

MEETING SUMMARY

California Department of Water Resources

Independent Technical Panel for Demand Management Measures

January 20-21, 2016 | Meeting #26

Prepared by the Sacramento State University, Center for Collaborative Policy

Table of Contents

1. OVERVIEW OF JANUARY 20 & 21, 2016	1
2. ACTION ITEMS.....	2
3. WELCOME & OPENING REMARKS.....	3
4. OVERVIEW AND TIMELINE OF LEGISLATIVE PROCESS	3
5. DRAFT ITP FINAL REPORT SECTION REVIEW	5
A. Introductory Sections: Key Strategies	5
B. SECTION 3: Vision Statement	5
C. SECTION 4-1: Voluntary Turf Replacement	6
D. SECTION 5-1: Single Family Residential Properties	8
E. SECTION 5-2: Multifamily and Commercial Industrial Properties	9
F. SECTION 5-3: State Owned Facilities.....	12
G. SECTION 6-2: State Facility Leadership for New Landscapes	12
H. SECTION 7-1A: Product Standards for Irrigation Equipment - Controllers.....	13
I. SECTION 7-1B: Product Standards for Irrigation Equipment – Sprinkler Bodies	14
J. SECTION 7-2: Permit Required for Irrigation Installation	15
K. SECTION 7-4: Piloting Connection Charges that Promote Landscape Efficiency.....	15
L. SECTION 7-5: Plant Labeling	17
M. SECTION 8-2: C-27 Exam Questions	18
N. SECTION 9-1: Public Perceptions and Social Norms	19
O. SECTION 10-1: Research and Documentation Needs and Support	19
P. SECTION 10-2: Water Use Classification of Landscape Specied (WUCOLS) IV Support	
6. NEXT STEPS & CLOSING REMARKS	21
7. ATTENDANCE	22

1. OVERVIEW OF JANUARY 20 & 21, 2016

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) Independent Technical Panel (ITP) for Demand Management Measures met for their twenty-sixth meeting on January 20 and 21, 2016 to accomplish the following objectives:

- Review draft sections of the ITP’s Proposed Final Report on Landscape Water Use

- Develop recommendations for next steps to prepare the ITP Final Report content for Landscape Water Use

On December 14-15, 2015, ITP members met to review and discuss each section of the ITP's Final Report. Authoring teams took the feedback provided by fellow panel members and members of the public and conducted a subsequent set of revisions to the Final Report sections. These revised documents were again reviewed and discussed at the ITP's in-person meeting on January 20-21, 2016. At this meeting, the ITP made only administrative decisions on the next steps for each presented section. No formal decisions or recommendations were made.

Revised drafts of the ITP Final Report Sections discussed on January 20 and 21 are available on the DWR Water Calendar, here: <http://www.water.ca.gov/calendar/index.cfm?meeting=25111> and <http://www.water.ca.gov/calendar/index.cfm?meeting=25410>. Note these documents do not contain red lines or mark-ups, though the ITP members may have chosen to verbally describe iterations considered when developing their proposals.

Per the direction of the ITP Planning Team, the meeting facilitator allocated a commensurate amount of time to discuss each section of the Final Report, and provided a block of time at the end of each day to continue discussing/refining sections as need. Sections were not discussed in sequential order. Rather they were reviewed per the participation availability of authoring team members and indicated level of priority. However, for the purposes of meeting summary content accessibility, the discussions are presented sequentially here.

2. ACTION ITEMS

1. **Meagan Wylie** to work with Section 3 Authoring Team and Dave Fujino to update figure included in the Vision Statement.
2. **Julie Saare-Edmonds** to continue contact attempts to Department of General Services (DGS) to determine the number of buildings leased by the State to inform Section 5-2.
3. **Julie Saare-Edmonds** to share sample published protocol on building commissioning for water efficiency (as presented at an Irrigation Show in November 2015).
4. **Metrics Committee** to validate statement that MWELo is stronger than EPA tool in Section 6.2.
5. **Julie Saare-Edmonds** to assist Lisa Maddaus and Penny Falcon in referencing the appropriate management memos in the background sections of Recommendations 5-3 and 6-2.
6. **DWR** to personally send Recommendation 7-2 to the League of Cities inviting them to submit comment on this proposal.
7. **CCP** to implement global syntax change across individual proposals to read "The ITP recommends that:"
8. **Meagan Wylie** to work with Jeff Stephenson on securing a venue for either March 3rd or 4th in San Diego for which to host the Public Meeting.

3. WELCOME & OPENING REMARKS

Dave Ceppos, meeting facilitator from the Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP), California State University Sacramento, called the meeting to order. He thanked the ITP for the tremendous amount of work contributed to the final report to date. He further explained that all work on the ITP Final Report sections completed by authoring teams has been consistent with Bagley-Keane legal requirements.

Mr. Ceppos reviewed the agenda, and reminded participants that report sections will be revised or advanced by general consensus only (straw poll), not by formal decision. It was lastly noted that *Word* versions of the Report Sections posted as PDF files to the DWR website would be accessed during the meeting such that comments and revisions could be made real-time during the ITP's discussions. These real-time edits were broadcast over the WebEx webinar platform for public members participating remotely.

