

Meeting Minutes

Meeting of the California Water Commission

Wednesday, February 18, 2015

State of California, Resources Building

1416 Ninth Street, First Floor Auditorium

Sacramento, California 95814

Beginning at 9:30 a.m.

1. Call to Order

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

2. Roll Call

Acting Executive Officer Rachel Ballanti called roll. Commission members Joseph Byrne, Daniel Curtin, Kim Delfino, Joe Del Bosque, Luther Hintz, David Orth, and Armando Quintero were present, constituting a quorum. Anthony Saracino participated remotely, and Andy Ball was not present.

3. Approval of January 2015 Meeting Minutes

A motion was made to approve the January 21, 2015 meeting minutes. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

4. Acting Executive Officer's Report

Rachel Ballanti provided the Executive Officer's Report. She described several changes made to the Commission's website. The water bond page was revised and information related to the bond should be easily available to the public. Information on the Water Storage Investment Program (WSIP) has also been added to Natural Resources Agency's Bond Accountability website and will be expanded and accessible as more information is added. A Frequently Asked Questions page will be available to the public soon.

Ms. Ballanti also announced that the WSIP scoping survey is nearly complete and will be published on the Commission website within the week. The survey will close on March 15, 2015.

Next Ms. Ballanti discussed the tracking of WSIP outreach activities. Since the passage of the bond, there have been an increased number of invitations and requests for speaking engagements. Staff is tracking these requests and seeking input on how the Commission members wish the requests be answered and maintained. Ms. Ballanti proposed that a schedule of speaking invitations and events be made available to the Commission members. Chairman Byrne concurred.

The final update was in regards to matters of administration and staffing. The Commission is seeking a new Executive Officer and staff is working on advertising for the position. In the upcoming weeks an advertisement will be posted on the Commission's website, and Chairman Byrne and Vice-Chairman Del Bosque will assist in the vetting process. The website posting will last around two weeks, and the Commission may also solicit candidates and invite them to apply

during this process. The announcement and proceedings of the interviews shall be done in accordance with Bagley-Keene Regulations and Guidelines.

5. Public Testimony

Steve Evans, Friends of the River:

Mr. Evans wanted to alert the Commission to a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation. Mr. Evans and his organization feel that the project does not provide substantial ecological benefits and no substantive benefit to fish. He also stated that there are conflicting reports on the cost with regards to the benefit and public goods portion of the EIS, with one federal agency assuming the cost would be 61% of the total predetermined allotment, and another federal agency assuming it would be nothing at all.

He hopes that the Commission contacts The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and asks them to produce reports to provide details regarding how they came to their decisions and the sources of their figures.

6. Discussion of Potential Ad Hoc Committees

Staff is seeking ways to make meetings between the Commission, participating organizations, and staff more efficient by establishing committees to address particular topics. There are two established subcommittees: budget/finance and groundwater. There has also been discussion of forming a legal committee and a committee that can interact with Ajay Goyal, Chief of DWR's Statewide Infrastructure Investigations Branch.

Ms. Delfino commented that it might be a good idea to wait until the stakeholders are established and their meetings are underway before ad hoc committees are formed. She said that if the smaller meetings start overlapping the larger meetings, there may be a breakdown in communication and redundancies amongst topics of discussion. The Commission decided to postpone the matter until it is developed further.

7. Legislative Update

This agenda item was postponed.

8. Drought Update

Jeanine Jones, DWR's Deputy Drought Manager, provided the drought update. Water year 2014 was the fourth driest on record in terms of statewide runoff, and the last three years have been the driest consecutive years in recorded history. Warm weather has prevented a robust snow pack, and there have been reports of wells running dry that have required the assistance of county and state emergency services.

