

# MEETING SUMMARY

## California Department of Water Resources

### Independent Technical Panel for Demand Management Measures

March 30, 2016 | Meeting #29

Prepared by the Sacramento State University, Center for Collaborative Policy

#### Table of Contents

1. ACTION ITEMS.....	2
2. INTRODUCTION .....	3
3. WELCOME & OPENING REMARKS.....	4
4. FINAL REPORT SUPPORTING SECTIONS .....	4
A. FRONT MATTER - SECTION 1: Introduction.....	4
B. FRONT MATTER - SECTION 2: ITP on Demand Management Measures: Organization and Process.....	5
C. FRONT MATTER - SECTION 3: Vision .....	5
<i>Section #3-1: ITP Vision Statement – Achieving Sustainable Urban Landscapes Throughout California .</i>	<i>5</i>
D. FRONT MATTER - SECTION 3: Vision .....	6
<i>Section #3-2: The Watershed Approach to California Landscapes.....</i>	<i>6</i>
E. FRONT MATTER - SECTION 3: Vision .....	7
<i>Section #3-3: Actions to Support the Watershed Approach.....</i>	<i>7</i>
F. FRONT MATTER - SECTION 3: Vision.....	8
<i>Section #3-4: ITP Recommendations on Landscape Water Use Reduction and Efficiency.....</i>	<i>8</i>
G. NEW RECOMMENDATION - Executive Leadership .....	9
H. GLOSSARY OF TERMS.....	10
5. ITP MEMBER INPUT ON INDIVIDUAL REPORT SECTIONS .....	12
A. SECTION 7: Complementary Policies and Regulations .....	12
<i>Recommendation #7: Expanded CIMIS.....</i>	<i>12</i>
B. OPEN DISCUSSION and SECTION 4: Voluntary Turf Replacement.....	12
C. OPEN DISCUSSION - Public Comments Received by March 13 <sup>th</sup> Deadline .....	13
6. PUBLIC COMMENT .....	14
7. NEXT STEPS & CLOSING REMARKS .....	14
8. ATTENDANCE .....	14
<i>ITP Members.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Staff.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Public.....</i>	<i>14</i>

## 1. ACTION ITEMS

1. **CCP** to ensure “watershed-based approach” descriptions in the full report match the glossary definition.
2. **Authoring Teams** to check in their respective sections that any “baseline” language refer to pre-drought levels, not current levels.
3. **Lisa Maddaus** to develop language that acknowledges the costs to implement the ITP recommendations, reiterates the ITP’s charge to develop these recommendations, and emphasizes the importance of these recommendations (e.g., include language in vision statement, Section 3-4, and Section 11-1).
4. **Authoring teams** to work from the public draft shared at the March 4 public meeting (excluding the “front matter,” glossary, Section 7-7, and newly created Section 11-1) to make revisions and conduct all revisions in Track Changes
5. **CCP** to send authoring teams the appropriate report sections in Microsoft Word format on which to conduct their revisions.
6. **CCP** finalize specific revisions conducted/identified in real-time during the March 30 webinar.
7. **Lisa Maddaus** to consider and incorporate edits into the vision statement based on public comments, particularly in regards to integrated water management.
8. **Julie Saare-Edmonds** (DWR) to ask Mark Cowin for a written copy of his comments shared on March 18 and send to ITP members.
9. **Front Matter Authoring Team** to include citation for first sentence of Section 3-2 (cite from 2013 CA Water Plan – Chapter 3, page 8 under landscape irrigation).
10. **Lisa Maddaus** to make first edits in Section 3-3 to acknowledge complementary efforts that support the watershed approach.
11. **Front Matter Authoring Team** to incorporate language in Section 3-4, second paragraph that acknowledges near term and long term impacts.
12. **CCP** to fully populate Section 3-4, Figure 1, with remaining ITP recommendations.
13. **Executive Leadership Authoring Team** to use active voice in second paragraph of the Executive Leadership section.
14. **Executive Leadership Authoring Team** to define ITP Executive Leadership recommendations.
15. **CCP** to develop draft language in Section 3-4 that references Section 11-1; send to Executive Leadership Authoring Team for review.
16. **Julie Saare-Edmonds** to develop 1-2 definitions for “sustainable landscapes” and/or “water efficient landscaping” based on ITP members’ input (e.g., captures the definitions for “drought tolerant landscaping”) and suggest which glossary terms can then be removed. **Julie Saare-Edmonds** to then communicate with Authoring Teams per

their respective sections to finalize definitions and ensure accurate and consistent usage.

