

Senate Bill X7-7  
2009 Water Conservation Bill  
**Urban Stakeholder Committee**  
**FINAL CHARTER**  
**(DRAFT) Updated April 25, 2013**

## **Background**

Senate Bill X7-7 was enacted in November 2009 mandating water conservation, measurement, and reporting activities for urban and agricultural water suppliers. There are 14 actions in this legislation for which the Department of Water Resources (DWR) is assigned as the lead agency (see Attachment 1). These actions have been designated by DWR as “projects” for implementation of the legislation. The legislation directs DWR to:

- Consult with the: California Urban Water Conservation Council, Agricultural Water Management Council (AWMC), California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), California Department of Public Health (CDPH), California Bay Delta Authority (CBDA) or its successor agency, and State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) on various parts of the legislation.
- Develop regulation for commercial, industrial, and institutional (CII) process water.
- Develop regulation for agricultural water measurement.
- Update the Agricultural Efficient Water Management Practices (EWMPs).
- Convene a CII Task Force and develop alternative Best Management Practices for CII.
- Develop technical methodologies and criteria for urban water suppliers to set per capita baseline, target, and compliance water use.
- Develop a fourth water use target method that cumulatively could result in a statewide 20 percent reduction in urban per capita water use considering certain flexibilities.
- Report to the legislature by the end of 2016 and make recommendations on needed changes if the state is not “on track” to meet per capita targets.
- Promote implementation of regional water resources management practices.
- Propose new, or review and update existing statewide targets for regional water resources management practices, including recycled water, brackish groundwater desalination and infiltration, and direct use of urban stormwater runoff.

The legislation requires that DWR implement certain provisions of the law through public process. DWR has decided to meet this requirement through the following actions:

- Form an Urban Stakeholder Committee (USC).
- Form an Agriculture Stakeholder Committee (ASC).
- Hold public workshops.
- Post information on DWR’s Website.
- Convene a CII Task Force with public process.

To ensure effective coordination between affected State and Federal agencies, DWR is also convening an Agency Team (AT) to provide general advice in the implementation of the

SB X7-7 requirements. DWR will seek input from the AT on draft materials being reviewed or produced by the USC. Similarly, DWR will coordinate among the initiatives under SB X7-7 such as between the USC and the proposed CII Task Force.

### **Purpose of USC**

SB X7-7 requires that DWR carry out certain provisions of the law through a public process. DWR has formed the USC to seek technical and policy input from stakeholder representatives and the public as it plans and implements the requirements of the law. The USC is a part of DWR's public process. DWR will hold public workshops to engage the public and to allow further public participation. The USC will inform DWR as it implements the law. The USC is chartered to review technical material and documents, and to provide comments, data and supporting information to DWR's Project Management Team in implementing provisions of the SB X7-7 requirements and as DWR prepares the legislatively mandated reports.

The USC will identify technical and policy issues and is expected to provide input regarding specific issues related to:

- urban water use calculation methodologies,
- a fourth urban water use target method,
- standardized reporting form for urban and agricultural water use, and
- regional water resources management practices,
- Provide input on DWR regulation for process water.

In some cases, DWR may seek USC recommendations on specific issues or items. The Scope of USC section reflects the current status of each of the bulleted items above at the time of the last Charter revision.

### **Scope of USC**

Using a project schedule that will be revised and updated on a regular basis, the USC will address and be aware of multiple tasks that will be expected of them.

The USC will be convened to work on the following projects:

Project U3 (Urban Technical Methodologies) directs DWR to develop technical methodologies for calculating base daily per capita water use, baseline CII water use, compliance daily per capita water use, gross water use, service area population, indoor residential water use, and landscape area water use and criteria for compliance year adjustments for the consistent implementation of urban water conservation pursuant to the 2009 Water Conservation Act. Additionally, DWR, with the USC, developed a methodology for regional compliance.

All the above methodologies, with the exception of criteria for compliance year adjustments (Methodology 8), were released by DWR in October 2010. In February 2010, DWR updated the

methodology document to include appendices C (Fourth Urban Water Use Target Method) and D, (the Regulation for Implementing the Process Water Provision). In July 2011, the methodologies were incorporated by reference in the Process Water Rulemaking.