Recently, two atmospheric river events were beneficial to Northern California, so the Sacramento Valley watersheds are currently close to average precipitation. The San Joaquin Valley, on the other hand, has received only about half of average precipitation. Both of the storm events were warm storms so they did not contribute to snowpack. Reservoir storage is also below average everywhere except for Folsom Lake, which benefitted from the two big recent storms. Groundwater levels continue to decline as an expected result of a lack of surface storage. Even if there is above-average precipitation in the spring, warmer temperatures will make it difficult to

build and retain snowpack. The State Water Project (SWP) allocation for 2015 is 15% and the Central Valley Project (CVP) allocation is pending.

Commissioner Del Bosque asked if there was an update on the funds that have been appropriated by the state and federal governments for the drought. Ms. Jones responded that in the emergency drought relief legislation that the state passed last March, the State Water Resources Control Board received \$25 million for helping small systems with extreme water supply problems. Most of that money has been spent. DWR received \$2 million for smaller projects. Commissioner Delfino asked if there are new drought funds in this year's proposed budget. Ms. Jones said the Governor's Office wants to ensure that the state continues necessary drought response actions. Ms. Delfino noted the remarkable drop in levels at the Perris, Castaic, Exchequer, and Pine Flat Reservoirs. Ms. Jones pointed out that some those reservoirs are smaller, so their capacity is lower and it is more difficult to keep them full. Others, such as Diamond Valley Lake, are being overstretched some water is reserved for emergency response.

9. Briefing on the Report *Integrating Storage in California's Changing Water System*

Dr. Jay Lund, Director of the UC Davis Center for Watershed Sciences, discussed the integration of water storage. He began by laying out five main ideas:

1. Storage is part of a system with inflows, conveyance, & demands. We are interested in how the whole system performs, not just one small part of the infrastructure.
2. Not all storage is equal, in particular with regards to location and how it operated in conveyance and demands.
3. Storage without water is useless. Increased capacity does not automatically result in increased yield.
4. Storage will be used differently than it has been used traditionally; it will be used as part of a network.
5. Storage decisions should be cold and calculating.

Dr. Lund provided a short history of California's record with regards to water surplus and shortage, stating that the broad picture over time is still being formulated and built upon as we learn and gain a more thorough scope. California has a statewide water network, although it is not a single entity. Because ownership is spread among many agencies, California must find ways for local, state, and federal agencies to come together to have well-run, integrated systems.

Existing water storage infrastructure was built to serve under vastly different conditions, so many of these older systems will need to be adapted to fit today's challenges and future conditions. This is an institutional and legal challenge as well as an infrastructure and engineering challenge.

Dr. Lund illustrated that not all water storage is equal by discussing yield. Different sources of water and storage methods yield different results with regard to additional water supply produced per acre-foot of capacity. Larger reservoirs yield proportionally less water from investments because they are filled less often than smaller reservoirs. Location and rain fed hydrology vs. snowmelt hydrology may also produce different results. Water storage practices are constantly diverging from their original design and use. Newer uses include cold water for fish and pulse flows for habitat. Other examples are regional conjunctive use and statewide conjunctive use.

Dr. Lund then discussed a pilot study consisting of four storage programs: two groundwater storage locations and two surface water storage locations, each with 2 million acre foot capacity. The aim was to learn how much new capacity could be used given current conditions. In the study, the northern example of the Sacramento Valley fared well with replenishment of both groundwater and surface water storage, while the San Joaquin Valley only used around half of the surface storage capacity and very little groundwater capacity. With Delta conveyance similar to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP), more water can be moved from the northern part of the state to the southern part of the state, which allows much greater use of the surface water storage capacity as well as more frequent use of groundwater capacity in the San Joaquin Valley. The results of the study strongly leaned toward the conclusion that integration in both examples results in greater utilization of storage, with the San Joaquin Valley example showing the most promise.

Dr. Lund also described the value of added storage capacity given the effects of urban water conservation and climate change using the specific examples of New Melones Reservoir and New Don Pedro Reservoir. He pointed out that the value of these reservoirs is diminished despite their robust size because a warmer, drier climate will result in reduced values. The dryness of the location makes storage less valuable because the reservoirs do not stay full.

