allow for the reintroduction of low intensity fire.

Commissioner Quintero asked what a Critical Zone Observatory (CZO) includes. Dr. Conklin said the Southern Sierra CZO is examining water balance and yield in the forests. Dr. Bales said the CZO is the largest watershed research project in the Sierra Nevada. Ms. Delfino asked if mountain meadow restoration is part of the CZO project. Dr. Conklin said some meadows are being

monitored. Meadows are incredibly important for biodiversity within a catchment, and SNRI is trying to understand the role of meadows in the overall catchment process.

Mr. Quintero asked how LiDAR is used in data point collection. Dr. Bales said LiDAR is a laser imaging system that can be used on the ground or in an aircraft. It has been used to obtain unprecedented information about forest density. Forests are heterogeneous and information is needed to determine biomass. LiDAR is also used to detect snow and determine the accuracy of sensor data. The LiDAR data shows the heterogeneity of snow and vegetation across the landscape, verifying manually collected data. Dr. Conklin added that there is deeper soil and bedrock erosion on north-facing slopes than south-facing slopes.

Mr. Saracino asked how legalization of marijuana in California would affect forest issues. Mr. Gentry said that as long as marijuana commands a high price, the problem of illegal marijuana grows in forests will exist. Commissioner Hintz asked how the private forest and lumber industries can be incorporated into activities such as thinning. Mr. Gentry said there are several pieces of current legislation aimed at facilitating forest thinning. The Board is currently implementing AB 744 which allows for increased thinning and reduction. The BOF also came up with several approaches, such as emergency fuel hazard notice regulations. One way to mimic pre-fire suppression conditions is mechanical thinning. Dr. Conklin pointed out that there are many smaller trees that cannot be used for lumber, and management is likely to be costly. Mr. Del Bosque said farmers are concerned with crop density because there are diseases among crops that are too dense and asked if that is a problem in forestry. Mr. Gentry said there is an increased mortality rate, particularly in the Sierra Nevada region, due to pest and disease outbreaks in overly dense forests.

Mr. Curtin said the energy sector wants to reduce fire danger to transmission lines and could be part of a large-scale regulatory effort. Biomass is work intensive, but is a sensible solution if there is a biomass plant nearby. Biomass could also provide jobs in economically depressed areas. Mr. Curtin would like to bring together as many agencies as possible to work on these issues. Mr. Gentry suggested collaboration with the California Biomass Collaborative, Chairman Nichols of the California Air Resources Board, and the California Energy Commission. Mr. Curtin said the Commission could work with the California Public Utilities Commission to make biomass a preferential energy source.

**9. Briefing by the Pacific Institute on *The Untapped Potential of California's Water Supply***

Dr. Peter Gleick, President of the Pacific Institute, briefed the Commission on their recent report *The Untapped Potential of California's Water Supply: Efficiency, Reuse, and Stormwater*, and more generally on conservation and efficiency. The Pacific Institute is a research institute that has worked extensively on global water issues. The Pacific Institute recently worked with UC Santa Barbara and the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) to release reports on urban efficiency,

agricultural efficiency, water recycling, and stormwater capture and reuse. There is great diversity in the demands and sources of water throughout California. California extensively overdrafts groundwater, particularly during droughts. Most urban water use is still residential. There is a lot of potential for water savings by applying simple fixes and existing technology, particularly outdoors. Total potential residential savings is 53 to 90 gallons per person per day. There are very significant potential savings still to be gained in the agricultural sector as well. The Pacific Institute estimates that over 5 million acre-feet (MAF) per year could be saved through increased agricultural efficiency. California has made some improvement in recycled water production and use, but there is potential to expand water reuse by 1.2 to 1.8 MAF per year. There is more potential for water reuse if water efficiency techniques are not aggressively implemented because increased efficiency decreases the supply to wastewater treatment facilities. Stormwater capture and reuse could be increased by 420,000 to 630,000 acre-feet per year. Urban and coastal communities have the highest potential for stormwater capture. The potential for implementing the techniques discussed varies regionally.

Dr. Gleick also pointed out that there are many misconceptions about water use efficiency. Efficiency is not the same as conservation. Efficiency involves continuing the same habits, but using less water. Conservation and efficiency are not the only necessary actions. No single technique will solve all problems because water is a complicated issue in California. The state has made remarkable progress in efficiency. Total and per capita water use has decreased despite a growing population and economy. That is primarily due to improvements in the agricultural and urban sectors. Nonetheless, there is much more that could be done. Dr. Gleick used several simplified examples to illustrate the differences and benefits of conservation and efficiency and define beneficial and non-beneficial use, and consumptive and non-consumptive use. Some believe that water use efficiency potential is small. If so, there are only difficult solutions, such as fallowing land, limiting population, and developing new supply. There is still plenty of potential for water use efficiency and more can be done to capture inefficient uses throughout the state, which will allow us to maintain population and the agricultural sector. "New" water is not the only goal of water use efficiency. Co-benefits are traditionally ignored in conversations about conservation and efficiency. Co-benefits of efficiency include water quality, increased instream flows, improved timing of instream flows, ecosystem benefits, delayed or eliminated spending on new water supply infrastructure, improved crop quality and yield, and reduced energy use. Productivity of water use is another factor, particularly in industry and agriculture. The economic productivity of water has improved over time. What happens with "saved water" is a policy question. There should be policy discussion to determine how to capture and monetize or allocate co-benefits to encourage savings.

