



## **Meeting Minutes**

Meeting of the California Water Commission

Wednesday, February 16, 2022

Remote Meeting

Beginning at 9:30 a.m.

### **1. Call to Order**

Chair Teresa Alvarado called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

### **2. Roll Call**

Assistant Executive Officer Laura Jensen called the roll. Commissioners Alvarado, Arthur, Curtin, Gallagher, Makler, Solorio, Steiner, and Swanson were present, constituting a quorum.

### **3. Closed Session**

The Commission did not hold a closed session.

### **4. Approval January 19, 2022 Meeting Minutes**

Commissioner Arthur motioned to approve the January 19, 2022 meeting minutes.

Commissioner Solorio seconded motion. All Commission members present voted in favor.

### **5. Executive Officer's Report**

Executive Officer Joseph Yun said April's meeting will be in-person at the California Natural Resources Agency auditorium, and staff is working on preparations. Staff is open to further conversations with the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians tribal leadership. Staff continues to coordinate with the Department of Water Resources (DWR) on the Big Notch Project and are ready to begin the Resolution of Necessity (RON) process in March. Staff is preparing the work plan for Water Resilience Portfolio (WRP) Action 26.3 – planning strategies for six-year drought.

### **6. Commission Member Reports**

Commissioner Solorio spoke at the Southern California Water Dialogue meeting, and also had coffee with Executive Officer Yun in Sacramento. Commissioner Curtin said he needs to leave the meeting at 1:15 p.m. Executive Officer Yun added that the Commission's op-ed regarding the status of the Water Storage Investment Program (WSIP) has run in five newspapers.

### **7. Public Testimony**

Dierdre des Jardins with California Water Research said she filed a protest with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) over DWR's 2021 temporary urgency change petition (TUCP), asked SWRCB to require DWR to do a report on their forecasting methods and to hold a workshop on climate change. She asked if today's State Water Project (SWP) presentation is in place of a workshop, and was told by Executive Officer Yun that it was not.

## **8. Water Storage Investment Program: Second Solicitation Considerations and Other Options (Action item)**

WSIP Manager Amy Young presented considerations around a second WSIP solicitation and identified other options available to the Commission to utilize \$63.9 million in funding. She presented a timeline of the WSIP from 2014 to present, showing that 12 applications were submitted, four were deemed ineligible, eight were given Maximum Conditional Eligibility Determinations (MCEs), one project withdrew, and the remaining seven met the January 1, 2022, continuing eligibility deadline. Two screening projects also met that deadline, and would be the only projects eligible to apply in a second solicitation. The Commission can decide to pursue a second solicitation, apply the funds to the existing projects, postpone the solicitation but begin drafting regulations, or defer the decision to a later date. A second solicitation would require staff to begin the rulemaking process, the Commission to adopt the regulations, the project proponents to submit applications for the review process, with the Commission making MCEs by mid-2024. If the Commission decided to distribute the funds to the existing projects, the screening projects would be held in the current state should more funding become available. If the Commission decides to hold off on the second solicitation but begin the rulemaking process, it would save some time, but would likely require changes made prior to the solicitation. In a comparison of timing and effort, a second solicitation would take two-and-a-half years and require significant work on the part of the state and applicants. Distribution among existing projects would take about three months, with minor work involved. Preparing the rulemaking without a solicitation would take about one year with moderate work for the state and minor work for applicants.

Public comment from Erin Evans of Lighthouse Public Affairs, representing Valley Water and the Pacheco Reservoir Expansion Project, who urged the Commission to distribute the remaining funds among the existing seven projects as the cost of all the projects has increased significantly. If a second solicitation takes place, allow the existing projects to apply for additional public benefits and compete for additional funding.

Public comment from Monique Day of West Yost Associates, representing Stanislaus Regional Water Authority, who supports a second solicitation.

Public comment from Maureen Martin of Contra Costa Water District, proponent of the Los Vaqueros Expansion Project, who urged the Commission to distribute the remaining funds among the existing seven projects as the cost of all the projects has increased significantly.

Commissioner Arthur asked about the process of determining project eligibility in the screening process compared to the application process. Ms. Young said there was no screening the first time; the application process was open to everyone. Some projects fell out because they were unable to show benefits that met the Delta requirements. This solicitation would be different.

