

Date of Hearing: April 14, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WATER, PARKS, AND WILDLIFE

Diane Papan, Chair

AB 2215 (Calderon) – As Amended March 19, 2026

SUBJECT: Water rights: permits: State Water Project

SUMMARY: Extends the time periods to put water appropriated under six water right permits held by Department of Water Resources (DWR) for the State Water Project (SWP) to beneficial use until December 31, 2085. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Extends the time periods under water right permits number 16477, 16478, 16479, 16480, 16481, and 16482 (held by DWR for SWP) to put water to beneficial use until December 31, 2085.
- 2) Clarifies that this bill shall not be construed as an approval for any proposed modification of the physical facilities of SWP, including the Delta Conveyance Project.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Requires a permit holder to put water under the right to beneficial use. If the water right holder does not do so, the right to use water under the right ceases (Water Code § 1240).
- 2) Provides that if a water right holder fails to put all or any part of the water claimed under the right to beneficial use for a period of five years, the right to the unused water shall revert to the public. Requires that the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) must provide notice to a water right holder and make a finding before revoking a water right (Water Code § 1241).
- 3) Provides that a permit to use water shall be effective for such time as the water actually appropriated under it is used for a useful and beneficial purpose (Water Code § 1390).
- 4) Provides that construction of any infrastructure necessary to convey water appropriated under a permit shall begin within 60 days of the issuance of the permit (Water Code § 1395).
- 5) Requires a permittee to exercise due diligence in developing diversion works to put water appropriated under the permit to beneficial use (Water Code § 1396).
- 6) Provides that construction of diversion works and the application of water to beneficial use shall be in accordance with the period specified in a permit (Water Code § 1397).
- 7) Provides that the State Water Board may extend the period specified in a permit for construction of infrastructure or application of water to beneficial use if the permittee demonstrates good cause. Provides that the State Water Board may revoke a permit after a hearing on a petition to extend the time periods under a permit if it finds that work on infrastructure has not been commenced with due diligence or that water appropriated under a permit has not been put to beneficial use (Water Code § 1398).

- 8) Requires a permittee to immediately report to the State Water Board when diversion works have been completed and water under a permit has been put to beneficial use (Water Code § 1600).
- 9) Requires the State Water Board to make a full inspection and examination of the construction of diversion works and application of water to beneficial use upon a report of completion from a permittee (Water Code § 1605).
- 10) Requires the State Water Board to issue a license to a permittee if it determines that the permittee has complied with the terms of the permit and put the water appropriated under the permit to beneficial use (Water Code § 1610).

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown. This bill is keyed fiscal.

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Purpose of this bill.** According to the author, this bill is necessary to avoid uncertainty and allow more time for DWR to complete infrastructure for SWP that will allow DWR to perfect its water right permits:

“[DWR] is responsible for operating and maintaining the SWP, and has been diligently working under a permit allowing DWR to enhance their capacity to appropriate water from the SWP – often referred as ‘perfecting’ a water right. Projecting the need for more time, DWR began proactively seeking an extension from the [State Water Board] to continue perfecting their water rights in 2009. Despite an updated request in 2025, DWR’s requests have gone unprocessed. Without an extension, the State Water Board could limit DWR’s water rights to current levels, which will not meet the growing demand for water and will hinder DWR’s ability to address climate change.”

- 2) **Background.** Since the passage of the Water Commission Act of 1913, the licensing and permitting system now administered by the State Water Board (the Water Commission and State Water Rights Board were predecessors to the State Water Board) is the exclusive way to obtain an appropriative right to use surface water. The Water Commission Act is the genesis of an important distinction in California water rights: pre-1914 and post-1914 water rights. Water rights issued prior to the passage of the Water Commission Act were recognized by and valid under the Act (pre-1914 rights), new water rights after the Act are subject to state approval (post-1914 rights). The doctrine of prior appropriation (“first in time, first in right”) governs surface water rights in California. “An individual who first appropriates and uses water for a reasonable, beneficial purpose has a right that is superior to that of later appropriators.”¹ Under the doctrine of prior appropriation, junior water right holders can be prevented from using water under their rights until the needs of senior water right holders are met.