Commissioner Delfino commented that she agreed that integration is key, but asked how it will be done in a way that maximizes operational efficiency. Dr. Lund's response was that we need to give people enticements to do the right thing. Proper structuring of the markets will incentivize people to get along.

Commissioner Del Bosque asked if there is conveyance for proposed groundwater storage sites. Dr. Lund responded that it has been important to build new infrastructure in some areas. Mr. Del Bosque noted that the San Joaquin Valley has not gotten much water for groundwater recharge. Dr. Lund said that from the point of view of Reservoir Operations Theory, he would like more storage capacity if there were no added costs, but that right now the more pertinent concern is the water shortage and not the storage shortage. Storage will yield a little water but should not be treated as the only, nor the most important, solution.

Commissioner Orth asked how Dr. Lund sourced his facts and figures, and what assumptions were being made. Dr. Lund answered that the team who created the study only used in-lieu recharge, so the only way that storage was filled was by persuading groundwater users to use surface water. The study does not integrate aggressive active floodwater capture and utilization.

Commissioner Curtin commented that the infrastructure and planning involved in these projects are so vast that it is impossible for anyone to truly see the big picture. He said that integration and connectivity are key factors where the Commission is concerned. He also pointed out that the Commission is limited to strict rules regarding what they can and cannot fund. Dr. Lund stressed that integration is extremely difficult and will continue to be a challenge.

Commissioner Delfino asked how Dr. Lund would suggest the Commission deal with uncertainty regarding Delta conveyance. Dr. Lund reiterated that Delta conveyance is the biggest uncertainty. The Commission may wish to analyze proposed projects based on multiple conditions.

Commissioner Curtin mentioned that climate change will decrease snowpack, and asked how new sources of water will be found and how they will be captured and moved where they will ultimately need to go. Dr. Lund responded that there is more value for Delta exports than there was before, and that there is value in moving drought storage out of surface water and into groundwater. This will help capture the higher peaks that occur without snowpack to provide additional storage.

10. Update from Department of Fish and Wildlife and the State Water Resources Control Board on Water Storage Investment Program Participation (Proposition 1)

Scott Cantrell, Chief of the Department of Fish and Wildlife's (DFW) Water Branch, began by outlining the Commission's role in implementation of Proposition 1. He also explained the relationship between the Commission and DFW and mentioned DFW's role in drafting the language in the Commission's draft regulations and guidelines.

Since November 2014, the interagency team has picked up where they left off, making refinements and adding specificity. They are also adding information regarding ecosystem priorities. California has a lot of species that are in bad shape, and when it comes to their preservation, DFW takes an ecosystem approach instead of a species-by-species approach. Well-conceived projects may provide multiple benefits, such as enhancing stream flows for salmon and providing water in wetlands for migratory birds. System approaches like the ones mentioned in Dr. Lund's presentation are approaches that will improve management of ecosystem conditions and water quality conditions. The immediate task that DFW is working on is to continue working with the interagency team to refine and articulate priorities and to internally coordinate with experts in DFW's fisheries and water branches and regional environmental scientists in order to get those priorities together in a form that will be useful. DFW is also focusing on consumptive and non-consumptive forms of recreational use, such as fishing and bird-watching, as well as working with the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) on priorities to maintain properly functioning aquatic ecosystems. DFW will also be working with Commission staff on their technical teams, stakeholder teams, and public meetings as they provide input on the draft regulations and guidelines. DFW is also working closely with the Wildlife Conservation Board on matters concerning the Delta as well as Conservancies and Non-Governmental Organizations to get input on priorities. Integration of programs will be key to achieving the most benefits.

Commissioner Delfino asked if there has been any discussion of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service providing input on proposed projects. Mr. Cantrell said there have not been formal conversations, but it would make sense and DFW will reach out to a broad array of public agencies.

