SBx7-7 Urban Stakeholder Committee Meeting
Meeting Summary
May 18, 2010
10 AM – 3:00 PM

All documents can be found at http://www.water.ca.gov/wateruseefficiency/sb7/
Please send all comments and inquiries to the project staff email: wue@water.ca.gov

Welcome

The second meeting of the SBx7-7 Urban Stakeholder Committee (USC) was held on May 18, 2010, in Sacramento. Facilitator Dave Ceppos, Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University Sacramento (CCP), welcomed committee members and participants. Members who were unable to attend in person participated through Webinar. Mr. Ceppos confirmed time was allotted for public comment during each agenda item.

Mr. Ceppos reviewed the meeting agenda and materials. The objectives of the meeting were to (1) present the Department of Water Resources (DWR) USC Charter and Schedule, (2) discuss and obtain input on Draft U3 Technical Methodologies, (3) present the proposed charge of the U4 Technical Subcommittee, (4) present an overview of process water project (U5) and provide opportunity for USC input, and (5) present information on Travel Expense Claims. After a review of the USC Charter, Mr. Ceppos explained the USC's discussion will concentrate on the U3 Technical Methodologies. The USC will focus on the draft gross water use, service area population, and base daily per capita use Technical Methodologies. Time permitting, the USC will discuss compliance daily per capita use, landscape area water use, baseline commercial, industrial, and institutional water use, criteria for compliance year adjustment, and indoor residential use. Items not addressed will be discussed at a June 1st follow-on meeting. Charlotte Chorneau, CCP, will send out additional information via email regarding the follow-on meeting.

Manucher Alemi, Chief of the DWR Water Use and Efficiency Branch and USC Co-Lead, welcomed the group and introduced the consultants who work under the direction of the DWR project team. Mr. Alemi communicated that all comments will be posted on the project website (see link above), resources, staff and the lead consultant name are listed in the charter.

Chris Brown, Executive Director of the California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC) and USC Co-Lead, added that the project team and consultants understand the complexity of the USC's task, and he emphasized they are listening to the USC's input.

DWR Final USC Charter

Mr. Alemi reviewed the modifications made to the USC Charter in response to members' comments. He explained that the intent of the Charter was to provide a roadmap for the USC, though the USC will not be asked to vote to ratify the Charter.

Mr. Alemi offered additional explanation of how some of the more consistent comments were addressed in the Charter update. One consistent comment received requested creating a liaison between the USC and the commercial, industrial, and institutional (CII) Task Force. Mr. Alemi stated that language was added to the Charter committing to coordinate information between initiatives under SB x7-7 (such as between the USC and the proposed CII Task Force.

The project team also received a comment about maintaining the USC through the 20X2020 timeline. Mr. Alemi stated that sustaining a large group membership for an extended period of time requires many resources and logistical support. He pointed to added language in the final Charter, reflecting that the group will continue through the completion of appropriate SBx7-7 projects and any further activities would be determined by the need and available resources.

Another comment requested that the DWR respond to all comments received from the USC. Mr. Alemi explained that the USC is a group voluntarily formed by DWR to receive focused, stakeholder advice and to provide a venue for public input. The USC is different from a formal process such as a task force in a rule-making or California Environmental Quality Act process. The project team does not have the capability to formally respond to every comment. However, Mr. Alemi confirmed that each comment will be carefully considered. The DWR project team will respond to comments from the public workshops, though not in a formalized comment-by-comment basis.

Lastly, Mr. Alemi reported receiving many comments regarding how DWR will treat a recommendation from the USC. He noted that page nine of the final Charter describes the group's consensus-seeking process, and that DWR will give high priority consideration to consensus recommendations or items of significant agreement among USC members. However, DWR is not bound to adopt a recommendation from the group. However, Mr. Alemi confirmed that should DWR find a need to deviate from consensus or majority perspectives by the USC, DWR will provide summary explanations about what those differences are and why DWR has pursued them despite USC input.