Permitting and licensing. Acquisition of a post-1914 appropriative water right consists of two main phases: (1) permitting and (2) licensing. Permitting is the process of filing an application to request that the State Water Board authorize the development of a water

¹ Arthur L. Littleworth and Eric L. Garner, *California Water, 3rd Edition* (Point Arena: Solano Press Books, 2019), p. 49.

diversion project. A permit provides the legal authorization to develop the project and divert water in accordance with conditions and within a time schedule. Licensing is the process of reviewing a permitted project that is complete to confirm the amount of water put to beneficial use and that the permit conditions were met. A license is the final confirmation of the water right and remains effective as long as the license conditions are met and beneficial use continues. The issuance of a license is colloquially referred to as “perfecting” a water right.

Conditions in a permit may include deadlines for the construction and completion of diversion works (e.g., conveyance) because infrastructure must be built in order for the permittee to put water under the permit to beneficial use. The State Water Board may revoke some or all of the right to use the water subject to a permit during the permit development period if the permittee has not put water under the permit to beneficial use. In cases where the deadlines in a permit have passed, referred to as an “expired permit,” the permit can still be used as an authorization to divert water. However, only the amounts, including storage amounts, diversion rates, and amounts put to beneficial use, prior to the permit deadlines can be diverted and used under the expired permit. Use of a permit cannot be expanded after the permit deadlines, and any expanded use will not be included as part of the licensing process.

Permit extensions. To avoid loss of the use of all or a portion of the water appropriated under a permit, a permittee may request that the State Water Board extend the time periods under a permit; however, the permittee must demonstrate that they have pursued putting water under the permit to beneficial use with due diligence.² A party requesting a time extension may be required to complete an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to assess the environmental impacts of a project, and alternatives, necessary to put unused water under a permit to beneficial use.

SWP. DWR is also responsible for managing SWP, “a multi-purpose water storage and delivery system that extends more than 705 miles” and encompasses a collection of canals, pipelines, reservoirs, and hydroelectric power facilities that delivers clean water to 27 million Californians, 750,000 acres of farmland, and businesses throughout California. SWP collects surface water from the northern part of the state in its largest reservoir, Lake Oroville, and transports that water south through rivers, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, and the California Aqueduct to 29 cities, counties, and water districts that have contracts with SWP. DWR delivers a percentage of water to its contractors depending on hydrologic conditions and forecasted runoff.

There are currently 29 contractors with SWP [i.e., the State Water Contractors (SWC)]; their contracts grant them up to 4.2 million acre-feet (AF) of water annually (Table A water) depending on hydrologic conditions. Since 2000, SWP has delivered the full 4.2 million AF (a 100% allocation) to SWC in only two years, 2006 and 2023. As of 2017, DWR estimates total capital expenditures for SWP of \$9.5 billion and \$16.1 billion in operations, maintenance, and replacement costs. These costs are primarily paid by SWC and other water users for water supply. The contracts have a term until 2085.

The contractors request an amount of their contracted water on October 1st (the beginning of

² Ibid, 56.

the “water year”) and DWR issues an initial percentage allocation around the beginning of December indicating how much water DWR anticipates, based on hydrologic conditions, it will be able to deliver to contractors in the remainder of the year. This initial allocation is typically adjusted three to four times over the winter and early spring as the total precipitation for the year becomes clearer. As an example, for water year 2024, DWR announced an initial allocation of 10% due to low reservoir storage and relatively dry conditions through November of 2023. As conditions improved and precipitation was in the “normal” range through early 2024, DWR increased the allocation to 30% in March 2024 and then to 40% in April 2024, the final allocation for the 2024 water year.

SWP water right permits. This bill applies to six water right permits held by DWR for the SWP. Permits 16477 and 16480 are primarily for power generation at the Oroville/Thermalito Complex (non-consumptive uses) and the others (16478, 16479, 16481, and 16482) are primarily for water supply purposes that authorize DWR to divert and redivert water in the Feather River and Delta channels. Regarding allowable water diversion under the six permits affected by this bill, DWR states (in the 2009 petition for extension of time):

DWR can divert and redivert up to 10,350 cubic feet per second (cfs) at the Banks Pumping Plant for direct use and storage from January 1 to December 31 of each year. DWR can also divert up to 3,880,000 acre-feet per year (AFY) of water to storage in Lake Oroville between September 1 and July 31 and up to an additional 1,186,100 AFY to storage in San Luis Reservoir and the other southern California reservoirs January 1 through December 31 for multiple uses in the SWP service area. DWR’s ability to divert and store water at the maximum rates authorized in the permits is dependent on annual hydrologic conditions, in-basin demands, instream requirements, water quality objectives, and operational and regulatory restrictions.

