Appendix B: Public Comment Summary

In-Person Public Comments

Public comments were received in-person at the end of Day 2 of the Advisory Committee meeting, at approximately 11:50 a.m. Eight members of the public provided comments summarized in the table below. Full public comment remarks can be viewed on the Day 2 meeting recording.

Name	Public Comment
Kimery Wiltshire, Conveyance West	Regarding AC members' remarks on the importance of natural infrastructure and partnerships, Kimery Wiltshire highlighted the need for the AC to think about ways to slow down runoff water so that it be used to replenish aquifers and protect forestlands. The AC should consider incorporating projects such as meadow restoration, Tribal, and community-led projects into the CWP.
Dennis O'Conner, Mono Lake Committee	Dennis O'Conner cited a section of the California Water Code that speaks to the purpose and scope of the CWP and emphasized the need for strategies that address California's natural resource dependent ecosystems. Regional Forums will elevate this and AC members were advised to get ahead of it. Many non-governmental organizations and environmental justice groups also experience difficulties and barriers to attending these meetings so the AC must think about how those voices will be brought in. In addition to looking at Groundwater Sustainability Plans and Urban Water Management Plans for projects, the AC should look at projects that are not included in agency plans such as non-centralized systems and grey water systems.
David Wilcox, Reach Scale	David Wilcox shared that for California to have access to technology that can aid in addressing water challenges, the AC must look into creating an outcome-based innovation category to require innovations that meet the technology needs of the State. David referred to California's success with the Renewable Portfolio Standard that was developed and required technology to meet new renewable energy standards.
Scott Cantrell, Public Member	Scott Cantrell pointed out that the 9-MAF frequently asked questions (FAQs) contain a double-negative sentence that misconstrued the meaning DWR may have intended: "The target is informed by an estimate of the projected reduction in future water supply loss…" which may suggest an increase. Scott suggested writing it to say:

Name	Public Comment
	"The target is informed by an estimate of the projected future water supply loss…"
David Yow, Internation Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials	David Yow expressed support for the work of the AC and offered to assist with data and industry relationships that will be responsible for implementing projects related to water efficiency and water conservation.
Harold Tapley, Aquos Pools — Pools and Hot Tubs Alliance	Harold Tapley spoke on the opportunity for outdoor water use involving aquatic facility wastewater best management practices. In 2010, a California Water Efficiency Partnership (CalWEP) study identified swimming pool filter backwash as one of the largest single uses of water associated with pools. Across the state, facilities clean their filtration systems and generate wastewater that is discharged and replaced with potable water. In total, that accounts for over 3 billion gallons of water wasted. The impact is then doubled since it must be replaced with potable water. Harold Tapley advocated for aquatic facility reuse to reduce environmental discharge impacts and decrease demand for potable water.
Paul Helliker, Retired General Manager/Director	Paul Helliker noted his contentment with DWR for advancing the action plan approach of SB 72, and expressed gratitude to the DWR and consultant team, supporters of SB 72, and the AC for their time and dedication to helping make the CWP a success. Water agencies prepare multiple plans, and the AC should explore how these plans will be integrated with the CWP planning efforts. The CWP should focus on projects that provide the most benefit for the least cost.
Gary Bobker, Friends of the River	Gary Bobker commented that the 9-MAF reduction should not only look at a reduction in use but also look at how changes in water availability translate to changes in use. It is important to look at both the demand and supply issues. Secondly, though groundwater recharge was highlighted in the AC interactive poll as one of the most promising strategies, groundwater recharge is not an approach that is risk-or cost-free. DWR and the AC should caution against shifting impacts to surface water supplies in attempts to make groundwater systems sustainable. Surface water supplies are not sustainable now. The fear is that we're not just going to divert surface water in very wet conditions, but that surface water diversions will occur when conditions are not dry, which will lead to exacerbated impacts on natural ecosystems, fisheries, and communities dependent on natural water resources. Recharge must be realistic about what is possible and the conditions under which diversions should occur.

Written Public Comments

Written public comments submitted to cwpcom@water.ca.gov by Thursday, May 14, 2026, at 5:00 p.m. are also included here. Five members of the public provided written comments via email.