Comments:

- David Bolland, Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA), asked if USC members may request outside experts to participate in a subcommittee.
    - Mr. Alemi confirmed that experts may be invited to participate at the USC's request.

- Mary Lou Cotton, Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, inquired if there was legal standing for DWR to not adopt a recommendation from the USC.
    - Mr. Alemi explained that the USC was not mandated, but invited to participate so DWR could benefit from members' expertise. He affirmed that the project team will consider all comments and recommendations, but DWR may modify a recommendation based on a technical issue or if there is a conflict with DWR policy, as interpreted by DWR's legal office.

- Penny Falcon, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, requested that language on how the USC's activities will be documented also appear on page ten of the final Charter.
    - Mr. Alemi noted that the information was already included on page nine, and responded that additional language will be added to the end of the second paragraph on page ten.

USC Meeting Schedule Review

Mr. Ceppos presented the USC Meeting Schedule to the group. The USC will have meetings once a month. Meetings will start at10 AM and will range in duration. Meeting locations will alternate from Northern California to Southern California. The U4 Technical Subcommittee will likely meet once a month through August and public workshops will be held in August. Mr. Ceppos stated that a follow-on workshop will be held in Sacramento on June 1st, as the project team does not anticipate getting through all the draft methodologies in Meeting #2. The June 22nd USC meeting will be held at the Inland Empire Utilities Agency in Chino; Ms. Chorneau will send the meeting specifics to the USC via email.

The project team aims to schedule the U4 Technical Subcommittee the day after the June 22nd USC meeting, and details will be announced as soon as confirmed.

Comments:

- Ms. Falcon recommended that U4 Technical Subcommittee meetings should also try to remain in the same region as the USC meetings, to avoid excessive travel. She offered to help the project team find rooms if needed.

- Ms. Cotton recommended that the project team confirm the meeting dates as soon as possible to account for vacation schedules.
    - Mr. Ceppos acknowledged Ms. Cotton's concern, and explained that the project team will try to confirm some dates during the lunch break of today's meeting

Overview of Draft U3 Methodologies

Peter Brostrom, Acting Project Manager for DWR, introduced the seven draft methodologies. The methodologies are in first draft format, and he stressed the importance of the USC's input. He described that the project team has held lengthy debates examining the law. Two of the guiding principles in the methodologies' development were to use the same process in the base and compliance years and that the per capita calculations were for individual supplier's compliance purposes and were not developed to compare water use between agencies.

Mr. Brostrom explained that there are essentially three steps required for urban supplier water use target compliance: (1) calculate the base daily use, (2) use the base daily use, to pick one of the four methods to select a target, and (3) measure per capita water use in 2015 and 2020 to test compliance against their water use target . The methodology will set how suppliers decide their target. The years used to calculate base daily use can vary depending on a range of variables such as recycled water, time scale, etc.

Gross Water Use

Mr. Brostrom presented the draft methodology for Calculation of Gross Water Use. He reviewed the set of eleven basic steps:

1. Define the 12-month period for which Gross Water will be calculated
2. Delineate Distribution System Boundary
3. Compile the volume of water from own sources
4. Compile the volume of water imported from outside sources
5. Compile the volume of water exported to outside water utilities or jurisdictions
6. Calculate the net change in distribution system storage
7. Calculate Gross Water use before indirect recycled water use deductions
8. Deduct recycled water used for indirect portable reuse from Gross Water Use
9. Calculate Gross Water use after indirect recycled water use deductions
10. Optional: Deduct from Gross Water use the volume of water delivered for agricultural use
11. Optional: Deduct the volume of water delivered for process water use

Mr. Brostrom also presented a figure depicting a schematic of a typical urban retail water supply system. He pointed out the flexibility in how water suppliers can define their distribution systems to include untreated diversions and indirect potable reuse.