Further details on each permit are as follows:

- **Permit 16477.** Issued September 26, 1972.
 - Face value: 5,882,229 (AF).
 - Source: Feather River.
 - Priority date: 1927.
 - Beneficial use(s): power, recreational, and fish and wildlife preservation and enhancement.
 - Deadline for completion of construction work: December 31, 2000 [originally December 1, 1980 (extended in July 1991)].
 - Complete application of water to beneficial use: December 31, 2009 [originally December 31, 1990 (extended in July 1991)].
- **Permit 16478.** Issued September 26, 1972.
 - Face value: 1,393,568 AF.*
 - Source: Feather River.
 - Priority date: 1927.
 - Beneficial use(s): other (salinity control), irrigation, municipal, fish and wildlife preservation and enhancement, industrial, power, recreational, and domestic.
 - Deadline for completion of construction work: December 31, 2000 [originally December 1, 1980 (extended in July 1991)].

- Complete application of water to beneficial use: by December 31, 2009 [originally December 1, 1990 (extended in July 1991)].
- **Permit 16479**. Issued September 26, 1972.
 - Face value: 9,004,510 AF.*
 - Source: Feather River, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Channels.
 - Priority date: August 24, 1951.
 - Beneficial use(s): domestic, industrial, recreational, power, municipal, fish and wildlife preservation and enhancement, and irrigation.
 - Deadline for completion of construction work: December 31, 2000 [originally December 1, 1980 (extended in July 1991)].
 - Complete application of water to beneficial use: by December 31, 2009 [originally December 1, 1990 (extended in July 1991)].
- **Permit 16480**. Issued September 26, 1972.
 - Face value: 11,463,752 AF.
 - Source: Feather River.
 - Priority date: August 24, 1951.
 - Beneficial use(s): power, recreational, and fish and wildlife preservation and enhancement.
 - Deadline for completion of construction work: December 31, 2000 [originally December 1, 1980 (extended in July 1991)].
 - Complete application of water to beneficial use: by December 31, 2009 [originally December 1, 1990 (extended in July 1991)].
- **Permit 16481**. Issued September 26, 1972.
 - Face value: 1,575,212 AF.*
 - Source: Italian Slough, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Channels.
 - Priority date: August 25, 1951.
 - Beneficial use(s): other (salinity control), domestic, municipal, industrial, recreational, power, and fish and wildlife preservation and enhancement.
 - Deadline for completion of construction work: December 31, 2000 [originally December 1, 1980 (extended in July 1991)].
 - Complete application of water to beneficial use: by December 31, 2009 [originally December 1, 1990 (extended in July 1991)].
- **Permit 16482**. Issued September 26, 1972.
 - Face value: 1,100,000 AF.*
 - Source: Italian Slough, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Channels, and San Luis Creek.
 - Priority date: March 15, 1957.
 - Beneficial use(s): power, municipal, domestic, irrigation, fish and wildlife preservation and enhancement, industrial, recreational, other (salinity control).
 - Deadline for completion of construction work: December 31, 2000 [originally December 1, 1980 (extended in July 1991)].
 - Complete application of water to beneficial use: by December 31, 2009 [originally December 1, 1990 (extended in July 1991)].

*These four permits all contain term 0000114 that stipulates “the total quantity of water to be appropriated by storage from the Feather River under ... [permits 16477, 16478, 16479, and 16480] shall not exceed 3,880,000 [AF] per annum.”

2009 DWR petitions for time extension on SWP permits. In 2009, DWR filed six petitions requesting a five-year extension for the six permits affected by this bill because the project associated with the permits was not yet complete. In its petition for extension of permits 16478, 16479, 16481, and 16482, DWR offers the following rationale for the extension: “the initial conservation and transportation facilities were essentially completed in 1973, however, other facilities have been constructed, are under construction, or are planned to accommodate existing and anticipated demand for SWP water and to minimize impacts of SWP operations.” Additionally, DWR indicated that SWP is a large and complex system “and as such it is difficult to separate water diverted under the provisions of specific individual permits.” Finally, DWR stated it could not determine when construction would be complete nor when all water under the permits would be put to beneficial use, though it did state “it is clear, however, that demand exists for the additional SWP water supply and is expected to grow as demand continues to increase in the SWP contractors’ service area.”