4. OVERVIEW AND TIMELINE OF LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Kasey Schimke, DWR Office of Legislative Affairs, provided an overview of the process and associated timeline for ITP members to submit applicable Final Report recommendations to the legislature. The following information was shared:

- The legislature has reconvened for the second year of their two-year session.
- Important dates:
 - **February 19, 2016:** Deadline for new legislation to be introduced
 - **April 22, 2016:** Deadline for policy committees to forward proposed legislation that is scored with a “cost” to the fiscal committee. These bills go to appropriations for discussion.
 - **June 3, 2016:** Last day to pass bills from their house of origin to the other house (Assembly to Senate or vice versa)
- If the ITP does not meet the February 19th deadline, it may not be a major concern. The State is moving into a 5th year of continuing drought, and the conversation of water conservation remains an important one to the Legislature.
 - Other water conservation bills will be introduced this year, which may serve as vehicles for the ITP to introduce their recommendations.
- Because DWR has a statutory requirement to review, comment on, and submit the ITP's report to the Legislature, this is a default internal process for sponsoring the ITP's recommendations.
- It is recommended to focus on preparing a strong and credible report with recommendations fully vetted by all panel members and the public, regardless of the legislative timeline. In this way, the recommendations can be picked up in a future legislative cycle or by the next ITP.

- The ITP may choose to focus attention on distributing select recommendations to the legislature in advance of the full report being completed.

Discussion:

- Not all of the ITP's proposed recommendations are for the Legislature. Some are recommendations for administrative action that may require funds to implement, perhaps more than the current level of resources available. What is the timeline for the governor making budget adjustments this year, and preparing for next year's budget?
 - **Mr. Schimke:** The Governor has already proposed 2016-2017 budgets, and spring budget adjustments are already in discussion. In July, the budget committee will begin closely looking at the following year's needs. Funding is often easier to obtain when it directed towards achieving the goals of a statutory mandate (e.g. water use reduction targets). Also, note that DWR has significant requirements that resulted from the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) that will require a significant portion of their funding.
- When the Water Conservation Act of 2009 was passed, there was associated bond funding that was put on hold due to the recession. Was this backlog ever addressed?
 - **Mr. Schimke:** As funding is a finite resource, it is true that certain items that should have been funded have not been. As there are increased costs now associated with drought measures and groundwater legislation, funding may never go to past priorities unless a strong case is made to do so.
- What is the typical deadline for DWR to submit funding requests for the next fiscal year?
 - **Peter Brostrom, DWR:** Internal budgets must be completed by the end of August 2016, then internal routing is conducted. It is about a two-week process for budget change approvals at this stage. Revised budgets are due in October, and are approved by the finance department at the end of November. These approved budgets are rolled up into the Governor's budget.
 - **Mr. Schimke:** Appropriations will make the ultimate decision on how money is allocated. The ITP should not be concerned if their recommendations have associated costs. If it takes funding to implement an important program, then that is what the ITP should continue to recommend.
- Bills can be introduced as spot bills to the legislature any time if the topic is an important one. It is agreed that the ITP should focus on report content and also offer a proper review period to receive public comment on the recommendations.
- Would it be helpful for the ITP to prioritize their recommendations and somehow communicate them to the legislature?

- **Mr. Schimke:** The ITP should discuss priority to some extent, though the detail contained within the recommendations will help DWR and the legislature to determine the priorities. For example, is their priority the proposal that will result in highest water savings, or the highest water savings at the lowest costs?

5. DRAFT ITP FINAL REPORT SECTION REVIEW

A. Introductory Sections: Key Strategies

The concept of drafting *Key Strategies* was recently proposed by my Ms. Maddaus. They are intended to be supporting narratives included before the recommendations in the Final Report, to: a) provide context for the collective body of recommendations, b) demonstrate how various recommendations are interconnected, and c) further explain *why* the ITP chose to address certain topics in their report. Furthermore, they serve to draw attention to important concepts that warrant further exploration at a future time.

ITP Discussion

- While perhaps a worthy idea, the ITP should consider their writing priorities and timeframe before committing to prepare these narratives. It may be more important to spend limited time remaining clarifying and resolving issues in the draft recommendations.
- Several members agreed that inclusion of the Key Strategies would be helpful, and they would be comfortable drafting the Key Strategies after the Public Draft Report has been completed. The ITP could then make these documents available for an abbreviated public comment period.

