



Meeting Agenda

Date & Time: 10/05/2026 | 10:00 AM

Location: SLDMWA Boardroom

Notice of Water Resources Committee Regular Meeting / Joint Water Resources Committee Regular Meeting-Special Board Workshop

842 6th Street, Los Banos
(List of Member/Alternate Telephonic Locations Attached)

Public Participation Information

Join Zoom Webinar -

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88441411574?pwd=4SeLd4wsKL2H71Al4uaF0DS55rCpdB.1>

NOTE: Any member of the public may address the Water Resources Committee/Board concerning any item on the agenda before or during consideration of that item.

Because the notice provides for a regular meeting of the Water Resources Committee ("WRC") and a joint regular WRC Meeting/Special Board workshop, Board Directors/Alternates may discuss items listed on the agenda; however, only WRC Members/Alternates may correct or add to the agenda or vote on action items.

NOTE FURTHER: Meeting materials have been made available to the public on the San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority's website, <https://www.sldmwa.org>, and at the Los Banos Administrative Office, 842 6th Street, Los Banos, CA 93635.

Agenda

Item	Topic	Lead
-------------	--------------	-------------

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | Call to Order/Roll Call | |
| 2. | Water Resources Committee to Consider Additions or Corrections to the Agenda for the Water Resources Committee Meeting only, as Authorized by Government Code Section 54950 <i>et seq.</i> | |
| 3. | Opportunity for Public Comment – Any member of the public may address the Water Resources Committee/Board concerning any matter not on the agenda, but within the Committee or Board's jurisdiction. Public comment is limited to no more than three minutes per person. For good cause, the Chair of the Water Resources Committee may waive this limitation. | |

ACTION ITEMS

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 4. | Approval of September 14, 2026 Meeting Minutes | |
|----|--|--|

5. **Recommendation to Board of Directors to Adopt Central Valley Project Performance Framework** Petersen

REPORT ITEMS

6. Status Update Regarding the DMC Subsidence Correction Project Barajas
7. Update on Status of Golden Mussels Petersen, Meyer
8. Executive Director's Report Barajas
(May include reports on activities within the Water Resources Committee's jurisdiction re: 1) CVP/SWP water operations; 2) California infrastructure projects; 3) regulation of the CVP/SWP; 4) existing or possible new State and Federal policies; 5) Water Authority activities)
9. Update on Water Policy/Resources Activities Petersen
(May include reports on federal, state, and local agency regulatory, legislative, and administrative water policy/resources activities)
10. Update on Water Operations and Forecasts Milligan
11. Committee Member Reports
12. Closed Session Akroyd

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION

Initiation of Litigation Pursuant to paragraph (4) of Subdivision (d) of Gov. Code Section 54956.9 – 3 potential cases

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION

Significant Exposure to Litigation Pursuant to Paragraph (2) or (3) of Subdivision (d) of Gov. Code Section 54956.9 – 2 potential cases

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION

Existing Litigation Pursuant to paragraph (1) of Subdivision (d) of Gov. Code Section 54956.9

- A. CSPA, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), et al., Sac. Co. Superior Court, Case No. 34-2021-80003761 (2021 TUCP Order)
- B. CSPA, et al. v. SWRCB, et al., Sac. Co. Superior Court, Case No. 34-2021-80003763 (2021 Temp. Mgmt. Plan)
- C. SWRCB, Administrative Hearings Office, Petitions for Change of California Department of Water Resources (DWR) Water Right Permits, Delta Conveyance Project (DWR Change Petition)
- D. Long-Term State Water Project Operation Cases, Sacramento Co. Superior Court, Lead Case No. 24WM000181 (SWP 2024 EIR Challenge)
- E. San Francisco Baykeeper, et al. v. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, et al. U.S. District Court, E.D. Cal., Case No. 2:26-cv-00671 (2025 CVP Operations)
- F. Bettencourt v. SLDMWA, et al., Merced Co. Superior Court, Case No. 26CV-01422 (employment complaint)
- G. AquAlliance, et al. v. SLDMWA, et al. Sacramento Co. Superior Court, Case No. 26WM000149 (2026-2027 North to South Transfers CEQA Addendum)

- 13.** Return to Open Session
- 14.** Report from Closed Session, if any, Required by Government Code Section 54957.1
- 15.** Reports Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.2(a)(3)
- 16.** ADJOURNMENT

Persons with a disability may request disability-related modification or accommodation by contacting Cheri Worthy or Sandi Ginda at the San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority Office, 842 6th Street, P.O. Box 2157, Los Banos, California, via telephone at (209) 826-9696, or via email at cheri.worthy@sldmwa.org. Requests should be made as far in advance as possible before the meeting date, preferably 3 days in advance of regular meetings or 1 day in advance of special meetings/workshops.

This agenda has been prepared as required by the applicable laws of the State of California, including but not limited to, Government Code Section 54950 et seq. and has not been prepared with a view to informing an investment decision in any of the Authority's bonds, notes, or other obligations. Any projections, plans or other forward-looking statements included in the information in this agenda are subject to a variety of uncertainties that could cause any actual plans or results to differ materially from any such statement. The information herein is not intended to be used by investors or potential investors in considering the purchase or sale of the Authority's bonds, notes or other obligations and investors and potential investors should rely only on information filed by the Authority on the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board's Electronic Municipal Market Access System for municipal securities disclosures, maintained on the World Wide Web at <https://emma.msrb.org/>.