The 2009 petitions note that maximum annual diversion to storage from the Feather River at Lake Oroville was 2,488,607 AF during the 1977-78 water year (compared to a maximum permitted diversion of 3,880,000 AF). Likewise, in the petition to extend permits 16477 and 16480, DWR indicates “the maximum rate of direct diversion at the Oroville/Thermalito Complex for power generation was 17,888 [cubic feet per second] on March 25, 1995, plant capacity.” DWR acknowledges in both petitions that additional time extensions would likely be needed in the future: “DWR may need to petition for further extensions of said permits.” DWR and the State Water Board disagreed on whether an EIR was required for the 2009 petitions. DWR noted that issuance of the permits pre-dated CEQA and that DWR was not required to complete an EIR for its petitions for extension of time in 1991. As a result, DWR never prepared an EIR for the 2009 petitions and due to other priorities and workload, the State Water Board never approved or denied the 2009 petitions. DWR withdrew the 2009 petitions in August 2024 and subsequently submitted a new, single petition for time extension for all six permits in January 2025.

2025 DWR petition for time extension on SWP permits. DWR filed a new, single petition with the State Water Board for a time extension on permits 16477, 16478, 16479, 16480, 16481, and 16482 on January 1, 21, 2025. The 2025 petition updates the 2009 petitions and requests a 76-year time extension from 2009 to 2085, similar to the time extension in this bill. DWR indicates that due to updated methodology, the maximum diversion to storage in Lake Oroville to date is 2.6 million acre-feet (MAF) in 1977-78 and the maximum diversion and re-diversion from the Jones pumping plant in the southern Delta to date is 4.043 MAF in 2005. DWR issued a notice of preparation of an EIR and scoping meeting for the petition to comply with CEQA on September 30, 2025. The EIR is intended to be used by the State Water Board in issuing a decision on the petition.

Pending change petition for Delta Conveyance Project. In February 2024 DWR submitted a petition for change to the State Water Board on four of the six permits addressed by this bill: permits 16478, 16479, 16481, and 16482. The change petition seeks to add two new points of diversion and re-diversion with a combined maximum rate of 6,000 cubic feet per second in the North Delta to implement the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. The petition was

transferred to the Administrative Hearings Office of the State Water Board in June 2024 and the hearing is currently underway. Protestants to the change petition have raised the issue of the expired SWP permits addressed by this bill in the hearing.

Proposed 2025 Delta Conveyance trailer bill. In May 2025, the Newsom Administration proposed trailer bill language for inclusion in the 2025–26 Budget that would have expedited various permitting processes for, and responded to legal challenges to, the Delta Conveyance Project. One provision of the proposed trailer bill was similar to this bill in that it dealt with SWP water rights. The trailer bill declared the permits held by DWR for SWP “shall not be subject to permit requirements” nor “subject to revocation” pursuant to existing State Water Board processes. Further, the proposed trailer bill stated: “It is the intent of the Legislature that those permits are perpetual until determined by [DWR] to no longer be necessary for the purposes of [SWP].” The Budget Committees in both the Senate and Assembly rejected the Delta Conveyance Project trailer bill language and deferred the issues to the policy bill process. While this bill does not propose to make SWP water permits perpetual, the 76-year extension effectively achieves a similar outcome.

- 3) **Policy consideration.** The Committee may wish to take into account the following considerations as it deliberates this bill:
- *Is a 76-year extension appropriate?* This bill grants DWR 76 additional years to perfect six of the water rights it holds for SWP. As discussed above, in 1991, the State Water Board previously granted DWR a 20-year extension to complete construction of diversion works and a 19-year extension to put water under these six permits to beneficial use. These six permits are currently “expired” permits and some action is likely necessary to ensure sufficient water supply for roughly 27 million Californians and 750,000 acres of farmland. SWC argues the 76-year extension is appropriate given that their contracts for SWP water run until 2085; however, the 76-year extension far exceeds the previous extension granted in 1991 and DWR’s request for a five-year extension in 2009.
 - *Setting a precedent?* There are dozens of other petitions for extension of time pending before the State Water Board. If the Legislature extends these six permits, will other permittees follow? And, is it appropriate for the Legislature to take an action that has heretofore been the domain of an administrative agency? This bill, in effect, perfects the six water rights listed by legislative fiat. It is understandable that SWC are frustrated by the long delay in dealing with a petition for a time extension for the six permits affected by this bill, but other permittees will certainly take note if this bill is enacted. What would stop other permittees from pursuing legislation to grant themselves a time extension?
- 4) **Proposed Committee amendments.** To address the policy considerations raised above, the Committee may wish to request that the author consider the following amendments:

Amendment 1

Add legislative finding that DWR has exercised due diligence in working to put the water permitted to beneficial use:

The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(a) The State Water Project is critical infrastructure that serves 27 million Californians and 750,000 acres of farmland. The State Water Project is necessary to maintain California's economy and quality of life.