B. SECTION 3: Vision Statement

Title: Achieving Sustainable Urban Landscapes Throughout California

ITP Discussion

- The descriptive term “vivid” shall be added back into this section.
- Data used in the figure was compiled by Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) from data that was reported and posted by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) during the 2014 voluntary reporting period. Agencies were requested to provide the State Board with monthly water production for the period of 2011-2013. Not every agency in the State submitted this data.
- Updates to the embedded figure:
 - Year correction: 2011, not 2001
 - Identify source of the data
 - Change title: Average Monthly California Potable Water Production (2011-2013)
 - Strike “2011-2013” at bottom of figure
 - List the number of agencies that participated in the reporting

- **ACTION ITEM:** Meagan Wylie to work with Section 3 Authoring Team and Dave Fujino to update figure included in the Vision Statement
- In 2011 the State was in the recession and was still in a drought. During a “normal” year, monthly water use would be greater.
- The Metrics Work Group recently discussed how to validate the numbers and provide citations for the three bulleted water savings sources.
 - The California Water Plan will be used for the overall landscape water use value. It provides a basis for indicate that landscape water use accounts for about 50% of total urban water use during non-drought conditions.
- One member was concerned that large parks and recreational areas were being counted toward total landscape water use, though these functional turfs will not be required to reduce water use, so should not be included in water savings estimates.
 - Note that the Vision Statement does not state that all landscape water use at all facilities should be reduced by 50%.
 - In total, these large functional turfs and parks account for only about 7-10% of water use. Also, upwards of 30% of water savings can be generate from proper management, not turf removal.
 - The related MWELo estimates are not robust, and there is not reliable data for the whole state.
- Note that there may be instances where citations will be outstanding, and the ITP must decide if they are comfortable with posting a recommendation for public review with the citation pending.

ITP Straw Poll

- Providing the incorporation of discussed edits, all members were in favor of moving this draft forward for inclusion in the Public Draft Report.

C. SECTION 4: Voluntary Turf Replacement

Recommendation #1: Turf Replacement Incentive Program

ITP Discussion

- Revisions were made to this recommendation per the discussions in December.
- One member expressed pessimism for this recommendation to get adopted, as the Governor vetoed nine other tax credits last year.
 - These vetoed items were for a variety of tax credit programs, not necessarily related to water conservation measures.
 - One bill introduced last year asked for a tax credit of \$2 per sq. ft., but was cancelled at the request of the bill’s author.
- There is a cost-benefit component to consider with these proposals. Addressing the drought will cost money, as does *not* addressing the drought. A 2009 California Water Plan Update table lists potential annual costs savings estimates, and if extrapolated to

2015 estimates would be \$276 million. Thus, this proposal, along with others, would save the State money.

- A statement to the affect of putting a monetary value to water savings, can be added to one of the proposed key strategy sections, e.g. The Value of Water.
- DWR was recently contacted by a lobbying group who is in support of a bill of this nature.
- There are program designs that could be inserted into this recommendation to make it more administrable.
 - The time frame for administering should be adjusted to five years.
- There may be some appeal to making the tax credit available only to those who are meeting local standards for turf replacement. The State could match the local incentive being offered, or some portion of.
 - However, many small agencies will not be able to offer rebate programs. If written this way, these citizens would have not access to the rebate.
- Eligibility should be based on use of potable urban water supply, not well water.
- DWR recommends to have the turf replacement validation be conducted by the water supplier. Confirmation of turf conversion could be by visual review of photographs.
 - A random sample is reviewed, and questionable photographs can be flagged for follow-up.
- The ITP should propose a broad program, leaving some level of detail for implementation to the bill drafters.
- The program should be localized. One possibility is for local agencies to pool their efforts under the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) programs.
 - Myriad small agencies have only a one-person staff, with limited capacity for increased responsibility.
 - Many local programs are also concluding. Perhaps they can validate the turf replacement without being required to contribute matching funds.
 - It is important that everyone in the State has the opportunity to participate in this program. Engagement should be at the local level while maintaining universal eligibility.
- Members were comfortable revising the timeframe back to the originally proposed five-year implementation.
- Credits for commercial and industrial (CII) buildings should be included.
- Cap should remain at \$1 per square foot for single family residences, and \$0.50 per square foot for businesses.
 - Business cap should be \$10,000 per property.
- There could be a requirement to report to the Legislature by BOE and DWR on the program after year five.
- It was suggested to consider referencing energy tax credit programs in the background section.
- Features of the landscape that were present prior to the effective date of the bill are the features eligible for tax credit (i.e. one cannot install a lawn and then receive credit for replacing it).

- One option suggested was for self-certification of turf replacement by the homeowner. Photos can be uploaded to a site, and then the homeowners can receive ad printout to include in their tax documentation (similar to solar tax credit program).
 - This level of detail may be determined by BOE.
- This replacement program should not be confined to front yard areas.

ITP Straw Poll

- Providing the incorporation of discussed edits, all members were in favor of moving this draft forward for inclusion in the Public Draft Report.