SLDMWA WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING TELEPHONIC LOCATIONS**October 5, 2026**

15671 W. Oakland Ave
Five Points, CA 93624

4190 Zanker Road
San Jose, CA 95134



Meeting Minutes

Date & Time: 9/14/2026 | 10:00 AM
Location: SLDMWA Boardroom
842 6th Street, Los Banos

San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority Water Resources Committee Regular Meeting and Joint Water Resources Committee Regular Meeting – Special Board Workshop Minutes

Attendance

Committee Members Present

Ex-Officio: Cannon Michael
Division 1: Anthea Hansen, Member
Division 2: Lon Martin, Alternate
Division 3: Chris White, Member
Division 4: Vince Gin, Member
Dana Jacobson, Alternate
Division 5: Manny Amorelli, Alternate

Board of Directors Present

Division 1: Anthea Hansen, Director
Division 2: Justin Diener, Director
Lon Martin, Alternate
Division 3: Chris White, Alternate
Jarrett Martin, Director
Cannon Michael, Chair/Director
Division 4: Dana Jacobson, Director
Brett Miller, Alternate
Division 5: Manny Amorelli, Director

Authority Representatives Present

Federico Barajas, Executive Director
Pablo Arroyave, Chief Operating Officer
Scott Petersen, Chief Strategic & Admin. Officer
Rebecca Akroyd, General Counsel
Rebecca Harms, Deputy General Counsel
Ray Tarka, Director of Finance
Jaime McNeil, Engineering Director
Jacob Bejarano, Civil Engineering Manager
Cindy Meyer, Special Programs Manager (ZOOM)
Eddie Reyes, Information Systems Technician
Stewart Davis, IT Officer

Others Present

Stephen Farmer, Westlands Water District
Lea Emmons, City of Tracy (ZOOM)

Agenda

Item	Topic	Lead
1.	Call to Order/Roll Call – The meeting was called to order by Acting Chair Cannon Michael at approximately 10:00 a.m. and roll was called.	
2	Additions or Corrections to the Agenda of Items, as authorized by Government Code Section 54950 et seq. – No additions or corrections.	
3.	Opportunity for Public Comment – No public comment.	
4.	Water Resources Committee to Consider Approval of the August 3, 2026 Meeting Minutes – Acting Chair Cannon Michael deemed the August 3, 2026 Meeting Minutes approved as submitted.	

-
5. **Recommendation to Adopt Staff Recommendation for Positions on Legislation** Petersen
- A. A.B. 2728 (Soria), Groundwater: de minimus extractors: fees: exemption – Watch Position**
- Chief Strategic & Administrative Officer Scott Petersen reviewed the staff recommendation for position on the listed legislation. Petersen answered questions throughout the presentation.
- M/S – Member Vince Gin, seconded by Member Chris White, the Committee recommended adoption of the staff recommendation for position on A.B. 2728 Vote: Ayes – Michael, Hansen, Martin, White, Gin, Amorelli; Nays – 0; Abstentions – 0.
- Petersen also reviewed a PowerPoint presentation regarding the 2026 State Legislative Session – End-of-Session Report.
6. **Presentation of Draft Central Valley Project Performance Framework** Petersen
- Chief Strategic & Administrative Officer Scott Petersen presented a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Draft Central Valley Project Performance Framework. Petersen reported that the framework proposes a management method for the Water Authority’s CVP policy, science, and communications programs. Petersen reviewed the three pillars, 1) Water Supply Resilience, 2) Environmental Stewardship, and 3) Adaptive Governance & Readiness. Petersen reported that he will be emailing out the information and would like the Committee’s review and written comments on the Discussion Draft. Petersen requested comments to be sent to staff by September 25, in advance of anticipated Board of Director’s consideration in October 2026. Petersen answered questions throughout the presentation.
7. **Status Update Regarding the DMC Subsidence Correction Project** Arroyave
- Chief Operating Officer Pablo Arroyave introduced the item. Civil Engineering Manager Jacob Bejarano reviewed the PowerPoint presentation included in the packet, which summarized the work completed on the project in August, and provided an overview of completed work. Executive Director Federico Barajas provided additional information on Phase 1-Task 2. Staff answered questions throughout the presentation.
8. **Update on Status of Golden Mussels** – Chief Operating Officer Pablo Arroyave reviewed the memo included in the packet. Arroyave reported that operational impacts are beginning due to the Golden Mussels, especially at O’Neill Pumping Plant. Special Programs Manager Cindy Meyer provided additional information. Chief Strategic & Administrative Officer Scott Petersen provided a brief Golden Mussel legislative update. Staff answered questions throughout the presentation. Arroyave, Petersen, Meyer
9. **Executive Director’s Report** Barajas
- a. O’Neill Pumping Plant Outage** – Chief Operating Officer Pablo Arroyave reported that the outage started first thing this morning, and the Plant is offline. Arroyave reported that the Authority has

been able to maintain four units at Jones Pumping Plant, and all six units at the Intertie, based on current demands. Arroyave reported that the recommissioning will start at 12:00pm on Wednesday, September 23, 2026 if everything goes as planned.