(b) Climate change has caused unprecedented challenges for the State Water Project, including a diminished snowpack leading to reduced water runoff and changes in the timing of runoff, severe drought, groundwater overdraft causing land subsidence, and extreme atmospheric rivers causing flooding.

(c) To address the impacts of climate change, the Department of Water Resources must modernize the State Water Project by updating its long-term operation guidelines, planning a new point of diversion for a North Bay Aqueduct Project, working to develop additional water storage south of the Delta to capture wet year surplus water for drought-year supplies, and working to construct the Delta Conveyance Project. Together these efforts will enable the Department of Water Resources to put the water appropriated under permits 16477, 16478, 16479, 16480, 16481, and 16482 to beneficial use in the future.

(d) A time extension for permits 16477, 16478, 16479, 16480, 16481, and 16482 is necessary to allow the Department of Water Resources to complete these planning efforts and projects to modernize the State Water Project and make it resilient to climate change.

(e) The Department of Water Resources has proceeded with due diligence and good cause has been shown for the extension of time contained in this act.

Amendment 2

Add legislative intent that this bill is due to special circumstances and not intended to establish a precedent for other water right permits or for future extensions of SWP permits:

(f) Due to the unique circumstances pertaining to the State Water Project, this act does not set a precedent for any other permit issued by the State Water Resources Control Board.

(g) It is the intent of the Legislature that the State Water Resources Control Board retain its full authority to administer and enforce permits 16477, 16478, 16479, 16480, 16481, and 16482 and that any future time extension for these permits be considered by the State Water Resources Control Board through existing administrative processes.

Amendment 3

Limit the time extension to 20 years, consistent with the previous petition for time extension obtained by DWR:

Water Code § 1398...(b) (1) The time periods for application of water to beneficial use and for the completion of construction work for water right permits numbered 16477, 16478, 16479, 16480, 16481, and 16482 held by the Department of Water Resources for the operation of the State Water Project shall be December 31, 20~~8~~**546**.

- 5) **Arguments in support.** SWC is the sponsor of this bill and asserts that “SWP is the nation’s largest state-owned water and power generator and user-financed water system, and it plays a critical role in addressing climate change, helping California manage its water supply during

extremes such as flood and drought.” SWC argues that “DWR has been diligently pursuing the development of its existing SWP water rights. Over several decades, DWR has constructed 36 water storage facilities, 21 pumping plants, five hydroelectric power plants, four pumping-generating plants, and approximately 700 miles of canals, tunnels, and pipelines.” Further, SWC contends “Without the full development of the SWP water rights, rates may increase for 27 million Californians, water supply reliability is less certain, and the SWP risks an investment that cannot be fully realized. Unfortunately, the full development of the SWP’s water rights has been hindered by circumstances outside of DWR’s control, making [this bill] necessary. Giving DWR more time to develop its already approved water rights addresses water availability and affordability for the vast majority of the state and is clearly in the public’s interest.”

- 6) **Arguments in opposition.** The Delta Counties Coalition (Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo) opposes this bill arguing that it is unfair to other water right holders, interferes with the ongoing water rights hearings on the Delta Conveyance Project change petition, and will jeopardize the health of the Delta. The Delta Counties Coalition states: “This change would make SWP water rights subject to a completely different set of rules than any other water rights in the state. While others must show good cause to the State Water Board for their rights to be extended, [DWR] would be allowed to construct and expand its water rights decades after those time periods elapsed (in 2000 and 2009, respectively). This is unfair to other water users and moreover jeopardizes the health of the Bay Delta estuary.” The Delta Counties Coalition notes that the EIR for the petition for time extension has not been completed and asserts “there is every reason for the largest water rights decision in modern history to follow the normal public permit extension process. To provide a special legislative carveout for the SWP and the Delta Tunnel would be unfair not only to those communities most impacted by this megaproject, but also to water rights holders and applicants throughout the state that continue to be obliged to follow normal procedures.”