Comments:

- John Mills, Offices of John S. Mills, inquired if the system is required to be metered for raw water, or if there was a way to include measurement by "miners' inch". He clarified that some districts sell by the miners' inch.
    - Mr. Brostrom confirmed Mr. Mills' suggestion will be considered.
    - David Mitchell, consultant from CH2M Hill, referred to the American Water Works Association (AWWA) Manual of Water Supply Practices—M36 for guidance on reasonable and accurate measurement conversion procedures.

- Mr. Bolland underscored the importance of appropriate measurement, parallel with agricultural use water. He suggested agencies refer to the AWWA manual to evaluate it provides adequate flexibility.

- Chris Dundon, Contra Costa Water District, raised concern regarding agencies with inadequate data.
    - Mr. Brostrom responded that the agencies are required to follow the law, and will have to use the data they acquired.

- Tim Blair, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, complimented the draft document. He requested that the methodology address regional compliance, as it may become an issue for agencies partnered with utilities.
    - Mr. Brostrom replied that regional partnerships were eliminated from the Compliance Daily Per Capita Use paper to address the topic in a separate document. This separate document is expected to come out during the summer. He stated that these separate documents will eventually be merged into a single Urban Water Management Plan Guidebook. DWR publishes the guidebook once every 5 years to provide instructions to water suppliers on the developing an urban water management plan.

- Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority, noted that the statute subtracts for long term storage in regards to distribution storage accounting. She suggested that the calculations focus on what is put in long term storage rather than short term. Short term storage can vary by the time of day.
    - Mr. Brostrom noted that the methodology accounts for long term storage and the annual change in storage should only be considered if it is significant in relation to the annual gross water use.
    - Mr. Mitchell clarified that the M36 Manual states that changes in storage should be considered where they are significant.

- Ms. Cotton pointed out that there are cases where wholesale agencies recycle raw water. She recommended that the schematic be modified to include wholesaler services.

- John Woodling, Regional Water Authority, said that there may be more opportunity for flexibility. Some agencies are combined institutionally, and should be able to report separately. He also asked about the source of the 4% minimum of industrial water uses supplied, used to determine whether or not industrial water use could be considered a substantial percentage of total water use in Step 11. Mr. Woodling also recommended that any agency be left the flexibility to define the substantial percentage as higher or lower. He explained that an agency will do the work to calculate the percentage, and it would not significantly deduct the agency's conservation savings.
    - Mr. Mitchell responded that the law says that process water can be excluded from the gross water calculation if it is substantial part of the delivery. He explained that the project team gathered water delivery data submitted to the California Urban Water Conservation Council. They then examined the distribution of water suppliers in terms of the percentage of

industrial water or combined industrial and commercial water they supplied. As an initial starting point in quantifying what is "substantial process" the project team chose the 75% percentile from the CUWCC data. For suppliers above this point, industrial water accounted for more than 4% of total water deliveries. Mr. Mitchell also explained a second test of substantial for suppliers who did not separate industrial and commercial accounts. These suppliers could exclude process water if commercial and industrial water use was greater than 20% of total deliveries. This second method is based on the CUWCC water use data and the 75% percentile of commercial, industrial and institutional water use.

- Mr. Brostrom reiterated that this measure for the methodology is optional.

- Mr. Mills concurred that agencies should have the flexibility to measure their own system. He stressed that agencies don't want to change how they measure when they know their method works. He also asked for a definition of the term *distribution network*, found in Step 3.
  - Mr. Brostrom explained the term was pulled from the law's language where gross water is defined as the total volume of water, whether treated or untreated, entering the distribution system….

- Mr. Dundon suggested that the industrial water use percentage be less prescriptive and that agencies should have more flexibility but also clear criteria.
  - Mr. Brostrom explained that the agencies' flexibility has to meet the legislation's call to set up compliance and methodologies. He said the project team has been working to balance this relationship.

