Advisory Committee Meeting 1
Day 1 Meeting Summary

May 13, 2026 | 1:00 PM-5:00 PM

Introduction

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) convened the first Advisory Committee (AC) meeting for the California Water Plan (CWP) 2028 on May 13 and 14, 2026, which was held in person in Sacramento.

The AC consults with DWR and provides recommendations to help inform development of the CWP. The following meeting summary provides a brief overview of the first AC meeting.

The meeting summary provides a high-level overview of discussions and is not a transcript of the meeting. To view recordings, presentation slides, and materials from the meeting, please visit the CWP's Advisory Committee Meetings webpage.

Day 1 Meeting Overview

Day 1 Meeting Objectives

- Discuss and confirm the AC's purpose, role, requirements, and expectations
- Reflect on California's water history and the drivers for change
- Develop a shared understanding of Senate Bill (SB) 72, SB 659, and the CWP Roadmap for 2028 and 2033 (Roadmap)
- Discuss DWR's approach for achieving the 9-million-acre-foot (MAF) interim water supply target, the origins of the target, and how this target will be addressed in CWP 2028 and CWP 2033

Day 1 Meeting Highlights

- **SB 72 drives modernization of the CWP.** SB 72 establishes the first-ever statewide water supply target of 9 MAF by 2040. This legislation tasks DWR with developing actions to meet this target and expand engagement to various interested parties.

- **AC members accepted the draft Charter.** There was unanimous agreement on the draft AC Charter and its contents.
- **CWP 2028 will lay the groundwork for CWP 2033.** The 9-MAF target will be adjusted for CWP 2033 as DWR develops watershed-scale targets.
- **DWR has a deep bench of staff and consultants** to deliver CWP 2028, and DWR will work across divisions and State agencies to integrate with existing State plans and programs.
- **The Water Evaluation and Adaptation Planning (WEAP) model will be critical to setting targets and evaluating portfolios of regional projects.** The AC expressed a strong interest in better understanding WEAP model capabilities, limitations, assumptions, and project inputs.
- At the end of Day 1, AC members felt **optimistic about the process** and recognized the **amount of work ahead**. AC members noted that success will require **integrated solutions**, **embracing uncertainty**, and **greater coordination**. Some AC members advised being **open to new ideas**, **challenging our assumptions about what is needed,** and considering **larger infrastructure projects** that may not yet be planned.
- Many AC members wanted to hear more about **funding**, plans for building **public engagement and political will,** consideration of **impacts to vulnerable groups**, changes needed to current **regulations**, and how the CWP will **integrate with existing planning efforts**.

Day 1 Quote of the Day

"One thing many of us could agree on is that we're really, really good at finding money for new projects, and we're really, really bad at finding money for maintenance."
— Ann Willis, California Regional Director, American Rivers

Day 1 Meeting Summary

Welcome, Review Agenda, and Meeting Objectives

Speaker: Emily Finnegan, Lead Facilitator, Stantec

Emily Finnegan welcomed AC members and the public, and provided an overview of the Day 1 agenda, meeting objectives, and public comment process. Emily also conducted a brief review of meeting procedures and agreements

Tribal Acknowledgement

Speaker: Anecita Agustinez, Executive Manager Office of Tribal Affairs, DWR

Anecita Agustinez provided a Tribal Acknowledgement on behalf of DWR. Governor Newsom, under Executive Order N-15-19, recognized the State's commitment to

reconciliation, restorative justice and reaffirming Indigenous people's relationship to ancestorial lands and waters. AC members were encouraged to continue to strengthen Tribal relationships as part of their work with the CWP.

Since 2009, each CWP effort hosts a Tribal Water Submit to incorporate Tribal voices and participation into the CWP. CWP 2023 included a new chapter devoted to Tribal issues, written in the voice of Tribal communities. DWR's Tribal Standards of Practice includes respect for and understanding of Tribal sovereignty, communications conducted on a government-to-government level, an understanding of ancestral territories, and the importance of protecting sacred lands and waters. The land upon which this meeting was held is the homelands of the Nisenan, Southern Maidu, Plains Miwok, Patwin Wintun, and Wilton Rancheria people.