Eric Oppenheimer, Chief of the State Board's Office of Research, Planning and Performance, was the next to speak. Back in 2012 and 2013, the State Board was highly engaged with the Commission in anticipation of the bond. They provided draft reports outlining priorities, such as water supply projects impacting salinity, dissolved oxygen, and water temperature. They also emphasized projects that increased Delta stream flows, created additional capacity south of the Delta, and cleaned or restored groundwater in high use basins. In the time that has passed since the passage of the bond, there have been a number of large events that have caused the State Board to revisit their initial priorities. These are the worsening drought, the Governor's Water Action Plan, the passage of Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, and the movement of the drinking water program from the Department of Public Health to the State Board.

The State Board is currently fine-tuning its priorities. The relative environmental values is a topic that needs more input and will be difficult to determine. There is also the issue of staffing, which will take time because staffing at the State Board needs to go through a lengthy approval and contact process. There may be some internal hiring, but at this point it is too early to speculate.

Commissioner Delfino expressed concern about this, stating that the Commission has been tasked by the legislature and is under great pressure by both the legislature and the public to move forward. Mr. Oppenheimer noted that he and his staff will still be involved with projects as the State Board and the Commission work together even as they go through their staffing process internally.

14. Action Item: Consideration of Revised State Water Project Encroachment Permit Regulations

This item was taken out of order.

Jim Openshaw, with DWR's Office of the Chief Council, provided an update on the Encroachment Permit Regulations. DWR has been working with the Office of the Administrative Law (OAL) in order to refine the language in the Encroachment Permit Regulations. There were two specific changes made in the most recent revision: one dealing with fill or borrow material being placed on the right of way, and the other concerning casing requirements, which OAL thought had clarity issues. No other changes were made in the latest revision and none were done without the cooperation of OAL.

Commissioners Curtin and Delfino suggested that should the need arise to revisit such a document, that the presenters highlight the changes so that they are easily spotted in the large body of text. Mr. Openshaw said he would do so in the future.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the regulation. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

13. Update on Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Implementation

This item was taken out of order.

Rich Juricich from the management team for the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) provided an update on the implementation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act. He stated that the Tulare Lake Region is the largest user of groundwater on a volumetric basis, while the Central Coast Region is the most groundwater dependent. For the state as a whole, 40% of the water use comes from groundwater, but in a dry year, these numbers go up to 60%. As part of the drought proclamations, DWR produced a report showing that groundwater levels are historically low. There are a number of groundwater impacts associated with drought. Amongst these are saline intrusion, land subsidence, and an increasing disconnection of groundwater and surface water. The Governor's Water Action Plan includes increasing ground and surface storage capacity as a key action, and the SGMA team is endeavoring to integrate their existing activities with the Water Action Plan.

The SGMA legislation defines sustainability as preventing undesirable results. As DWR moves forward, water balance is going to play a critical part in defining sustainability. This balance is not just what is happening with the groundwater itself, but how interrelated components such as the

water use and available surface supplies are integrated to develop a comprehensive water budget for those basins.

The California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) Program provided the high and medium priority basins. Commissioner Curtin asked if the prioritization reflects lowest recorded groundwater levels. Mr. Juricich responded that the priorities are based on the amount of use in each basin, so the prioritization does not necessarily reflect vulnerabilities as much as it does amount of usage. Chairman Byrne asked if DWR is looking at adding or expanding basins in areas not covered by CASGEM. Mr. Juricich responded that DWR looked at some specific criteria in terms of total water use priorities, and these were not among those priorities. He added that there may be basins that are outside the alluvial areas. As they get up onto the foothills where the compositions of the basins change, the team is not concentrating on those areas at this time.

DWR is taking actions to implement the SGMA by updating basin priorities, developing the regulations for changing or revising those boundaries, and developing the regulations for Groundwater Sustainability Plans within the next year and a half. By 2017, the local Groundwater Sustainability Agencies must be formed. Beginning in 2020, the high and medium priority basins will need to start submitting sustainability plans.

There is also a strategic plan for implementing the SGMA. The project team will be listening to input from the public and interested groups, and working with the State Board. They will also be communicating via DWR's newly revised website, speaking engagements, brochures, webinars, workshops, and technical fact sheets.

