

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.

State Water Project (SWP). The Department of Water Resources (DWR) is also responsible for managing the 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. The 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 the SWP. DWR delivers a percentage of water to its contractors depending on hydrologic conditions and forecasted runoff.

There are currently 29 contractors with the SWP [i.e., the State Water Contractors (SWC)]; their contracts grant them up to 4.2 million acre-feet (AF) of water annually (known as Table A water) depending on hydrologic conditions. Since 2000, the 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 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.

² Ibid, 56.

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 the 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.”

According to a 2009 Petition for Extension of Time submitted by DWR to the State Water Board, the following boilerplate language was included:

“Before the [State Water Board] can approve a petition to change your water right permit or a petition for extension of time to complete use, the [State Water Board] must consider the information contained in an environmental document prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This form is not a CEQA document. If a CEQA document has not yet been prepared, a determination must be made of who is responsible for its preparation. As the petitioner, you are responsible for all costs associated with the environmental evaluation and preparation of the required CEQA documents. ...” (emphasis in the original)

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 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, 2025. The 2025 petition updates the 2009 petitions and requests a 76-year time extension from 2009 to 2085. 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 (DCP). The petition was transferred to the Administrative Hearings Office of the State Water Board in June 2024 and the hearing is currently underway. Those who have submitted protests to the change petition have raised the issue of the expired SWP permits addressed by this bill in the hearing.

Proposed 2025 Delta Conveyance Project (DCP) 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 DCP. 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 the 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 [the SWP].” The Budget Committees in both the Senate and Assembly rejected the DCP trailer bill language and deferred the issues to the policy bill process. This bill does not propose to make SWP water permits perpetual, but originally proposed a 76-year extension, until 2085. Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife committee amendments shortened the extension to 2046.

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. (WAT §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 the State Water Board to provide notice to a water right holder and making a finding before revoking a water right. (WAT §1241).
- 3) Provides that a permit to use water shall be effect for such time as the water actually appropriated under the permit is used for a useful and beneficial purpose. (WAT §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. (WAT §1395).
- 5) Requires a permittee to exercise due diligence in developing diversion works to put water appropriated under the permit to beneficial use. (WAT §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. (WAT §1397).
- 7) Authorizes the State Water Board to extend the period specified in a permit for construction of infrastructure or application of water to beneficial use if good cause is shown. (WAT §1398).
- 8) Authorizes the State Water Board to revoke a permit after a hearing on a petition to extend the time periods under a permit if the work is not commenced, prosecuted with due diligence, and completed, or that water appropriated under a permit has not been put to beneficial use. (WAT §§1398, 1410).

PROPOSED LAW

This bill would:

- 1) Extend the time periods under water rights permits number 16477, 16478, 16479, 16480, 16481, and 16482 (which are held by DWR for SWP) to put water to beneficial use until December 31, 2046.
- 2) Provide that these provisions shall not be construed as an approval of any proposed modification of physical facilities of the SWP, including the DCP.
- 3) Make findings and declarations relating to the need to modernize the SWP.

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT

According to the author, “[SWP] extends more than 705 miles, providing water for 27 million people and 750,000 acres of farmland. [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.”

“To avoid future uncertainty, Assembly Bill 2215 protects DWR’s water rights by ensuring their ability to perfect their water rights until 2046. This timeframe allots DWR sufficient time to bolster their infrastructure and protects water ratepayers from water reliability concerns.”

A coalition letter representing an extensive list of water agencies, agricultural interests, and business interests, amongst others, states that “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. ... 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.”

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION

Writing in opposition, the California Water Impact Network (CWIN) asserts that AB 2215 would “insulate DWR from the public review and accountability required of water rights holders seeking time extensions” and calls the bill “the epitome of unfair special interest legislation” as it would “give DWR and major users of imported water from the Delta a free pass to exempt the SWP from regulatory oversight and public review required of any other appropriative water rights holder seeking a time extension.” CWIN argues that the bill would “evade still-unresolved issues vital to the public interest raised by CWIN and other protestants and dismantle existing regulatory authority which remains sorely needed to comply with legal duties and protect against severe risks to other water users and the environment.”

