

1 California Water Plan Update 2009
2 **The Advisory Committee View**
3 **A Mini-Assessment**
4 **August 2009**

5 **Introduction**

6 California Water Plan Update 2009, the ninth
7 since 1957, comprehensively reviews the
8 State's water challenges and opportunities and
9 makes recommendations for strategic
10 responses. The 2009 plan builds on Water Plan
11 Update 2005 and reflects progress toward
12 implementation of integrated water
13 management. It also focuses on:

- 14 • Recent years of below average precipitation
- 15 • New demands for Conservation
- 16 • Critical California Bay-Delta (Delta) issues,
17 and
- 18 • Emerging information on climate change
- 19 • Related uncertainties

20
21 While the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and a State Agency Steering
22 Committee (SC) shepherded development of the 2009 Update, an Advisory Committee
23 (AC) was charged with providing guidance on what would be required for a high-
24 quality and robust document.

25
26 The AC includes a diverse group of 45 organizations (see ATTACHMENT A)
27 dedicated to managing California's water resources. The AC represents wide interests
28 including business, public health, multiple levels of government, the environment,
29 recreation, purveyors, consumers, regulated water agencies, flood managers, and others.

30
31 The AC has attended numerous meetings over the past three years to provide input and
32 guide the planning process, improve information, point out areas that need greater
33 attention or clarity and raise difficult questions.

34 **AC View 2005**
35

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. Areas of Agreement and Disagreement
3. Perspectives about Approaches and Process
4. AC Role in 2009 and Future Updates
5. Areas for Future Work
6. Other General Feedback

1 In order to better articulate areas of agreement, disagreement, and points needing further
2 explanation, a document titled the AC View was drafted as part of Water Plan Update
3 2005. Authored by the AC and adopted by consensus, the document explained the
4 diverse AC perspectives to both constituents of the organizations they represented and
5 the DWR.

6
7 DWR leadership found the first AC View extremely helpful in making final Water Plan
8 edits and providing background information to decision makers. DWR requested a
9 similar document be prepared for Update 2009.

11 **AC Mini Assessment 2009**

12
13 Following release of the Update 2009 Public Review Draft, the Water Plan facilitation
14 team, staffed by the Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University
15 Sacramento, prepared a first draft a of the 2009 AC View based on meeting notes,
16 comments received and other input from AC members. The draft was then reviewed by
17 the AC members with interests as diverse as agriculture, flood management, public
18 health, water quality, environmental, government, and urban planning, during small
19 group work sessions. Conducted between March 27th and April 15th, 2009 and engaging
20 28 members, the goal was to use the draft as the first step in developing a document
21 similar to the one used in 2005. Additional comments were also received from
22 members not able to attend work sessions.

23
24 AC Members provided many comments on the AC View Draft. Interestingly and
25 overwhelming members questioned the relevance of the AC View for Update 2009 and
26 wondered if it was even necessary. There were a variety of reasons for this conclusion:

- 27
28 1. The 2005 Update represented a dramatic shift in approach that required some
29 explanation. As an extension of the 2005 Plan, the approach for 2009 will not
30 need a similar explanation.
- 31
32 2. While Update 2009 may include areas of substantial policy disagreement, many
33 of the more contentious issues are being managed outside of the Advisory
34 Committee process. These will incorporated by reference in the plan. For
35 example water conservation requirements, management options for the California
36 Bay-Delta and drought planning are companion efforts with a separate review
37 process. As a result the AC has not had an opportunity to, as a group, establish a
38 collective view.

1 3. Further, due to a number of factors, some of the large and potentially contentious
2 policy recommendations have yet to be made. The group felt even attempting
3 some statement about them would be highly premature.

4
5 4. Finally with a shift to more state agency and regional outreach as recommended
6 in Water Plan Update 2005, the 2009 AC did not meet as frequently and members
7 were less interdependent. As a result there was not a perceived need to create a
8 cohesive group statement or document.

9
10 After learning more about the value of the AC View to DWR, members suggested that a
11 more useful product may be a mini-assessment¹ prepared by the facilitation team and
12 reviewed by the AC. A mini-assessment had been conducted by the facilitation team in
13 2008 and the group and DWR found that process helpful.

14
15 Given the AC feedback, comments gathered during the Spring 2009 small group work
16 sessions were used to revise text and transition the document to an assessment format.
17 This second iteration was then reviewed and refined by the Advisory Committee during
18 their August 2009 meeting and additional subcommittee sessions.