- b. O'Neill Pumping Plant Repayment Negotiation** – Executive Director Federico Barajas reported that on Wednesday of this week there is a public repayment negotiation session taking place with Reclamation for the O'Neill Transformer Replacement Project.
- c. Sites Project** – Executive Director Federico Barajas reported that there are Sites Reservoir excess capacity negotiations taking place today and tomorrow in Sacramento.
- d. Forecasting Workshop** – Chief Strategic & Administrative Officer Scott Petersen reported Reclamation will be holding a Forecasting Workshop October 1-2, 2026.

- 10. Update on Water Policy/Resources Activities** – Chief Strategic & Administrative Officer Scott Petersen provided a brief update on Green Sturgeon, Bay-Delta Plan, Tribal Beneficial Use, San Joaquin Valley Blueprint, and CAP activities. Petersen answered questions throughout the presentation. Petersen
- 11. Update on Water Operations and Forecasts** – Chief Operating Officer Pablo Arroyave introduced consultant Ron Milligan, who provided information regarding CVP supply, reservoir storage, allocations, and operations. Milligan and staff answered questions throughout the presentation. Arroyave
- 12. Committee Member Reports** – Member Vince Gin announced that Aaron Baker will be the next Valley Water CEO, effective January 4, 2027.
- 13. - 15. Closed Session** – Acting Chair Cannon Michael adjourned the open session to address the items listed on the Closed Session Agenda at approximately 11:29 a.m. Upon returning to open session at approximately 12:05 p.m., Acting Chair Cannon Michael reported that no reportable actions were taken in closed session. Akroyd
- 16. Reports Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.2(a)(3)** – No reports.
- 17. Adjournment** – The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:06 p.m.



Official Memorandum

PO Box 2157
Los Banos, CA 93635
sldmwa.org

To: SLDMWA Board of Directors, Alternates
SLDMWA Water Resources Committee, Alternates

From: J. Scott Petersen, Chief Strategic & Administrative Officer

Date: October 5, 2026

RE: Adoption of Central Valley Project Performance Framework

Summary

This memorandum transmits the attached *Central Valley Project (CVP) Performance Framework — Discussion Draft* for the Committee's review and a recommendation request for the Board of Directors to approve this as the management method for the Water Authority's CVP policy, science, and communications programs. The Framework describes an integrating approach titled Performance-Based Operations (PBO); organizes the Water Authority's work under three Pillars — Water Supply Resilience, Environmental Stewardship, and Science, Governance & Readiness — and seven lines of work; and uses Reliability, Affordability, and Accountability as the public-value themes through which results are explained and measured. Staff request the Committee's recommendation to advance the Framework to the Board of Directors for adoption in October 2026.

Background

The 2023 Strategic Plan directs that south-of-Delta water supply reliability be maximized (Objective 1.1) and that the effectiveness of the Water Authority's regulatory, legislative, legal, and administrative strategies be periodically evaluated and improved (Objective 1.6). Reclamation's allocation records show that from 2012 to 2026 federal allocations to south-of-Delta agricultural water service contractors averaged approximately 36 percent of contract and municipal and industrial allocations approximately 67 percent, while implementation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act reduces the groundwater historically used to offset shortfalls.

Staff developed the CVP Performance Framework to give the Water Authority a single method for choosing, carrying out, and measuring its CVP work under the Strategic Plan. The Water Resources Committee received a Discussion Draft in September 2026 and invited written comments through September 25. Eight reviewers submitted comments — member-agency representatives, the Water Authority's communications and federal-affairs consultants, and a water-resources consultant — and staff documented the disposition of those comments in a comment matrix (Attachment 2). The attached Board Discussion Draft (Attachment 1) restructures the Committee draft into a five-section body with supporting appendices; Appendix I of the draft logs every change.



Issue for Decision

Whether the Water Resources Committee should recommend, and the Board of Directors adopt, the CVP Performance Framework (Board Discussion Draft, October 2026) as the management method for the Water Authority's CVP policy and program work.

Recommendation

Staff recommends adoption of the CVP Performance Framework as a management method and the provision of direction to staff to return within 60 days with the first Annual Action Portfolio, the associated staff workplans, and baseline scorecard measures.

The Framework is a strategic management method to implement key Objectives from the 2023 adopted Strategic Plan; It is **not** a new Strategic Plan. Adoption would **not** authorize any project, expenditure, regulatory position, or contractual commitment; those authorizations would continue through existing budget, policy, and project processes. Adoption also would **not** require new staff — the annual action portfolio would be sized to available staff capacity.

Analysis

What the framework does. It applies Performance-Based Operations — asking of each CVP operating requirement whether it is achieving its intended outcome — and organizes the Water Authority's work in three Pillars (Water Supply Resilience; Environmental Stewardship; Science, Governance & Readiness) with seven lines of work beneath them. Each year the Water Authority selects a balanced Annual Action Portfolio through a two-stage screen — pass/fail thresholds tied to the Strategic Plan, then ranking — with at least one near-term benefit for each contract type, and reports progress quarterly on measures grouped as reliability, affordability, and accountability.