*Project Start Date: January 1, 2010                      Methodologies Document Released: October 2010*  
*Revised Methodologies Document including Methodology 8 Target Date: April 2015*

Project U4 (Urban Water Use Target Method) directs DWR to develop an urban per capita target method through a public process by December 31, 2010 that, if adopted statewide, cumulatively would result in a 20 percent reduction in urban daily per capita water use by December 31, 2020. A Provisional Target Method was completed in February 2011. In July 2011, the Target Method was incorporated by reference into the Process Water Rulemaking. SB X7-7 directs DWR to revise the provisional Method 4, as needed, and report to the Legislature in December 2014.

*Project Start Date: January 1, 2010                      Provisional Method 4 Released: February 2011*  
*Method 4 Legislative Report Submittal Date: December, 2014*

Project U5 (Regulations for Implementing Process Water Provision) through an emergency rulemaking process, DWR shall adopt regulations implementing the SB X7-7 provisions related to process water. The interim products from Project U3 (Methodologies) and U4 (Target Method) were incorporated by reference into the rulemaking for Project U5. The rulemaking file for U5 will be re-opened to incorporate the final products from Projects U3 and U4 in 2015.

*Project Start Date: April 2010                                      Regulation and References Adopted: July 2011*  
*Update of References: 2015*

In addition to the focused projects above, the USC and the ASC will also have an opportunity to provide input in the following projects:

Project B1 (Standard Water Use Reporting Form). DWR, in consultation with CBDA, DPH, CPUC, and SWRCB, will develop a single standardized water use reporting form to meet the water use information needs of each agency.

*Project Start Date: January 1, 2010                      Project End Date: TBD (target 2013)*

Project B2 (Regional Water Resources Management). DWR, in consultation with SWRCB, will promote the implementation of regional water resources management practices through increased incentives and removal of barriers.

*Project Start Date: Not Initiated                                      Project End Date: TBD*

The work of the USC will continue until the projects listed above are completed. DWR will then decide whether to continue the chartering of the USC based on the need and resources available.

## Goals of USC

- To review technical materials and provide comment, data, and relevant local information to DWR.
- To make recommendations to DWR, when such recommendations are sought by DWR.
- To assist in deploying concepts and requirements to the larger community.

- To provide comments on draft materials and draft reports prepared.

## **USC Membership**

Executive Sponsor: Kamyar Guivetchi - Manager; DWR Division of Statewide Integrated Water Management

USC Co-Leads: Manucher Alemi - Chief; DWR Water Use and Efficiency Branch  
Chris Brown – Executive Director; California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC)

The USC members were invited to participate based on the following criteria: policy and technical skills, geographic diversity, a balance between wholesale and retail water suppliers, agency size diversity, private and public water agencies, water associations, environmental advocacy and academics. Membership is to be as inclusive as feasible to ensure broad representation (see Attachment 2).

Recognizing that all USC members have other responsibilities, members are encouraged to designate an alternate.

## **Roles and Responsibilities**

### DWR will:

1. Function as the host agency, convene all meetings, prepare meeting materials, and arrange logistics.
2. Provide technical and administrative staff support to the USC including development of publicity and materials, maintenance of a website, and other means.
3. Serve as a “clearinghouse” for information.
4. Equitably share the information between CII Task Force and the USC to inform the complimentary work products.
5. Develop text and format work products.
6. Provide and update a project timeline and schedule to help manage assignment deadlines.
7. Serve as a peer and one of many voices during the meeting process.
8. Prepare the work plan and schedule for the overall USC process.
9. Listen to and consider the USC comments, dialogue, and information on special local circumstances. As this is not a formal process, such as a rulemaking process or environmental review process subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), DWR will not respond formally to each USC or public comment made or submitted.
10. Use USC data, information, concerns, proposals and/or recommendations to inform the final products of the projects included in this charter, most notably those proposals and recommendations for which there is consensus and/or significant agreement among USC members.
11. Transmit findings and make them available to the public as appropriate.

12. Consider reimbursing members for eligible travel expenses, subject to review and approval by DWR, for attending the USC meetings.

USC Members will:

1. Co-Leads will provide general guidance to the process including draft agenda development and review, review USC and DWR task progress, and preside over USC meetings.
2. Provide honest perspectives, representing a broad scope of California interests impacted by the SB X7-7 implementation requirements.
3. Review and provide recommendations on policy and technical issues relevant to the projects in this charter.
4. (May) be asked to chair or attend smaller subcommittee meetings.
5. (May) develop content and text or provide other assistance to staff and facilitators.
6. Participate in USC meetings consistently.
7. Assist DWR to anticipate short and long-term future events, trends and conditions that will impact and shape the requirements of SB X7-7.
8. Help identify, review, verify and critique data, assumptions, analysis and methods used by DWR to implement the requirements of the legislation.
9. Assist DWR to communicate to the broader public, as well as the individual constituencies and communities represented by each individual member, information about the process and products of the USC.
10. Seek consensus and agreement on proposals and/or recommendations to DWR.