CWIN further argues that “without the required process before the State [Water] Board, informed by [the environmental] review, there will be no reliable basis to ensure that the extension, if granted, will not adversely affect other water users, affected communities, and the environment.”

Also writing in opposition, Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, Winnemem Wintu Tribe, Little Manila Rising, and Restore the Delta, also argue that the bill “would threaten Tribal Beneficial uses and public trust interests in the Bay-Delta watershed ...[and] cut the public and critical stakeholder, including Tribes and Delta communities, out of the process and improperly invade State water Board jurisdiction.”

COMMENTS

This bill. This bill grants DWR until 2046 to perfect six of the water rights it holds for the 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.

Not about DCP, but perhaps DCP-adjacent? The author and sponsor maintain that this bill is not about the DCP and that the permits impact SWP operations that are separate from the DCP, such as forecast-informed reservoir operations. While this may be true, it is also noted that 4 of the 6 permits for which this bill seeks to extend are a part of the DCP. While the DCP has been subject to its own approval processes, including CEQA, the SWP needs the extension so that DWR has additional time to continue developing the SWP so it can make fuller use of the water authorized under the expired permits. According to some, the DCP is one of the principal projects that DWR identifies as helping it to fully develop the SWP. Although the two are legally distinct, they are operationally intertwined as the DCP is a major component of DWR’s strategy for fully developing its water rights.

It is noted that the same permits in question here were a part of last year’s Delta Conveyance trailer bill (see above). Furthermore, the bill’s own findings state:

“(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” (emphasis added).

What is gained and what is lost with a statutory extension? According to the author and sponsor, the statutory extension is necessary because 27 million Californians rely on the SWP for water, and until DWR knows the status of these permits, DWR’s authority to use this water is unclear. It is noted, however, that these permits have been “expired” since 2009, and DWR is authorized to continue to use an amount equal to amounts historically used. Further, it is argued that the delay in extensions is hindering DWR’s ability to modernize the SWP and effectively plan for climate change. It is unclear how the delay in extensions is preventing DWR from taking actions to modernize the SWP and plan for climate change. A time extension is needed only to the extent that DWR is seeking to increase diversions based on that modernization. That being said, the time extensions could be needed to increase diversions resulting from repairing or upgrading conveyance systems to reduce water loss or improve efficiency, better timing of releases of water to maximize storage and flows for fish, or restoration projects that require a new diversion.

In contrast, multiple groups in opposition have come forward pointing out the consequences of granting an extension through legislative action. These include, amongst others:

- No environmental review pursuant to CEQA.
- Limits public participation.
- State Water Board unable to make a fully informed decision.
- Consequences to other water right holders also seeking an extension.
- Setting a precedent.

Application of CEQA.

The 2009 petition. As discussed above, it appears there was discrepancy between DWR and State Water Board about whether any environmental documents were required when DWR submitted its 2009 permit extensions, even though the “Environmental Information for Petitions” form clearly states that the State Water Board must first receive environmental documents before it can approve a petition. Further, in its form, DWR indicated as the petitioner that it will be preparing the environmental document and stated that “DWR is the lead CEQA agency and will prepare the appropriate environmental documentation in compliance with CEQA. DWR will work with the State Water Board to ensure that adequate environmental documentation is completed to support the requested time extensions.”

It does not appear that DWR completed the environmental documents for its original 2009 petition for time extension.