What acceptance does and does not do. Acceptance adopts a method. It does not authorize any project, expenditure, regulatory position, or contractual commitment, does not amend the Strategic Plan, and does not add staff; those decisions continue through the Water Authority's existing budget, policy, and project approval processes, and portfolio size respects the capacity governed by Strategic Plan Goal 5.

Committee review and comment. Thirty-seven comments were received. All were incorporated or clarified in the redline except three structural suggestions — condense the model diagram, relocate the communications and prioritization sections, and reduce length — which are carried out in the Board draft. The one contested item was the weighting of prioritization criteria; three reviewers questioned fixed weights from different directions. The framework now uses threshold screens followed by ranking, with no fixed weights and an option for the Committee to set weights annually. Two reviewers found the original Pillar 3 title unclear; the Board draft adopts the title favored in comment. One reviewer asked whether "Policy Action Portfolio" was too narrow for infrastructure, science, and operational work; the Board draft uses "Annual Action Portfolio."

Next steps. Upon adoption, staff will (a) return within 60 days with the first Annual Action Portfolio, together with three workplans (policy, communications, and science) and baseline measures, and (b) review the framework alongside the Strategic Plan every three to five years, or sooner if a named warning sign appears.



Attachment

Central Valley Project Performance Framework — Board Discussion Draft (October 2026)



CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK

*Improving Reliability, Affordability, and Accountability
through Performance-Based Operations*

BOARD DISCUSSION DRAFT

October 2026

CONTENTS

- 00 Executive Summary
- 01 The Approach — Performance-Based Operations
- 02 Three Pillars, Seven Lines of Work
- 03 Action Portfolio Architecture
- 04 Implementation Roadmap

Appendices

- A Line of Work Profiles
- B Action Card Template and Example
- C Screening Criteria and Anchors
- D Scorecard Measures
- E Communications Crosswalk and Message Template
- F Crosswalk to the 2023 Strategic Plan
- G Relationship Among Planning Documents
- H Plain-Language Summary
- I Change Log from the Committee Draft

Page numbers are omitted in this discussion draft; section numbers are used for reference throughout.

The Water Authority's Mission

To operate and maintain the Delta-Mendota Canal and related facilities reliably and cost-effectively, and to support member agencies in restoring and protecting adequate, affordable water supplies to benefit people, wildlife, and the economy.

This framework describes how the Water Authority will choose, carry out, and measure its Central Valley Project (CVP) work — a portion of the Board's 2023 Strategic Plan. It provides a consistent approach for how the Water Authority evaluates priorities, advances Actions, and measures progress. The framework uses Performance-Based Operations (PBO) as its overarching management objective; three Pillars — Water Supply Resilience, Environmental Stewardship, and Science, Governance & Readiness — to organize the Water Authority's work; and Reliability, Affordability, and Accountability to evaluate and communicate results. Together, these elements provide a common basis for prioritizing Actions, allocating resources, coordinating member-agency efforts, and determining whether CVP operational, environmental, and institutional strategies are producing their intended results.

The Challenge This Framework Addresses

South-of-Delta CVP surface-water reliability has declined as regulatory, physical, and hydrologic constraints limit Delta exports. From 2012 to 2026, federal allocations averaged approximately 36 percent for south-of-Delta agricultural water service contractors and 67 percent for municipal and industrial contractors. At the same time, SGMA implementation is constraining groundwater supplies that historically helped offset surface-water shortfalls. Together, these pressures increase risks to agricultural production, infrastructure financing, refuge obligations, and groundwater sustainability. They also heighten the need to ensure that operational and environmental requirements are evaluated against clearly defined water-supply, biological, and ecosystem outcomes.

Three Pillars

Three Pillars organize the Water Authority's work: (1) Water Supply Resilience defines the principal supply and infrastructure outcomes, (2) Environmental Stewardship advances measurable ecosystem and species outcomes, and (3) Science, Governance & Readiness provides the science, institutional capacity, and risk-management tools needed to support both. Pillars organize the work, lines of work plan and measure it, Actions execute it, and public-value themes explain what it delivered.

Pillar	Lines of work	Public-value emphasis
1 · Water Supply Resilience	1A Water Supply Portfolio Development 1B Infrastructure Modernization 1C Hydrologic Variability & Climate Resilience	Reliability, with affordability delivered through total cost of ownership analysis ¹ and outside funding
2 · Environmental Stewardship	2A Bay-Delta Watershed Ecosystem Recovery 2B Listed Species Recovery	Measurable environmental outcomes that demonstrate stewardship and support accountability
3 · Science, Governance & Readiness	3A Science & Evidence Leadership 3B Regulatory & Institutional Modernization 3C Enterprise Risk & Threat Readiness	Accountability — the capacity to know, decide, adapt, and withstand

The benefits, costs, and reliability risks associated with this framework will not be distributed uniformly across the membership. Agricultural water service contractors, municipal and industrial contractors, exchange and settlement contractors, and refuge water supplies face different exposure to CVP shortages, while every contract type shares² responsibility for Delta-Mendota Canal operation, maintenance, and capital costs regardless of allocation. The framework therefore incorporates contract-type-specific benefit analysis in prioritization (Section 03) and portfolio balancing (Section 02).