Agency Team will:

1. Serve as an advisory group to DWR.
2. Review and provide input on DWR work products and USC recommendations.
3. Provide policy and technical input and recommendations throughout the SB X7-7 implementation.
4. Identify points of coordination among state agencies.

Facilitators will:

1. Serve as professional neutrals and will be responsible to manage dialogue in meetings and oversee the provisions of this charter.
2. Design, implement and refine (as needed) a consensus-seeking process.
3. Facilitate USC meetings and subcommittee meetings as necessary.
4. Receive items of a personal or process nature input from USC members. (Not substantive technical or policy issues that should be discussed in open session.)
5. Ensure that all points of view held by USC members are heard and that the interests of each Member's constituencies are considered.
6. Act as professional neutrals in the relationship between the USC and DWR, and among the USC members.

7. Act as a professional neutral in terms of the outcome of the USC's work products. Whatever "options" or other pro-active initiatives are put forth by the facilitators will represent their best effort to reflect the discussions of the USC.
8. Provide assistance to members requesting help with communications.

## **Subcommittees**

### **A. Purpose/Tasks**

The USC may need to meet in smaller groups about a certain topic or issue. Such groups will be known as "subcommittees." Staff and facilitators as well as technical experts will provide assistance as feasible, warranted, and appropriate.

Subcommittees will be given specific tasks with identified work products and schedules for completion. Unless otherwise requested by the USC, following completion of the tasks, these groups shall disband.

### **B. Formation**

Subcommittees will generally be formed as a specific action during full USC meetings. When a group is formed, all USC members will be given an opportunity to indicate their willingness to participate. All members who express their willingness will be invited to participate. In order to ensure an acceptable range of perspectives on the subcommittees, additional members may be specifically invited to serve on the group by facilitators or the DWR staff.

Staff and facilitators will develop ways to accommodate the input of members who have particular areas of expertise relevant to a given work group, or who express a particular need to have input into a group, but who are not serving on the subcommittee itself. Nonmembers may be requested to participate in as appropriate resource people.

## **Meeting Schedule**

The USC, when reconvened in January 2013, will meet on a quarterly basis through December 2014 or thereafter if necessary. Meetings will vary by geographic location (Northern to Southern California); Web based participation options will be offered when appropriate for the work task. DWR intends to meet the public process requirements of certain provisions of the SB X7-7 by forming the USC, making the USC meetings open to the public, announce the meeting agenda 10 days prior to the USC meetings, and hold public workshops for the broader public to review and comment on draft documents. DWR will try to provide the meeting summaries to the USC within three weeks after a meeting.

## **Attendance**

Given the volume of information to be considered and the short time frame of the USC's work, regular attendance by the Member or his/her Alternate and timely review of work products is required. Alternates must be identified in advance, fully briefed and able to represent the Member and Members' constituents during decision making. Alternates are expected to be kept up to date on all USC activities by their Members and are expected to attend on behalf of a Member, fully prepared to discuss agenda items. No items addressed at previous meetings will be revisited to accommodate an Alternate.

## **Communication**

When communicating outside of the USC, Members are asked to speak only for themselves when asked about USC progress unless there has been adoption of concepts or recommendations by the full body. Such concepts or recommendations may also be released along with statements of USC work agreed to by the full group. Suggested text for such statements may be developed by staff and facilitators or may be offered by a group member. DWR will inform the CII Task Force of the progress, and products of the USC.

Meeting announcements and draft agendas will be sent out at least 10 days before each USC meeting and DWR will make a good faith effort to send out meeting materials at least three days prior to USC meetings. DWR will send out meeting summary notes within two weeks after each meeting.

Staff and facilitators will be available to provide presentations on the USC's work at meetings, conferences or other forums of the members. In addition, Members are strongly encouraged to provide or arrange presentations about the USC's work wherever feasible to increase awareness of the USC's process.

Press kits, a website and media releases will also be available.

## **Resources**

### DWR Staff

Manucher Alemi - Chief, DWR Water Use and Efficiency Branch; USC Co-lead

Peter Brostrom –Project Manager

Gwen Huff –Program Staff

Betsy Vail – Program Staff

Other DWR staff (as needed)

DWR Consultants: Ch2MHill consultants, Steve Hatchett and others as needed.