19 **Mini-Assessment Structure**

20 The mini-assessment considers the following topics:

- AC member agreement and disagreement with Update 2009 as proposed
- AC perspectives about the Update 2009 Approaches and Process
- AC Role in 2009
- Recommendations - related to Plan implementation
- Suggestions for areas of future work and the potential role of the AC in the next update
- Other General Feedback

23
24

¹ A mini-assessment is a high level situation assessment. As designed, it outlines AC perceptions of Update 2009 key elements, an assessment of the current text and a projection of future reactions by stakeholders. The review was limited in scope to Advisory Committee discussion items as the Water Plan will contain text incorporated by reference and not part of the Water Plan deliberations.

1 **Areas of Agreement**

2 ***Why the Water Plan is Necessary***

3

4 Those participating in the assessment believe the water plan is necessary. The group
5 identified five areas they consistently agreed the plan should address.

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------|----|---------------|
| 6 | • Urgency | 9 | • Uncertainty |
| 7 | • Reliable Supply | 10 | • Data |
| 8 | • Water Quality | | |

11

12 **Urgency**

13

14 The AC agreed there is an urgent need to address California's water situation and found:

- 15 • Nearly every aspect of the water management is facing crisis and water infrastructure
- 16 is severely strained and aging
- 17 • The ecosystem, communities and the economy are all at risk unless swift and
- 18 appropriate action is taken.

19

20 While the group members do not always agree on the actions that should be taken, they
21 share this urgency and think the document should strongly emphasize the consequences
22 of failing to plan and act now. Many suggested the document should be a call to action
23 and inspire people to do something.

24

25 Yet, even while this was a driving theme, there was concern from some that DWR was
26 being characterized as passive for not going as far as the AC recommended and this was
27 counter-productive.

28

29 **Action in Uncertainty**

30

31 AC members agreed that major uncertainties exist in both the natural world and policy
32 environments. They cited:

- 33 • Timing and severity of climate change
- 34 • Availability of funding
- 35 • Speed of plan implementation
- 36 • Specifics of legislation
- 37 • Integration of land use and water planning.

38

39 Some AC members stressed that without a solid plan in place and implementation of the
40 recommended actions, maintaining basic water needs up to the next Water Plan Update
41 is uncertain. Members also felt it necessary to acknowledge the external factors that

1 will affect the ability to implement the Water Plan such as other state policies and
2 initiatives and the current fiscal situation.

3 4 **Reliable Supply**

5
6 The AC agreed a reliable water supply is a high priority. With drought affecting many
7 parts of the State and increasing restrictions on Delta pumping, current water supplies
8 across California are critically low. The Committee agreed that an adequate and reliable
9 water supply is crucial to both people and the environment and that augmentation
10 options such as additional aggressive conservation and other supplemental strategies
11 must be developed. The group agrees that not all options are appropriate in all places
12 but does not agree on the full suite of potential supplemental strategies. Some in the
13 group believe there should be acknowledgment that factors outside of the Water Plan
14 scope could affect the ability to implement the plan.

15 16 **Water Quality**

17
18 Members concur that water quality must be a central consideration in water planning,
19 not only because of the need to maintain the highest standards of water quality for
20 currently available supplies, but also because of its potential to contribute to new
21 supplies. One member pointed to the trend of regional water suppliers and retail
22 purveyors placing increasing reliance on treating contaminated water to augment local
23 water supplies. They saw water quality as a key in decreasing dependence on imported
24 supplies.

25 26 **Data**

27
28 There is an increasing need for additional investments in comprehensive high quality
29 water management data,² sophisticated quantitative data analysis, and robust peer
30 review. The Committee agrees that these three elements are the foundation of a
31 common understanding of the problems facing California and a credible, widely
32 supported and genuinely strategic plan.

33 **Approaches**

34

² "DWR, CPUC, DPH, and SWRCB are working to improve the integration of water consumption data collected by state agencies as part of the 20x2020 Initiative." (CC comment: footnote was suggestion of Diana Brooks – this isn't really true as that is a planning document and 20x2020 made a recommendation for data collection to be streamed – might be better to cite AB 1404 feasibility report...")