D. SECTION 5: Improvements in Existing Landscapes

Recommendation #1: Single-Family Residential Properties

Public Comments

- In regard to the proposal that would require irrigation inspections as part of a home inspection, the ITP should note that inspectors are generalists rather than specialists. They are trained to conduct a high level review important home systems and their components, with inspections taking 2-3 hours. The California Real Estate Inspection Association (CREIA) developed inspection standards of practice in 1983, which has been revised numerous times over the years and includes some 300-400 items to inspect. The last update was completed in August 2012. This document has been submitted to the ITP for review. Inspection procedures are determined by a committee of members and outside consultants, and they have determined that irrigation inspections are not a priority for their clients. If the ITP's proposal is intended to correct deficiencies in irrigation systems, the CREIA inspection standards would need to be revised, resulting in an expense. CREIA is therefore opposed to this recommendation. A suggestion is to instead have Code Enforcement officers conduct irrigation inspections, as they do with smoke detectors.
 - **ITP Member:** One concern with deficient irrigation systems is the potential for soil moisture intrusion near the foundation of the home. Sprinklers must therefore be at the correct height to meet code requirements and avoid this problem.
- **ITP Member:** Are there any inspectors that currently do conduct rudimentary irrigation inspections?
 - Possibly. Inspections are not required in the State of California, but they are in other states.
- **ITP Member:** How does the CREIA inspection process differ for an average home versus an estate?

- Inspection for an average 1,500 – 2,500 square foot home may take 2-3 hours. Inspections of estates take proportionately longer. Also, older homes take longer to inspect.
- **ITP Member:** Are fire sprinklers included in the inspection?
 - Their functionality may be noted, but they are not part of the inspection.
- **ITP Member:** With this recommendation, the ITP is attempting to help educate a potential homebuyer about the irrigation system before they purchase the home. Are there other suggestions for how to do this education?
 - Perhaps inspection of irrigation systems can be conducted for an additional fee, similar to what is done for pools and spas. Basic CREIA inspections cost \$300-600. Note also that about 20-25% of homes that are sold via cash sales do not get inspected before purchase.

ITP Discussion

- As currently drafted, this proposal does make it a requirement for a home to be inspected before sale, but *if* an inspection is conducted, the inspection must include irrigation systems.
- Item b in legislative proposal can be changed to requiring a “visual inspection.” Though ideally, the inspector would manually turn on the valves. The issue of potential water intrusion to the home foundation can also be addressed in this item.
- Several additional language changes were made real-time to this proposal.

ITP Straw Poll

- Providing the incorporation of discussed edits, all members were in favor of moving this draft forward for inclusion in the Public Draft Report.

E. SECTION 5: Improvements in Existing Landscapes

Recommendation #2: Multifamily and Commercial Industrial Properties

ITP Discussion

- It was recommended to change the reporting contact from the governing water provider to DWR.
 - There is language in the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWEL) MWEL, Section 493, that possibly already requires DWR to undertake this responsibility. However, most of the actions in the context of the ordinance are directed to the land use authority. It also uses the terminology “may.”
 - There remains an issue of enforcement and how to ensure submittal of reports.
 - A background paragraph on Section 493.1 should be added.

- Per the Executive Order (EO), DWR must report to the State Water Board on local land use agency adoption, though it is unclear if then the State Water Board would be more responsive or take on enforcement.
 - Later this year DWR will submit a list of Land Use agencies that have not submitted their reports on MWELo. It will then be seen the level of enforcement they wish to take.
 - There is an appropriate tie-in to stormwater requirements and/or recycled water. The State Board can issue fines if agencies do not submit specific reporting.
 - It may be unnecessary to include enforcement component to this recommendation.
- This recommendation is intended to apply to both private and public properties.
- Large landscapes should be subject to periodic confirmation of their performance.
- One of the primary purposes of this recommendation to have a centralized database and universally useful template for irrigation system inspection reports. It is also important to use this database to gain an understanding of water use and applications for large landscapes.
 - The submission of data to a centralized database would require the use an EPN (parcel number). Queries could then be made by water district boundary area, and reports could be generated stating who did not yet submit their report.
- General agreement that a centralized data management system can be organized by DWR, but enforcement, utilizing the appropriate enforcement and notification mechanisms, can be conducted at a local level.
- Timeline for implementation should be extended to 2020.
- Change requirement for submission of landscape reports from once every year to once every three years.
 - DWR could submit a summary of data and recommendations after initial three years of program for purposes of MWELo updates.
 - The local agency could contact owner of property remind contacts when their report is due via a letter inserted in their annual property tax bill (akin to smog check program).
- May be too cumbersome and require too much staff time to require reports annually.
 - Reports could be submitted every three years.
- Initial focus should be on excessive water users, not only big water users.
 - This will help utilities to identify sites for water savings in order to meet their goals.
 - East Bay MUD penalizes those single family residences using more than 1,00 gal/day per their collected water use data. They institute drought allocation based water use limits, and could be an example.
- Proposal still missing the number of properties that are leased by the state. The purpose of including this statistic was to determine if exemptions should be made for leased properties.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Julie to continue contact attempts to the Department of General Services (DGS) to determine the number of buildings leased by the State to inform Section 5-2.
- The term “reasonable regulations” should be clarified.
- The ITP/DWR should consider allocating a pool of financial resources to assist disadvantaged communities (DACs) in participating in this.
- One member believes this recommendation should be a directed legislative change.
 - There may be opportunity for the requirement as related to state-owned facilities could be incorporated into Section 6.2. Additionally, focus could be directed to state-owned administrative buildings (e.g. City Halls).
- A concern was raised that maintenance and proper upkeep will not be conducted with regularity on mandated demonstration landscapes. Neglect in maintenance could deter public from making landscape conversions to their homes.
 - This was a recent problem on a smaller landscape near the Capitol building.
 - Suggested to have statewide grant program where DACs could establish demonstration landscapes near their City Hall buildings.
- Funding for energy upgrades comes from a public goods charge. Undetermined if something similar could be instituted to fund this type of program.
- Any new landscaping installed on State buildings after the EO was passed will be subject to strict requirements. DWR is requiring an inventory of these new landscapes.
- Large landscapes should be defined as landscapes over 1 acre. Note: this update should be made across the Recommendation titles.
 - It is important to begin collecting data like this to assess the effectiveness of updated MWELo. Furthermore, many grant funding opportunities are available on the basis of measurable outcomes.
 - Water budget planners, such as Ms. Maddaus, would also find great usefulness in this type of collected data.
 - Landscape contractors are interested in collecting data sets related to the lowering of ETAF.
- Note the database can only be accessed by a customer or agency. It is not intended to become a public database.
 - If data is housed by DWR, it may be become publically accessible by regulation. May be necessary to confirm this if a major concern.