Welcome from DWR

Speaker: Karla Nemeth, Director, DWR

Director Karla Nemeth thanked AC members for taking on this assignment on behalf of all Californians. Director Nemeth noted that historical droughts in 2021 led to the development of the *2022 California Water Supply Strategy: Adapting to a Hotter, Drier Future*, which prompted a new, proactive, and more inclusive approach to California water management. Director Nemeth acknowledged the deep bench of DWR staff present and shared her enthusiasm for the new era of DWR that is integrated across divisions and water resource management needs and committed to a revamped CWP. Director Nemeth previewed the content for the meeting ahead, thanked members of the public for their interest, and highlighted upcoming CWP engagement opportunities for everyone to get involved.

Who We Are: The California Water Plan Team

Speaker: Joel Metzger, Deputy Director of Statewide Water Resources Planning, DWR

Joel Metzger shared about the influence of SB 72 in the development of a new, modernized CWP. SB 72 establishes the first-ever statewide water supply target of 9-MAF of additional water supply, conservation, or storage capacity by 2040. In CWP 2033, DWR will develop new watershed-based targets for 2050. The legislation tasks DWR with developing actions to meet those targets. Finally, SB 72 directs DWR to expand engagement to various interested groups and other forums. DWR staff and the CWP consulting team provided brief introductions regarding their contributions to CWP 2028.

Finding Common Ground: Advisory Committee Connections

Speaker: Emily Finnegan, Lead Facilitator, Stantec

In small groups, AC members were instructed to make introductions and discuss their commonalities. An AC spokesperson for each group introduced all members and highlighted commonalities and shared interests.

What It Means to be an Advisory Committee Member: Charter Review

Speaker(s): Emily Finnegan, Lead Facilitator, Stantec, and Tripp Mizell, Assistant General Counsel, DWR

Emily Finnegan provided a recap of key takeaways from intake calls that occurred with each AC member prior to the first AC meeting. Key takeaways included what AC members consider to be most important about the CWP, what AC would like to see in the CWP to make it relevant to their regions and agencies, and how AC members define success for CWP 2028. The AC was then presented with an overview of key components of the AC charter. Emily asked the AC if members were satisfied with the contents of the charter as proposed and all AC members agreed.

State of the State for California Water: Where We've Been

Speaker: Karla Nemeth, Director, DWR

Director Karla Nemeth provided an overview of California water history to set the table for the day's discussions. The State's first CWP was developed in 1957 and it was the main driver for the construction of the State Water Project. Over time, the CWP shifted away from being a technical document focused on big infrastructure projects to a collection of documents and reports focused on policy issues and actions to address the State's water challenges. The CWP has adapted over time as the State's priorities shifted, including more recent CWPs that led to the development of DWR's Integrated Regional Water Management program. Today, key drivers of California water management include increased temperatures, precipitation, snowpack, and sea-level rise. Director Nemeth emphasized the importance of recognizing California's new hydrology and the need to modernize strategies to adapt.

California Water: Where We're Going and Drivers for Change

Speaker: Emily Finnegan, Lead Facilitator, Stantec

The AC divided into small groups to discuss one of three topics:

- **Hydrology**—When you look at hydrology and our natural systems over time, what does this tell us about the future of California water?
- **Regulations**—When you look at regulations over time, what are the implications for this CWP?
- **Infrastructure**—When you look at infrastructure development over time, what needs to be done differently in the future?

Each group then provided a report out of their discussion, which is summarized below:

Topic	Summary of Discussion
Hydrology	- Traditionally, water has been stored but with flashier weather systems, **operations must be optimized** and include **adaptive management strategies** for responding to a less predictable hydrology and **moving away from the traditional methods** of "fill and drain." - Throughout California, climate change is having cascading effects because of the **interconnectedness of water**. - Our water resources are **becoming more unpredictable**. There needs to be more done to **help manage flows** and consider **environmental needs.**
Regulations	- Regulations **can be conflicting** and slow down project implementation. **Coordination across agencies and regulations** and establishing an iterative process to assess the effectiveness of regulations will be important. - There is a need to **redefine regulations** and terms such as "public benefits." - Need to think about how to address **aging legal structures** and **shifting regulatory systems** to be faster and more adaptive. - Too many regulations can have impacts on **funding and affordability**.
Infrastructure	- There are **infrastructure impacts on Tribes** that were never mitigated and continue to have ongoing impacts. **Tribal water rights** have not yet been addressed. - There is a **need to update current infrastructure** to allow for more functioning conditions such as levee setbacks and ag-wetland management. - There is a **need to address long-term depreciation of infrastructure** and maintaining and repairing infrastructure as conditions and needs change.