Vice-chair Swanson said we want to be supportive, we want to build these projects. The Stanislaus County project is being built in a region where a large amount of growth is expected. It is good to have these projects in our back pocket for the future if something changes.

Commissioner Makler said an inflation adjustment is small but would help, a second solicitation might not do much to incentivize the screening projects, and he is inclined to not take any action today. The existing projects need to show deliverables in public benefit contracts and funding.

Chair Alvarado asked if an option exists for the two screening projects without a full application process, and was told the screening process was there to meet January 1, 2022, statutory requirements, the Commission does not have a process outside of that at this time. Legal Counsel Holly Stout said there is not a current mechanism, it would be difficult outside of the regulatory framework, and regulations would probably be needed.

Commissioner Solorio said he leans toward option two, giving the funds to the existing seven projects, and asked if we could create an incentive to give money to those who can get projects constructed in a certain amount of time.

Commissioner Gallagher said she also leans toward option two. The Commission wants to see the existing projects move forward. There is a sense of urgency; the Commission needs to get funding allocated sooner rather than later. Sites should be awarded the full MCED originally allocated.

Commissioner Steiner said she is leaning toward option two but needs more information before deciding how to distribute it. She did not support the Del Puerto project because she was unclear on what public benefits it could provide.

Commissioner Curtin said this is a profoundly complex process, it will be several years before the two new proposals will be prepared, and strongly recommends pursuing option two. The existing WSIP projects have met all of the conditions are in desperate shape because of inflation. Commissioner Curtin moved to vote on option two.

Commissioner Steiner seconded the move to vote on option two.

Commissioner Arthur said the Commission has time to better understand the timelines of these projects and how they are moving forward on their public benefit contracts. That could change how we consider applying the funding.

Commissioner Makler agreed and does not see the pressure on timing because none of the existing projects are shovel ready. Shovel ready would mean they have their entitlements, they have their benefits contracts negotiated, they have their financing in place, and they are ready to roll. Allocating the \$64 million will not make a difference in their project planning. What if

another project drops out in the next year? Is there any effort to upsize the funding outside of Proposition 1 to deal with inflation? Executive Officer Yun said we do not know of any additional funding coming into the program, and the decision is based on what we have now.

Commissioner Curtin said if other projects fall out the Commission will have the opportunity to reallocate money. If Commissioners do not allocate the money, they might hurt some of these projects going forward. We could think about this in another couple of months, but there is no earth-shattering information coming our way that will make things clearer.

Commissioner Solorio said we can either support the two screening projects or reallocate the money to the existing projects. We have more time to determine how we might do the latter, and staff could give us a recommendation on whatever path we decide to go down.

Commissioner Arthur asked for clarification: if Commissioners were to move forward with option two, is there an opportunity to proceed with a solicitation process in the future? Ms. Young said yes. Executive Officer Yun said the motion language can be refined to what Commissioners want it to say. Ms. Stout said option two is a discussion and does not obligate Commissioners to allocate those funds at this time. Staff is looking for direction on what option Commissioners want to explore.

Commissioner Steiner confirmed that they are voting on option two and asked staff to return, perhaps at the March meeting, with options on how the Commission might distribute the money.

Chair Alvarado confirmed with Commissioner Curtin that his motion was to vote to apply the \$63.9 million to existing projects and request staff come back with options for the use of those funds, with the recognition that this does not close the possibility of future solicitations.

All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

#### **9. 2021 Annual Review of the State Water Project (Action item)**

Water Code section 165 requires the Commission to conduct an annual review of the progress of the construction and operation of the SWP. Assistant Executive Officer Laura Jensen presented the draft 2021 Annual Review of the SWP for Commission consideration and approval. The theme of the 2021 SWP briefings was creating a resilient SWP: addressing climate change and aging infrastructure to provide multiple benefits for Californians. The Commission received 12 briefings in 2021. Highlights included drought contingency planning, the climate change vulnerability assessment and adaptation plan, and aging infrastructure. Water delivery numbers were the lowest since 2014; power generation and use numbers were the lowest since 2000. It was found that the SWP delivered water for California and the environment; it provides renewable energy and advances emissions reduction; DWR adapted business practices for the pandemic; DWR informed the Commission of the SWP's financial goals and budget; and