ITP Straw Poll

- Dave Fujino was opposed to advancing this section as written to the Public Draft Report. This section will be revised by the authoring team to reflect the discussion, and will be revisited during the ITP’s February 1st webinar.

F. SECTION 5: Improvements in Existing Landscapes

Recommendation #3: State Owned Facilities

ITP Discussion

- This recommendation is intended to address existing landscapes, not ones that will be built in the future.
- A concern was raised that some or many local agencies do not have the authority to make updates to existing landscapes.
- An item regarding water budget reporting pursuant to MWELo section 493.1 can be copied over from Recommendation 6-2.
 - Perhaps some state facilities have already initiate reporting to MWELo standards and these templates can be leveraged.
- It is unclear on if this recommendation is applicable only to structures, or if it applies to roads and right-of-ways also (for example, those that under Caltrans' jurisdiction).
 - Minimum acreage requirements may be too low to address freeway systems.
- There is confusion as to if/how turf on educational campuses are subject to this recommendation.
 - Several members agreed that this recommendation would apply to universities with the exception of functional turf.
 - Many college campuses do not yet have water budgets for all of their various hydrozones.
 - As currently written in the proposal, the responsibility is directed to DGS for the reason that the State Architect is housed here. However, the State Architect does not oversee universities. This should be considered further.

ITP Straw Poll

- All members were in favor of moving this draft forward for inclusion in the Public Draft Report.

G. SECTION 6: New Landscapes

Recommendation #2: State Facility Leadership for New Landscape

ITP Discussion

- Ms. Saare-Edmonds provide the authoring team with available background information per her Action Items from December. The proposal was revised to incorporate this information.
- Caltrans is being trained on Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs), but not on landscape water use. Thus, the education component of this recommendation is critical.
 - The education component could dovetail with the stormwater training program. For example, a new module on landscape water use efficiency could be added.

- DGS is the most appropriate agency to develop this training, as they work with staff at this level. Also, the State landscape architect is housed in DGS, and they consult with DWR.
- One missing item the ITP should consider including is a directive to the budget.
- Recommendations related to retrofit actions could be consolidated with Section 5.3 (items 3 and 6), thereby allowing this proposal to address new landscapes only.
- Recommendation should be ambitious enough to seek to eliminate potable water use on outdoor landscaping entirely, where applicable.
 - A good soil profile is needed to develop healthy urban landscapes. Non-potable water can be high in salinity, affecting the soil profile.
 - The landscape should be designed to fit the resource, not vice versa.
- **ACTION ITEM: Julie Saare-Edmonds** to share sample published protocol on building commissioning for water efficiency (as presented at an Irrigation Show in November).
- The section on training is more appropriate for inclusion in Section 5.3
- **ACTION ITEM: Metrics Committee** to validate statement that MWELO is stronger than EPA tool in Section 6.2.
- DWR recommends that the ITP simply state the State should provide funding funding to fully implement EO B-18-12, rather than specifying funding sources.
 - The statement requiring the identification of funding sources was revised to include “or alternative source of funding.”
 - Some of the items of this recommendation would only require one-time costs, rather than ongoing funding.
- Reference to the Green Building Action Plan was added.
- Proposal should also include language about hiring contractors to conduct the work with equal consideration given to qualification as to price.
- **ACTION ITEM: Julie Saare-Edmonds** to assist Lisa Maddaus and Penny Falcon in referencing the appropriate management memos in the background sections of Recommendations 5-3 and 6-2.

Next Steps

- It was necessary for Mr. Osann to leave the meeting early due to flight constraints. All other members remaining present were in favor of moving this draft forward for inclusion in the Public Draft Report. Note that the recommendation numbers in Section 6 will be updated so that the two recommendations addressing MWELO will be presented in sequential order.