A Service-Area Framework

The framework is intentionally focused on the Water Authority's member-agency service area; it is not a general plan for California water management. It focuses on CVP performance where that performance directly affects Water Authority members and their beneficiaries — approximately 1.2 million acres of highly productive irrigated agriculture, more than two million people, and roughly 135,000 acres of managed wetlands and associated Pacific Flyway habitat in the western San Joaquin, San Benito, and Santa Clara Valleys.

Coordination as a Core Value Proposition

Many member agencies maintain their own federal and state advocacy, science, and communications resources. The Water Authority's role is to coordinate those resources where

¹ Total Cost of Ownership evaluates all expenses related to acquiring, operating, maintaining, and disposing of an asset.

² For Exchange/Settlement contractors, Friant Water Authority funds operations and maintenance pursuant to current agreements.

members share an interest — through agreed positions, clear lead and spokesperson roles, a shared science agenda, consistent messaging, and transparent cost and participation arrangements.

DRAFT

Performance-Based Operations (PBO)

Performance-Based Operations asks a practical question of each CVP operational requirement: is it achieving its intended outcome?

The Water Authority supports operations that are measured against results — including water supply reliability, environmental and species outcomes, and cost — and adjusted as conditions and science evolve.

PBO is the organizing methodology of two Board directions in the 2023 Strategic Plan: that south-of-Delta water supply reliability be maximized (Objective 1.1) and that the effectiveness of the Water Authority's regulatory and advocacy strategies be periodically evaluated and improved (Objective 1.6).

Operational flexibility is a means to improve defined public outcomes, not an end in itself. An operational option has value when it improves reliability, affordability, environmental performance, or resilience, and its effects can be measured transparently.

The objective is durable improvement. Real-time, evidence-based tools can support better decisions, but the longer-term goal is operating rules and institutions designed around measured outcomes.

Whose Decisions the Approach Seeks to Improve

The framework targets decision quality in two places: the operational and regulatory decisions of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the California Department of Water Resources, the fishery agencies, and the State Water Resources Control Board that govern CVP performance; and the Water Authority's own decisions about where to direct member resources. Better evidence, clearer measures, and disciplined portfolios improve both.

What PBO means in practice

- Invest in tools to respond more effectively to hydrologic variability and changing forecasts.
- Test the forecasts and assumptions used to run the Project — demands, Delta outflow, upstream releases, exports, and storage — for accuracy, bias, and responsiveness, and reconcile material differences during the operating year. A forecast assumption that does not adjust as conditions become known is a self-imposed operational constraint.
- Capture and manage water during high-flow and storm events when lawful and operationally feasible — including for groundwater recharge that advances SGMA compliance.
- Optimize reservoir, conveyance, pumping, and delivery operations across changing conditions.
- Integrate storage, groundwater, transfers, recharge, and other portfolio tools.
- Engage in science and adaptive management to focus environmental measures on performance — and convert demonstrated results into lasting improvements that improve outcomes for water supply reliability and species recovery.

- Pursue projects that increase resilience to drought, flood, infrastructure outages, and regulatory uncertainty.
- Create clearer links among investments, operations, costs, and measurable results.

The approach operates within applicable law, contracts, environmental requirements, fiscal controls, and open governance. It improves performance within those obligations and supports changes to requirements only where evidence shows they can be improved. It works by reducing constraints, capturing opportunities, and choosing Actions that create value across one or more systems — and it favors bringing forward a corrective Action over commissioning another study when a constraint is already well understood.

Three words for the public

Internally, Performance-Based Operations is the method. In public, the Water Authority explains results through three words — reliability, affordability, and accountability — because those describe what members and communities experience. The same logic gives staff a consistent line of sight from technical work to public value: each science program, habitat action, infrastructure project, or governance reform should expand operating options, improve CVP performance, and contribute to reliability, affordability, or accountability. Appendix E shows how each line of work maps to the three themes.

02

THREE PILLARS, SEVEN LINES OF WORK

The Pillars are the Board-level structure of the work; the lines of work are how it is planned and measured. Appendix A profiles each line. Actions often serve more than one Pillar; each is assigned a primary line for portfolio management, with co-benefits recorded.

Pillar	Line of work	What it does, in one line
1 · Water Supply Resilience	1A Water Supply Portfolio Development	Builds each member's mix of CVP, banked, exchanged, recharged, and local supplies.
	1B Infrastructure Modernization	Restores and modernizes the canal, pumps, and storage that move and hold the water.
	1C Hydrologic Variability & Climate Resilience	Captures wet-year water and prepares for dry years and extremes.
2 · Environmental Stewardship	2A Bay-Delta Watershed Ecosystem Recovery	Improves habitat and ecosystem function where it reduces uncertainty and constraint; delivers refuge water reliably.
	2B Listed Species Recovery	Advances measurable recovery of the listed species that drive CVP operations.
3 · Science, Governance & Readiness	3A Science & Evidence Leadership	Produces the monitoring, data, and studies that decisions — the Water Authority's and its regulators' — rest on.
	3B Regulatory & Institutional Modernization	Pursues lasting rule changes and the funding to pay for the work.
	3C Enterprise Risk & Threat Readiness	Prepares the organization for cyber, seismic, outage, and legal shocks that cannot be scheduled.

