Date of Hearing: April 14, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY AND TOXIC MATERIALS
Damon Connolly, Chair
AB 2447 (Bauer-Kahan) – As Amended April 6, 2026

SUBJECT: Water: Nitrogen Pollution Reduction Act

SUMMARY: Creates the Nitrogen Pollution Reduction Act. Requires the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) to require the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Water Boards) to update the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP) in order to reduce nitrogen waste discharges from commercial irrigated agricultural lands so that by January 1, 2030, those lands do not cause or contribute to exceedances of the maximum contaminant level (MCL) for nitrate, or exceedances of a water quality objective or total maximum daily load (TMDL) for nitrate. Specifically, **this bill**:

1) Creates the Nitrogen Pollution Reduction Act.

2) Requires the State Water Board to require the Regional Water Boards to update the ILRP in order to reduce nitrogen waste discharges from commercial irrigated agricultural lands so that by January 1, 2030, those lands do not cause or contribute to either of the following:

   a) Exceedances of the MCL for nitrate, as set forth in Section 64431 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, for waters designated for municipal and domestic supply, or,

   b) Exceedances of a water quality objective or TMDL for nitrate, as set forth in applicable approved basin plans.

3) Requires, on or before January 1, 2028, the Regional Water Boards to adopt revised orders with waste discharge requirements that are sufficient to meet the reductions in nitrogen waste discharge required by this bill and requires the orders to include both of the following:

   a) Quantitative limits on nitrogen fertilizer application and nitrogen discharge implemented through an adaptive irrigation and nutrient management plan designed to minimize nitrogen discharge, and,

   b) Sufficient procedures to ensure compliance with the quantitative limits, which may include, but not be limited to, verification by a certified crop advisor or cooperative or independent monitoring program, cross-referencing fertilizer application information with fertilizer sales information, and water quality or soil testing.

4) Authorizes the order required by the Regional Water Boards to include any of the following elements, provided the elements are designed to meet the reductions in nitrogen waste discharge required by this bill:

   a) Provisions to encourage increased participation in programs designed to reduce nitrogen waste and greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture and improve soil health, including, but not limited to, the Healthy Soils Program, the Organic Transition Pilot Program, and the State Water Efficiency and Enhancement Program;

b) Standardized figures estimating reductions in nitrogen discharge for certain sustainable farming practices based on the best available science;

c) Credits or discount factors based on the standardized figures, which may be accounted for in meeting the requirements of the quantitative limits;

d) Interim limits on nitrogen pollution that accommodate regional differences in agricultural production or surface or groundwater quality; or,

e) Alternative or streamlined compliance pathways for small and diversified farms of fewer than 50 acres, including simplified monitoring and reporting procedures as well as forms published in languages spoken by small farmer operators, including, but not limited to, Spanish, Hmong, Mandarin, and Punjabi.

5) Authorizes the State Water Board, consistent with existing law and regulations, to adjust its fee schedule for the ILRP to cover the cost of the State Water Board and Regional Water Boards in implementing the update to the ILRP pursuant to this bill.

6) Requires, on or before July 1, 2027, the State Water Board to publish both a list of standardized crop names and categories, and a statewide methodology for calculating, and field-level reporting of, nitrogen balances for croplands, including nitrogen fertilizer applications and nitrogen discharges, that shall account for available soil nitrogen, to be used by the Regional Water Boards and incorporated into the orders required by this bill.

7) Requires, on or before January 1, 2031, the State Water Board, in coordination with the Regional Water Boards, to submit a report to the relevant policy committees of the Legislature on progress achieved in implementing this bill.

8) States, for purposes of this bill, commercial irrigated agricultural lands include, but are not limited to, lands that are irrigated to produce crops or pasture for commercial purposes with one or more of the following characteristics:

a) The landowner or operator holds a current operator identification number or permit number for pesticide use reporting;

b) The crop is sold to a third party; and,

c) The landowner or operator files federal taxes using the Internal Revenue Service Schedule F (Form 1040) for Profit or Loss From Farming.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Establishes as the policy of the state that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes. (Water Code (WC) § 106.3)

2) Requires, pursuant to the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) and California SDWA, drinking water to meet specified standards for contamination (MCLs) as set by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) or the State Water Board. (Health & Safety Code § 116270, et seq.)

3) Establishes MCLs for the various forms of nitrate. (California Code of Regulations § 63341)

4) Establishes the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) to regulate discharges of pollutants into the waters of the United States and to set quality standards for surface waters. (33 United States Code §1251 et seq.)