- Richard Harris, East Bay Municipal Utility District, emphasized that the USC should avoid the smaller details that could impede their overall work.

- Heather Cooley, Pacific Institute, asked if all industrial water use was going to be considered process water use, and thus excluded.
  - Mr. Mitchell communicated that there is a threshold test to determine if there is substantial use.

- Dave Koller, Coachella Valley Water District, advised that each agency will be different to a certain degree. As such, he suggested adding a paragraph to describe an equivalent approved method.
  - Mr. Brostrom responded that DWR can consider Mr. Koller's suggestion, but the intent is to capture individual agencies' nuances while meeting the legislative requirements.

- Mr. Woodling urged DWR to examine what is strictly in the law. He expressed concern about a distribution center starting from the center, and voiced that agencies should have flexibility when feasible.

- Fiona Sanchez, Irvine Ranch Water District, commented that the process water exemption was added to the legislation to account for unique situations where an exemption was needed. She encouraged members to recognize the exemption as a special situation that not every agency will encounter.

- Mr. Bolland noted that flexibility had surfaced as a theme for the group, and that there was also a need for standardization. He proposed that agencies should receive guidance in place of prescription. Demonstrated evidence of a problem should then warrant standardization. He underscored that standardization should be used as a tool to apply what the legislation is calling for.

- Mr. Mills emphasized that the process is for compliance, not for comparison, and that the methodology should be flexible rather than prescriptive.

- Mr. Brostrom clarified that the methodology calls for measurements and for the agency to define the measurements. The law includes distribution, but otherwise the methodology is fairly flexible in following the law.

- Ms. Falcon requested clarification regarding the option of taking out the total industrial and commercial water use, particularly if private golf courses would be included. She also requested the source of the commercial water use definition, found on page six of the draft methodology.
    - Mr. Mitchell explained the definition came from the CUWCC website.
    - Mr. Harris noted that the definitions for the calculation step seemed unclear. He recommended that DWR modify the definitions to refer only for that calculation.
        - Mr. Brostrom confirmed DWR will clarify the definitions.

- Matt Lyons, Long Beach Water Department, echoed Ms. Sanchez's comments regarding how only agencies with dramatic swings will be impacted.

Service Area Population

Mr. Brostrom presented the draft methodology for Service Area Population. He highlighted the Census definition of a resident, which includes college students at their school and military personnel at their deployment location. The legislation encourages flexibility to allow for federal, state, or local projections, but the same source should be used for the base and compliance year to maintain consistency. The service area used for calculating population should match the distribution system used in the gross water calculation. Area's that are supplied from private wells should be excluded from the service area. Mr. Brostrom explained agencies would have three options:

1. Water suppliers' distribution areas match municipal boundaries, thus they can use Census data.
2. Water suppliers' distribution areas do not match municipal boundaries, but have mapped boundaries by GIS. These agencies may layer their GIS data over the latest Census information to estimate people per connection.
3. Water suppliers who do not match municipal boundaries or have GIS data may refer to the guidance provided in the draft methodology to extrapolate the ratio of connections from the latest Census data.

Mr. Brostrom confirmed the third category was tested by DWR staff and was successful, though the process can be further refined.

Comments:

- Ms. Sanchez complimented the project team on their work. She stated that the retailer should not be obligated to use wholesaler data. She emphasized that retailers should be flexible to use more refined data.

- Sharon Fraser, El Dorado Irrigation District, added that agencies in the third group could use active residential connections and multiply that by the households from the last Census.

- Mr. Woodling recommended a terminology correction. He remarked that the draft methodology should consider that populations can be drawn from single or multiple person households even if they're not metered.

- Joe Berg, Municipal District of Orange County, said that his organization has taken a combined approach of Census data and traffic analysis zones. He wanted to ensure this method would be acceptable
    - Mr. Brostrom confirmed that the district can determine which source is better, as long as the data is consistent with the Department of Finance.