Mr. Saracino said the numbers in the report may prevent a real policy conversation about reducing demand by creating a perception that there much new water to be gained. The estimates of new water may be grossly exaggerated. Dr. Gleick said that not all of the estimates in

the report are new water. He agreed that it would be useful to estimate of what can be reallocated and where. There is still a substantial amount of consumptive use that can be saved and become new water. Mr. Saracino said the initial Pacific Institute report did not seem to account for the groundwater recharge implications. Dr. Gleick said there are many arguments that much of applied water in the agricultural sector goes to groundwater recharge. There may be overestimates of how much actually goes to recharge because we do not do well in measuring unproductive evaporative losses. With increased efficiency, less water could be used to grow crops and the saved water could be applied to intentional groundwater recharge.

Mr. Del Bosque asked what Dr. Gleick meant by unproductive evaporative losses. Dr. Gleick said growing crops is a productive, beneficial use of water. Unproductive losses evaporate without benefitting the crop. Unproductive evaporative losses exist but are not accurately measured. Mr. Del Bosque said it should be easy to measure with the knowledge of water applied. He added that there may be fewer evaporative losses from incidental groundwater recharge than standing recharge ponds that may lose a lot to evaporation. Dr. Gleick said that is potentially true.

Mr. Quintero said fixing residential leaks could have a large impact. He also noted that different applications of recycled water have different expenses. Dr. Gleick pointed out that California has made great progress in conservation and efficiency, but new technologies are developed all the time. The costs of the solutions discussed vary enormously. Data from multiple sources suggests that conservation and efficiency are less expensive than new supply options. Mr. Orth said there is a significant divergence of views regarding how much potential there is for water savings; the Center for Irrigation Technology at Fresno State University determined a much smaller estimate for savings potential in the Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region. With regard to groundwater, how to manage the irrigation of agricultural lands for conjunctive management is a management decision that does not create new water. Ms. Delfino said the information in the Pacific Institute's report should be used to generate conversation about the most effective ways to incentivize efficiency. It is important to translate discussion into action. Dr. Gleick said there are many policy tools for conservation and efficiency and all of them are important.

Erik Ringelberg with Local Agencies of the North Delta provided public comment. The removal of invasive weeds is a collaborative opportunity to reduce consumptive water losses. The California Invasive Plant Council's research shows that about 1 million acre-feet per year is consumed by star thistle alone. Controlling these weeds would benefit rural communities and agriculture.

Frank Ramirez, National Director of Government Affairs for National American Indian Veterans, Inc., provided public comment. The amount of water that is lost through evaporation is huge. Australia and Indonesia have been doing work on water evaporation suppressants that could lead to water savings. Reducing evaporation could also save energy by reducing the amount of water that needs to be moved.

Mike Wade, Executive Director of the California Farm Water Coalition, provided public comment. There is much in the Pacific Institute report with which the Coalition agrees, but much of the data used in the agricultural section is outdated. A 2009 report on which the new report was based assumed that 20% of agriculture was applying efficiency techniques. In 2010, the Agricultural Water Management Council conducted a survey that found that 57% of farmers were using professional irrigation management systems. In 2013, DWR issued a report that discussed changes in crop patterns and irrigation systems that increased efficiency techniques. The Pacific Institute also used a CALFED projection representing the maximum possible investment in water use efficiency for agriculture, which DWR says is impractical and not attainable. Additionally, attaining this projection level would cost \$1.6 billion a year, which is unreasonably expensive. Farmers are willing to adopt new technology when it is affordable and makes sense. There is more that can be done, but the figures presented in the Pacific Institute report are not useful in policy discussions.

Dave Eggerton, General Manager of El Dorado County Water Agency, provided public comment. Headwater management issues and the resilience of forests and meadows are critically important and require attention.

**10. Consideration of Items for Next California Water Commission Meeting**

In September, the Commission will be performing its statutorily required annual inspection of SWP facilities.

Mr. Del Bosque suggested that staff could develop a dashboard summarizing current water conditions in California that the Commission could view at each meeting. Ms. Delfino said DWR provides that information online. Ms. Sims agreed to provide that information to the members at each meeting.

Mr. Byrne adjourned the meeting at 12:47 p.m.