5) Declares, under Porter-Cologne law, that the health, safety, and welfare of people require there to be a statewide program for water quality control and that the statewide program for water quality control can be most effectively administered regionally, within a framework of statewide coordination and policy. (WC § 13000)

6) Establishes the State Water Board and Regional Water Boards to preserve, enhance, and restore the quality of California's water resources and drinking water for the protection of the environment, public health, and all beneficial uses, and to ensure proper water resource allocation and efficient use, for the benefit of present and future generations. (WC § 13100, et. seq.)

7) Prohibits the discharge of waste or pollutants to surface and ground waters unless the discharger obtains a permit from the State Water Board or a Regional Water Board. (WC § 13260, et seq.)

8) Requires specified persons to file a report of waste discharges with the appropriate Regional Water Board. Provides that specified persons include a person who is a citizen, domiciliary, or political agency or entity of this state discharging waste, or proposing to discharge waste, outside the boundaries of the state in a manner that could affect the quality of the waters of the state within any region. (WC § 13260(a)(2))

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown.

COMMENTS:

Need for the bill: According to the author,

> "AB 2447 ensures that California protects clean water for people and ecosystems by reducing nitrogen fertilizer pollution. California officials have been aware of the dangers of nitrogen pollution since the 1960s and more than two decades ago, the State Water Board created the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program to address the overapplication of such fertilizers. This program, however, is not working and wells continue to test above safe drinking water thresholds and upwards of 600,000 predominantly low-income families currently lack access to safe drinking water. Nitrate contaminated drinking water has been linked to blue baby syndrome, higher rates of leukemia, lymphoma, and childhood brain cancers. This same polluted runoff goes into lakes and rivers, fueling harmful algal blooms that sicken children and animals and threaten important species in our environment. This bill takes important steps to ensure all Californians have access to clean water by directing state officials to establish clear limits on how much nitrogen fertilizer can be applied and encourages the adoption of sustainable farming practices that reduce this pollution."

Human right to water: In 2012, California became the first state to enact a Human Right to Water law through AB 685 (Chapter 524, Statutes of 2012). Public policy continues to focus on the right of every human being to have safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitation. Water supply, contaminants, costs of treatment and distribution systems, the number and nature of small public water systems, especially in disadvantaged communities, and many other factors will continue to challenge progress in addressing the human right to water.

Nitrates: Nitrate is commonly used in fertilizers because plants need nitrates to live and grow. Nitrite comes from the same sources as nitrate. Once consumed, nitrate is converted into nitrite in the body. Nitrogen is applied to cropland in the form of synthetic fertilizers or as animal manure. The nitrogen in these fertilizers transforms to nitrate and is carried to groundwater by the percolation of water through the soil column any time water from irrigation or rainfall percolates below the root zone.

The problem with nitrates is that it can interfere with the ability of red blood cells to carry oxygen to the tissues of the body, producing a condition called methemoglobinemia. The greatest threat is to infants, whose immature stomach environment enables conversion of nitrate to nitrite, which is then absorbed into the blood stream. The effects of nitrite are often referred to as "blue baby syndrome" because the affected babies' bodies do not absorb enough oxygen. High nitrate levels may also affect the oxygen-carrying ability of the blood of pregnant women.

Legal limits on nitrates: The current state MCLs for nitrates were adopted by the California Department of Health Services in 1994 based on the US EPA's MCLs promulgated in 1991.

The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) established its public health goals (PHGs) for nitrate and nitrite in 1997. The PHGs, based on methemoglobinemia in infants, are 45 parts per million (ppm) for nitrate (equivalent to 10 ppm nitrate-nitrogen), 1 ppm for nitrite-nitrogen and 10 ppm for joint nitrate/nitrite (expressed as nitrogen) in drinking water

This bill: This bill requires the State Water Board to require the Regional Water Boards to update the ILRP in order to reduce nitrogen waste discharges from commercial irrigated agricultural lands so that by January 1, 2030, those lands do not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the MCL for nitrate, as set forth in Section 64431 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, for waters designated for municipal and domestic supply.

Causes of nitrate contamination: High concentrations of nitrate in groundwater are primarily caused by human activities, including fertilizer application (synthetic and manure), animal operations, industrial sources (wastewater treatment and food processing facilities), and septic systems. Agricultural fertilizers and animal wastes applied to cropland are by far the largest regional sources of nitrate in groundwater, although other sources can be locally important.