17. **Julie Saare-Edmonds** to review document for mention of “California-Friendly Sustainable Landscaping” and include the trademark symbol where appropriate.
18. **Julie Saare-Edmonds** to suggest either a revised definition for “Net Zero Energy Approach” or suggest language to the Section 6-3 Authoring Team that narratively describes the approach in Section 6-3 and remove the term from the glossary.
19. **CCP** to italicize all glossary terms in document to indicate definitions can be found in the glossary.
20. **Peter Estournes** to develop language that accurately defines “rotor.”
21. **Section 4 Authoring Team** to address comments about more descriptive terms and language to differentiate among the various forms of “turf.”

**AGREEMENT:** All ITP members present agreed to advance Section 1, Section 2 (per minor edits), and Section 7-7 to the Final Report and final ITP meeting review.

**AGREEMENT:** All ITP members present agreed the vision statement in the Public Draft Report will become Section 3-1.

**AGREEMENT:** All ITP members present agreed the Executive Leadership section will be the standalone Section 11-1; Section 3-4 will reference the importance of Section 11-1.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) Independent Technical Panel (ITP) for Demand Management Measures met via webinar for their twenty-ninth meeting on March 30, 2016 to accomplish the following objectives:

- Continue discussing development of Supporting Sections for inclusion in the ITP’s Final Report.
- Receive ITP member input on the various sections of the Public Draft Report in response to public comments.
- *Updated or new sections of the ITP’s Proposed Final Report on Landscape Water Use are available on the DWR Water Calendar at:*  
<http://www.water.ca.gov/calendar/index.cfm?meeting=25672>
- *The March 4 Public Draft Report on Landscape Water Use can also be found at:*  
<http://www.water.ca.gov/calendar/index.cfm?meeting=25370>

On February 13, 2016, the ITP’s Public Draft Report was released for public review; the public comment period concluded on March 13, 2016. Members of the public had the opportunity to provide oral comments to the ITP at the March 4, 2016 public meeting in San Diego. Following

the conclusion of the public comment period, ITP authoring teams were to all comments submitted and conduct any necessary or desired revisions to the various Public Draft Report sections. The March 30<sup>th</sup> webinar was organized as an opportunity for the ITP to collectively consider and openly discuss possible revisions to their Final Report sections in advance of their final meeting, scheduled for April 14-15 in Sacramento.

Documents posted to the DWR Water Calendar for this webinar included revised supporting sections (i.e., front matter [Sections 1 through 3], a glossary, and an executive leadership document) and a revised Section 7-7. For all remaining report sections, the ITP used the Public Draft Report presented at the March 4, 2016 meeting during this webinar discussion.

The ITP will conduct a last review and formally vote on the Final Report during the April 14-15, 2016 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 noted each member was participating in the webinar via their locations listed publically on the meeting agenda. ITP member Penny Falcon was unable to attend the meeting. Upon reviewing the agenda and considering time constraints, Mr. Ceppos offered his suggested process to review the Draft Report sections: first by revisions posted to the Water Calendar, then open discussion for ITP members to review any of the remaining sections that may warrant revisions, especially in regard to received public comments.

Mr. Ceppos added that sections will be revised or advanced to the Final Report review by general consensus or a straw poll, not by formal decision. Any section that the ITP did not discuss during the March 30 webinar is assumed to be subject to revisions by their respective authoring teams. The ITP agreed to advance all sections to the Final Report review that received five or more straw poll votes, per their Charter.

This meeting summary presents the draft report sections in the order in which they were discussed by the ITP, rather than in sequential order.

### 4. FINAL REPORT SUPPORTING SECTIONS

#### **A. FRONT MATTER - SECTION 1: Introduction**

Front Matter Authoring Team: Dave Fujino, Lisa Maddaus, CCP

#### *ITP Discussion*

- None.

#### *Public Comment*

- None

#### *ITP Straw Poll*

- All members present in favor of advancing Section 1 to the Final Report and final ITP meeting review.

## **B. FRONT MATTER - SECTION 2: ITP on Demand Management Measures: Organization and Process**

Front Matter Authoring Team: Dave Fujino, Lisa Maddaus, CCP

#### *ITP Discussion*

- ITP members identified minor revisions (e.g., list correct number of ITP meetings and alphabetize ITP members by last name).
  - **ACTION ITEM:** CCP to finalize specific minor revisions identified in real-time during the March 30 webinar.