1 The Committee found broad agreement on the approaches be promoted in Update 2009.
2 Strategic Planning, the State Agency Steering Committee, Integrated Water
3 Management, and Regional Management were cited.
4

5 **Strategic Planning**

6 The AC felt that a strategic planning approach is appropriate for the Water Plan effort.
7

8 The Committee generally supports the final drafts of the vision, mission, goals,
9 objectives, and Volume 1 recommendations of Update 2009. The development of
10 multiple scenarios to consider future water use and related conditions was also valued.
11

12 **Integrated Water Management**

13
14 AC members felt Update 2009 places the right focus on comprehensive and integrated
15 management of water resources. This approach, was articulated in Update 2005 as “a
16 comprehensive, systems approach for determining the appropriate mix of demand and
17 supply management options that provide long-term, reliable water supply at the lowest
18 reasonable cost and highest possible benefits to customers, economic development,
19 environmental quality, and other social objectives.” The group found utility in the
20 expanded approach of providing both short-term flexibility and long-term adaptability.
21 All caucuses agreed that integrated water management should be linked to regional
22 management.
23

24 **Regional Management**

25
26 Many in the group suggested statewide policy direction should be linked with regional,
27 on-the-ground applications. The Committee believed policy must translate into
28 meaningful practice at the regional level and individual members have devoted
29 considerable effort to enhancing regional information. The AC stressed the need to
30 begin articulating performance indicators to measure success of regional water
31 management efforts to ensure effectiveness in achieving regional and statewide
32 objectives and goals.
33

34 Some members urged that regional management should be linked with place-based
35 policy actions and projects.
36

37 **Integrated Flood Management**

38
39 The AC found the integration of water and flood management was long overdue.
40 Central to a comprehensive approach to managing California’s water resources,
41 integrated flood management is a new and important component of the Water Plan.

1 Participants outlined the importance of addressing the threats of catastrophic flooding
2 resulting in loss of life and property. The AC proposed important strategies and actions
3 needed to manage flood risk on a system-wide basis and through an integrated approach
4 linked to integrated water resources management, land use planning and environmental
5 stewardship.

6
7 Many in the group advocated strategies that highlighted the:

- 8
- 9 • Connection between land use policies that effectively address flood risk, including
- 10 reducing risk associated with climate change
- 11 • Importance of accurate statewide information on flood risk, infrastructure and
- 12 floodplain resources
- 13 • Integration of natural floodplain functions with more traditional flood risk
- 14 management methods
- 15

16 They suggested this effort could provide an essential tool in planning for sustainable
17 communities, ecosystems and natural resources.

18 **State Agency Steering Committee**

19
20
21 Members noted their support for and appreciation of the increased participation of state
22 agencies. They believed this collaboration would be essential in defining integrated
23 planning and resource management approaches.

24 **Considerations**

25
26 Members highlighted some areas where important considerations needed to be made to
27 ensure success of the effort. For example, they found the plan must address
28 environmental justice concerns. They also highlighted the importance of understanding:

- 29
- 30 • Tribal Perspectives
- 31 • Climate Change
- 32 • Definitions
- 33

34 **Environmental Justice**

35
36 The AC recognized that major disparities exist in the ability of different California
37 communities to manage their water resources. The Committee agreed a complete and
38 inclusive plan hinges on engaging and assisting disadvantaged communities in planning
39 for flood, water supplies and quality, infrastructure and costs.

1 **Tribal Perspectives**

2
3 Water Plan Update 2009 promoted a new appreciation of important and complex tribal
4 perspectives. The members agreed inclusion of tribal interests, issues and concerns in
5 the plan was essential to understanding the full California water dynamic. Members
6 understood that Update 2009 could only serve to initiate a needed on-going relationship
7 and future plans would continue to expand this relationship..
8

9 **Climate Change**

10
11 The AC recognized that climate change will profoundly affect water and flood
12 management in the coming decades. They saw needs for mitigation and that patterns of
13 water use are closely coupled with energy and land use. For this reason the Committee
14 extended the scope of its deliberations to begin addressing these linkages, including the
15 critical need to coordinate land use and water use policies and regulations. The AC does
16 not agree on the all the science and the potential implications of climate change but
17 found it important to move forward in discussion, even with uncertainty.
18

19 **Definitions**

20
21 AC members strongly agree that common definitions are very important in this multi-
22 discipline group. Terms must be consistently defined. There is agreement that consistent
23 use of terms is needed throughout Update 2009, and that a glossary should be provided.
24 In instances where a term is being used in a different context, the specific meaning
25 should be called out.
26