The Defenders of Wildlife (DOW) also oppose this bill arguing it “gives preferential treatment to [SWC], and would set a bad precedent for water right permits going forward. All water rights holders should be held to the same standard.” Further DOW maintains, that despite language in this bill providing it does not authorize the controversial Delta Conveyance Project, this bill is connected to approval of the Delta Conveyance Project because “the extension is a necessary requirement for [DWR] and SWCs to pursue construction projects” like the Delta Conveyance Project.

- 7) **Related legislation.** SB 224 (Hurtado) of 2025 would have required DWR to update its water supply forecasting models and procedures to address the effects of climate change, and to implement a formal policy and procedures for documenting its operational plans and rationale for its operating procedures. SB 224 was vetoed by the Governor:

This bill would require [DWR] to update its water supply forecasting models and procedures to address the effects of climate change.

This bill is in response to an audit request in 2022 that incorrectly claimed the DWR overestimated the amount of water expected to run off from the Sierra Nevada and prematurely released over 700,000 acre-feet of water in 2021. The resulting State Auditor report indeed found no unnecessary release of water, but stated that DWR did not

adequately account for climate change in its water supply forecasts. In June of this year, DWR submitted its final report to the State Auditor, identifying in detail how it has implemented the Auditor's recommendations, including additional climate change modeling.

I am satisfied with DWR's response to this audit and with its ongoing work to model climate change, particularly rain and snowfall, across California. As a result, this bill is unnecessary.

SB 231 (Hurtado) of 2023 was very similar to SB 224 of 2025 and would have required DWR to adopt a new water supply forecasting methodology, put in place a formal process to evaluate the accuracy of such methodology, and develop a long-term plan for responding to and mitigating drought by December 31, 2025. SB 231 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

State Water Contractors (sponsor)
Agricultural Council of California
Alameda County Water District
Antelope Valley East Kern Water Agency
Associated General Contractors of California
Association of California Cities - Orange County
Burbank Water and Power
CalAsian Chamber of Commerce
California Alliance for Jobs
California Building Industry Association
California Business Roundtable
California Chamber of Commerce
California Farm Bureau Federation
California Forever, Inc.
California Multicultural Business Alliance
California State Council of Laborers
California Water Association
Calleguas Municipal Water District
Central Coast Water Authority
Chino Valley Chamber of Commerce
City of Torrance
Coachella Valley Water District
Construction Industry Coalition on Water Quality
Crestline-lake Arrowhead Water Agency
Cucamonga Valley Water District
Desert Water Agency
Dudley Ridge Water District
Eastern Municipal Water District
Foothill Municipal Water District
Gateway Chamber Alliance

Greater West Covina Business Association
Groundswell for Water Justice
Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Irvine Ranch Water District
Kern County Water Agency
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Mesa Water District
Metropolitan Water District of Orange County
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Milk Producers Council
Mojave Water Agency
Moreno Valley Chamber of Commerce
Municipal Water District of Orange County
Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
New California Coalition
North San Diego Business Chamber of Commerce
Norwalk Chamber of Commerce
Orange County Business Council
Palmdale Water District
Pasadena Water and Power
Rancho California Water District
San Bernardino Valley Water District
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership
San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District
San Geronio Pass Water Agency
Santa Clara Valley Water District
Santa Clarita Valley Water District
Secure Water Alliance
Solano County Water Agency
Southern California Contractors Association
Southern California Leadership Council
Southern California Water Coalition
Southwest California Legislative Council
State Building and Construction Trades Council of California
Three Valleys Municipal Water District
Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce
Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District
Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District
Valley Industry and Commerce Association
West Basin Municipal Water District
West Valley Water District
West Ventura County Business Alliance
Western Growers Association
Western Municipal Water District
Western Riverside Council of Governments
Zone 7 Water Agency

Opposition

California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
California Water Impact Network
Central Delta Water Agency
Clean Earth 4 Kids
County of Sacramento
Defenders of Wildlife
Delta Counties Coalition
Friends of Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge
Friends of the River
Golden State Salmon Association
Reclamation District 150
Resource Renewal Institute
Restore the Delta
San Francisco Baykeeper
Sierra Club of California
Winnemem Wintu Tribe

Analysis Prepared by: Pablo Garza / W., P., & W. / (916) 319-2096