The 2025 petition. In DWR’s response to the form’s *Description of proposed changes or work remaining to be completed*, submitted as a part of its 2025 petition for time extension, DWR provided the following information:

“This petition includes construction of new facilities as contemplated by the Delta Conveyance Project but does not include any expansion of authorized uses beyond those currently authorized under the permits listed above. The purpose of this petition is to allow DWR additional time to place the water currently authorized under the permits to beneficial uses prior to licensing using the existing State Water Project facilities or any constructed Delta Conveyance Facility. The State Water Project is a large, complex water supply system consisting of 30 dams (29 of which impound water), 21 reservoirs, 30 pumping and generating plants, and approximately 700 miles of aqueducts and pipelines. The initial facilities were essentially completed in 1973. Other facilities have been constructed or are planned to accommodate existing and anticipated demand for SWP water and to minimize impacts of SWP operations. DWR is currently undergoing the State Water Board’s hearing process for the [DCP] Change in Point of Diversion Petition (CPOD). The DCP CPOD hearing and this petition contain separate issues and, therefore, should be conducted as independent but coordinated hearings.

.
. .
.

“DWR is the lead CEQA agency and will prepare the appropriate environmental documentation in compliance with CEQA. DWR anticipates the CEQA documentation will be completed early 2026. DWR will work with the State Water Board to ensure that adequate environmental documentation is completed to support the requested time extensions.”

The status of the environmental documentation for the 2025 petition is unknown.

Independent of DWR’s estimate that its environmental documentation will be completed in early 2026, the author argues that it is unclear what would go into a CEQA analysis since there is no project specific to this bill – only a date change. The author asserts that every future action and project that seeks to put the water rights to full beneficial use will be required to comply with CEQA and any other permitting process and requirements in place at the time.

Limitation on public participation. A person may file a “protest” based on an allegation that a proposed appropriation or change (or in this case, an extension) would do any of the following:

- Would interfere with prior water rights;
- Would have an adverse environmental impact;
- Would not best conserve the public interest or public trust;
- Would be contrary to law; or
- Would not be within the jurisdiction of the State Water Board.

The State Water Board has the authority to reject protests if insufficient information is provided, are of a general nature, or are inconsistent with constitutional or legislated state policy. If the State Water Board determines that a protest is acceptable, the applicant/petitioner is required to answer the protest within 15 days. The protestant and the applicant/petitioner are expected to make a good faith effort to resolve the protest within 180 days from the close of the protest period.

According to CWIN's letter, following the 2009 petitions, a number of groups filed such protests relating to whether there would be adverse effects on the Delta and other water rights, failure to explain how much water can be put to a beneficial use, failure to clarify maximum diversions, and harm to the public trust and public interest, amongst others. However, those protests were never resolved. Providing a statutory extension for the permits eliminates the requirement that the applicant/petition (in this case DWR) attempt to resolve any protests that may have been filed in response to its 2025 petition, also eliminating public participation in the process.

Fully informed decision making. The State Water Board is unable to process a petition without the proper environmental review documents because it relies on the information in the documents to help determine the impacts of the increased diversion that would result from the permit extension. Related, the State Water Board may take into account changed regulatory and environmental circumstances that may have occurred since the original permits were issued and the impact on the amount of water "available" in the system (e.g. Delta Reform Act, Environmental Species Act listings, decline of unlisted species, closures of the salmon fishing industry, increased awareness of threats to tribal beneficial uses, increase in Harmful Algae Blooms, ongoing updates to the State Water Board's Delta Water Quality Control Plan, and further understanding of Delta ecology to name a few). Additionally, in processing an application, the State Water Board takes into account other water right holders that are diverting water to which DWR is claiming rights.

None of these things are taken into account when providing a permit extension statutorily.

Impacts to other right holders. The Placer County Water Agency (PCWA), writing from a neutral position, points out that "[t]he State Water Board requires the environmental review for an extension of time to account for increased diversions from the maximum use at the time of expiration, including analysis of impacts and mitigation measures." PCWA references its own experiences in this regarding the negotiation of a mitigation plan for dry years and are concerned that their own investment in mitigation will be compromised by granting a statutory extension to the SWP. PCWA comments that "[t]he SWP is one of the most consumptive water rights in California. By granting statutory extension of DWR water rights, upwards of 2 MAF of demand could be added to the strains on the California Water System, without commensurate mitigation measure for impacts to the environment. Any subsequent water rights extensions by others, subject to oversight of the State Water Board, will be required to mitigate the impacts of extending their water rights on an environment that has been stressed with an additional 2 MAF of demand."