27 **Areas of Disagreement**

- 28
- 29 ■ Water Rights
- 30 ■ CA Bay- Delta Solutions
- 31 ■ Land Use
- 32 ■ Sustainable Funding
- 33 ■ Water Pricing
- 34 ■ Groundwater Management and Regulations
- 35 ■ Surface Storage and Conveyance
- 36 ■ Agricultural Water Conservation
- 37 ■ Structure and Definition of Scenarios
- 38 ■ Definition of Conserved Water
- 39

40 **Water Rights**

1

2 The AC does not agree on the extent to which considerations of reasonable use and
3 public trust, areas of origin, and impacts to different users, should factor into water
4 management decisions. No new policies are recommended in this Update but these
5 topics are raised. Many members suggested that the water rights debate is a fundamental
6 dispute outside the scope of the Water Plan.

7

8 **Surface Storage and Conveyance**

9

10 As mirrored in the larger public debate, the AC has highly divergent views on the need
11 for, scale and location of surface storage and water conveyance. This Update
12 incorporates existing state policy and includes discussion of surface storage and
13 improved conveyance as potential appropriate options in some circumstances.

14

15 Some members believe these options to be unacceptable while others argue the options
16 presented are not adequate to meet existing needs. Even so, the AC agreed that as a
17 strategic plan, the Water Plan is not a vehicle for promotion of specific projects or
18 resolution of site-specific issues. Instead the document outlines the state strategy for
19 moving forward with technical and policy evaluation of such options on a case-by-case
20 basis. At the same, many group members believe the plan should be more aggressive in
21 outlining a definitive plan of action in the area of surface water and conveyance..

22

23 **Land Use**

24

25 This update considers the complex interrelationships among land use planning and
26 management, climate change, water supply, and flood management. There was general
27 agreement that local governments should consider land use policies that promote
28 compact, sustainable development to reduce greenhouse gases, water demands, flood
29 risks, and nonpoint source pollution. However, the members disagreed on whether the
30 state should mandate these policies or, recognizing California's strong tradition of local
31 control over land use, simply provide guidance and incentives. For example, some
32 members suggested the plan should recommend a mandatory General Plan Water
33 Element, whereas others prefer the current approach of the state providing guidance for
34 an optional Water Element. There was also disagreement about the effectiveness of
35 current legislation (SB 610 and SB 221) directing local governments to coordinate with
36 water supply agencies when making land use decisions.

37

38 **Structure and Definitions of Scenarios**

39

40 While the AC recognizes the value of scenario planning, it has not agreed on the
41 scenarios to include in analysis, and how to characterize them. The disagreement is

1 around the implied outcomes depicted in the scenarios and how they tool should be
2 used. Some AC members commented that the scenarios are not realistic. Others felt
3 they have not seen enough of the data to even comment on the scenarios.
4

5 **Definition of Conserved Water**

6
7 The Committee has not agreed on how to categorize and credit water conservation
8 efforts. The debate is over the owner of conserved water and whether it belongs to the
9 conserver or to the system.
10

11 **Groundwater Management and Regulations**

12 While all Committee members favor proactive management of groundwater resources,
13 some believe groundwater management should remain at the local level, while others
14 favor greater intervention in groundwater management at the state level. Those AC
15 members felt it important to note that California remains one of only two states in the
16 US that does not regulate groundwater.

17 While there is shared agreement on the importance of groundwater resources,
18 disagreements arise on the approaches for protecting and regulating groundwater. This
19 Update does not recommend an approach but frames the issue.

20 21 **CA Bay-Delta Solution**

22
23 The AC did not agree on how much attention the Water Plan gives to recommendations
24 for the Delta and many members directly disagree with the State's direction. While the
25 Delta is the hub of the State and federal water projects and bridges the needs of northern
26 and southern California, some suggest a Delta focus downplays the distinctive issues of
27 non-Delta-dependent regions. This is in contrast to the views of others who see the
28 Delta and Delta issues as a topic with unique strategic importance. These members
29 strongly favor a detailed and forthright approach to the issue in the Water Plan as one of
30 critical importance. Further, in response to the charge that detailed discussion of Delta
31 issues in the Water Plan will detract from on-going regional planning, these members
32 counter that a reliable water supply from the Delta is, for a large portion of the state, a
33 key element of these same regional planning efforts and must, from this standpoint as
34 well, therefore factor prominently in the Water Plan.
35

36 **Agricultural Water Use Efficiency**

37
38 Debate continues about the extent and adequacy of existing efforts in the area of
39 agricultural water use efficiency, as well as the extent of the potential gains which can