DWR delivered timely capital improvement projects and maintenance practices that mitigated aging infrastructure risks. The asset management program implemented a risk-informed process to prioritize capital, operations, and projects. DWR advanced safety assessments at SWP dams, addressing seismic and flood hazards and aging infrastructure issues; advanced near-term and long-term solutions to capacity and conveyance lost to subsidence; kept the Commission and the public informed on plans for a single-tunnel Delta conveyance system, and engaged stakeholders in consideration of a community benefits program for those impacted by the Delta conveyance project; explored adaptation strategies to improve the SWP's resilience to climate change; supported and led projects to enhance the climate and ecosystem reliability of the Delta and Upper Feather River Watershed; furthered forecast informed reservoir operations with the intent of operating Lake Oroville more optimally under changed hydrology; completed a draft Flexible Resources Study that looks at how the SWP can aid California in reaching its climate and energy goals; took actions to mitigate the impacts from the 2021 drought and is involved in early drought planning for 2022 and 2023; and informed the Commission about key construction activities undertaken in the past year. It was recommended that DWR provide information about how it is adapting and planning operations to address the anticipated challenges of climate change; efforts to advance large-scale infrastructure construction and maintenance; and balancing the needs of its multiple beneficiaries over the long term in years of extreme drought.

Public comment from Erin Wooley, policy advocate for the Sierra Club of California, who said DWR had repeatedly relied on TUCPs during dry periods to avoid meeting water quality standards intended to protect the Delta. Reducing Delta outflows has consequences for endangered species and water quality in the Delta. The Delta Conveyance Project is extremely expensive and would have major impacts on the environment and communities, and should consider local and regional projects that would better meet the water needs of Californians.

Public comment from Dierdre des Jardins, California Water Research, who said DWR needs to move to physics-based modeling, they are not working across silos, they need to update their methodology, they cannot rely on the past record or it will be a disaster for fish.

Commissioner Curtin asked if we are seeing more subsidence, and if SGMA has stabilized it at all, and was told that question can be posed to our DWR presenters.

Commissioner Makler said it was an excellent report; staff was able to distill and explain a very broad and complex subject.

Commissioner Arthur asked if Delta salinity standards might be part of the six-year drought plan, and was told it was possible to bring it into the drought discussions, and can also be considered for a future briefing.

Chair Alvarado said she would like to see a future briefing about the correlation between energy use and SWP operations to improving our climate resilience.

Commissioner Makler motioned to approve the report. Commissioner Steiner seconded the motion. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

#### **10. State Water Project Briefings: Preparing for Climate Extremes**

The Commission launched its 2022 SWP briefings and introduced this year's theme: Preparing for climate extremes – ensuring a reliable SWP to meet the challenges of drought, flood, and wildfire. Assistant Deputy Director of the SWP John Yarbrough introduced the four presentations and introduced DWR's Assistant Deputy Director for Climate Change John Andrew, who provided an overview of the climate action plan, DWR's comprehensive response to climate change. The goal is to improve the consistency and scientific rigor of DWR's approaches for analyzing the potential impacts of climate change while preserving both flexibility and efficiency. The Vulnerability Assessment assessed hazards, the Adaptation Plan identified and implemented adaptation strategies.

State Climatologist Michael L. Anderson briefed the Commission on how DWR is adapting its water forecasting processes for climate change. Above average warm years have gone from an extreme event in the 1930s, to episodic events in the 1980s, to commonplace the last decade. Water year 2021 brought new extremes and consequences. It was the second worst single year and driest two-year period in statewide precipitation, the second warmest year for statewide mean temperature, and the driest and warmest spring in 126 years. The comparative precipitation index shows wet years are not offsetting accumulated dryness of dry years over the last decade. Forecast improvement efforts include adopting emerging technologies to improve and expand the collection of hydrometeorological data, and developing physically based and climate informed runoff forecasting models. Three strategies include data augmentation, forecast model improvements, and partner collaboration. Improvements underway include updating hydrologic averages from 50-year to 30-year average to better reflect most recent years; updating precipitation and snow median increments based on new averages; improving automation of daily precipitation data collection, full natural flow calculations, and the quality control process; new methodology to evaluate and improve 90% and exceedance forecasts; and developing new statistical models based on updated data. A 12-month project is to develop machine learning models that incorporate new variables like the climatic water deficit, observe daily full natural flow, incorporate May 1 snow data, and separate out precipitation and snow parameters that were previously lumped together. Three-year projects are to integrate airborne remote sensing of snow data and modeling into the forecasting process, expand coverage of airborne lidar data collection, integrate weather and climate forecast information into the modeling process, and continue partner collaborations to improve observation and forecast capabilities. California Water Watch provides a snapshot of the state's water conditions at the local watershed, regional, and statewide scales. It allows

users to query hydroclimate and water supply information from a variety of sources. This water year to date sees continuing extremes, with a category 5 atmospheric river in October, less than 50% average precipitation in November, record snowfall in December, and the second driest January in 127 years. Real-time water management is to minimize the hazard and maximize the benefit.