Where is nitrate contamination?: Nitrate in drinking water is widespread in numerous areas of the state. A 2012 University of California at Davis (UC Davis) report, "Addressing Nitrate in California's Drinking Water," indicated that about 2.6 million people in the four-county Tulare Lake Basin and the Monterey County portion of the Salinas Valley rely on groundwater for drinking water, including those in some of the poorest communities in California. The report found that nitrate contamination is increasing and currently poses public health concerns for about 254,000 people in the study area.

Assembly Bill 2222 (Caballero, Chapter 670, Statutes of 2008) required the State Water Board to submit to the Legislature a report that identified, among other things, communities that rely on contaminated groundwater as a primary source of drinking water. The resultant report, "Communities That Rely on a Contaminated Groundwater Source For Drinking Water," which was released in January 2013, identified 682 community public water systems that rely on contaminated groundwater as a primary source of drinking water. These community water systems serve nearly 21 million people.

According to this report, most of the community public water systems with violations of drinking water standards are located in the Southern California Inland Empire, the east side of San Joaquin Valley, the Salinas Valley, and the Santa Maria Valley. The findings from this report suggest that drinking water contamination in California disproportionally affects small, rural, and low-income communities that depend mostly on groundwater as their drinking water source.

In the Salinas Valley, 58% of raw groundwater has been found to be contaminated with nitrates, along with other contaminants including arsenic. Nitrate levels in the groundwater are particularly high south of Salinas, with levels as high as 690 ppm.

An additional two million Californians rely on groundwater from either a private domestic well or a smaller groundwater-reliant system that is not regulated by the State. Most of these residents lack an assessment of their water because they are not required to test its quality.

Costs for nitrate cleanup: The 2012 UC Davis nitrate report calculated that up to $36 million per year is needed for safe drinking water solutions to address nitrate contamination. The report elaborated that, "Costs for safe drinking water solutions to nitrate contamination in the Tulare Lake Basin and Salinas Valley are roughly $20 and $36 million per year for the short- and long-term solutions, respectively. About $17 to $34 million per year will be needed to provide safe drinking water for 85 identified community public and state small water systems in the study area that exceed the nitrate drinking water MCL (serving an estimated 220,000 people). The annualized cost of providing nitrate-compliant drinking water to an estimated 10,000 affected rural households (34,000 people) using private domestic wells or local small water systems is estimated to be at least $2.5 million for point-of-use treatment for drinking use only. The total cost for alternative solutions translates to $80 to $142 per affected person per year, $5 to $9 per irrigated acre per year, or $100 to $180 per ton of fertilizer nitrogen applied in these groundwater basins."

Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs): TMDLs are action plans to restore clean water by defining how much of a pollutant a water body can tolerate and still meet water quality standards. Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act requires that states identify water bodies -- bays, rivers, streams, creeks, and coastal areas -- that do not meet or are not expected to meet, water quality standards (i.e., impaired water bodies) and also identify the pollutants that impair these water bodies. TMDLs examine water quality problems, identify sources of pollutants, and specify actions that create solutions for the impaired water bodies. TMDLs account for all the sources of a pollutant, including discharges from wastewater treatment facilities; runoff from homes, agriculture, and streets or highways; "toxic hot spots;" and deposits from the air. TMDLs in California are developed either by Regional Water Boards or by the US EPA. TMDLs developed by the Regional Water Boards are proposed as Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) amendments and include implementation provisions. TMDLs developed by

the US EPA typically contain the total load and load allocations required by Section 303(d), but do not contain comprehensive implementation provisions.

This bill: This bill requires the State Water Board to require the Regional Water Boards to update the ILRP in order to reduce nitrogen waste discharges from commercial irrigated agricultural lands so that by January 1, 2030, those lands do not cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality objective or TMDL for nitrate, as set forth in applicable approved basin plans.

Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP): Water discharges from agricultural operations in California include irrigation runoff, flows from tile drains, and storm water runoff. These discharges can affect water quality by transporting pollutants, including pesticides, sediment, nutrients, salts (including selenium and boron), pathogens, and heavy metals, from cultivated fields into surface waters. Many surface water bodies are impaired because of pollutants from agricultural sources. Groundwater bodies have suffered pesticide, nitrate, and salt contamination.