1 be achieved in this area. This discussion includes the contribution of agricultural
2 practices to statewide water conservation efforts, what types of crops should be grown
3 in California, and what “sustainable” agriculture and food means. Some members
4 believe agricultural practices and agricultural water use is not well understood and that
5 both are frequently not fairly or accurately represented. In addition, these members
6 question data and assumptions used to characterize the current situation and the
7 potential for water savings. Others believe that agriculture, as the major consumer of
8 California water, should be subject to some restraints. They suggest water use practices,
9 crop choice, and agricultural practices can be altered to provide food and fiber with far
10 less water than is used now. This plan does not make any new recommendations for
11 agricultural water use efficiency but explores the topic in the planning scenarios, the
12 resource management strategies and in the overall discussion of water use today.

13 14 **Sustainable Funding**

15
16 Committee members agreed on the need for sustainable funding to support
17 comprehensive water management; however, it is not agreed whether water projects
18 should primarily be funded by public monies or by the users or beneficiaries of these
19 projects. This issue is particularly complex when ecosystem restoration projects are
20 involved. Debate remained around how a beneficiary was defined. This Water Plan
21 recommends sustainable funding without resolving the other issues.

22 23 **Water Pricing**

24
25 Some view water as under-valued and priced too low, while others cited the need to
26 keep water affordable. The range of water prices and water quality across California, as
27 well as the various arrangements and regulations for provision of water supplies,
28 complicates the discussion of water affordability and the impacts of pricing. Some AC
29 members believe using pricing to drive policy creates disparities. Some note that water
30 pricing in itself is not a conservation method but a mechanism for rewarding and
31 incentivizing conservation. Others see water pricing as a tool to manage demand. Part of
32 the conflict is between agriculture and urban, and a conflict over tiered pricing models.
33 There is also policy, legislation and regulation that affect the way water is priced and
34 must be considered in the policy debate.

35 36 37 **AC perspectives about the Update 2009 Approaches and Process**

38
39 As a planned continuation of Water Plan Update 2005, Update 2009 focused on key
40 2005 recommendations to:

- 1 • Improve Water Planning Collaboration among State Agencies
- 2 • Focus on Integrated Regional Water Management
- 3 • Increase Tribal Participation and Access to Funding³

4

5 **TEXT TO BE COMPLETED AFTER AC INPUT**

6

7

8 **AC Role in Water Plan Update 2009 and Future Updates**

9

10 Because of the emphasis on implementing Update 2005 recommendations related to

11 state agencies, regions and tribes, the role of the AC was shifted to a statewide policy

12 body. This new role and composition of members was challenged by:

13

- 14 1. Concurrent demands of many other processes that often conflicted and required
 - 15 attendance at other sessions on the same days
 - 16 2. A down turn in the economy that caused some organizations to be unable to
 - 17 support the robust participation of representatives and some cases high turnover
 - 18 of representatives assigned to the AC
 - 19 3. A reduced quarterly meeting schedule resulting in difficulty in restarting and
 - 20 revisiting topics
 - 21 4. Higher diversity leading to less on-going relationship building. In Water Plan
 - 22 Update 2005 members had occasion to do work together outside of meetings.
 - 23 With more disciplines now engaged in the Water Plan work, different members
 - 24 were less likely to interact outside of meetings.
- 25

26 **TEXT TO BE COMPLETED AFTER AC INPUT**

27

28

29

30 OTHER – Text to be completed in a different session.

31

- 32 • Suggestions for areas of future work
 - 33 • Other General Feedback
- 34

³ Update 2005 Recommendation 13 – noted that DWR and other State agencies must invite, encourage, and assist tribal government representatives to participate in statewide, regional, and local water planning processes and to access State funding for water projects. Further, State agencies should include tribal water concerns and water uses in future water plan updates and should engage appropriate local, State, and federal agencies to resolve tribal water issues that are identified.