California's Future with Climate Change

Speaker: Mike Anderson, State Climatologist, DWR

Dr. Mike Anderson presented about California's hotter, drier climate, which is leading to flashier, less predictable hydrologic cycles. Mike shared about the state's current and future precipitation variability, noting that California experiences greater climate variability compared to states on the east coast of the United States. With a Mediterranean climate, however, California still typically experiences precipitation beginning in the fall, half of the annual precipitation showing up in the winter, and conditions beginning to dry by late spring. Mike noted California's strong partnerships with National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration that supports California understand the timing, pace, and scale of storms. The State now has a better understanding of climate change patterns, but the challenge will be adapting our policies and infrastructure to adapt to the changing climate.

California Water Plan Roadmap for 2028 and 2033

Speaker: Joel Metzger, Deputy Director, Statewide Water Resources Planning, DWR, and Eric Tsai, Supervising Engineer, DWR

Joel Metzger provided an overview of SB 72 and SB 659 requirements and reviewed the CWP Roadmap for development of the CWP 2028 and CWP 2033. The recent 2021–2022 drought drove unanimous support from the legislature for SB 72, which was signed by Governor Newsom in 2025. SB 72 establishes the first-ever statewide water supply target: CWP 2028 will include a 9-MAF interim target for 2040; for CWP 2033, DWR will establish watershed-scale targets for 2050, and future updates will include water supply targets with a 50-year planning horizon. The WEAP model will help DWR assess water supply targets at the Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC)-8 watershed scale. For CWP 2028, five hydrologic regions will be modeled, and will then be expanded to the rest of the state for CWP 2033.

Baseline assumptions are integrated into the WEAP model and include key topics such as Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) compliance, subsidence, environmental regulations, future land use, and agricultural, urban, and environmental water demands. The baseline assumptions will be a topic of discussion for the second AC meeting in August. DWR will use the baseline assumptions and modeling to evaluate future conditions, quantify regional water demands, and set future water supply targets. For CWP 2028, DWR will begin developing an initial statewide database of projects and actions based on existing local and regional plans, and input projects and actions into the Watershed Hub, an online, interactive project database. DWR will develop criteria to select which projects to include in the WEAP model, and the project selection criteria will be discussed at the next AC meeting. For CWP 2033, all statewide modeling will be completed, and DWR will develop regional project portfolios to help meet water supply targets, which will include economic assessments of projects and actions. CWP 2028 and CWP 2033 will also include policy recommendations to support the implementation of projects and actions.

Regional forums will be held across the state for water managers, local organizations, and other interested parties to provide input on the future regional water demands, targets, and regional project portfolios. This statewide analysis will help DWR evaluate how planned projects and actions are closing the gap between future supply and demand, and where future adjustments are needed. CWP 2028 will include a "test of concept" on a subset of a hydrologic region to test the process of developing baseline assumptions, project selection criteria, regional project portfolios, and working with local water managers to identify and evaluate projects and adaptation strategies. Lessons learned from this test of concept will inform the CWP Regional Forums, development of adaptation strategies, and analysis for CWP 2033.

DWR's approach for SB 659 was also discussed, and DWR will be developing and analyzing groundwater recharge opportunities, barriers, and recommendations as part of CWP 2028. Steven Springhorn from DWR's Sustainable Groundwater Management Office covered this in more detail on Day 2.

To get input throughout the CWP development process, DWR has established several avenues for engagement, including the AC, State Agency Team, Tribal Advisory Committee, Technical Working Group, Regional Forums, and the Groundwater Recharge Working Group. A handout was provided with the AC meeting materials to summarize the CWP engagement approach.

The CWP Roadmap was then presented with all the above information summarized. The CWP includes three main workstreams (technical, planning and engagement) that occur simultaneously and are interrelated. CWP policy recommendations will be a central focus for the AC. Building relationships, trust, storytelling, and shared messaging will be critical to CWP's success.

There is not as much funding as DWR initially requested to implement the CWP and SB 72 , pending any updates in funding in the Governor's May revised budget. Baseline funding for the CWP is $4 million per year, which has been the baseline funding for about the past 20 years. Currently, there is a build phase of an additional $5.8 million per year for 5 years to support the development of new tools and the implementation of SB 72 mandates. After 5 years, additional funding drops off to an additional $2.4 million per year on top of the baseline funding to sustain work for CWP 2033 and future CWP updates. Given the available funding, DWR had to make difficult decisions on what workstreams to cut. Within this more-limited funding, DWR's budget priorities include delivering the CWP on time and within budget, prioritizing future-focused tools, building internal staff capacity, investing in communications and engagement, and evaluating how to optimize and modernize systems and reporting.