To prevent agricultural discharges from impairing the waters that receive these discharges, the ILRP, overseen by the State Water Board, regulates discharges from irrigated agricultural lands. This is done by issuing waste discharge requirements (WDRs) or conditional waivers of WDRs (Waivers) to growers (WDRs and Waivers collectively referred to as Orders). Due to regional diversity of farm practices, hydrogeology, and other factors, each Regional Water Board adopts their own Orders to protect water quality from agricultural practices. Over 29,000 farm operations with over six million acres are enrolled in the ILRP

Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Expert Panel Draft Report March 30, 2026: On March 30, 2026, the ILRP Expert Panel released a draft report. The report states, "Nitrogen is an essential nutrient for crops and is often the most limiting nutrient in cropping systems. While insufficient nitrogen can reduce yield and profitability, excess nitrogen can be lost to the environment with undesirable environmental impacts, and ultimately human health. California's agriculture is highly diverse with respect to crops grown, cropping systems and size of operations. California is a highly productive agriculture region. However, nitrate leaching from intensive crop production systems has led to increased nitrate concentrations in groundwater with a large proportion originating from fertilizer and manure applications to crops."

The Expert Panel was asked to answer nine questions, below are excerpted responses to those questions:

"1) In some regions sufficient data and analytical tools are available to set long-term crop-specific targets/limits for nitrate discharge from agricultural land that is protective of water quality. Other regions need more time to collect and analyze data to assess groundwater risks from nitrate; however, this should not preclude these regions from collecting data on applied nitrogen and implementing targets/limits.
2) Targets/limits should be addressed on a local/regional basis. The diversity of agricultural production systems in the state makes it impossible to impose a one-size-fits-all approach to the regulatory process.
3) Targets and limits may be applied to a specific crop, a specific multi-cropping system, or to a specific land area.
4) The Panel agrees that there is a point at which nitrogen discharges to groundwater are excessive and the Regional Water Boards may set initial limits that all growers should be

able to meet within a reasonable timeframe (3 to 5 years). These limits should be considered by individual Regional Water Boards, but not as a statewide precedential requirement.

5) The Expert Panel agrees that targets/limits can be made now and provides a roadmap for reducing nitrate discharges in regions where groundwater is at risk for nitrate contamination. The interim targets/limits do not necessarily need to immediately achieve the 10 ppm nitrate MCL. However, an iterative process that gradually brings water quality targets closer to the operational water quality objective in a steady and measured way that is environmentally beneficial and agronomically feasible would be the desired path forward.
6) The use of winter cover crops and high-carbon amendments prevent nitrate losses during the winter fallow when residual soil nitrate is most at risk for leaching due to uncontrolled winter rains. The Expert Panel supports nitrogen removal credits for these practices as they provide incentives for growers to implement these practices, which not only help reduce nitrate leaching, but also have a multitude of other benefits to the operation, soil health and environment.
7) The Panel finds that wine-grape vineyards, alfalfa, and non-fertilized pastures are potential candidates for some form of exception or alternative compliance pathway.
8) In regions where there is no current and no reasonable foreseeable future groundwater use for domestic, municipal, commercial, irrigation, public supply, or groundwater dependent ecosystem purposes, the Panel recommends consideration of alternative compliance pathways."

It's important to note that the recommendations by the Expert Panel in March, 2026, are still a draft and the final recommendations are expected in the summer of 2026.

This bill: This bill requires the State Water Board to require the Regional Water Boards to update the ILRP to reduce nitrogen discharges by January 1, 2030, in order to meet specified standards. Tens of thousands, to hundreds of thousands, of Californians lack drinking water that meets state standards for various reasons, including nitrate contamination. AB 2447 takes an aggressive approach to reduce nitrate contamination in California, potentially restoring safer drinking water wells to tens of thousands (or more) Californians. While the bill does acknowledge a regional approach, it's likely there will be further discussions to reflect that certain regions have better data and have been working on reducing nitrates for a considerable period of time, while other regions have much more work to do. In any regulatory setting there are areas that will have clear excess nitrogen levels (also considered the low-hanging fruit) and there will need to be a comprehensive approach, likely including carrots (incentives) and sticks (regulatory deadlines). Importantly, even the opponents to this bill acknowledge that nitrate contamination can last for decades after the nitrogen applied to crops has been stopped or greatly reduced. This clearly calls on the need to start reducing nitrate discharges as soon as possible.