Contact information: 916-651-7034 or [Peter.Brostrom@water.ca.gov](mailto:Peter.Brostrom@water.ca.gov)

### CUWCC Staff

Chris Brown - Executive Director, CUWCC; USC Co-lead

Facilitation Staff -

California State University, Sacramento, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)

Dave Ceppos - Lead Facilitator

Other CCP staff (as needed)

Contact Information: 916-445-2079 or [dceppos@ccp.csus.edu](mailto:dceppos@ccp.csus.edu)

DWR or CPP may substitute or provide additional staff as required. Members will receive notification of any changes.

**Values and Principles**

This is a consensus seeking, collaborative process. Participants will seek to:

- Establish a common factual base and vocabulary in order to address issues of common concern.
- Develop a thorough understanding, not only of their interests, but also the interests of the other parties at the table.
- Negotiate, in good faith, fair agreements with the intent to satisfy as many of the varied interests as possible.

It is understood that all the parties must continue to operate under their own guidelines and timetables. As such, some Members may need to take action related to those requirements that could have a negative impact on the discussions taking place. Even so, members agree to work in good faith within the process.

While all parties are expected to act in good faith, it is expressly understood that no party is asked to waive any right or to forego any obligation related to water resource issues. To facilitate these values and principles, USC Members agree to the following:

- To the extent possible and without jeopardizing any legal rights or activities, any member of the USC who anticipates taking an action which will impact either the collaborative process or other parties engaged in the process, will disclose their action in advance (such disclosure is not intended to restrict action but to inform other participants). Examples of such activities include introduction of legislation or legal action, staging of press conferences, or release of reports.
- In the interest of preserving working relationships within the collaborative process, such disclosure will be made at the earliest time practicable.
- In those circumstances in which advanced disclosure of an intended action is not possible, USC Members are asked to attempt to mitigate any negative consequences of an intended action by taking actions that could include, but not be limited to: consultation with staff or facilitators, concurrent special notification to all interest groups, and/or side-bar conversation with other affected parties as soon as possible following an action, etc.

## Decision Making

In some cases, DWR may seek recommendations from the USC. This is a consensus seeking process. The USC will strive to reach consensus, though it is not mandatory, in making a decision and moving the process forward. When seeking consensus, the USC will consider a range of definitions for support in order to provide the most accurate picture of their collective viewpoint. The range of support will include:

**Unqualified Support:** Full agreement with all aspects of a proposal.

**Strong Support** for most aspects of a proposal. No fundamental disagreements with any aspect of a proposal.

**General Support** for all or most aspects of a proposal. No fundamental disagreement with key aspects of a proposal, which includes having unanswered questions that need additional information or clarification.

**Qualified Disagreement:** Significant disagreement with one or more aspects of a proposal; however, can live with the proposal as packaged. (i.e. the overall suggested proposal is better than leaving things as they are now). In this “not happy, but I’ll live with it” option, parties will be asked to work on generating alternative options or language that address the concerns of all.

**Fundamental Disagreement** with key aspects of a proposal. Not willing to support or live with the proposal as it stands. Parties with this opinion must suggest alternatives that move the proposal toward accommodating the interests of all.

To determine if the USC is moving in a particular direction, the facilitator will periodically ask for an informal “read” or “straw poll” of the group’s perspective. Answers to this question are used for the purpose of developing the dialogue and not binding.

When there appears to be general agreement regarding a proposal, a more formal question may be asked of the USC to determine if they have reached consensus and can provide a final recommendation. If consensus has been reached, the decision of the group will be memorialized (e.g. through meeting summaries, reports, memos, etc.) and will take the form of a recommendation from the USC to DWR. DWR will seek consensus among USC members and it will give high priority consideration to proposals and recommendations for which there is consensus and/or significant agreement among USC members. DWR is not bound to adopt a proposal or recommendation where consensus exists. If DWR differs from the USC consensus recommendation, DWR will provide explanation.

If consensus is not possible, the USC in coordination with the DWR staff will decide if the topic or proposal warrants more discussion to try to reach consensus. Due to the expedited nature of the overall SB X7-7 program, prolonged discussions by the USC on a specific topic may not be feasible. Relative to DWR Role #9 and #10 (described above), DWR will retain final decision responsibility on whether the USC should continue to seek consensus or move on to other topics. If USC Members find that consensus is not feasible on a specific topic, the USC will prepare a

summary (e.g. through meeting summaries, reports, memos, etc.) describing the full range of perspectives including minority opinions.