After the presentation, the AC was invited to comment and ask questions, and those discussions are summarized below.

Comment/Question	DWR Response
What are the capabilities and limitations of the WEAP model?	The DWR Planning Team has started developing factsheets and one-pagers to introduce the WEAP model to explain these concepts clearly. Materials will be shared with the AC once finalized.
There is a tremendous amount of local knowledge. Is there a way local agencies can help DWR compile and/or QA/QC data to offload some of the labor power needed to do this work?	The DWR team would like to know more about this idea and expressed support for ideas from AC members that could cut down on duplicative work where possible.
Regarding WY dynamics, how are tides accounted for in the modeling process? There is a need to take a closer look at tidal impacts due to the significant influence in the Bay-Delta. Tides have almost as much influence as atmospheric rivers in part of the Bay-Delta.	DWR staff was unsure if tides were accounted for in the WEAP modeling. Upon discussing with DWR technical staff after the meeting, tides are not accounted for in the WEAP model, which is on a monthly time step.
How do wildfires and the effects on watersheds fit into the WEAP model?	DWR is working with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

Comment/Question	DWR Response
	(CAL FIRE) to determine how forest management projects impact water supplies, and additional data and work is needed to evaluate if these projects can be modeled as part of a statewide water supply strategy. Even if there is no strong correlation between forest management and water supply, it does not mean forest management shouldn't occur. Forest fires are burning at a higher intensity due to excess fuel which results in hydrophobic soils that limits water absorption into the ground and causes an increase in runoff. Water quality parameters are also negatively impacted by fires.
One AC member emphasized that the relationship between water supply and wildfire impacts cannot be compartmentalized. Infrastructure impacts of wildfire such as sedimentation and toxicity will affect water supply. While the exact water supply benefits of reducing evapotranspiration may be uncertain, there is definitely a benefit. One AC member advised that DWR should not separate wildfire from how it impacts water supply.	DWR thanked the AC member for the comment.
Why are operations and regulatory changes not included in the DWR graphic as a SB 72 adaptation strategy given it can affect water supply significantly?	The strategies included in the DWR graphic were those specifically mentioned in SB 72, but the CWP water supply strategies are not only limited to those described in the legislation. Additionally, the WEAP model can assess how certain changes in policy would change water supply relative to the baseline assumptions.
One AC member noted there is a lack of technical assistance providers and environmental justice groups on the AC. How does DWR plan to get those perspectives incorporated into the CWP Roadmap?	DWR did their best to expand upon what was required by SB 72 but had to balance the diverse representation with keeping the AC a manageable size. DWR is committed to bringing diverse voices to the AC meetings and including additional opportunities for engagement during Regional Forums, California Water Commission meetings, and speaking with DWR directly. The goal is not to exclude any perspective. If there is a perspective that is missing from the table, the AC should let DWR know so they can seek out those perspectives and bring them into future engagements.

Comment/Question	DWR Response
There was a suggestion for DWR to interact with the Wildfire Taskforce to inform impacts to forest land, water resources, habitats and communities. The U.S. Forest Service can support this engagement with the Wildfire Taskforce. Regarding forest and watershed health, how are aquatic invasive organisms being accounted for in terms of their impacts on water systems?	Invasive species are not currently incorporated in the WEAP model.
To what extent will scenario planning be incorporated? What types of projects would be included in the project database?	There will be different scenarios evaluated which may result in several regional project portfolios, with the intent of providing a diversity in project portfolio alternatives. Projects included in the project database will be actual projects, but not all will be modeled. The AC will advise on the project criteria for modeling. DWR is also looking at how they can use consolidated sets of projects (for example groups of recharge projects) to model their collective performance within a watershed.
How are energy costs being incorporated into the model? How will the deployment of the additional 9 MAF of projects across California impact the energy affordability and finance-ability of projects?	The WEAP model currently does not have an aspect that assesses the energy footprint of projects, and that is likely something that would need to be done on the back end after project portfolios are modeled within WEAP. DWR is conducting a cost benefits analysis as part of the planning process. Funding and affordability are high priorities for the AC, and DWR is considering forming a separate working group to help tackle the water-energy nexus and funding and affordability discussions. These topics can also be explored further through the AC.
Can the AC review the baseline assumptions that go into the WEAP model sooner than the fourth quarter of 2026? If we get the baseline assumptions too late and the AC has comments, it can set DWR back. There are concerns about how demand management would be incorporated into the model, especially for the agricultural community who are concerned demand management will put them out of business. What are the assumptions in the model?	Baseline assumptions are a high priority for many AC members based on the AC intake calls. The next AC meeting will include a deep dive into the baseline assumptions and provide an opportunity for AC input. DWR clarified that the model has been developed for five hydrologic regions (Sacramento Valley, San Joaquin, Tulare, South Coast, and San Francisco), but the baseline modeling runs have not been completed yet. Before DWR runs the model, the AC will have the