- Mr. Blair emphasized that the same data should be used for base and compliance years.

- Ms. Roy suggested that the third group should be simplified by allowing for a standard number per service connection.
    - Mr. Brostrom said the department would take that into consideration. Mr. Brostrom added that to simplify the population methodology paper, the step by step calculation procedures would be moved from the main document into appendixes.

- Ms. Cotton added that agencies should use substantiated local data. She commented that the groups seemed prescriptive, and there should be language towards the beginning of the document to emphasize that data is acceptable as long as it is substantiated and consistent.
    - Mr. Brostrom confirmed the document's language can be modified to better reflect the intent.

- Mr. Mills referred to the last paragraph on page 2-9, and commented that the terminology "methodically rigorous" was unnecessary. He recommended replacing the text with "documented".

- Mr. Brostrom clarified that the draft methodology accounts for a changing ratio during base and compliance years to adjust for special communities, such as retirement communities. He added that seasonal residents will not be counted unless there is a significant change in the number of seasonal residents.

- Ms. Cooley echoed concerns about population methodology, and proposed stricter requirements for those choosing the second target method.

Base Daily Per Capita Water Use

Mr. Brostrom presented the draft methodology for Calculation of Base Daily Per Capita Water Use. He reviewed the five basic steps:

1. Determine the base period for which Base Daily Per Capita Water Use is to be calculated
2. Estimate Service Area Population for each year in the base period
3. Calculate Gross Water Use for each year in the base period
4. Calculate Daily Per Capita Water Use for each year in the base period
5. Calculate Base Daily Per Capita Water Use

He explained that there are two baselines to calculate; a 10 or 15 year base period that is used for urban water use target calculations and a 5 year base period that is used for measuring compliance with the 5% minimum savings standard.

Comments:

- Ms. Falcon requested additional clarification regarding the methods and baselines. She advised that DWR make the two different baselines more clear.
    - Mr. Mitchell described that there are two baselines but they are used for slightly different purposes. The main baseline, 10-year, is used for water use target calculations while the five year is used with the 5% savings calculations.

- Mr. Lyons asked if the diagram accounting for recycled water includes indirect potable reuse.
    - Mr. Brostrom confirmed the diagram does intend to include indirect potable reuse as recycled water.

- Ms. Cotton questioned the reason for doing the additional calculation if an agency was not going to keep the 5%.
    - Mr. Brostrom said that an agency can't know they have saved more than 5% unless they calculate the baseline.

- Mr. Blair explained that his understanding of the law did not match the flowchart.
    - Mr. Mitchell offered his understanding of the law. He stated that there is a minimum threshold, which is the minimum savings. The reduction is required to be at least 5%, which can be calculated by taking the 5-year average and applying this number to the target. He continued to explain that the target is subtracted from the 10-15-year baseline. If this number is greater than the other 5-year baseline, the target must be lowered.

- Mr. Blair noted that weather normalization is calculated on a 30-year cycle. He observed that a few years with abnormal weather would alter an agency's baseline calculations.

- Ms. Cotton requested that DWR obtain additional legal review to further investigate the intent of the law.
    - Mr. Brostrom confirmed the project team will come back to this topic at the June 22nd USC meeting with more information. He also encouraged USC members to send in written comments.

- Mr. Woodling supported the project team's interpretation of the legislation.

- Ms. Roy advised the project team to create a flow chart for the next meeting. This flowchart would depict the entire process to help USC members better understand all the methods.

- Mr. Blair recommended that a more accurate baseline calculation would involve taking the sum of water use for the entire base period and dividing it by the sum of population for the entire base period.
    - Mr. Brostrom replied that the current draft methodology was based on the project team's interpretation of the law, and that Mr. Blair's recommendation would be considered.

Compliance Daily Per Capita Water Use

Mr. Brostrom presented the draft methodology for Compliance Daily Per Capita Water Use. He explained it is very similar to the previous methodology, except calculated in 2015 and 2020. This methodology also provides information on how to handle changes in the supplier's distribution area.