Pillar 1 — Water Supply Resilience

Pillar 1 focuses on achieving dependable supplies across a range of year types by protecting CVP surface-water delivery reliability, expanding complementary local and regional tools, maintaining capacity to convey, store, and recharge water, and improving the ability to respond to increasingly volatile hydrology. It primarily advances Reliability and, through lifecycle cost analysis and outside funding, Affordability. The long-run test of Pillar 1 is whether average annual CVP allocations and deliveries to member agencies improve over time; the scorecard tracks that trend by contract type as its principal long-run outcome measure.

Pillar 2 — Environmental Stewardship

Pillar 2 pursues measurable environmental outcomes for two related reasons. First, improved species and ecosystem performance can provide the evidence needed to support durable operational improvements. Second, environmental stewardship is part of the Water Authority's

mission: its members include refuge suppliers, and the Delta-Mendota Canal conveys water supporting roughly 135,000 acres of Pacific Flyway wetlands.

Consistent with the principle that reductions in water supply should not be the first, last, or only measure sought to support species, Pillar 2 gives priority to habitat, facility, and operational actions that improve outcomes with the water already dedicated to the environment before additional supply reductions are sought.

Refuges appear under both Pillars on purpose. Under Pillar 1 they are a contract type whose supply reliability and portfolio tools are member interests like any other. Under Pillar 2, the Water Authority's delivery performance to the refuges and the habitat it supports are stewardship results the Water Authority owns and reports. Supply is Pillar 1; delivery service and environmental outcome are Pillar 2.

Discipline against ineffectual spending

A recurring and legitimate concern is that ecosystem investments can absorb resources without producing measurable water-supply or biological returns. The framework's answer is proportional investment and measured results: no Pillar 2 Action advances without (1) a defined biological or functional metric, (2) an explicit link to a constraint or obligation that matters to members, and (3) monitoring to assess effectiveness. This is the Pillar 2 test applied in Stage 1 screening (Section 03); Actions that cannot meet it are not selected without a compelling reason.

Pillar 3 — Science, Governance & Readiness

Pillar 3 focuses on the Water Authority's capacity to make informed decisions, adapt as conditions change, and remain prepared for disruption. Science and evidence reduce decision uncertainty; institutional modernization can translate demonstrated results into durable operating rules and financeable programs; and readiness — meaning enterprise preparedness for disruption, not only emergency response — protects the program against shocks that cannot be forecast. Pillar 3 primarily advances Accountability.

Balancing the Annual Portfolio

Each year, the Water Authority selects a manageable portfolio of Actions across the seven lines of work. The portfolio should balance near-term operating improvements, medium-term capital and institutional work, and longer-term investments. It should also identify tangible benefits by major contract type and show the Board how resources are distributed across Pillars, time horizons, risks, contract types, and public-value themes. Multi-year Actions are carried in the portfolio as standing commitments with annual milestones, so that annual selection re-confirms them rather than re-opening them.

The Action card

Every proposed Action is documented on a two-page card with ten fields (Appendix B). The card states the member need — who is affected and what happens if nothing is done; the CVP-performance barrier the Action addresses and the opportunity that makes action possible now; whether the flexibility gained is lasting or temporary; the system value; the reliability, affordability, and accountability claims and their evidence; performance measures with baseline and target; risks and dependencies, including constraints on carrying out the Action itself; the implementation plan; and the Pillar, line of work, and 2023 Strategic Plan objective it advances.

Two-stage screening

Stage 1 — thresholds. An Action must advance an adopted Strategic Plan objective and CVP performance for members; must be relevant to the service area and name the contract types that benefit; and, if it involves environmental investment, must meet the Pillar 2 test. Actions that fail are returned for redefinition, not scored.

Stage 2 — ranking. Actions that pass are ordered under each of five criteria — member benefit by contract type, contribution to operational flexibility, measurable outcome benefit, risk reduction and urgency, and readiness and partner leverage — and staff identify those near the top across several criteria. Where numbers exist, the ranking uses them directly: acre-feet or dry-year acre-feet for flexibility, dollars for affordability, defined metrics for outcomes. An Action that ranks in the top third on at least three criteria, or first on any one, is a candidate for the year's portfolio, subject to the balancing rules and to capacity. Fixed percentage weights are not assigned; if the Committee wants numerical weighting in a given year, staff propose and the Committee confirms the weights at the start of the cycle. A lower-ranked Action with an immediate partner opportunity may proceed ahead of a higher-ranked one that is not ready. Criteria and scoring anchors are in Appendix C.