Comment/Question	DWR Response
	chance to review and provide input on the baseline assumptions.
Will projects need to have certain criteria, such as having permitting completed, in order to be considered for the model?	Projects are at different stages of development, some may not have a location yet, others may not have defined capacity, while others may have all environmental permitting completed. DWR needs to think through the project criteria for modeling and the scale of action that can be modeled. The AC will have an opportunity to provide input on the project modeling criteria. It is typical in planning studies that when projects have had their environmental compliance completed by a certain date, they are considered part of the baseline condition.
Cobbling together existing projects will not get close to the 9-MAF goal, and the scale of projects needed to address future climate variability will require more than just local projects that individual agencies are already planning for. We need to challenge our assumptions and consider larger storage and infrastructure projects that aren't yet on the books that may benefit the state as a whole. If DWR only looks at existing agency-led projects, we will never get there. We have to be open to all ideas even if they may take a long time to build. The Colorado River and State Water Project looked beyond the local level, and we need to open our minds up to look at larger solutions. If we start with "who's going to pay for it?" we're not going to get anywhere. We need to do the planning work to look at what's needed and be open to all ideas.	The project database is a starting point to understand what has been proposed to date, but that doesn't limit us to look at other solutions, including larger State or federal projects, that haven't been proposed yet.
It was emphasized again to look beyond standard local projects and be open to new ideas. How will DWR be working with regulators on environmental flows for a more complete water balance?	This theme of looking at environmental regulations was echoed at the Association of California Water Agencies listening sessions held in early May. DWR will be looking at existing regulations, what will need to change, and what impacts changing regulations will have on our water supply goals.

Overview of the 9-MAF Interim Water Supply Target

Speaker: Karandev Singh, Senior Water Resources Engineer, DWR

Karandev Singh presented the origins of 9-MAF interim target, what it means, and how DWR plans to address the target. SB 72 Section 1 provides the context for how the 9 MAF number was developed. The need for an increased water supply was driven by key studies such as the *2022 California Water Supply Strategy: Adapting to a Hotter, Drier Future* and the 2024 California Municipal Utilities Association study, *The Magnitude of California's Water Challenges*, which illustrated water supply challenges emerging from climate change, policy changes and infrastructure needs. The 9-MAF target was derived from simplified statewide assumptions to serve as a useful planning approximation. DWR plans to update and revise the target goals in CWP 2033. This interim target will help define the scale of the challenges the State is facing, focus on inventorying projects and actions in CWP 2028, and establish an analytical runway for CWP 2033.

After the presentation, the AC was invited to comment and ask questions, and discussion is summarized below.

Comment/Question	DWR Response
Is there a way to start tracking potential projects and actions for regions that won't be modeled until later?	DWR clarified that the planning and evaluation will be sequential in terms of regions, but initial inventorying of projects will be conducted at the statewide level as part of CWP 2028. DWR is planning to time the more intensive Regional Forum engagement to align with when models will be ready to share.
Will the model or economic analysis take into account the increasing risk and costs of infrastructure failure? More extreme climate events will challenge the infrastructure put into place. When we're putting in new water storage projects, their design life will extend beyond this CWP. One thing many of us could agree on is that we're very good at finding money for new projects and we're very bad at finding money for maintenance.	The CWP is looking at a 50-year planning horizon. The reliability and performance of infrastructure is not something that DWR is currently considering in the analysis.
The Central Valley Project and State Water Project are intended to bridge watersheds so setting individual, watershed targets will have impacts on other neighboring watersheds. There is no "hard" boundary conditions between watersheds.	The WEAP model does not look at watersheds in isolation, it's an integrated model that takes into account water flowing from one watershed to another and Central Valley Project and State Water Project imports and exports.
As we're accounting for the projects that contribute to the 9 MAF, are you looking	DWR is discussing this internally and considering projects that have had their environmental