Arguments in support: According to a coalition of environmental, public health, and environmental justice organizations,

> "This bill is urgently needed to safeguard the human right to clean, safe, and affordable water while advancing climate-smart agriculture and driving innovation in the fertilizer market.
>
> In 2012, the Governor declared water as a human right. Unfortunately, that right is being violated for the hundreds of thousands of Californians who still, to this day, do not have access to clean and affordable drinking water. The science is clear: excessive nitrogen

fertilizer use causes nitrates to leach into drinking water supplies. More than 600,000 Californians lack access to safe drinking water due, in part, to nitrogen pollution.

Nitrogen pollution in drinking water is linked to blue baby syndrome as well as increased risk of stomach, ovarian, colorectal, thyroid, and kidney cancers. Nitrogen pollution threatens California's unique biodiversity and ecosystems, contributing to harmful algal blooms (HABs) that kill fish, sicken pets, and cause rashes and blisters in children swimming in contaminated streams. HABs also compromise recreational and fishing economies, costing millions to clean up and remedy. Imperiled California species such as the Bay checkerspot butterfly and arroyo toad are particularly vulnerable to nitrogen pollution.

The Nitrogen Pollution Reduction Act responds directly to these challenges by setting a clear goal that nitrogen pollution from croplands should no longer threaten California's drinking water, rivers, and climate. This bill adds deadlines to an existing nitrogen management program and directs the State Water Resources Control Board to coordinate with regional water boards to update their programs with science-based guidelines on nitrogen fertilizer use and discharge while also encouraging the use sustainable farming practices.

The Nitrogen Pollution Reduction Act fills a gap in existing regulations that policymakers have been trying to address for nearly 30 years and drives progress towards other statewide climate and water quality and supply efforts. Some state programs rely on voluntary efforts to reduce nitrogen pollution, but on their own, these efforts do not work fast enough. By strengthening California's existing nitrogen management program, the Act will spur more farmers to use healthy soils practices, help achieve sustainable groundwater quality targets, protect ecosystems, and provide a long-term drinking water solution for communities."

Arguments in opposition: According to a coalition of farmers, ranchers, processors, and allied agricultural businesses,

"As residents of agricultural and rural communities, we share the goal of protecting groundwater quality and ensuring safe drinking water for all Californians. For this reason, we have engaged with the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) and regional water boards for decades to investigate, monitor and attempt to remedy long-standing water quality issues across the State. And while we share your interest in hastening this process, we express our concerns here with the approach proposed in AB 2447.

First, AB 2447 is premised on an incorrect assumption that nitrogen discharges from irrigated agriculture are unregulated. Contrary to this assumption, California agriculture operates under one of the most comprehensive regulatory frameworks in the nation. Starting in or around 2003, discharges of waste from irrigated agricultural operations have been regulated by regional water quality control boards through Conditional Waivers or Waste Discharge Requirements. Such regulatory requirements have evolved over time resulting in today's comprehensive Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP), which is administered by the State Water Board and the regional boards.

In short, nitrate contamination in groundwater is a decadal long challenge for the State regardless of grower practices today. Over the decades, growers have followed and employed the best scientific and state-supported research on application rates and fertilization management practices. Data shows that even if growers applied zero nitrogen

fertilizer and essentially stopped farming, water quality issues will persist in some areas for over a hundred years. Importantly, California agriculture is committed to improving water quality, protecting public health and advancing the best precision agricultural practices possible. To that end, the existing ILRP framework, regional orders, coalition monitoring, and ongoing expert review provide a robust and iterative pathway for progress grounded in science and regional adaptability. AB 2447 replaces that adaptive framework with rigid mandates, exposes growers, communities and the state to unsustainable burdens, and generates unintended harm."

Double-referral: Should this bill pass the Assembly Environmental Safety and Toxic Materials Committee, it will be re-referred to the Assembly Agriculture Committee.

Related legislation:

1) AB 1605 (Caballero, 2017). Would have provided legal relief for signatories participating in a state program to provide drinking water. Would have exempted a person or entity who is providing replacement water to as a substitution for drinking water that exceeds the MCL for nitrate in groundwater from civil liability for causing pollution or a nuisance, public or private, to groundwater; liability for negligence; or, liability for trespass under common law if specified conditions are met. This bill was held in the Assembly Judiciary Committee.