#### *Public Comment*

- None.

#### *ITP Straw Poll*

- Per minor revisions, all members present in favor of advancing Section 2 to the Final Report and final ITP meeting review.

## **C. FRONT MATTER - SECTION 3: Vision**

Section #3-1: ITP Vision Statement – Achieving Sustainable Urban Landscapes Throughout California

Section #3-1 Authoring Team: Peter Estournes, Ed Osann, Jeff Stephenson

#### *Background and Introductory Comments*

The Front Matter Authoring Team noted Section 3-1 derives directly from the Vision Statement in the Public Draft Report (developed by the Section 3 Authoring Team). The Front Matter Authoring Team did not adjust any language from the original Vision Statement. The Front Matter Authoring Team then added three subsection topics: the watershed approach in California (Section 3-2), watershed approach actions (Section 3-3), and an overview of the ITP recommendations (Section 3-4).

#### *ITP Discussion*

- Several ITP members concurred that more descriptive language should be used whenever the term “turf” appears to differentiate among various turf types. This was a

prominent recurring theme from the public comments. An ITP member suggested that descriptive language may be more pertinent to Section 3-4 than the broader language in the Vision Statement section.

- Ms. Maddaus offered to develop language that mentions “integrated water management” more prominently, especially in regards to stormwater. She also suggested including a relatable comparison between the ITP’s goal of reduced potable water use by 2 million acre feet per year and another goal (e.g., large water supplier). These suggestions are based upon comments from Paul Herzog (Surfrider Foundation) and DWR Director Mark Cowin. ITP members requested a written copy summarizing Mark Cowin’s oral comments.
  - **ACTION ITEM:** Lisa Maddaus to consider and incorporate edits into the Vision Statement based on public comments, particularly in regards to integrated water management.
  - **ACTION ITEM:** Julie Saare-Edmonds (DWR) to ask Mark Cowin for a written copy of his comments shared on March 18 and send to ITP members.

#### *Public Comment*

- None.

#### *ITP Straw Poll*

- All members present in favor of establishing the ITP Vision Statement as Section #3-1.

### **D. FRONT MATTER - SECTION 3: Vision**

Section #3-2: The Watershed Approach to California Landscapes

Section #3-2 Authoring Team: Dave Fujino, Lisa Maddaus, CCP

#### *ITP Discussion*

- A few ITP members noted that “watershed-based approach” is not consistently described (e.g., the glossary definition differs from the description on Section 3, footnote citation #3).
  - **ACTION ITEM:** CCP to ensure “watershed-based approach” descriptions in the full report match the glossary definition.
  - An ITP member emphasized that the report overall needs to better underscore the beneficial impacts and importance of the watershed-based approach. The holistic approach supports integrated infrastructure and systems for improved rain water retention, stormwater management, reliable water supply, etc.
- ITP members reviewed the accuracy of the statement that approximately half of the State’s potable water supply is used as supplemental irrigation on urban landscapes. ITP members discussed whether the estimate differentiated between potable water used

on urban landscapes versus agricultural uses or on non-landscape surfaces (e.g. filling pools). An ITP member explained the estimate is derived from the 2013 California Water Plan; the group decided to include this citation for the statement.

- **ACTION ITEM: Section 3-2 Authoring Team** to include citation for first sentence of Section 3-2 (cite from 2013 CA Water Plan – Chapter 3, page 8 under landscape irrigation).

#### *Public Comment*

- None.

#### *ITP Straw Poll*

- No straw poll conducted. Authoring Team will revise Section 3-2 based on public comments and ITP discussion.

### **E. FRONT MATTER - SECTION 3: Vision**

Section #3-3: Actions to Support the Watershed Approach

Section #3-3 Authoring Team: Dave Fujino, Lisa Maddaus, CCP

#### *ITP Discussion*

- Ms. Maddaus mentioned that ITP members previously considered acknowledging complementary programs that support the watershed-based approach that are not necessarily quantifiable. She asked ITP members whether they want to include that information. The facilitator suggested Ms. Maddaus considers developing draft language for ITP members to review at the final ITP meeting.
  - **ACTION ITEM: Lisa Maddaus** to make first edits in Section 3-3 to acknowledge complementary efforts that support the watershed approach.
- An ITP member noted the last sentence in the introductory paragraph implied the key objectives for the watershed approach are listed by priority. ITP members agreed to replace “prioritized” with “as agreed to.”