Comments:

- Mr. Woodling asked for confirmation that annexed areas refer to existing areas rather than newly developed areas. He commented that undeveloped annexed areas could theoretically lower the Gallons Per Capita Per Day (GPCD), which would not occur for new areas.
    - Mr. Brostrom responded that draft methodology accounts for how to handle annexation of existing areas.
    - Mr. Brown observed that new developments generally have an upward trend in GPCD, despite features such as low-flow fixtures.

- Ms. Cotton commented that the methodology has to offer clear direction for agencies, and that new indoor building standards are a significant issue for high growth areas.

- Ms. Roy stressed that annexation adjustments should only apply with developed homes.
    - Mr. Brown added that Ms. Roy's suggestion would be easier than expecting existing developments to lower their per capita use.

- Mr. Woodling described that if an agency is serving new areas that didn't exist during the baseline, the new area could not accurately fit into the calculation. He recommended drawing a distinction between areas that are already in existence and areas what will be developed in the future.

- Ms. Falcon asked when the draft methodology is expected to be completed. She also suggested the document would be a good place to include the guidance document.
    - Mr. Brostrom confirmed the document will be completed during the next revision. He also stated that the project team is hoping to bring the entire guidebook for the USC's review.

- Mr. Koller explained that his district has exceeded requirements to conserve outdoor water, and expressed concern these efforts will not be counted.

- Mr. Lyons recommended using a substantial test for annexing, noting that the process will be manageable except in the absence of a negotiating authority.
    - Mr. Brostrom noted some areas have been asked to annex due to groundwater quality issues.

- Paul Selsky, Brown and Caldwell, asked if this document was going to include climate adjustment.
    - Mr. Brostrom replied that climate adjustment was initially included; however the legislature calls for a separate document / approach to address this topic.

Criteria for Compliance Year Adjustments

Mr. Brostrom briefly reviewed the draft methodology for Criteria for Compliance Year Adjustments. The legislation allows suppliers to adjust their compliance year GPCD based on rainfall and evapotranspiration, substantial changes in CII water use, and substantial changes in institutional water use from extraordinary events. He stated that the project team is working on the adjustments, and recommended that the October 1st deadline move to July 2011.

Comments:

- Mr. Blair agreed with the recommendation, pending weather normalization issues. He noted that normalizing to weather normal or to base year would affect what baseline an agency would choose.
    - Mr. Brostrom said that the project team has not yet addressed what the weather normal time period would be.

- Mr. Harris commented that how normalization is done might impact what base period is used in an urban water plan.
    - Mr. Brostrom responded that weather normalization would take time, but the project team will consider the normalization of baselines as well as compliance years.

- Mr. Blair added that allowing weather normalization to base conditions would allow everything else to be postponed, but more information is needed to normalize to a weather normal. He added that if his baseline year was abnormal, he would be adjusting to an abnormal base, and sought confirmation from DWR that his definition was correct.
    - Anil Bamezai, consultant for Western Policy Research, stated that the legislation allows agencies to normalize to the baseline year under any conditions.

- Ms. Roy voiced that people are not likely to choose their worst years for compliance and that a standard approach would be worthwhile.

- Ms. Falcon asked for clarification that the adjustments are an option for an agency.
    - Mr. Brostrom confirmed that the adjustments are optional.

- Another participant noted that the draft methodology is simply trying to understand the impact of temperature or rain on water use, and advised that creating a model would not have significant benefit in relation to the scope of other work in this process.

- Ms. Roy inquired how an agency could address a situation where the agency did not exempt industrial water in a base year, but the following year showed a significant rise in industrial water use.
    - Mr. Brostrom replied that the project team will look into Ms. Roy's concern.