Email Comment from Sacramento Area Sewer District (SacSewer), Page 1

Docusign Envelope ID: 0811FEC8-4195-8F79-82F6-E93A7F1AAF51

SACRAMENTO AREA SEWER DISTRICT
SERVING YOU 24/7

Administrative Office
10060 Goethe Road
Sacramento, CA 95827
Tel 916.876.6000

EchoWater Facility
8521 Laguna Station Road
Elk Grove, CA 95758
Tel 916.875.9000

May 13, 2026

Submitted electronically via cwpcom@water.ca.gov

The California Water Plan 2028 Advisory Committee
California Department of Water Resources
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Public Comment for Advisory Committee Meeting, May 13 and 14, 2026

Dear Advisory Committee:

The Sacramento Area Sewer District (SacSewer) is pleased to provide comments for your inaugural meeting. We understand the Advisory Committee (AC) will lead in providing recommendations to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) that will inform the development of the California Water Plan (CWP). Implementation of Senate Bill 72 (Caballero, 2025) is a critical step toward transparent and engaging planning for California's precious water resources. SacSewer is very supportive of this effort and strongly believes the State should prioritize strategies, projects, and policies that strengthen local water supply and support recycled water infrastructure.

Strengthening local water supply through sustainable groundwater management is essential in SacSewer's service area and for California's statewide water sustainability efforts. Our Harvest Water project is California's largest agricultural water recycling effort, designed to provide up to 50,000 acre-feet (16 billion gallons) of drought-resistant water annually to farms and habitats in southern Sacramento County by 2027. Harvest Water will reduce reliance on groundwater, allow for aquifer recovery, and enhance riparian and wetland habitats.

Email Comment from Sacramento Area Sewer District (SacSewer), Page 2

SacSewer is a partner and leader in protecting California's Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta); it is a responsibility we take seriously. We are proud to help safeguard water quality, support aquatic ecosystems, and serve millions across California through advanced treatment and environmental stewardship. As part of serving more than 1.6 million people every day, we discharge treated water into the heart of the Delta. We provide sewage collection, treatment, and resource recovery services to a significant portion of the Sacramento Region. We are the second largest sewage collection utility in California, and we own and operate the second largest water resource recovery facility of its kind in the nation, the EchoWater Resource Recovery Facility (EchoWater Facility).

SacSewer appreciates your leadership in developing the CWP, evaluating a range of water supply options for the state, and protecting California's Delta. We look forward to working with you as the CWP moves through its public and transparent process. Please contact Jofil Borja, Environmental Legislative and Regulatory Affairs Manager/Harvest Water Administrative Program Management Office Manager at borjaj@sacsewer.com for any additional information regarding SacSewer and our extensive efforts to be fellow stewards of the Delta.

Sincerely,

Signed by:
Mike Huot
8DF497DF682742D...

Mike Huot
Director of Policy and Planning
Sacramento Area Sewer District

cc: California Water Commission Members

Email Comment From Erika Beyer, Water Resources and Planning Manager

Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority

Dear California Water Plan Team and Advisory Committee Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in and observe the initial California Water Plan 2028 Advisory Committee meeting. I appreciate the significant effort DWR staff, facilitators, and Advisory Committee members are undertaking to develop a more integrated, adaptive, and forward-looking statewide water planning framework.

As a participant in the California Water Plan Technical Work Group (TWG), and from the perspective of regional watershed planning, hydrogeologic analysis, climate resilience planning, and integrated water resources management within Southern California, I wanted to provide several constructive observations and considerations related to discussions during the meeting.

First, I appreciate the emphasis placed on:

- integrated groundwater and surface water planning,
- watershed-scale analysis,
- climate adaptation and hydrologic uncertainty,
- regional engagement,
- and the recognition that implementation barriers are often institutional and operational in addition to technical.

The discussions regarding interconnectedness of California's water systems, changing hydrologic conditions, aging infrastructure, affordability, and the need for adaptive management approaches were particularly valuable and timely.

One topic that may warrant continued discussion as the framework evolves is the proposed use of HUC8-scale watershed delineations as a primary organizing framework for future modeling and planning efforts. While HUC8 boundaries provide a useful hydrologic planning scale, many California water systems, particularly in Southern California, function as highly interconnected operational systems that extend across watershed and jurisdictional boundaries through imported water, groundwater recharge and banking, recycled water, flood control infrastructure, conveyance systems, and water quality management programs.

For regions such as the Santa Ana River Watershed, planning and operational realities are strongly influenced by these interconnected systems. Several comments raised during the Advisory Committee discussions highlighted that there are not always "hard boundaries" between watersheds from an operational or management perspective, and that regions which may appear hydrologically similar can function very differently institutionally, operationally, economically, and hydrogeologically.

As development of the WEAP-based framework progresses, it may be valuable to ensure that:

- inter-regional dependencies,
- imported supplies,
- recharge and reuse operations,
- cross-boundary infrastructure interactions,
- and water quality constraints

are explicitly represented alongside watershed-scale hydrologic analyses and project evaluations.