#### *Public Comment*

- None.

#### *ITP Straw Poll*

- No straw poll conducted. Authoring Team will revise Section 3-3 based on public comments and ITP discussion.

## F. FRONT MATTER - SECTION 3: Vision

Section #3-4: ITP Recommendations on Landscape Water Use Reduction and Efficiency

Section #3-4 Authoring Team: Dave Fujino, Lisa Maddaus, CCP

### *ITP Discussion*

- An ITP member expressed his impression that the first paragraph implies the baseline for the ITP goal to reduce potable water use on outdoor landscapes by 50% is based on today's water use; the baseline is actually "pre-drought levels."
  - **ACTION ITEM: Authoring Teams** to check in their respective sections that any "baseline" language refer to pre-drought levels, not current levels.
- The group identified additional minor edits (e.g., correct number of report sections and grammar edits).
  - **ACTION ITEM: CCP** to finalize specific minor revisions identified in real-time during the March 30 webinar.
- ITP members discussed a draft dot matrix that categorizes the various recommendations in the ITP Report. The ITP was to discuss the chart's value and whether to fully populate it with the remaining recommendations. An ITP member expressed reservations on the chart's utility. Several ITP members said the intent of the chart is to help the reader understand the context of the recommendations and identify which recommendations they may be interested. Julie Saare-Edmonds, DWR, added the chart helps display the wide range of options for landscape water use reduction and efficiency. ITP members agreed to completing the dot matrix and revisit its value during the Final Report review meeting.
  - **ACTION ITEM: CCP** to fully populate Section 3-4, Figure 1, with remaining recommendations.
  - An ITP member suggested the dot matrix differentiates between legislative changes and administrative actions with different colors.
- An ITP member suggested the Front Matter Authoring Team include language noting the recommendations address both near term and long term benefits.
  - **ACTION ITEM: Front Matter Authoring Team** to incorporate language in Section 3-4, second paragraph that acknowledges near term and long term impacts.

### *Public Comment*

- None.

### *ITP Straw Poll*

- No straw poll conducted. Front Matter Authoring Team will revise Section 3-4 based on public comments and ITP discussion.

## G. NEW RECOMMENDATION - Executive Leadership

Executive Leadership Authoring Team: Peter Estournes, Ed Osann, Jeff Stephenson

### *Introductory Comments*

Mr. Osann explained the purpose of this section is to acknowledge the Governor's leadership role in recent years to utilize Executive Orders that have helped clarify and accelerate development and implementation of state policy pertaining to more efficient water use. The section calls upon the Governor to incorporate the ITP Report recommendations that can be implemented without legislation into Executive Orders before the end of the calendar year. The next steps for this section include determining its appropriate location in the report and populating the section with specific recommendations to the Governor.

### *ITP Discussion*

- An ITP member asked if the recommendations are intended to delegate certain actions to specific agencies. Mr. Osann suggested against naming agencies specifically, but rather listing recommendations already in the report that can be implemented with an Executive Order.
  - **ACTION ITEM: Executive Leadership Authoring Team** to define ITP Executive Leadership recommendations.
- An ITP member suggested the second paragraph needed to clarify the Governor's role in the development of the 2013 Water Action Plan.
  - **ACTION ITEM: Executive Leadership Authoring Team** to use active voice in second paragraph of the Executive Leadership section.
- The group discussed the next steps for the Executive Leadership section. ITP members considered how to best emphasize the importance of this section to the reader (e.g., at the beginning of the report as Section 3-5 or as a separate recommendation at the end of the report). ITP members agreed the section should be a separate recommendation (Section 11-1) and a Front Matter section (Section 3-4) should mention its importance.
  - **ACTION ITEM: CCP** to develop draft language in Section 3-4 that references Section 11-1; send to the Executive Leadership Authoring Team for review.

### *Public Comment*

- None

### *ITP Straw Poll*

- All members present agreed to incorporate the Executive Leadership section as standalone Section 11-1; Section 3-4 will reference importance of Section 11-1.