ATTACHMENT A**California Water Plan – Update 2009 Public Advisory Committee**

American Farmland Trust	<i>Ed Thompson, Jr.</i>
Association of California Water Agencies	<i>David Bolland</i>
California Association of Resource Conservation Districts	<i>Patrick Truman, Alternate: Tacy Currey</i>
California Association of Realtors	<i>Elizabeth Gavric</i>
California Association of Sanitation Agencies	<i>Richard Atwater</i>
California Building Industry Association	<i>Steve E. LaMar, Alternate: Steve Cruz</i>
California Business Properties Association	<i>Rex Hime, Alternate: Matthew Hargrove</i>
California Central Valley Flood Control	<i>Mike Hardesty</i>
California Chamber of Commerce	<i>Valerie Nera</i>
California Chapter of the American Planning Association	<i>Al Herson , Alternate: Sande George</i>
California Council for Environmental & Economic Balance	<i>Jerry Secundy, Alternate: Bob Lucas</i>
California Conference of Environmental Health Directors	<i>Terry Schmidtbauer</i>
California Council of Governments	<i>Rusty Selix</i>
California County Planning Commissioners Association	<i>Ted Allured, Alternate: Ron Sprague</i>
California Farm Bureau Federation	<i>Chris Scheuring, Alternates: Justin Fredickson, Danny Merkley</i>
California Farm Water Coalition	<i>Michael Wade</i>
California Landscape Contractors Association	<i>Larry Rohlfs</i>
California Rural Indian Health Board	<i>James Crouch</i>
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	<i>Mike Jackson, Alternate: Jim Crenshaw</i>
California State Association of Counties	<i>Merita Callaway, Alternate: Karen Keene</i>
California Urban Water Agencies	<i>Elaine Archibald</i>
California Urban Water Conservation Council	<i>Chris Brown, Alternate: Katie Shulte Joung</i>
California Water Association	<i>Jack Hawks, Alternate: Dawn White</i>
California Watershed Network	<i>Mary Lee Knecht</i>
Central Valley Project Water Association	<i>Bob Stackhouse</i>
Division of Ratepayer Advocates, California PUC	<i>Dan Sanchez, Alternate: Diana Brooks</i>
Ducks Unlimited	<i>Chris Unkel, Alternate: Kevin Petrik</i>
Environmental Defense	<i>Laura Harnish</i>
Environmental Justice Coalition for Water	<i>Gary Mulcahy</i>
Floodplain Management Association	<i>Iovanka Todt, Alternate: Pal Hegedus</i>
Friends of the River	<i>Betsy Reifsnider</i>
Institute for Ecological Health	<i>John Hopkins</i>
Inter-Tribal Council of California, Water Commission	<i>Atta Stevenson, Alternate: Randy Yonemura</i>
League of California Cities	<i>Kyra Ross</i>
League of Women Voters	<i>Jack Sullivan, Alternate: Wendy Phillips</i>
Local Government Commission	<i>Patrick Stoner, Alternate: Laura Podolsky</i>
Natural Resource Defense Council	<i>Barry Nelson, Alternate: Kristina Ortez</i>
Planning & Conservation League	<i>Jonas Minton, Alternate: Evon Parvaneh Chambers</i>
Recreational Boaters of California	<i>Lenora Clark, Alternate: Bob Riopel</i>
Regional Council of Rural Counties	<i>Kathy Mannion, Alternate: Nick Konovaloff</i>
Sierra Club California	<i>Jim Metropulos</i>
State Water Contractors	<i>Grace Chan, Lloyd Fryer</i>
The Nature Conservancy	<i>Susan Tatayon</i>
Trust for Public Land	<i>Kathleen Farren, Alternate: Rico Mastrodonato</i>
WaterReuse Association	<i>Paul Klein</i>

WORKSHEET QUESTIONS

1
2
3
4 **1. Looking at the text on areas of Agreement and Disagreement please provide**
5 **suggested amendments for any area where you DO NOT see your**
6 **perspective represented OR you believe the your perspective has been**
7 **misunderstood.** *[NOTE: Your review should focus on content rather than editorial issues.*
8 *You are welcome to provide editorial suggestions off-line.]*
9

10
11
12
13
14 **2. Thinking about the Update 2009 Approaches and Process, what is your**
15 **perspective about the effectiveness and/or utility of emphasizing these**
16 **approaches:**
17

- 18 • Improving Water Planning Collaboration among State Agencies
- 19
- 20 • Focus on Integrated Regional Water Management
- 21
- 22 • Increasing Tribal Participation and Access to Funding
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26

27 **3. Thinking AC Role in Water Plan Update 2009**
28

- 29 • What additional benefits and/or challenges would you put in this section?
- 30
- 31 • What else might you include in this section.
- 32

33 **4. Thinking AC Role in Future Updates**
34

- 35 • What Role should the AC play in the next Update?
- 36