I also appreciate DWR's acknowledgement that assumptions, project definitions, and evaluation approaches are still under development and may continue to evolve through stakeholder engagement and technical review. Given the importance of these foundational assumptions to future quantitative analyses and long-term planning recommendations, early transparency and iterative technical review of:

- baseline assumptions,
- project screening criteria,
- climate and hydrologic assumptions,
- model structure,
- and treatment of groundwater-surface water interactions

will be important to support technical defensibility, stakeholder confidence, and long-term usability of the planning framework.

From a hydrogeologic and regional planning perspective, groundwater resilience involves not only recharge or storage volumes, but also considerations related to:

- water quality,
- operational recoverability,
- timing and variability of recharge,
- interconnected surface water interactions,
- subsidence and infrastructure constraints,
- and long-term basin response under changing climatic conditions.

Continued integration of these factors into the planning framework will strengthen the technical robustness and practical implementation value of the Water Plan. I also appreciated the discussions regarding regional engagement strategies and the recognition that planning approaches may need to reflect regional differences in hydrology, infrastructure, governance structures, operational realities, and local priorities. The emphasis on iterative engagement, place-based knowledge, and coordination across regions and stakeholder groups is encouraging.

Thank you again for your time, transparency, and willingness to engage collaboratively throughout this process. I look forward to continued participation and technical collaboration through the TWG and future California Water Plan engagement efforts.

As a side note: given my background in hydrogeology, groundwater sustainability, climate resilience planning, groundwater-surface water interaction, recharge, water quality, and regional integrated water resources planning, I would also welcome the opportunity to support future Groundwater Recharge Work Group discussions associated with the California Water Plan process, particularly as DWR continues advancing integration of groundwater and surface water considerations within the statewide planning framework.

Very Respectfully,

Erika Beyer

Water Resources and Planning Manager

Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority

Email Comment from Harold Tapley, Aquos Pools

Harold Tapley provided an attachment to the Pools and Hot Tubs Alliance's (PHTA) Government Relations Advisory Committee White Paper.

Email Comment from Kelley List, Principal, Rincon Consultants

Afternoon,

Great meeting discussion and it is encouraging to hear all the engagement with the AC

team. My questions are:

The Watershed Resilience Plan efforts have demonstrated the value of bringing together all beneficiaries and users of water at the local level, and pairing those efforts with SGMA GSPs has helped address important planning gaps. As the California Water Plan advances these large statewide objectives, how does DWR envision balancing and integrating the growing number of overlapping planning efforts while elevating locally driven solutions, providing funding support to offset implementation costs, and ensuring equitable access to assistance across regions?

And specifically, with the increasing emphasis on groundwater recharge, why is there not greater statewide support for AgMAR projects, which can often be implemented more quickly and with fewer permitting and environmental hurdles than large regional recharge basin projects?

Thank you again!

Kelley

Email Comment from Martha Ture, Resident of Inverness, California

Dear California Water Plan staff,

My name is Martha Ture, and I am a resident of Inverness, California. I have been following California's water issues and plans since 1978, and was involved in the Peripheral Canal matter as an environmental analyst and fisheries biologist. I am writing to ask about the current California Water Plan, as shown on the DWR website.

My initial questions have to do with the stated development of 9 million additional acre-feet of water, with the goal of serving 18 million households.

Can you tell me what the sources of the additional 9 million acre-feet would be? For example, I understand that the proposed Sites Reservoir west of Colusa is intended to hold 1.5 million acre-feet of water. Does the development of this 9 million acre-feet include building additional dams? Does it include increasing the height of existing dams? If the answer to either of these questions is affirmative, can you tell me what percentage of the proposed 9 million acre-feet of additional water would come from more or higher dams?

Can you tell me what percentage of the proposed 9 million additional acre-feet of water would be derived from desalination? Can you tell me what percentage of the proposed 9 million additional acre-feet of water would be derived from conservation, in the forms of purple pipes, changes in agricultural practices, changes in municipal and industrial processes?

As the state of California is currently in a long term state of groundwater overdraft, it is not clear to me how much-needed groundwater recharge can be accounted as any part of an addition 9 million acre-feet; the groundwater recharge presumably would not be used for further development, but only to restore the existing deficit.

Can you explain the meaning of "18 million households?" In Marin County, where I reside, the Marin Water District engineering department uses specific figures for the amount of water to be allocated to different sizes of "households." One lower-income unit uses .22 acre-feet of water per year. a single-family house is calculated to use 1 acre-foot per year. Can you define what sizes of 18 million households the plan proposes to serve?

Thank you kindly, in advance, for your time in providing replies to these questions.

Sincerely,

Martha Ture

Martha Ture's Substack

https://substack.com/@marthature

Mt. Tamalpais Photography

https://mttamalpaisphotos.com

The greatest joy in the world is in restoring the earth