Mr. Ceppos reminded the group that the rest of the draft methodologies will be discussed at the June 1st follow-on meeting. He encouraged members to send any comments to the project team (see email above) to expedite the methodologies' development. The next revisions will be sent out on June 17th.

Charge of the U4 Technical Subcommittee

Mr. Ceppos confirmed there will be a U4 Technical Subcommittee to review and evaluate proposals for "Method 4". One proposal has already been prepared by a stakeholder group, and more are expected to be provided to DWR. The Subcommittee will serve the USC by reviewing proposals, assessing "pros and cons", and providing insights to the USC. The Subcommittee's membership will be self-selecting, with a particular focus on technical specialists who feel their capabilities can bring a level of skill and benefit to the group.

The Subcommittee will function as tiered from the USC Charter. The group is not expected to reach consensus or to make recommendations. The group's activities and outcomes will be memorialized to the USC. The meetings will be public, and the outcomes will be posted online.

Mr. Brostrom called the USC's attention to the criteria for evaluation listed on page two of the U4 Technical Subcommittee Charge and Evaluation Criteria. He listed ease of implementation, cost of implementation, and that the method would result in a 20% Statewide savings if the method were adopted by all suppliers. DWR also clarified its understanding of the law that method could be developed from which agencies could calculate a numeric water use target.

Comments:

- Ms. Roy recommended that the charge should be modified to encourage the Subcommittee to reach consensus.
    - Mr. Alemi stated Ms. Roy's recommendation would be considered.

- Mr. Bolland stated that proposals need to be available by June 17th for the Subcommittee's consideration at the first meeting on June 23rd.

- Ms. Sanchez asked if the Subcommittee was able to develop its own proposal.
    - Mr. Brostrom confirmed the Subcommittee was able to develop a proposal. He added that the process calls for a public draft by October 1st, so the Subcommittee must have a final report for the USC by August.

- Ms. Falcon asked if consultants were working on a framework.
    - Mr. Brostrom confirmed consultants and staff would be engaged before the June meeting

- Mr. Harris recommended that the Subcommittee work with the proposals in hand for the first meeting, but to consider proposals through the summer months. He also asked what level of support would be available to the Subcommittee.
    - Mr. Ceppos confirmed CCP will facilitate and document the Subcommittee's activities and outcomes.
    - Mr. Alemi expressed that there are limited resources available for some computation.

DWR committed to revising the Charge with the group's input, and to send the finalized version to the group via email. A sign-up list for the Subcommittee was passed around the group.

Overview of Process Water Project (U5)

Kent Frame, Senior Land and Water Scientist for DWR, summarized the U5 Process Water Project for the USC. He explained the statute grants DWR the authority to enter into an emergency rulemaking process and a regular rulemaking process, which involves a public process and hearing. Provisions that need to be addressed include the definition of process water, what is a substantial percentage of water use, and what is a disproportionate burden. The statute additionally specifies that a local agency cannot require water use efficiency methods or tools that might hamper the ability to process water, though the local agency may provide technical assistance.

The expected timeline is as follows:

1. June 2010: Begin working sessions
2. July, August 2010: Write first draft
3. October 2010: Submit emergency rule making

4. 10 days later: Submit regular rulemaking
5. December 2010: End 45 day comment period
6. Respond to comments
7. April 2011: Submit FSR
8. May 2011: Adopt regulation

Mr. Frame said that DWR's intent is to have information back to the USC to incorporate into urban water use plans.

Comments:

- Ms. Sanchez commented that notification requirements for urban water use plans require information by December.
    - Mr. Kent responded that he anticipates that the regulation submitted as part of the emergency rulemaking process will not contain any differences for the regular rulemaking process.

- Ms. Roy suggested that individuals involved industrial and commercial water use should be included in the process.

Public Comment

No public comments were submitted.

Closing Comments

Mr. Alemi thanked the group for their thoughtful comments and dedicated participation. He further encouraged the group to submit additional comments via email as soon as possible so the comments can be processed in time for the next meeting. He also encouraged members to email any questions to the project email address, and it will be forwarded to the appropriate person (the project email is listed on page one).