## H. GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Glossary Authoring Team: Dave Fujino, Julie Saare-Edmonds, CCP

### *Introductory Comments*

Mr. Ceppos explained the ITP Planning Team (Peter Estournes, Dave Fujino, DWR staff, and CCP staff) identified several issues that the Planning Team would like the ITP to discuss:

1) If and how to consolidate terms that seem to have similar definitions:

- **California-Friendly Sustainable Landscaping™** - a trademarked program of the Metropolitan Water District Southern California that emphasizes gardening with native and climate adapted non-native plants.
- **Drought tolerant landscaping** - a landscape with plants that can tolerate and recover from periods of drought or intermittent irrigation.
- **Sustainable landscaping** - landscapes that are developed with regenerative practices to ensure continued benefits and minimize the need for inputs in perpetuity.
- **Water efficient landscaping** - landscaping that has been designed and installed with water saving practices and products, including low water needing plants.
- **Water wise landscapes** - another term for water efficient landscapes.
- **Low water use landscapes** - please see water efficient landscaping.

2) Whether to use the trademarked term “California-Friendly Sustainable Landscaping™.”

3) Public comments received on “Net Zero Energy Approach.”

### *ITP Discussion*

- An ITP member suggested consolidating terms around “water efficient landscaping” because the term ties closely with the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELo) definition. Another ITP member stipulated that “low water use landscapes” should remain differentiated from “water efficient landscaping,” because low water use landscapes imply utilizing only low water use plants.
- ITP members shared differing opinions in regards to replacing “sustainable landscaping” definition with the current definition for “water efficient landscaping” – water efficient landscaping uses more accessible language; however, currently the two terms tend to evoke very different approaches to landscaping.
- Ms. Saare-Edmonds added that people often differentiate “drought tolerant landscaping” from “climate adaptive landscaping.” There was a suggestion that “drought tolerant landscaping” could be incorporated into one of the other terms (e.g., water efficient landscaping).
- Ms. Saare-Edmonds offered to develop a few definitions to consolidate terms based on ITP members’ comments.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Julie Saare-Edmonds to develop consolidated definitions, especially for “sustainable landscapes” and/or “water efficient landscaping” based on ITP members’ input (e.g., captures the definitions for “drought tolerant landscaping”) and suggest which glossary terms can then be removed.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Julie Saare-Edmonds to communicate with authoring teams per their respective sections to finalize definitions and ensure accurate and consistent usage.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Julie Saare-Edmonds to review document for mention of “California-Friendly Sustainable Landscaping” and include the trademark symbol where appropriate.
- Ms. Saare-Edmonds explained “Net Zero Energy Approach” was incorrectly defined in the glossary; the glossary definition describes a net zero *water* approach. An ITP member suggested describing the Net Zero Energy Approach in the text (Section 6-3) without specifically naming the term and remove the term from the glossary.
  - **ACTION ITEM:** Julie Saare-Edmonds to suggest either a revised definition for “Net Zero Energy Approach” or suggest language to the Section 6-3 Authoring Team that narratively describes the approach in Section 6-3 and remove the term from the glossary.
- An ITP member suggested glossary terms should be italicized in the report for easy recognition by readers. He added that terms should be universally italicized in the report since different audiences will focus on different chapters.
  - **ACTION ITEM:** CCP to italicize all glossary terms in document to indicate definitions can be found in the glossary.
- Mr. Estournes noted the definition for “rotor” was inaccurate.
  - **ACTION ITEM:** Peter Estournes to develop language that accurately defines “rotor.”

#### *Public Comment*

- A member of the public articulated the challenge of using terms such as “sustainable” or “water efficient” is that they often lack a metric to gauge compliance. He suggested alternative terms such as “low maintenance” are more easily quantifiable. He acknowledged the challenge to define these terms, as definitions often vary depending on the individual’s interpretation.

#### *ITP Straw Poll*

- No straw poll conducted. Glossary Authoring Team will revise the glossary based on public comments and ITP discussion.

## 5. ITP MEMBER INPUT ON INDIVIDUAL REPORT SECTIONS

### A. SECTION 7: Complementary Policies and Regulations

Recommendation #7: Expanded CIMIS

Section 7-7 Authoring Team: Peter Estournes, David Fujino

#### *Introductory Comments*

Mr. Estournes explained that, based upon received public comments, the authoring team added language that mentions automatic irrigation scheduling networks.

#### *ITP Discussion*

- None.

#### *Public Comment*

- None

#### *ITP Straw Poll*

- All members present in favor of advancing Section 7-7 to the Final Report for final ITP meeting review.