2) AB 2222 (Caballero, Chapter 670, Statutes of 2008). Requires the State Water Board to develop a report on groundwater contamination and quality.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

350 Bay Area Action
7th Generation Advisors
Active San Gabriel Valley
American Nurses Association, California
Azul
CA League of United Latin American Citizens
CactusToCloud Institute
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
Californians for Pesticide Reform
Catholic Charities of Stockton
Center for Biological Diversity
Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice
Center for Environmental Health
Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge
Cleanearth4kids.org
Climate Action California
Coastal Environmental Rights Foundation
Endangered Habitats League
Environmental Center of San Diego
Environmental Information Protection Center
Environmental Law Foundation

Environmental Working Group
Facts: Families Advocating for Chemical & Toxics Safety
Food & Water Watch
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Friends of Griffith Park
Friends of the Earth
Friends of the Inyo
Heal the Bay
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy
Los Angeles Climate Reality Project
Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust
Monterey Waterkeeper
NRDC (sponsor)
Pesticide Action and Agroecology Network
Poison Free Malibu
Prevention Institute
Russian Riverkeeper
San Diego Bird Alliance
San Diego Food System Alliance
San Diego Pediatricians for Clean Air
San Jerardo Cooperative INC.
SanDiego350
Santa Barbara Channelkeeper
Santa Clara University, Department of Environmental Studies and Sciences
Santa Cruz Climate Action Network
Save California Salmon
Save Mount Diablo
Sierra Club California
Siskiyou Crest Coalition
SoCal 350 Climate Action
Social Compassion in Legislation
Sunrise Bay Area
Sunrise Movement Foothills
Sunrise Movement Monterey Bay
Sunrise Movement Occidental College
Surfrider Foundation
The Climate Center
The Salvador E. Alvarez Institute for Non-violence
The Summertree Institute
The Wildlands Conservancy
Turtle Island Restoration Network
Union of Concerned Scientists
Valley Improvement Projects
WildCoast
Wildlands Network
Wishtoyo Foundation
Yosemite Rivers Alliance

Opposition

African American Farmers of California
Agricultural Council of California
Alameda County Farm Bureau
Almond Alliance of California
Amador County Farm Bureau
American Pistachio Growers
Buena Vista Coalition
Butte County Farm Bureau
Butte Yuba Sutter Water Quality Coalition
Calaveras County Farm Bureau
California Agricultural Aircraft Association
California Apple Commission
California Association of Pest Control Advisers
California Association of Wheat Growers
California Avocado Commission
California Blueberry Commission
California Chamber of Commerce
California Citrus Mutual
California Cotton Ginners and Growers Association
California Dairies, INC.
California Date Commission
California Farm Bureau
California Fresh Fruit Association
California Grain & Feed Association
California Pear Growers Association
California Rice Commission
California Seed Association
California State Association of Counties
California Strawberry Commission
California Tomato Growers Association
California Walnut Commission
California Warehouse Association
Cawelo Water District Coalition
Central Valley Salinity Coalition
Chowchilla Management Zone
Colusa County Farm Bureau
East San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition
El Dorado County Farm Bureau
Fresno County Farm Bureau
Glenn County Farm Bureau
Grassland Drainage Area Coalition
Grower-Shipper Association of Central California
Humboldt County Farm Bureau
Imperial County Farm Bureau
Imperial Valley Irrigated Lands Coalition
Kaweah Basin Water Quality Association
Kaweah Water Foundation
Kern River Watershed Coalition Authority
Kern Water Collaborative

Kings River Watershed Coalition Authority
Kings Water Alliance
Lake County Farm Bureau
Madera County Farm Bureau
Merced County Farm Bureau
Monterey County Farm Bureau
Nisei Farmers League
Northern California Water Association
Northern California Water Association for Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition
Olive Growers Council of California
Olive Oil Commission of California
Pacific Egg & Poultry Association
Plumas-Sierra County Farm Bureau
Reeb Government Relations, LLC
Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
Riverside County Farm Bureau
Rural County Representatives of California
Sacramento County Farm Bureau
Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition
San Benito County Farm Bureau
San Diego County Farm Bureau
San Joaquin County & Delta Water Quality Coalition
San Joaquin County Farm Bureau
Siskiyou County Farm Bureau
Sonoma County Farm Bureau
Stanislaus County Farm Bureau
Tulare County Farm Bureau
Tule Basin Management Zone
Tule Basin Water Quality Coalition
Tuolumne County Farm Bureau
United AG
Valley Water Collaborative
Ventura County Farm Bureau
Western Growers Association
Western Plant Health Association
Western Tree Nut Association
Westlands Water Quality Coalition
Westside San Joaquin River Watershed Coalition
Westside Water Quality Coalition
Wine Institute
Yuba Sutter Farm Bureau

Analysis Prepared by: Josh Tooker / E.S. & T.M. / (916) 319-3965