There are several work teams being developed with the State Board that will assist in coordination. These include a management team, communication team, data team, and regulation team, a technical advisory panel, and more teams are under development. The management team will be working with a Commission subcommittee to ensure that the regulation development is effective and efficient.

The design of the DWR's Sustainable Groundwater Management Program is as follows:

1. Develop a framework for sustainable groundwater management
2. Conduct technical activities to improve groundwater management
3. Conduct planning activities to improve groundwater management
4. Support local activities to improve alignment of groundwater management
5. Support projects and programs to improve interregional management

DWR's immediate actions include developing regulations for basin boundaries, updating basin prioritization, identifying basins subject to conditions of critical overdraft, and developing regulations for groundwater sustainability plans. Mr. Juricich provided a timeline for developing and adopting the basin boundary regulations by January 2016.

Commissioner Orth stated that the timeline for the basin boundary regulations is fairly aggressive, and that the overlay on the Groundwater Sustainability Plan regulations, which is due June 1, 2016, is missing. He stated that local agencies are anxious and would appreciate any clarification the team can provide when forming Groundwater Sustainability Agencies, particularly the content of a coordination agreement or memorandum of understanding for agency creation. Commissioner Delfino added that some coordination with Commission staff would be helpful, such as providing staff with understanding of what will be expected of the Commission, and when it

will be expected. Commissioner Byrne concurred, adding that he would like explicit expectations for Commission involvement.

11. Update on Program and Administrative Activities for Water Storage Investment Program

Rachel Ballanti discussed the Water Storage Investment Program (WSIP) budget and staffing overview for the fiscal year (July 2015 – June 2016). Ms. Ballanti reviewed an organization chart for the WSIP and went over the various duties, which were based upon the Commission's Budget Change Proposal. There will be different groups within the organization that have varying responsibilities, and Ms. Ballanti stressed that the initial workload will be quite heavy in the beginning but that over time the amounts of both work and staff will decrease as the program is established. She then discussed the project roles and projected program costs.

Regarding the need for additional consultant support, Ms. Ballanti pointed out that there are additional consultants that will be needed but that are not covered within the \$3 million that was included in the Budget Change Proposal. These include communication planning, development of priorities, development of evaluation criteria, engineering and modeling support, and economic support. Staff has also been working with the Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) in development of a stakeholder process, but the Commission will need a method to utilize other consultant services. Staff is working on a 5-year contract with task orders that will give the Commission flexibility and oversight over consultant contracts.

Ajay Goyal provided more information on the types of work which may need consultant support. The activities that may require consultants include developing ecosystem priorities and relative environmental values. In a meeting with Scott Cantrell last week, he indicated that it would be good to have consultant support. Mr. Goyal suggested a budget for that of roughly \$300,000 from February 2015 until December 2016 for that purpose.

A decision-support tool may be needed that combines all of the various factors and lists the benefits that projects would hypothetically provide if enacted. Consultant support may also be used to develop common assumptions that all of the applicants can use in evaluating their projects. Developing economic values for the various kinds of benefits may also profit from consultant support. This will ensure that funding is awarded on a competitive basis. Staff and consultants should develop spreadsheet-based tools that will be used to do peer-reviewed accounts of those actions and ensure protection against redundancies in the calculations that may result in inappropriate weight assigned to applicants. There may also be need for stakeholder outreach support, depending on the level of stakeholder involvement the Commission desires. Mr. Goyal estimated that the costs will be roughly \$2.2-\$2.5 million for consulting over the next fiscal year. Combined with the \$3 million already set aside, this would come up to a budget of approximately \$5.5million. Staff is still determining what needs to be done and who will be hired. Ms. Ballanti added that with the type of contract being described by Mr. Goyal, there is more potential for Commission oversight in the determination of services and how the monies are spent.