H. SECTION 7: Complementary Policies and Regulations

Recommendations #1A: Product Standards for Irrigation Equipment – Controllers

ITP Discussion

- Limited edits have been made to this proposal. The Purpose Statement now makes mention of the recent Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announcement of their

intention to develop specifications for soil-based sensors. Item 8 was added to the list of recommendations.

- Estimates for potential water savings from this recommendation are large, though the sources are undocumented. Mr. Osann is working to identify documented data sources for this statement.
- One member expressed concerns about combining training on the use of controllers with MWEL0 being a large task for DWR to undertake. Especially as there is no standardization for controllers. The programming of controllers is product specific and can be complicated.
- Most controllers can accommodate a daily or weekly watering window. They have varying levels of sophistication.
 - The criteria listed in this recommendation is taken directly from the WaterSense criteria for weather-based controllers.
 - WaterSense criteria were used instead of Smart Water Applied Technology (SWAT) testing metrics, as the intent of SWOT testing is simply to test controllers and report the results to the EPA. SWOT does not have pass/fail performance criteria to reference.
- The requirement for rain shut-off valves should be maintained, due to the 48 hour no-watering regulation recently implemented.
- Is it possible to lower the minimum of level of rainfall detected to less than ¼"?
 - This level is the industry standard for rainfall. There is not a significant number industry standard units that can meet a lower threshold.

Public Comments

- The reference to external battery backup is not clear, as most controllers have a lithium battery on their motherboard that will continue to keep time during a power outage.
 - **ITP Member:** This recommendation is intended to address those controllers with non-volatile memory. This terminology is derived from the EPA WaterSense criteria.

ITP Straw Poll

- All members were in favor of moving this draft forward for inclusion in the Public Draft Report.

I. SECTION 7: Complementary Policies and Regulations

Recommendations #1B: Product Standards for Irrigation Equipment – Sprinkler Bodies

- No changes were made to this proposal since the December 2015 version.

ITP Straw Poll

- All members were in favor of moving this draft forward for inclusion in the Public Draft Report.

J. SECTION 7: Complementary Policies and Regulations

Recommendation #2: Permit Required for Irrigation Installation

ITP Discussion

- This proposal is critical for the ITP to meet their stated goal of 2 million AF of water savings.
- DWR expressed concerns about adding significant requirements on landscapers to acquire a permit for irrigation installation without having enough dialogue with folks who would be tasked with implementing the permits (e.g. league of cities, land use agencies, etc.)
 - The ITP has tried to engage such parties to an extent, but have not yet received significant feedback.
 - **ACTION ITEM:** DWR to personally send Recommendation 7-2 to the League of Cities inviting them to submit comment on this proposal.
- Should the recommendation specify a landscape size minimum for non-residential landscapes?
 - Typically, all commercial landscapes are already permitted, with a required plan check and design review.
 - Note also that MWELo is triggered by landscapes at a minimum of 500 square feet.
- The ITP should be prepared to address questions and comments about the costs versus benefits of implementing this proposal.

ITP Straw Poll

- All members were in favor of moving this draft forward for inclusion in the Public Draft Report.

K. SECTION 7: Complementary Policies and Regulations

Recommendation #4: Piloting Connection Charges that Promote Landscape Efficiency

ITP Discussion

- No changes to this proposal have been made since December.
- There was a question as to the validity of the statement in the second paragraph “the great majority of these charges...”

- Connection charges are published every two years via the Cal Nevada rates survey. While the connection charges for the city of Los Angeles may not be very high, some rates are as high as \$25,000.
- The City of Sacramento charges \$1,277 for a 1" connection, and \$7,000 for a 1.5" connection. Rates are expected to increase.
- This language can be revised to read "a significant portion of these charges..."
- DWR indicated this is another recommendation that require funding to implement.
- One member indicated he is uncomfortable making rate setting recommendations to local agencies as pertaining to connection charges.
 - Rate consultants assist water agencies in developing their rates. Rates are negotiated agreements done within a City's jurisdiction.
 - There is no mandate associated with this recommendation.
 - This recommendation can develop guidance, education, and testing mechanisms for MWELo implementation methods.
- It may not be within the appropriate of purview for DWR to develop this guidance. Data and information collection methods vary between member agencies. Thus guidance by DWR many not be universally applicable to all service areas.
- Savings on connection charges would be seen if less water is utilized.
 - The only way to guarantee a customer will use less water is by installing a smaller meter size.
 - Water utilities can protect themselves via contract.
 - Fire-flow meters are required to be a certain size, and cannot be downsized. However, irrigation-only meters provide opportunities for downsizing.
- One member prefers to move this recommendation away from addressing connection charges entirely, and redirect the focus to issuing grant funding for meeting code water use requirements.
- Another member disagreed with the proposal to remove reference to connection charges, stating this proposal is framed to align the interests of project developers, home builders, and customers wherein developers bring more efficient products to mater to meet locally determined criteria to meet a verified level of water use performance. This proposal would incentivize builder behavior.

Next Steps

- Due to time constraints, additional conversation on this recommendation was tabled until the February 1st webinar. No straw poll was taken.