This is one example of how water rights holders with pending permit extensions may be affected by this bill. There may be others similarly situated.

Setting a precedent. As noted in the Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife (AWPW) committee analysis, “[t]here 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?” As noted in the AWPW analysis “[t]his 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 ... but other permittees will certainly take note if this bill is enacted. What would stop other permittees from pursuing legislation to grant themselves an extension?”

Despite AWPW’s amendments stating that these are unique circumstances pertaining to the SWP and that this bill does not set precedent for any other permit, other water agencies have been asking to be added to the bill since the bill’s introduction.

Conclusion. Taking all of the above into consideration, the Committee may wish to amend the bill to strike the statutory extension for the 6 water rights permits and instead require the State Water Board, within 18 months of receiving a complete application for the water rights permit extensions, to either approve or deny the extensions.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT 1

Strike Section 2 from the bill as follows:

~~SEC. 2. Section 1398 of the Water Code is amended to read:~~

~~1398. (a) (1) The period specified in the permit for beginning construction work, for completion of construction work, for application of the water to beneficial use, or any or all of these periods may, for good cause shown, be extended by the board.~~

~~(2) After any hearing on a petition to extend the period or periods, the board may revoke the permit in accordance with Section 1410.~~

~~(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, 2046.~~

~~(2) This subdivision shall not be construed as an approval of any proposed modification of physical facilities of the State Water Project, including the Delta Conveyance Project.~~

AMENDMENT 2

Add a new Section 2 to the bill as follows:

SEC. 2. The State Water Resources Control Board shall either approve or deny the extension for water right permits numbered 16477, 16478, 16479, 16480, 16481, and 16482 within 18 months of receiving a complete application, including any environmental review documents, if applicable.

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
Bay Area Council
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 Municipal Utilities Association
California State Council of Laborers
California Water Association
Calleguas Municipal Water District
Camrosa 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 Chambers Alliance
Groundswell for Water Justice
Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Irvine Ranch Water District
Jurupa Community Services District
Kern County Water Agency
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
Long Beach Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles County Business Federation
Mesa Water District
Milk Producers Council
Mojave Water Agency
Monte Vista Water District
Municipal Water District of Orange County
Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

New California Coalition
North San Diego Business Chamber
Norwalk Chamber of Commerce
Orange County Business Council
Palmdale Water District
Pasadena Water and Power
Rancho California Water District
San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership
San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District
San Geronio PASS Water Agency
Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency
Secure Water Alliance
Serrano Water District
Solano County Water Agency
Southern California Contractors Association
Southern California Leadership Council
Southern California Water Coalition
Southwest California Legislative Council
State Building & Construction Trades Council of California
The Greater West Covina Business Association
The Metropolitan Water District of Southern 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 & Commerce Association
Valley Water
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
Western United Dairies
Yorba Linda Water District
Zone 7 Water Agency

OPPOSITION

AquAlliance
California Indian Environmental Alliance
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
California Water Impact Network
Center for Biological Diversity
Center for Environmental Health
Central Delta Water Agency
City of Stockton
Clean Earth 4 Kids
Contra Costa County
County of Sacramento

Delta Counties Coalition
Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS)
Friends of Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge (FSL)
Friends of the River
Golden State Salmon Association
League of Women Voters of California
Little Manila Rising
Local Agencies of the North Delta (LAND)
Mountain Countries Water Resources Association (unless amended)
Planning and Conservation League
Reclamation District 150
Regional Water Authority (unless amended)
Resource Renewal Institute
Restore the Delta
Sacramento Area Sewer District
San Francisco Baykeeper
Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians
Sierra Club of California
South Delta Water Agency
Winnemem Wintu Tribe
Yosemite Rivers Alliance

-- END --