Regarding final recommendations, it is understood that some USC members may represent organizations and are unable to make final commitments without a concurrence of a board or other body. In this case, agreements will be considered tentative pending approval. Such confirmation does not need to return to the group unless it affects the recommendation.

The AT and USC are advisory committees and DWR will consider their comments and recommendations. DWR will seek consensus among USC members and it will give high priority consideration to proposals and recommendations for which there is consensus and/or significant agreement among USC members. Consistent with DWR Role #9 and #10 (described above), DWR may accept, modify, or may not follow the recommendations of the USC and AT as it prepares documents or final products. Related to this, consensus seeking can be time consuming; therefore, it will only be used for cases where DWR seeks a unified USC recommendation on a particular subject or item of discussion. Otherwise, DWR will benefit from the review comments, data, and information exchange at USC meetings and will utilize the knowledge as it prepares its products and makes final decisions.

The USC will periodically make "administrative decisions". Administrative decisions are about the daily activities of the USC (including but not limited to: logistics, meeting dates and times, agenda revisions, schedules, etc.). All administrative decisions will be made on a simple majority vote of all Members present at any USC meeting or subcommittee meeting.

## **Ground Rules**

The USC will utilize standing ground rules regarding meeting protocol and may modify them as appropriate.

USC Members agree to:

- Listen and openly discuss issues with others who hold diverse views
- View disagreements as problems to be solved rather than battles to be won
- Not engage in stereotyping and personal attacks on other participants
- Not ascribe motives or intentions of other participants
- Respect the integrity and values of other participants
- Keep commitments once they are made

Several specific rules apply during meetings. The USC agrees to:

- Honor time
- Use conversational courtesy
- Follow the 25-mile rule  
*(This ground rule refers to pagers and phones. Electronic devices should be in the "silent" or "off" mode. If an individual receives a call, the call should be taken IF the caller would*

*have driven 25 miles to deliver the message in person. In other words, phone business that causes you to leave the room should be urgent. If calls are not urgent you are asked to wait for breaks or meals to return calls)*

- Appreciate humor but not engage in humor at the expense of others.

#### Open Process

- Meetings of the USC will be open to the public. Agendas will be sent out in advance of the meetings and posted on the DWR Water Use Efficiency web site, [www.wateruseefficiency/sb7](http://www.wateruseefficiency/sb7). At each meeting, the public will be given an opportunity to comment. This will be a facilitated process and occur at specified times on the agenda.
- Members of the public are expected to adhere to the same ground rules as USC members.

#### Other

The USC Charter describes the work of the group. Changes may be made to the Charter at the concurrence of the members and sponsors, utilizing the Charter decision-making process.

**ATTACHMENT 1  
Senate Bill X7-7  
Water Use Efficiency Actions**

<b>URBAN CATEGORY</b>			
<b>Project</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Process</b>
U1	DWR shall in conjunction with the California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC) convene a task force consisting of academic experts, urban retail water suppliers, environmental organizations, commercial, industrial, and institutional water users to develop alternative best management practices for the commercial, industrial, and institutional (CII) water sector. (10608.43)	Report to the Legislature: Early 2013	Task Force
U2	Per AB1420 of 2007, DWR shall convene an Independent Technical Panel consisting of retail water suppliers, environmental organizations, the business community, wholesale water suppliers, and academia to update Demand Management Methods and report to the Legislature.	ITP to convene March 2013	Independent Technical Panel
U3	DWR through a public process and in consultation with CUWCC, shall develop technical methodologies and criteria for baseline daily per capita use, baseline commercial, industrial, and institutional water use, compliance daily per capita water use, gross water use, service area population, indoor residential water use and landscaped area water use and post on its website. ((10608.20(h)(1) through (h)(2)	Methodologies Document Released February 2011 Final Methodologies Target Date: 2014	Public Process
U4	DWR shall develop a method for calculating urban water use targets that identify per capita use targets that cumulatively result in a statewide 20% reduction and report to the Legislature by December 31, 2010 (and update by 2014). (10608.20(b)(4))	Provisional Method 4 Released February 2011 Finalized Method 4 Target Date: 2014	Public Process
U5	DWR shall adopt regulations for implementation of the SB X7-7 provisions related to process water, 10608.20(i)(1),	Rulemaking Complete July 2011	Rulemaking