L. SECTION 7: Complementary Policies and Regulations

Recommendation #5: Plant Labeling

Public Comments

- A member of the public agreed that current plant labeling requirements are inconsistent and confusing. He explained that per CDFA code Section 53481 plant labeling is required, but labelling of individual plants is not. For example, the pallet for delivery of plants arrives to a warehouse must be labeled, or a sign over a grouping of unlabeled plants at a nursery is sufficient. The only label information that is required is the plant species or cultivar.
 - **ITP Member:** Upon reviewing the coded, the ITP identified a discrepancy in the language of “shall” label and “may” label, and concluded that it should be standard practice that all plants at the retail level be labeled. It would also be beneficial for plants to be labeled with their water usage.
- The section in the CDFA code that addresses plants at the retail level is section 53483, which currently stated that a block of plants can be labeled at the retail level.
 - **ITP Member:** The ITP is supportive of individual plants being labeled on retail displays. It is also preferable that labels include a photo of the plant in bloom as well as the plant’s water requirement.
 - **ITP Member:** When a person is on site for an inspection, they should be able to easily identify what has been planted, and if it climate appropriate.
- Currently, the plant’s water requirement listed on the label is provided voluntarily. This information is not regional, and it is unclear where it is sourced from.
- CDFA is currently redrafting a section of the code to clarify labelling requirements for nursery stock that is being shipped.

ITP Discussion

- One issue is that various wholesale plant growers have different labeling standards. Each vendor has different label contracts with various providers.
- It could be difficult to label each of the smaller plant units. Perhaps labeling can be done at some minimum size, for example, per pack of eight plants.
- The authoring team will address updates to Section 53481, per the discussion above.

ITP Straw Poll

- All members were in favor of moving this draft forward for inclusion in the Public Draft Report.

M. SECTION 8: Workforce to Accomplish the Transformation

Recommendation #2: C-27 Examination Questions Covering Water Use Efficiency and Sustainable Practices

Public Comments

- C-27 exam updates are made every five years. The C-27 exams are legally required to be both current with codes and legislation, and to be job-related, confirmed by occupational analyses which require exam specialists to speak with contractors to determine the appropriate breadth of knowledge that is required for the industry professionals. Draft questions are then reviewed, and another board of exam professionals (participation by invitation only) determines how many questions to dedicate to each particular subtopic. The most recent exam already includes questions related to water efficiency and sustainable landscaping. The accompanying study guide is also updated accordingly, and lists key references for those wishing to take the exam. The study guide will include reference to MWELO and the CalGreen Building Standards Code. Note that the purpose of this exam is not to educate, but to determine who is qualified to become a landscape contractor. Therefore, this recommendation is redundant to what is already being required of the C-27 exams.
 - Each issued exam includes 100 questions. These 100 questions are generated from a bank of 600 possible questions resulting in many variations of the exam as an effort to discourage cheating. It is not known exactly how many questions address MWELO or water use efficiency. The questions are confidential, and cannot be shared with the ITP. What can be reviewed by the ITP is an exam validation report on their content surveys.
 - **ITP Member:** The ITP's intent with this recommendation is not to legislate how the exams should be conducted, but to ensure there is a process for including this information in the exams.
- CSLB does not currently require any CEUs for their licensees, and they do not support this model.

ITP Discussion

- The ITP can put forth a recommendation that is consistent with what an agency claims is doing/ will do. It is an appropriate backstop and demonstrates the ITP's consideration for a wide range of landscape water use efficiency issues.
 - Another member agreed, and recognized that while the current C-27 exam review process is bottom-up, the ITP should also recommend a top-down initiative to sure goals are met.

ITP Straw Poll

- All members were in favor of moving this draft forward for inclusion in the Public Draft Report.

N. SECTION 9: Public Perceptions and Social Norms

Recommendation #1: Defining Professionals: Recognition of Examples of Low Water Use Landscapes and a Sustainable Statewide Approach to Outreach and Information

ITP Discussion

- Two new additions were made to the list of recommendations – items number 2 and 6. In addition, some minor wordsmithing was completed to this proposal.
- New recommendation 10-2 related to WUCOLS update is complementary to new item 5 listed here. The target audience for this is the landscape designer.
 - WUCOLS is not particularly user-friendly and does not include photographs of listed plant species for easy recognition.
- A timeline for implementation of this recommendation should be considered.
- As no funding mechanism was identified, suggested to add in language “DWR should request funding to complete the following:”
 - Continued funding of the SaveOurWater program, or similar statewide campaign, should be written into the proposal.
 - DWR indicated the Legislature would have to appropriate funding.
- As there are a number of administrative proposals the ITP is recommendation that all have a need for funding, one suggestion was made to develop a global funding recommendation for implementation of the ITP’s complete report.
 - Several members were in support of this idea, and will explore it further at a subsequent meeting.

ITP Straw Poll

- All members were in favor of moving this draft forward for inclusion in the Public Draft Report.