Commissioner Del Bosque inquired about the existing engineering firm that was already retained by DWR and asked if those consultants will be used. Mr. Goyal clarified that they are working on the regulations, but that that contract expires in less than six months.

Chairman Byrne added that staff should keep in mind whether or not consultants will be working with applicants. Commissioner Curtin, recalling Mark Evans' statement made during the public testimony period, remarked that it was of great concern that different agencies are calculating the public goods portion of the cost of certain projects, and there did not appear to be reliable baseline assumptions upon which the different agencies were making their calculations. Mr. Goyal answered that this is precisely why there is a need to develop specified economic values of public benefits. For example, take the cost per acre foot: 10,000 acre feet in Shasta are not the same as 10,000 acre feet in the San Joaquin Valley. Reiterating the point made earlier by Dr. Lund, factors such as location are just as important as those of cost, and must be included into the calculations when determining how much economic weight will be assigned per project.

Tracie Billington discussed the content of the statute, regulations, guidelines, and proposal solicitation packages (PSPs). There are two main items that must be in the regulations: quantification and management of public benefits, and priorities of relative environmental values. Other items, such as definitions or expert panel input, can be added but are not mandatory. The guidelines contain process-type items and clarifications, while PSPs contain things such as explicit instructions and logistics.

Commissioner Curtin asked if, in general, it is beneficial to include more or less in the regulations and guidelines. Ms. Billington answered that generally speaking, the regulations are reserved strictly for information that is definitive and unchanging. Items that can be amended would be better off going in the guidelines.

Commissioner Delfino stated that the Commission has to be mindful of things in the statute that will need to be written in, and commented that the conversation will need a more concrete framework to be helpful. Maureen King, Staff Counsel, answered that she and Ms. Billington will be working on developing a matrix that will clarify what content should go into specific documents so that the larger picture will be more clearly laid out and easy to understand.

Chairman Byrne expressed concern that simple regulations have historically taken an extensive length of time, and suggested that "simpler is better" with regards to what is added. Ms. Billington agreed, stating that staff will strip out the duplicative items and approach the project as a process and not an absolute. She stated that staff will try and get a copy of this matrix to the Commission at the next meeting.

Ms. Billington closed by listing the current activities being undertaken by DWR and Commission staff: detailing needed program components, identifying "location" for components, developing concepts for revised guidelines, using templates from other programs, incorporating Proposition 1 requirements, developing a conceptual model for solicitation process, and developing concepts for revised regulations.

Ajay Goyal spoke about how public benefits may be provided by groundwater storage projects. Eligible groundwater projects include (but are not limited to) groundwater storage projects, groundwater contamination prevention or remediation projects that provide water storage benefits, and conjunctive use and reservoir reoperation projects. These projects must provide any of the 5 public benefits (ecosystem, water quality, flood control, emergency response, or recreational) in order to be eligible for funding.

Groundwater storage projects could potentially provide the required public benefits in several ways. Many groundwater storage projects use spreading basins that could provide benefits to wildlife. Groundwater storage could also provide ecosystem benefits by connecting aquifers to streams. Groundwater basins operated in conjunction with surface storage could improve cold water pool and stream flow. Groundwater projects that result in the reduction of sea water intrusion and contamination remediation projects could provide water quality benefits. If a flood bypass were used for groundwater recharge, it could provide flood control benefits. If there were hunting and fishing opportunities in the bypass it could also provide recreation benefits. A groundwater storage project that stores water primarily for use in the event of a natural disaster could qualify for emergency response benefits.

Commissioner Del Bosque asked for clarification about emergency response benefits. Mr. Goyal explained that in the event of a disaster, such as a levee failure in the Delta, water from the ocean floods in, bringing in salt water. In this event, pumps south of the Delta will be stopped so that they do not start pumping salt water. In such a condition, there will need to be a groundwater bank for precisely this type of use. This water cannot be used for anything else in order to claim the benefit.