For travel-related inquiries, please contact Virgina Sajac at vsajac@water.ca.gov.

Adjourn

Attendance

Urban Stakeholder Committee Members

Ernesto Avila, California Urban Water Agencies
Tim Barr, Western Municipal Water District
Joe Berg, Municipal Water District of Orange County
Tim Blair, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
David Bolland, Association of California Water Agencies
Lisa Brown, City of Roseville
Ronnie Cohen, NRDC
Heather Cooley, Pacific Institute
Mary Lou Cotton, Kennedy/Jenks Consultants
Edwin de Leon, Golden State Water Company
Chris Dundon, Contra Costa Water District
Penny Falcon, Los Angeles Dept of Water & Power
Sharon Fraser, El Dorado Irrigation District

Kevin Galvin, Santa Clara Valley Water District
Luis Generoso, City of San Diego
William Granger, Otay Water District
Warren Greco, Municipal Water District of Orange County
Richard Harris, East Bay Municipal Utility District
Bill Jacoby, Bill Jacoby Water Resources Consulting
Bob Kelly, Suburban Water Systems
Dave Koller, Coachella Valley Water District
Matthew Lyons, Long Beach Water Department
Jim Metropulos, Sierra Club
John Mills, Offices of John S. Mills
Dan Muelrath, City of Santa Rosa
Lisa Morgan-Perales, Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Ron Munds, San Louis Obispo
Tom Noonan, Ewing Irrigation
Loren Oki, Agriculture & Natural Resources
Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority
Fiona Sanchez, Irvine Ranch Water District
Paul Selsky, Brown and Caldwell
John Woodling**,** Sacramento Regional Water Authority

Members of the Public and Staff and Agency Team Observers

Tamara Alaniz, MWA
Richard Anderson, GEI
Jennifer Ares, Yucaipa Valley Water District
Dong Chen, DWR
Randy Cox, PCWA
Baryohay Davidoff, DWR
Simon Eching, DWR
Tracey Eden-Bishop, El Dorado County Water Agency
Shahla Farahnak, SWRCB
Andrew Florendo, Solano County Water Agency
Elizabeth Gavric, CA Association of Realtors
Timothy Gobler, Mojave Water Agency
Janet Goldsmith, Kronick, Moskovitz, Tiedemann, & Girard
Claudia Hidahl, MID
Satoshi Ishida, CCP
Nancy King, DWR
Brian Lennon, Irrometer
Pamela Lewis, City of Torrance
Jim Lin, DWR
Helen Ling, City of Livermore
Carrie Loschke, Modesto Irrigation District
Mike McCullough, NCGA
Robyn Navarra, Zone 7 Water Agency
Dan Newton, SWRCB
Lorena Ospina, GEI
Natalie Pavlovski, Irvine Ranch Water District
Carolyn Schaffer, Metropolitan Water District
Justin Scott-Coe, Monte Vista Water District
David Sumi, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Anna Sutton, USBR
Bekele Temesgen, DWR
Kris Tjernell
Brian Van Lienden, CH2M Hill
Andrew Walker, City of Fairfield
Ya Wu, CCP observer
Kathryn Wuelfling, Erler &Kalinowski, Inc.
Hua Zhong, CCP observer

Project Team and Consultants

Manucher Alemi, DWR
Anil Bamezai, Western Policy Research
Elizabeth Bettancourt, CUWCC

Chris Brown, CUWC
Peter Brostrom, DWR
Dave Ceppos, CCP
Charlotte Chorneau, CCP
Kent Frame, DWR
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR
Steve Hachett, CH2M Hill
Gwen Huff, DWR
David Mitchell. CH2M Hill
Toni Pezetti, DWR
Virginia Sajac, DWR
Nicole Ugarte, CCP