Comment/Question	DWR Response
retroactively, and is there a date or year (such as CWP 2023) that you're looking at?	compliance completed by 2020 to be part of the baseline. Projects implemented after this date would be part of the "with-project" condition. This will be included as part of the baseline assumptions discussion at the next AC meeting.
Do we have a way to look at lost water storage due to sedimentation and evaluate what could be gained through removing sediment?	DWR reflected on ways that sedimentation could be accounted for in the modeling and planning work. Upon further discussion with DWR technical staff after the meeting, DWR confirmed that there is currently not an approach outlined for evaluating sedimentation impacts.
One AC member advised DWR and the AC to avoid illusions of precision. There is a worry that the process will be weighted toward projects that have a specific understanding of how much water will be generated or captured. We have an imperfect system of data and management. The AC was encouraged to look at various sources of water to include in the modeling and not discount something that may not have a granular level of understanding but could still advance us toward the 9-MAF target. Existing proposals should not be the only universe of solutions. All of the regulatory and administrative changes we're discussing will require new classes of actions and projects.	DWR agreed to avoid illusions of precision and noted that the tool itself has limitations, so it's important for the AC to understand the capabilities and constraints of the modeling tool. This will be discussed as part of the next AC meeting.
How will we understand data gaps and strategies to address them? There was support for optimizing existing systems and not only building new projects.	DWR is committed to a transparent process with the AC and will share data gaps as they emerge. DWR will look to the AC to be partners in thinking through how to optimize and address data gaps.

Reflections from Day One and Preview of Day 2

Speaker: Emily Finnegan, Lead Facilitator, Stantec

Emily Finnegan asked for a show of thumbs from the AC if they felt they had accomplished their meeting objectives for the day. The majority of AC members displayed a thumbs up, with some showing a thumb sideways.

AC members used an interactive poll to provide feedback on Day 1 of the AC meeting. Results from the poll are summarized below.

1. **What's one key takeaway from today's meeting?**
   - There is a lot of work to be done.
   - The WEAP model, project portfolios, and project criteria will be critical to the CWP. There is a lot of interest in learning more about modeling and how projects will be prioritized.
   - CWP 2028 will lay the groundwork for CWP 2033. The 9-MAF target will be adjusted as we learn more.
   - There needs to be more clarity on baseline assumptions.
   - What got us here will not get us there. It will be important to look at different types of projects and solutions.
   - It will be a challenge to balance risk and reward of actions.
   - There is broad range of subject matter experts and interests represented on the AC.
   - DWR and the consultant team have done a lot of pre-work. There is optimism that this will make our time together much more productive.
   - Great leadership of the DWR team.
   - Integrating perspectives from all sectors will be critical.
   - Defining watershed-scale is complicated.
   - AC members are serious about the process.
   - There will need to be a lot of coordination to move from silos to systems and effectively work at the watershed scale.
   - There is a need to embrace and advocate for living with uncertainty.
   - Too much time was spent discussing the model, the AC should trust DWR.
   - Consider environmental flows as a supply that should be part of the CWP.
2. **What would you like to hear more about?**
   - A word cloud summarized participant responses below. Larger words indicate responses that were submitted multiple times.

3. **What questions do you have or what is still unclear heading into Day 2?**
    - There were several questions about the **WEAP model and its assumptions.**
    - There were questions about **how outdated regulations, including water rights, will be addressed** and how the CWP will account for an **unstable regulatory future**.
    - How will **the CWP integrate with existing State plans, goals, and programs** (e.g., the Multi-Benefit Land Repurposing Program, the Bay-Delta Plan, etc.) that directly and indirectly touch water?
    - Where are we in the process and **where do we need to go**? What is the **defined problem**?
    - How will DWR plan to hear from and account for impacts to **disadvantaged communities and Tribal communities**?
    - How specifically **will DWR use the AC**?
    - What level of expertise from members of the public is required to engage?
    - How are we evaluating projects for **funding recommendations**?
    - There were several questions about the **9-MAF target**, and how it is calculated.
    - How do we balance what's possible with **what can be implemented**?
    - What is the strategy to **engage the legislature and new governor**?

Emily then reviewed the Day 2 agenda with the group, and a group photo (below) was taken.

Recess and Group Photo

The meeting recessed at 5:30 PM.