ACTION ITEM: CCP to implement global syntax change across individual proposals to read “The ITP recommends that:”

O. SECTION 10: Research and Documentation Needs and Support

Recommendation #1: [Title Pending]

ITP Discussion

- A paragraph was added to the background statement referencing the public goods charge, connecting this proposal to the State’s energy program, Electric Program Investment Charge (EPIC), and the need for water conservation research.

- The proposal should include examples of key problems that could be addressed that would represent breakthroughs in water efficiency with established and ongoing research programs.
 - Key problems could be categorized as agronomic, engineering, or programmatic.
- Less emphasis should be given to where the funding will come from versus *why* the research is needed. There should be focus on the statewide benefit of a research program(s).
- A clear set of objectives and criteria for a research program need to be identified in this proposal. E.g. research priorities could be identified per their associated potential water savings.
 - There is great potential for these research efforts to be spearheaded by non-governmental organizations.
- The “water sector” section on the energy commission website should be reviewed as a potential example. Here, they include a vision, list of resources, criteria, et.

Next Steps

- The authoring team will work to revise the recommendations and background statement and make a compelling case for the need for a research program. This proposal will be reviewed in further detail on February 1st.

P. SECTION 10: Research and Documentation Needs and Support

Recommendation #2: Water Use Classification of Landscape Species (WUCOLS) IV Support

ITP Discussion

- This new recommendation was developed by Dave Fujino, Peter Estournes and Ed Osann. It addresses establishing a processing for making timely and critical updates to the WUCOLS IV list.
 - The last update to WUCOLS was conducted approximately 15 years ago.
 - The list was not originally intended for public use, only as a tool for the horticulture professional. However, with advancements in internet accessibility over the last decade, WUCOLS would be an excellent public resource if the list included photographs, plant descriptions, etc.
- Initial updates should be completed within five years.
- The proposal also includes a recommended process for reviewing and revising the list no less than once every three years.
 - There are more than 3,500 plant taxa listed in WUCOLS. However, some plants sold in the state are not yet on the WUCOLS list, and vice versa. There will be efficiencies over time as more plants get added to the list every three years.
 - During the last review period, only four meetings of a group of nine experts were required to complete the review. The biggest challenge was scheduling these meetings.

- Major nurseries could be contacted and asked if they have any new plants to add to the list.
- Several language updates were made real-time to this proposal.
- There may be an opportunity to cross-reference plants listed in WUCOLS with plants on the *Garden Soft* website for image sources. Note a private developer created this site, so there may be property right impediments with this suggestion.
 - Both San Diego County Water Authority and City of Los Angeles reference *Garden Soft* and WUCOLS on their agency websites. There is an annual fee required to access *Garden Soft*, but the information can be regional to the water agencies jurisdiction.
- The entities with the largest repositories of photographs are label manufacturers. However, they are reluctant to sell their photographs for third party use (such as use on WUCOLS).
 - If possible, DWR should explore cost-efficient ways of including photographs and narrative plant descriptions in WUCOLS without being duplicative of efforts that have already been completed by third parties. E.g. access water utilities' data bases.
- As previous updates to WUCOLS were funded by DWR, funding of this proposal should be included in the overall global funding recommendation.
 - Possible for DWR to submit a budget change proposal and name specific source and allocation to WUCOLS updates.

ITP Straw Poll

- Dave Fujino recused himself from voting on the basis that he has been a WUCOLS IV contractor in leading the review and update process and for designing and implementing the online WUCOLS IV plant searchable database. All members were in favor of moving this draft forward for inclusion in the Public Draft Report.

6. NEXT STEPS & CLOSING REMARKS

- The ITP will meet via Webinar on **February 1st from 7:00 am – 10:00 am** to make formal decisions as to which Recommendations to include in the Public Draft Report.
- Once complete, the Public Draft Report will be made available for a 30-day public review period. The draft report will be posted on the DWR webpage and circulated to a comprehensive distribution list that is maintained by DWR.
- The public meeting will be held on either March 3rd or March 4th in San Diego, depending on meeting room availability.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Meagan Wylie to work with Jeff Stephenson on securing a venue for either March 3rd or 4th in San Diego for which to host the Public Meeting.

7. ATTENDANCE

DAY 1: January 20th

ITP Members

Dave Fujino
Ed Osann
Jeff Stephenson
Lisa Maddaus
Penny Falcon
Peter Estournes
William Granger

Staff

Dave Ceppos, CCP
Julie Saare-Edmonds, DWR
Meagan Wylie, CCP
Vicki Lake, DWR

Public

Amelia Lima
Johnathan Young
Jon Wreschinsky
Kasey Schimke
Leon Francisco
Marina Garcia
Peter Brostrom
Ron Wolfarth
Sandy Charty
Tom Ash

DAY 2: January 21st

ITP Members

Dave Fujino
Ed Osann
Jeff Stephenson
Lisa Maddaus
Penny Falcon
Peter Estournes

Staff

Dave Ceppos, CCP
Julie Saare-Edmonds, DWR
Meagan Wylie, CCP
Vicki Lake, DWR

Public

Jon Wreschinsky
Ron Wolfarth