SWP Climate Action Coordinator Andrew Schwarz briefed the Commission on the Delivery Capability Report (DCR), used for climate change planning throughout the state. The bi-annual report provides existing capability to deliver water over a range of hydrologic conditions. The most important information used by SWP contractors is the long-term average and single dry year delivery. Final 2021 DCR results will be released in April. It was the first to use the Cal Sim 3 model. DCR serves as a default climate change scenario for SWP planning, including the Power and Risk Office future resource planning, Oroville cold-water pump back studies, and the California Aqueduct Subsidence Program (CASP). Climate change was incorporated into the DCR in 2007. The current form provides existing delivery capability, and future capability informed by climate change. SWP contractors expressed desire for a single number they can use to reduce uncertainty. Creation of a new, climate-adjusted, current conditions simulation accounts for climate change that has already occurred, estimates current SWP capacity and reliability for use in operations and planning studies, and moving forward, future climate changes would be mapped into this new baseline. DCR has become the most consequential source of climate change information for the SWP, driven by the last-big-project approach, and moving forward wants to be more intentional and collaborative in its development.

Mr. Yarbrough briefed the Commission on drought planning for 2022. Dry conditions equal low runoff. 2021 ended with record low reservoir storage. Spring 2021 was the warmest and driest on record. These extremes challenged traditional water supply forecasting methods. Water supply planning must consider more extreme scenarios. 2022 objectives are to provide minimum health and safety needs, maintain Delta water quality, meet environmental needs to protect endangered species, conserve water storage to meet future critical needs, and deliver water based on priority. The decision process assumes we will see dry conditions. Initial actions include leaving in the salinity barrier, submitting a TUCP, and meeting a health- and safety-based allocation. October was the wettest on record, November in the top 10 driest, December in the top 10 wettest, and January in the top 10 driest. Actions are focused on Lake Oroville, the Delta, and San Luis Reservoir. Drought monitor shows the outlook for California, with very dry conditions and reduced storage in reservoirs and groundwater basins. However, much of California is in a better position than last year. Changes in approach for 2022 include consideration of more extreme scenarios when planning, adjustments to water supply forecasting approaches, and more frequent and earlier cross-agency coordination. DWR is not currently expecting to need the most intense drought actions, and is continuing close coordination with USBR and senior water holders to facilitate transfers, forecast and modeling

improvement efforts, and to monitor and evaluate conditions to determine whether to seek modified Delta standards and backfill the notch in the West False River salinity barrier.

Public comment from Dierdre des Jardins, California Water Research, who said the California Nevada River Forecast Center has a physics-based model that produces a forecast significantly lower than DWR's January 1, 2022, forecast. There is a real difference in predictions from the physics-based model and DWR models that are based on years in the historical records.

Public comment from Jim Brobeck, who said shifting the irrigation supply from surface water to groundwater substitution transfers and supplemental groundwater pumping will "desertify" the Sacramento Valley and eliminate the refuge from drought that allowed ecosystem-dependent pre-colonial people to survive, and asked how much these two strategies are being considered.

Commissioner Gallagher asked about the switch from a 50-year to a 30-year average, what the smallest range is you could go, and is this data incorporated into allocations. Mr. Anderson said moving to a 30-year average helps you capture more of what happened in the last decade. Any smaller and you get into sample-size challenges, and may not reflect all of the outcomes. The challenge is understanding where the observations are relative to the distributions

Commissioner Steiner asked Mr. Anderson about a possible staffing increase and was told they are going through the normal process of a budget change proposal. They have the benefit of working with several partners and have expanded their partner engagement. She asked Mr. Yarbrough if the 2022 objective to deliver water by priority was within the SWP allocations or is there a plan to change allocations to deal with an emergency, and was told they have settlement contracts with both customer agencies and senior water rights holder on the Feather River, and the prioritization was between those two entities.