The scorecard

Progress is reported quarterly on measures grouped under reliability, affordability, and accountability (Appendix D). The scorecard leads with what the Water Authority controls or directly influences — coordinated positions advanced, projects on schedule and budget, funding secured, conveyance capacity restored, reliability of conveyance by contract type, operational forecast performance, stewardship commitments delivered, risk register current — and reports the annual allocation trend by contract type as the long-run outcome the whole program is meant to move. Each Action keeps its own measures on its card. The first four measures to be baselined are reliability of conveyance by contract type, external funding secured, Delta-Mendota Canal capacity restored, and stewardship commitments funded, scheduled, and reported.

Timeline

- **October 2026.** Board of Directors considers acceptance of the framework as a management method.
- **Within 60 days of acceptance.** Staff return with the first Annual Action Portfolio; the three staff workplans (policy, communications, and science), each derived from the selected Actions; baseline measures; and the enterprise risk register — aligned with budget development so that resourcing and Action selection move together.
- **Each year after.** Scan conditions, develop cards, screen and rank, authorize through the budget and existing approval processes, implement, measure, and adjust.
- **Every three to five years.** Review the framework alongside the Strategic Plan, or sooner if a warning sign appears.

Signposts and Revision Triggers

The following conditions would trigger an out-of-cycle review. Staff would maintain a dashboard with assigned owners and a regular review cadence. If a trigger occurs, staff would report to the Board with any recommended framework adjustments:

- A step-change in the allocation pattern for any contract type, in either direction.
- Performance-based and stewardship commitments failing to earn reciprocal regulatory flexibility within a defined window.
- SGMA implementation reducing supplies faster than member portfolios can absorb.
- A major infrastructure, funding, litigation, or species-status event that changes the operating environment.

Role Clarity

Board of Directors	Set strategic direction; approve policy and funding decisions; review performance.
Water Resources Committee	Preliminary review of the Framework and the Annual Action Portfolio; screen candidate Actions and provide oversight on behalf of the Board; recommend action to the Board.
Member agencies	Define service-area needs; provide operational and policy expertise; participate in implementation and coordinated positions.
Water Authority staff	Develop Actions and portfolios; coordinate partners and member advocates; manage implementation; report results.
Operations and technical teams	Provide facility, hydrologic, biological, engineering, and performance information.
External partners	Contribute authorities, funding, science, implementation capacity, and independent review.

Appendix A — Line of Work Profiles

Each profile states what the line covers, the kinds of Actions it houses, how progress is measured, and who the Water Authority works with. Profiles are planning references for staff; the Board-level structure is Section 02.

1A — Water Supply Portfolio Development

Builds each member's mix of CVP, banked, exchanged, recharged, and local supplies.

Contribution to PBO	Increase operational options and drought resilience by combining CVP supplies — one component of each member agency's overall supply portfolio, alongside local, groundwater, and other imported sources — with complementary storage, recharge, transfer, banking, recycling, conservation, and regional-management tools, and by coordinating delivery operations.
Kinds of Actions	Storage and groundwater banking partnerships · Conjunctive-use and recharge programs aligned with local groundwater sustainability plans · Transfer and exchange mechanisms that improve flexibility and reduce transaction friction — including intra-Water Authority arrangements that use the differing exposure of the Water Authority's contract types as counterparties. · Delivery operations and coordination among CVP facilities, contractors, and partners, including rescheduling strategies · recycled water, local supplies, and demand management where relevant · pre-negotiated drought-sequencing protocols.
How progress is measured	Dry-year supply capability by contract type; storage and banking capacity; recharge volume; transfer readiness; portfolio cost per unit of reliability.
Potential Partners	Member agencies; groundwater sustainability agencies; Reclamation; state agencies; neighboring water agencies; local governments.

1B — Infrastructure Modernization

Restores and modernizes the canal, pumps, and storage that move and hold the water.

Contribution to PBO	Increase reliability and operational flexibility through resilient storage, conveyance, pumping, power, automation, monitoring, and redundancy — including restoration of conveyance capacity lost to subsidence.
Kinds of Actions	Canal and pumping-plant rehabilitation and modernization, including the Delta-Mendota Canal Subsidence Correction Project. · Storage expansion and improved use of existing storage, including the B.F. Sisk Dam Raise and San Luis Reservoir Expansion Project · Automation, telemetry, remote sensing, and supervisory-control improvements · Power reliability, energy efficiency, and operational redundancy · Maintain a master asset-management plan based on condition, risk, lifecycle cost, and service criticality
How progress is measured	Asset condition; outage frequency; conveyance capacity restored; energy intensity; deferred-maintenance reduction; project delivery performance against schedule and budget.
Potential Partners	Reclamation; Authority operations; member agencies; energy providers; engineering partners; federal and state funding agencies.

1C – Hydrologic Variability & Climate Resilience

Captures wet-year water and prepares for dry years and extremes.

