

**Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
State Legislation Matrix 6/12/2017**

<b>Bill Number Author</b>	<b>Amended Date; Location</b>	<b>Title-Summary</b>	<b>MWD Position</b>	<b>Effects on Metropolitan</b>
<p><b>AB 472 Frazier (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: California Waterfowl Association</p>	<p>Amended 3/28/17</p> <p>Senate Rules Committee</p>	<p><b>Water Transfers:</b> Requires Department of Water Resources (DWR) to, without penalty, allow nonirrigated vegetation to remain on land that has been idled for a water transfer, unless it determines, as specified, injury to another legal user of water would result from allowing vegetation to remain. Also creates incentive program for landowners to cultivate or retain nonirrigated vegetation for wildlife habitat.</p>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b> (4/11/17)</p>	<p>Would create new and significant burden on DWR to establish and implement costly habitat creation incentive program that could result in increased water transfer costs and/or redirected costs. Would also make it more difficult for DWR to ensure that purchasers of water transfer supplies and legal users of water are not impacted by water consuming vegetation on fallowed lands.</p>
<p><b>AB 574 Quirk (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: WateReuse California and California Coastkeeper Alliance</p>	<p>Amended 4/18/17</p> <p>Senate Environmental Quality Committee</p> <p>Date of Hearing: 6/21/17</p>	<p><b>Potable Reuse:</b> Promotes water recycling by categorizing potable reuse alternatives and by establishing a clear regulatory pathway and time frame for raw water augmentation.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b> (3/14/17)</p>	<p>By continuing to advance regulatory criteria for various types of potable reuse, AB 574 may accelerate deployment of recycled water projects throughout California.</p>

**Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
State Legislation Matrix 6/12/2017**

Bill Number Author	Amended Date; Location	Title-Summary	MWD Position	Effects on Metropolitan
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AB 732</b> <b>Frazier (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Amended 5/30/17</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Senate Rules Committee</p>	<p><b>Delta Levee Maintenance:</b> Delta levee maintenance program was established for reimbursement of costs incurred in connection with maintenance or improvement of projects or non-project levees in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. AB 732 extends the current 75% state reimbursement rate for Delta levee maintenance costs in excess of \$1,000 per mile, until July 1, 2020.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">based upon prior opposition to SB 554 (Wolk) from 2016</p>	<p>Prior to any further legislative action to extend the state cost share beyond 2020, AB 732 should be amended to direct DWR to enlist an outside entity of sufficient independence and financial expertise to conduct an affordability and benefits assessment for the Delta Levee Subventions Program. It is simply unclear which Delta islands, if any, lack the economic standing to underwrite their own levee maintenance, and whether statewide interests merit a 75 percent public subsidy.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AB 791</b> <b>Frazier (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Amended 3/21/17</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Assembly Appropriations Committee</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Two-Year Bill</p>	<p><b>New Conveyance Facility:</b> Would impose new and unnecessary requirements on “lead agency” (presumably DWR) to provide certain information about costs and benefits of new water delivery system improvements on a water-contractor-by-water-contractor basis <i>before</i> any water contractor could enter any contracts to fund design, construction and mitigation.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">based upon June 2007 Board-adopted Delta Action Plan</p>	<p>Could delay construction of California WaterFix, with no added benefit to the public process or environment.</p>

**Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
State Legislation Matrix 6/12/2017**

<b>Bill Number Author</b>	<b>Amended Date; Location</b>	<b>Title-Summary</b>	<b>MWD Position</b>	<b>Effects on Metropolitan</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AB 792 Frazier (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: Author</p>	<p>Amended 3/28/17</p> <p>Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee</p> <p>Two-Year Bill</p>	<p><b>Delta Plan:</b> Would take unprecedented and unnecessary step of requiring Delta Stewardship Council to affirmatively “grant” a certification of consistency with the Delta Plan before construction of California WaterFix could begin. Council could not “grant” the certification until <u>after</u> State Water Resources Control Board adopts update to 2006 Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <p>based upon June 2007 Board-adopted Delta Action Plan</p>	<p>Delta Reform Act of 2009 recognized need for new Delta conveyance to address declines in water supply reliability and the Delta ecosystem. Likewise, the Governor’s California Water Action Plan calls for new Delta conveyance, among a suite of other measures, to further the coequal goals, and to restore water supply reliability to millions of Californians. AB 792 is at odds with both.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AB 793 Frazier (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: Author</p>	<p>Amended 3/27/17</p> <p>Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee</p> <p>Two-Year Bill</p>	<p><b>Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta – Financing:</b> Would declare it state policy that the <u>existing</u> Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta be recognized and defined as an integral component of California's water infrastructure. Would state also that the maintenance and repair of Delta are eligible for same forms of financing as other water collection and treatment infrastructure and specifies that eligible maintenance and repair activities be limited to certain cleanup-and-abatement-related restoration and conservation activities.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <p>based upon June 2007 Board-adopted Delta Action Plan</p>	<p>Ignores the fact that the Delta, in its <u>current</u> state, has not been developed as a “water collection or treatment facility.” The current configuration of levees was largely completed in the early 20th century to reclaim swamp and overflow land for farming or other uses. Thus, the declaration of intent is contrary to reality and is not a sound basis for infrastructure financing.</p>

**Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
State Legislation Matrix 6/12/2017**

<b>Bill Number Author</b>	<b>Amended Date; Location</b>	<b>Title-Summary</b>	<b>MWD Position</b>	<b>Effects on Metropolitan</b>
<p><b>AB 869 Rubio (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: Author</p>	<p>Amended 5/15/17</p> <p>Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee</p> <p>Date of Hearing: 6/27/17</p>	<p><b>Recycled Water:</b> Excludes recycled water from the calculation of any water use or water use efficiency target established after 2020.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b> based upon Board-adopted legislative policy priorities dated 5/8/17</p>	<p>Metropolitan recognizes that recycled water is an efficient use and should be treated as such in any new water use efficiency targets. This will encourage continued development of recycling and potable reuse projects as called for through the State’s Recycled Water Task Force recommendations to develop 1.5 million acre-feet of recycled water by 2030.</p>
<p><b>AB 968 Rubio (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: Regional Water Authority and Irvine Ranch Water District</p>	<p>Amended 4/17/17</p> <p>Assembly Appropriations Committee</p> <p>Two-Year Bill</p>	<p><b>Water Use Efficiency Targets:</b> Defines “water efficiency target” as a target developed by an urban retail water supplier for 2025 water efficiency in its 2020 urban water management plan. Requires each urban retail water supplier to adopt one of three methods for determining water efficiency targets. Maintains the existing exclusion of recycled water from the calculation of base daily per capita water use. Requires Dept. of Water Resources, in consultation with the State Water Resources Control Board, to, by July 1, 2018, convene a task force for the purposes of recommending appropriate performance measures for the commercial, industrial and institutional sectors.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b> based upon Board-adopted legislative policy priorities dated 5/8/17</p>	<p>Preserves the legislative process for setting water-use efficiency goals and recognizes the role of state agencies to implement a detailed framework consistent with the goals. Supports multiple compliance methods that includes a water-budget based target-setting approach in addition to other methods that could be customized to unique local conditions and could be equally effective in reducing water use.</p>

**Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
State Legislation Matrix 6/12/2017**

<b>Bill Number Author</b>	<b>Amended Date; Location</b>	<b>Title-Summary</b>	<b>MWD Position</b>	<b>Effects on Metropolitan</b>
<p><b>AB 1323 Weber (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: San Diego County Water Authority</p>	<p>Amended 5/30/17</p> <p>Senate Rules Committee</p>	<p><b>Water Efficiency Targets:</b> Requires the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to convene a stakeholder workgroup no later than February 1, 2019, to recommend new water use targets for urban water suppliers. Does not require DWR to convene a stakeholder workgroup if a statute establishing water conservation targets and long-term drought contingency planning for urban water suppliers is chaptered in the 2017-2018 Regular Session.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b> based upon Board-adopted legislative policy priorities dated 5/8/17</p>	<p>Metropolitan supports state agency implementation of a framework consistent with the water use efficiency goals set by the Legislature by working through a stakeholder process to ensure the goals are met in a way that recognizes the unique challenges of agencies throughout California.</p>
<p><b>AB 1427 Eggman (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: Stockton-East Water District</p>	<p>Amended 3/21/17</p> <p>Assembly Appropriations Committee</p> <p>Two-Year Bill</p>	<p><b>Water – Underground Storage:</b> Amends Water Code Section 1242 to declare that storing water underground, including diverting surface water for storage, for purposes including, but not limited to, protection of water quality or recovery of groundwater levels, are beneficial uses. Also states that existing forfeiture provisions for non-use of water for a period of longer than five years would not apply.</p>	<p><b>OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED</b> based upon prior opposition to AB 647 (Eggman) from 2015</p>	<p>Must include safeguards to ensure that permanent underground storage is implemented in reasonable manner. SWRCB must confirm that flows are not already otherwise appropriated or diverted at times when federal Central Valley Project and State Water Project are required to release supplemental project water to meet water quality objectives in Delta watershed. Additional amendments are necessary to ensure alignment with Groundwater Management Sustainability Act of 2014.</p>

**Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
State Legislation Matrix 6/12/2017**

<b>Bill Number Author</b>	<b>Amended Date; Location</b>	<b>Title-Summary</b>	<b>MWD Position</b>	<b>Effects on Metropolitan</b>
<p><b>AB 1654 Rubio (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: Regional Water Authority and Irvine Ranch Water District</p>	<p>Amended 3/28/17</p> <p>Senate Rules Committee</p>	<p><b>Drought Contingency Planning:</b> Would require each urban retail water supplier to conduct an annual water shortage contingency analysis and implement certain actions and reporting when a water shortage is determined. Proposes changes to the Urban Water Management Planning Act, which would require urban water suppliers, as part of their five-year water supply planning and reporting, to include a detailed description of their water shortage contingency analysis, related actions and monitoring processes.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b> based upon Board-adopted legislative policy priorities dated 5/8/17</p>	<p>Preserves local and regional decision-making and control in determining actions to avoid shortage or mitigate shortage impacts. Supports inclusion of all available sources of water supplies and water management actions by urban water suppliers to mitigate water shortage impacts to customers.</p>
<p><b>AB 1668 Friedman (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: Author</p>	<p>Amended 4/18/17</p> <p>Senate Rules Committee</p>	<p><b>Drought Contingency Planning:</b> Would require each urban water supplier to conduct an annual water shortage contingency analysis and implement certain actions and reporting when a water shortage is determined. Also proposes changes to the Urban Water Management Planning Act (UWMP) which would require urban water suppliers, as part of their five-year water supply planning and report, to include a detailed description of their water shortage contingency analysis, related actions and monitoring processes.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT IF AMENDED</b> based upon Board-adopted legislative policy priorities dated 5/8/17</p>	<p>AB 1668 is consistent, in part, with the policy priorities adopted by Metropolitan’s board. There are specific provisions, however, that require revisions to merit full support. The bill does not preserve local and regional decision-making and control in determining actions to avoid shortage or mitigate shortage impacts. The bill also calls for creating a year-long challenge period for UWMPs and water shortage contingency plans. This is well in excess of the current 90-day period and is unnecessary considering that the state must review and certify all submitted plans.</p>

**Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
State Legislation Matrix 6/12/2017**

<b>Bill Number Author</b>	<b>Amended Date; Location</b>	<b>Title-Summary</b>	<b>MWD Position</b>	<b>Effects on Metropolitan</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AB 1669</b> <b>Friedman (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Amended 4/18/17</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Assembly Appropriations Committee</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Two-Year Bill</p>	<p><b>Water Use Efficiency Targets:</b> Requires the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), in consultation with the Department of Water Resources (DWR), to adopt long-term standards for urban water conservation and water use by May 20, 2021. Specifically, this bill requires the long-term standard to include indoor residential water use, outdoor irrigation water use, as specified, and industrial, institutional and commercial water use. Allows the SWRCB, in consultation with DWR, to adopt and update interim standards for urban water conservation and water use.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED</b> based upon Board-adopted legislative policy priorities dated 5/8/17</p>	<p>AB 1669, in many areas, conflicts with the policy priorities adopted by Metropolitan’s board. The bill grants authority to a state agency to issue interim standards through emergency regulations outside of a Governor-declared emergency. The bill does not protect existing water rights; provides for only one compliance path; fails to recognize recycled water as an efficient use of water; and proposes water use reduction targets for the commercial, industrial and institutional sector rather than pursuing a performance-based approach.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SB 80</b> <b>Wieckowski (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Amended 2/14/17</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Assembly Natural Resources Committee</p>	<p><b>California Environmental Quality Act:</b> Provides specified notice requirements regarding posting on websites and sending notices via email pursuant to CEQA. Also makes filing a Notice of Determination mandatory for a project subject to a categorical exemption.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED</b> based upon January 2017 Board-adopted State Legislative Priorities</p>	<p>Would require public agencies to prepare, file and post on the internet dozens, if not hundreds, of additional Notices of Exemption every month for every discretionary action that would cause any change in the physical environment, regardless how insignificant.</p>

**Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
State Legislation Matrix 6/12/2017**

<b>Bill Number Author</b>	<b>Amended Date; Location</b>	<b>Title-Summary</b>	<b>MWD Position</b>	<b>Effects on Metropolitan</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SB 224 Jackson (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: Environmental Defense Center and the Planning and Conservation League</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Amended 4/5/17</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Senate Appropriations Committee</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Two-Year Bill</p>	<p><b>California Environmental Quality Act:</b> Would require Office of Planning and Research to prepare, and Secretary of CA Natural Resources Agency to adopt, CEQA guidelines to make exceptions to general rule that environmental review should focus on each project’s impacts on the existing physical environment. Lead agencies undertaking their own projects, and project proponents seeking permits, funding or other discretionary approvals from lead agencies, would be required to analyze every proposed project’s impacts relative to an environmental condition that no longer existed at any site where unpermitted, illegal or previous emergency response actions occurred.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>OPPOSE</b> based upon January 2017 Board-adopted State Legislative Priorities</p>	<p>SB 224 is at odds with the fundamental precept of CEQA as a forward-looking statute. Lead agencies that undertake their own projects could be required to mitigate for environmental harms committed by others, which is inequitable and fails to deter bad actors.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SB 231 Hertzberg (D)</b></p> <p>Sponsor: Water Foundation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Amended 4/19/17</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Assembly Local Government Committee</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Date of Hearing: 6/14/17</p>	<p><b>Local Government - Fees and Charges:</b> Provides a definition of ”sewer” that predates Proposition 218 and treats fees for stormwater like all other water and sewer fees. Seeks to clarify where stormwater and flood control systems may overlap with water and sewer systems for which Proposition 218 requires a lower approval threshold. SB 231 does not change the CA Constitution’s mandate for rigorous oversight of water and sewer fees, including reports, hearings and protest votes.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SUPPORT</b> (4/11/17)</p>	<p>Stormwater is an important source of local water supply and careful management is necessary to reduce pollution. Currently, property-related fees to fund stormwater and flood control programs, not associated with water supply, require a higher approval standard than property-related fees for other water services.</p>