### B. OPEN DISCUSSION and SECTION 4: Voluntary Turf Replacement

Section 4 Authoring Team: William Granger, Ed Osann, Jeff Stephenson

#### *Introductory Comments*

Mr. Ceppos reiterated Section 7-7 was the last section that had been formally revised and uploaded to the Water Calendar for this webinar meeting; any discussion on the remaining sections are based off of the Public Draft Report presented at the March 4<sup>th</sup> public meeting. He then invited ITP members to discuss any section of particular interest to them, especially in response to received public comments.

ITP members agreed to focus on Section 4: Turf Replacement to address the large amount of comments received suggesting the report distinguish among the various types of turf.

#### *ITP Discussion*

- Mr. Stephenson said that the Section 4 Authoring Team plans to distinguish among alternative turf types. For instance, they will differentiate cool season turf versus warm season in response to several public comments that warm season turf is more suited for California's climate compared to cool season turf.
  - **ACTION ITEM: Section 4-1 Authoring Team** to address comments about more descriptive terms and language to differentiate among the various forms of "turf."

- Mr. Osann said the language on tax credits to replace high water use landscaping or plants warrants additional thought. Revisions may be made to provide a more feasible tax credit recommendation from the policy-makers' perspective. For example, a tax credit for businesses may be more cost-effective due to stewardship activities across a potentially larger area.
- An ITP member expressed reservations on the rebate program to replace high water use landscaping noting the savings also depend on the irrigation system and management of that system. The program may succeed better with landscape professionals, because the public generally lacks the expertise and resources to maintain an efficient irrigation system.
- Another ITP member expressed support for creating incentives, stating that incentives also benefit the economy and industry. He added that these programs need to include an education component to continue to promote water stewardship for both residential and commercial uses.
- Mr. Osann reflected that the Section 4 Authoring Team should also discuss to what standards new landscapes should be held (e.g., replace high water use plants, install low water use plants, provide state tax incentives for installations, etc.).

#### *Public Comment*

- None.

#### *ITP Straw Poll*

- No straw poll conducted. Section 4 Authoring Team will revise Section 4 based on public comments and ITP discussion.

### **C. OPEN DISCUSSION - Public Comments Received by March 13<sup>th</sup> Deadline**

#### *ITP Discussion*

- ITP members noted that a recurrent theme among comments received was that the State lacks the funding and resources to implement the ITP's recommendations. The ITP agreed to include language that acknowledges the high costs of implementation; however, successful sustainable and efficient landscape water use depends upon allocating the funds to implement these important recommendations. Additionally, the ITP's purview was to put forth recommendations based on their technical expertise regardless of existing funding sources.
  - **ACTION ITEM:** Lisa Maddaus to develop language that acknowledges the costs to implement the ITP recommendations, reiterates the ITP's charge to develop these recommendations, and emphasizes the importance of these recommendations (e.g., include language in Vision Statement, Section 3-4, and Section 11-1).

## 6. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A member of the public expressed agreement with a previous comment that successful water efficient programs depend on more than turf replacement, but on the entire water system. A leaky water system can easily negate good stewardship behavior. He suggested programs that focus on water efficiency (e.g., decrease water use by a certain percentage) rather than on plants.
- The member of the public suggested local agencies such as the water districts should implement rebate and incentive programs because they have the local knowledge to develop a program that best suits their communities' needs and interests.

## 7. NEXT STEPS & CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Ceppos thanked ITP members and members of the public for their time and input on the ITP report. He reminded authoring teams that April 7 is the final due date for report revisions before the final ITP meeting.

- **ACTION ITEM: Authoring Teams** to work from the public draft shared at the March 4 public meeting (excluding the “front matter,” glossary, Section 7-7, and newly created Section 11-1) to make revisions and conduct all revisions in Track Changes
- **ACTION ITEM: CCP** to send Authoring Teams the appropriate report sections in Microsoft Word format on which to conduct their revisions.
- **ACTION ITEM: CCP** to finalize specific edits conducted in real-time during the March 30 webinar.

The next and final ITP meeting will occur on April 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> at the Center for Collaborative Policy, 815 S Street, First Floor, Sacramento, CA.

## 8. ATTENDANCE

### ITP Members

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

### Staff

Dave Ceppos, CCP  
Julie Saare-Edmonds, DWR  
Stephanie Horii, CCP

### Public

Rich Covert (in-person at CCP office)  
Amanda Gualderama (teleconference)  
Matt [Anonymous] (teleconference)