Commissioner Makler asked Mr. Anderson to what extent have there been discussions about forest management, and was told that two-thirds of the Feather River Watershed has burned in the last three years, and the watershed DWR is working with this year are very different than in 2013. Fires have been that motivator to help open that dialogue with partner agencies.

Commissioner Makler asked Mr. Yarbrough if we have sufficient institutions in place to allow for water transfers, and was told that we have a lot of infrastructure in place already to implement transfers, but there is always room to improve and they are continuing to streamline the process.

Commissioner Solorio asked how we are going use this type of climate data and related information for the state to decide SWP contractor allocations. Mr. Yarbrough said the process begins with the snow survey and Bulletin 120, the data collected is turned over to SWP staff who run models and look for what water they see being south of the Delta, where does precipitation show up the rest of the year, and what allocation can they support.



Commissioner Gallagher asked if we do not know what the next water year is going to hold, how do we determine what to keep for the next year and what the next year's allocation is going to be. Mr. Yarbrough said DWR determines each year how much water it wants to keep in Lake Oroville and will not release any water supply that would take it below that amount.

The Commission took a 30-minute lunch break.

### **11. Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Implementation Update**

Tim Godwin, Technical Advisor for DWR's Sustainable Groundwater Management Office (SGMO), provided an update on Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) implementation, including an overview of the Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs) DWR has reviewed to date, and the approach and timeline for reviewing GSPs submitted in January 2022. In dry years, up to 60% of California's water supply comes from groundwater. Of the 515 alluvial basins in the state, SGMA Identified 94 high- and medium-priority, and 21 critically over-drafted basins. All required Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) have submitted GSPs. DWR has two years to evaluate GSPs and either approve them, disapprove them, or deem them incomplete. For the first batch on plans received by January of 2020, eight of the 20 plans received were approved, with recommended corrective actions. Twelve of the 20 were deemed incomplete and GSAs have 180 days to correct any deficiencies. DWR is working with GSAs to create a pathway forward. Most addressed overdraft head on. Eliminating overdraft is not the only requirement, but should be done in concert with avoiding the six undesirable results. GSPs need to consider all beneficial uses and users, and meet required actions related to drinking water, subsidence, stream depletion, and coordination. Some basins within multiple GSPs will need to further coordinate and address inconsistencies in their data and methodologies, as well as address any other deficiencies identified by DWR. Key considerations are to identify data gaps, uphold public transparency, continue local outreach, and implement comprehensive projects and management actions. High- and medium-priority plans submitted by January 31, 2022, are available for public review. Alternative plan periodic evaluations were provided by January 1, 2022. DWR issued 20 basin determinations on 42 GSPs. In 2022, DWR received 65 GSPs from 63 basins and eight alternative plans. DWR will issue determinations by 2024. Technical assistance programs available online include webinars, land subsidence data, airborne electromagnetic surveys, support services, and accounting platform efforts. DWR has a number of resources to support GSA outreach and engagement efforts. Funding includes \$350 million over the next three years.

Public comment from Ben King who asked when the updated freshwater map will be released.

Public comment from Jim Brobeck, from the Vina GSA Stakeholder Advisory Committee, who is concerned about the direction of several of the GSPs submitted in the northern Sacramento Valley that were designed to facilitate the water market and supply the rest of the state with water, to the great detriment of the non-participating entities.

Public comment from Lynne Plambeck, from a Southern California environmental organization, who said local GSP levels have been set lower than they have ever been, and hopes that DWR will take a close look at the comments and objections to Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency's plan, written by the same consultant doing water hydrology reports for all of the developers.

Commissioner Arthur congratulated SGMO on their progress, asked about staffing and support needs, any growth in coordination with other state agencies, and how they plan to use financial assistance to incentivize the more difficult tasks. Mr. Godwin said they are building out their team, and have grown a lot since the start of SGMA. They continue to effectively coordinate with other state agencies and are focused on incentivizing actions that meet the basin's needs.

Chair Alvarado asked how they evaluate collaboration between GSAs within a basin, and how they validate that public engagement is taking place. Mr. Godwin said collaboration and engagement are separate under SGMA regulations. Collaboration is about math, managing from the same data and methodology. There are certain regulations for developing a coordination plan. SGMA does not call upon DWR to tell the agencies how to do governance, how to manage their basins, but DWR recognizes the need and address this through its assessments.