Commissioner Saracino stated that the real work will come when the Commission develops guidance to applicants for how to quantify and demonstrate how the public benefits are actually realized. He also noted that reversing overdraft in and of itself is not necessarily a public benefit since it depends on how the water used for recharge is ultimately used. For example, if overdraft is reduced by recharging a basin to have the water subsequently used to grow local crops or provide water supply for urban development, that is not really a public benefit but a local benefit that should come under the beneficiary pays principal.

Jenny Marr, supervising engineer with DWR, discussed the overarching vision for the WSIP. She provided a staff draft document called *Program Goals, Objectives, and Principles*. She noted that the first page of the document states that by 2022, the CWC will commit the \$2.7 billion in Proposition 1 WSIP funds to qualified water storage projects that will provide public benefits to California, including improvements to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and the tributaries to the Delta.

Commissioner Curtin commented that the dates in the mission statement would be helpful because by statute, the Commission cannot allocate funding to projects until 2016. Ms. Marr responded that there was further clarification of these dates in the body of the document. Ms. Marr then went through the document itself, providing brief explanations for each section and articulating each goal and objective therein. One comment from the Commission was that the references be replaced with footnotes, which Ms. Marr agreed to do.

Commissioner Orth commented that when the document refers to program principals, some acknowledgement of how state agencies' consideration of how regulations, guidelines and actions affect the objectives of the Act would be appropriate. He also suggested adding some integration language and backing away from some of the verbiage used, specifically the word "alignments". Chairman Byrne added that some language regarding clarity and transparency should be used when mentioning stakeholder groups.

12. Update on Stakeholder Process for Water Storage Investment Program

Jenny Marr presented an update on the stakeholder process for the WSIP. Staff has been working with the Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) to come up with a summary of methods for the Commission to choose from with regards to how Stakeholders will be reached, communicated with, and advised. They are:

- Website info: providing a venue for stakeholders and the public to comment.
- Public comment: Opportunities for the public to speak during commission meetings.
- Public meetings: The Commission, or members of the Commission, will travel throughout the state and provide the same content in different venues. The idea is that this will allow for more attendance and public comment opportunities.
- Workshops during meetings; for example, a meeting in the morning and a workshop in the afternoon.
- Convening stakeholder advisory committees: provide advice to commission staff and the Commission. Made up of around 30 members with specific expertise that can provide advice.

Commissioner Curtin advised that in his experience, there is often dissent during stakeholder meetings that result in a lack of forward momentum. He stated that when an advisory body in session, a charter must make it clear that the forum is intended as an opportunity for seeking advice and sharing ideas, not an occasion to take votes.

Commissioner Delfino stated that the Commission needs to be very clear about what they are asking the committee to produce, and that they read the materials first so that they can be clear on what the expected output would be.

Regarding the "road show" approach, all meetings will be noticed and not all Commissioners will need to be at all the meetings. Commissioner Curtin noted that these types of outreach activities are receiving positive feedback from the public, who appreciate being involved. Reaching out has had the effect of being illuminating for both the public and the Commissioners who attend.

15. Consideration of Items for Next California Water Commission Meeting

Chairman Byrne proposed the development of a standard reporting form that the Commission members can fill out on a monthly basis. This form would detail their meetings with prospective applicants and its purpose would be a matter of transparency. On a separate subject, he also stated that it might be a good idea to include an agenda item in the meeting where the members discuss what events they went to and the topics about which they spoke. Commissioner Orth added that it would be helpful if all of the members could have access to a master calendar so that everyone is aware of everyone else's activities.

Also on the March agenda will be the legislative update that was postponed. Most of the meeting will be focused on the Water Storage Investment Program. Topics will include a report on the stakeholder engagement process, a presentation on the regulations vs. guidelines document that Ms. Billington discussed, and a tribal consultation update.

Commissioner Curtin proposed having a Commission meeting in the Central Valley, and the Commission agreed that it would be a good idea. They decided to aim for an April meeting, the details of which will be brought up for discussion in the March meeting. Chairman Byrne adjourned the meeting at 2:39 p.m.