U6	DWR shall review 2015 UWMPs and report to the Legislature on the progress toward achieving a 20% reduction in urban water use. (10608.42)	December 31, 2016	N/A
----	---	-------------------	-----

**AGRICULTURAL CATEGORY**

Project	Task	Deadline	Process
A1	DWR, in consultation with the Agricultural Water Management Council, stakeholders and academics, shall develop a methodology for quantifying the efficiency of agricultural water use and report to Legislature by 2011.(10608.64)	Completed June 2012	Public Process
A2	DWR will adopt a regulation providing a range of options for water measurements. 10608.48(i) (1)	Completed July 2012	Rule making
A3	DWR may update the EWMPs in consultation with AWMC, USBR and SWRCB. All EWMPs shall be adopted or revised only after public hearings.(10608.48(h))	Initiate in 2013	Public Process
A4	DWR shall submit a report to the Legislature on agricultural efficient water management practices that have been, or are planned to be, implemented and provide data to be used in legislative hearings to determine the effectiveness of the practices. (10608.48(g))	Initiate in 2013	N/A
A5	DWR shall prepare and submit to the Legislature on or before December 31, 2013, and thereafter in the years ending in six and one, a report summarizing the status of the AWMPs adopted. (10845)	Initiate in 2013	N/A

**BOTH (Urban and Ag) CATEGORY**

Project	Task	Deadline	Process
B1	DWR, in consultation with CBDA, DPH and CPUC, and SWRCB, shall develop a single standardized water use reporting form (10608.52(a))	Ongoing. Target 2013.	Public Process (ag & urban)
B2	DWR in consultation with the board shall promote implementation of regional water resources management practices through increased incentives and removal of barriers. (10608.50(a))	Not initiated.	Public Process

SB X7-7 Urban Stakeholder Committee Final Charter

B3	DWR shall propose new statewide targets or review and update existing statewide targets for regional water resources management practices including, but not limited to, recycled water, brackish groundwater desalination and infiltration and direct use of urban stormwater runoff. Updated targets should be included in the California Water Plan. (10603.50(b))	Ongoing.	
B4	DWR to revise grant/loan criteria to make urban and agricultural water suppliers ineligible for state funding unless they comply with the specific provisions of (10608.56). (10608.56 (a) and (b)).	AG: July 1, 2013 Urban: July 1, 2016	N/A

**ATTACHMENT 2**  
**Urban Stakeholder Committee Membership List (4 25 13)**

Member Name		Agency
Tim	Barr	Western Municipal Water District
Joe	Berg	Municipal Water District of Orange Co.
Tim	Blair	Metropolitan Water District of So. CA
Dave	Bolland	Association of California Water Agencies
Lisa	Brown	City of Roseville
*Ronnie	Cohen	California Water Foundation
Heather	Cooley	Pacific Institute
Mary Lou	Cotton	Kennedy/Jenks Consultants
Edwin	De Leon	Golden State Water Company
Jerry	Del La Piedra	Santa Clara Valley Water District
Chris	Dundon	Contra Costa Water District
Penny	Falcon	Los Angeles Dept. of Water & Power
Jenny	Gain	California Urban Water Agencies
Luis	Generoso	City of San Diego
William	Granger	City of Sacramento
Richard	Harris	East Bay Municipal Utility District
Jack	Hawks	California Water Association
Bob	Kelly	Suburban Water Systems
*John	Kingsbury	Mountain Counties WRA
*Lisa	Koehn	City of Clovis
Dave	Koller	Coachella Valley Water District
Matt	Lyons	Long Beach Water Department
John	Mills	Office of John S. Mills
Lisa	Morgan-Perales	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
*Danny	Motelyski	Irrigation Association
Dan	Muelrath	Valley of the Moon Water District
Ron	Munds	San Luis Obispo
Tom	Noonan	Ewing Irrigation
Lorence	Oki	UC Davis
Tracy	Quinn	Natural Resources Defense Council
Toby	Roy	San Diego County Water Authority
Fiona	Sanchez	Irvine Ranch Water District
Bob	Wilkinson	UC Santa Barbara
John	Woodling	Regional Water Authority
*Linda	Yager	Placer County Water Agency

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>New member pending DWR Management Approval</b></li> </ul>		
ALTERNATES		
Tony	Firenzi	Placer County Water Agency
Einar	Maisch	Placer County Water Agency
Edward	Osann	Natural Resources Defense Council
Amy	Talbot	Regional Water Authority