## **12. Groundwater Trading: Feedback on Draft White Paper**

Assistant Executive Officer Laura Jensen discussed comments received to date on the Commission's draft white paper containing preliminary findings regarding how to shape well-managed groundwater trading programs and proposed next steps for state engagement. Comments regarding protecting third parties required modifying language in Finding 1. Several comments were received about robust consideration for small- and medium-size farms. Staff suggests adding a finding that speaks directly to the need to engage these farmers when developing a trading program, and to add more specificity to Next Step 4.3. Several comments concerned the impacts of trading on communities. The white paper addresses closing data gaps, stakeholder engagement, and the Human Right to Water. Staff suggests adding a finding that speaks to the need for disadvantaged communities to receive an allocation that allows them to pump enough groundwater to meet their needs. Comments about accountability and resourcing will be addressed by the inclusion of language that encourages implementing agencies to develop a workplan for Action 3.6, and additional language about the need for resources and expertise in the Proposed Next Steps for State Engagement section. A variety of comments concerned the proposed next steps, and staff suggests adding language to Next Steps 2 and 3, and adding steps that focus on creating an incentive program and a diverse advisory body. Comments on opposition to groundwater trading will be noted in the white paper. Comments on opposition to expanding state authority will also be noted, saying it is not likely to be universally welcome and must be pursued thoughtfully and only if necessary. Language will be added to the introduction to cover transparency and price discovery, and language will be modified in the Transparency vs. Confidentiality section of the Points of

Divergence box. Staff will work with the Stakeholder Advisory Group to revise language on measuring water use so it is accurate but neutral. The Commission asked staff to include an offer of continued engagement on the topic, which will be noted in the Potential Next Steps for State Engagement section, and to augment the section on Current State Engagement to reflect additional state responsibilities outside of SGMA. Staff has drafted text and is working with the implementing agencies to refine it. The Commission received miscellaneous comments regarding water rights, directional trading, legislation modification, and surface water transfers. Staff will address these comments where we have information to do so. Comments received since this presentation was finalized include the use of existing processes, to make sure expectations for GSAs are reasonable, to treat allocations carefully, to trade in compliance with approved GSPs, that DWR is the preferable choice in leading the advancement of this work, there is a need for better data on water use, concerns about “Big Ag” overusing groundwater resources, the lack of appropriate safeguards for vulnerable users, more discussion on groundwater substitution, and mechanisms for insuring water quality. Public comment is welcome through February 28. The final draft version will be brought to the Commission for its consideration and approval on March 16, 2022.

Public comment from Tim Johnson, California Rice Commission, who is supportive of limited groundwater trading but only within the region. This point was not captured in the draft paper, and he thinks his industry will suffer a negative impact.

Public comment from Soren Nelson, Association of California Water Agencies Regulatory Relations, who said trading is framed as a problem to be mitigated, not as a tool that can be used to solve the problem. The state could end up disincentivizing some of these programs instead of encouraging their establishment. He encouraged the Commission to consider how we can fold groundwater trading into the work that has already been done by SGMA so as not to duplicate efforts. ACWA is supportive of a locally driven process for establishing programs with state technical and financial support.

Public comment from Jim Brobeck, Water Policy Analyst for AquAlliance in Chico, who said the paper neglected to identify the pumping of groundwater in lieu of surface water supply as a category of groundwater trading.

Public comment from Ben King, who asked if a contractor who has done a groundwater transfer can also sell their groundwater right. Would the program allow a seller on the east side of the Sacramento River to sell into an area of subsidence, like the Arbuckle area? This could exacerbate subsidence in the Colusa sub-basin. Water quality is a fundamental part of our groundwater resources, there is no real mechanism to control water quality in groundwater.

### **13. Consideration of Items for Next California Water Commission Meeting**

The next meeting of the Water Commission is currently scheduled for Wednesday, March 16, 2022, when the Commission will receive the final white paper on groundwater trading, hear the

six-year drought workplan, receive the first group of Big Notch Project Resolutions of Necessity, and consider how to use the remaining WSIP funds.

**14. Adjourn**

The Commission adjourned at 2:33 p.m.