Contribution to PBO	Strengthen the system's ability to manage hydrologic extremes and long-term change — capturing water at the wet end and buffering at the dry end — so operations remain reliable across a widening range of conditions.
Kinds of Actions	Forecast-informed reservoir operations (FIRO) · CVP operational forecasting and forecast reconciliation: tracking forecast-versus-actual project demands, Delta outflow, upstream releases, exports, and reservoir and San Luis storage; identifying material or persistent forecast bias; and reconciling material differences during the operating year so that subsequent operating decisions improve rather than being reviewed only after the fact · Atmospheric-river and high-flow capture for storage and groundwater recharge · Coordinated flood operations that convert high flows into stored or recharged supply · Drought preparedness and contingency planning, including dry-year reserves · Portfolio adaptation and scenario planning for a changing hydrology
How progress is measured	High-flow water captured; forecast lead time and skill applied to operations; dry-year reserve adequacy; recharge achieved during wet events; portfolio resilience to extremes; operational forecast performance (forecast vs. actual demands, outflow, releases, exports, and storage) and bias corrected.
Potential Partners	Reclamation; DWR; forecasting and atmospheric-science programs; member agencies; groundwater sustainability agencies; flood-management agencies.

2A – Bay-Delta Watershed Ecosystem Recovery

Improves habitat and ecosystem function where it reduces uncertainty and constraint; delivers refuge water reliably.

Contribution to PBO	Improve watershed and Delta ecosystem function in ways that reduce ecological uncertainty, address the stressors that drive species status to support more predictable, adaptive CVP operations.
Kinds of Actions	Outcome-based habitat, hatchery, food-web, passage, temperature, and predation strategies, prioritized by their relevance to the species and functions that drive operating constraints · Tidal, floodplain, and watershed habitat restoration connecting watershed, Delta, and facility actions to the landscape that supports species · Habitat and facility improvements that support ecosystem function · Refuge conveyance excellence: delivery reliability for Central Valley Project Improvement Act Level 2 and Incremental Level 4 refuge supplies in partnership with member agencies · Monitoring and adaptive management tied to operational decisions and capable of changing in response to new information
How progress is measured	Refuge delivery reliability (scheduled vs. conveyed); habitat function and acreage; food-web response; water-quality indicators; ecological uncertainty reduction; adaptive decisions completed.
Potential Partners	Federal and state fish and wildlife agencies; Reclamation; water agencies; conservation partners; Tribes; research institutions.

2B – Listed Species Recovery

Advances measurable recovery of the species that drive Delta operations.

Contribution to PBO	Advance measurable recovery of listed species toward downlisting and, where recovery criteria are met, delisting — and avoid new listings — reducing the biological constraints that most directly limit operational flexibility. Recovery pathways and criteria largely exist; the work is directing resources, agencies, and partners toward the actions that actually move them.
Kinds of Actions	Species-specific recovery actions with measurable milestones for the species that most drive Delta operations — milestones developed with the fishery agencies and agreed in advance, so that progress is assessed against a shared standard rather than contested after the fact · Hatchery, supplementation, and reintroduction actions where necessary and scientifically appropriate · Monitoring designed to provide robust assessments of species viability and to inform the management actions — including water project operations — that can influence recovery · Application of clear, science-based downlisting and delisting criteria, and early action to avoid new listings · Recovery-focused collaboration with environmental organizations and Tribes
How progress is measured	Survival and abundance indicators; recovery-milestone attainment; downlisting and delisting progress; incidental-take reduction; biological uncertainty reduction.
Potential Partners	Environmental organizations; USFWS; NOAA Fisheries; CDFW; Reclamation; water agencies; Tribes; research institutions.

3A – Science & Evidence Leadership

Produces the monitoring, data, and studies that decisions rest on.

Contribution to PBO	Reduce uncertainty and improve the speed, quality, and transparency of decisions — the Water Authority's and regulators' — through modern monitoring, data systems, models, forecasting, analytics, applied research, and structured adaptive management. Real-time tools are the enabling technology; the objective is an evidence base strong enough to support durable regulatory change, not only temporary operational adjustments.
Kinds of Actions	Integrated monitoring networks and interoperable data systems, including modernization of the aging monitoring infrastructure on which regulatory decisions rest · Predictive analytics, artificial intelligence, and scenario tools with appropriate validation and governance · Environmental DNA, remote sensing, and other emerging biological-monitoring methods · Independent review, transparent assumptions, and learning agendas — including support for studies whose results may be inconvenient, which is what makes the program credible · Adaptive-management frameworks that translate findings into operating procedures and policy decisions
How progress is measured	Data latency; model performance; decision adoption; monitoring cost; uncertainty reduction; findings incorporated into policy or operations.
Potential Partners	Reclamation; federal and state science programs; universities; national laboratories; technology providers; member agencies.

3B — Regulatory & Institutional Modernization

Pursues lasting rule changes and the funding to pay for the work.

Contribution to PBO	Improve regulatory predictability, implementation capacity, coordination, and affordability through governance, permitting, finance, and partnership reforms — replacing static, calendar-based prescriptions with durable, outcome-accountable instruments as the evidence base matures.
Kinds of Actions	Coordinated policy and permitting strategies · Allocation methodology improvements — engagement with Reclamation on how south-of-Delta allocations are forecast, set, and updated (initial-allocation timing, conservatism in runoff and operations assumptions, and treatment of carryover and rescheduled water) so that allocations track actual conditions more closely · Durable operating instruments with built-in adaptive ranges, in place of serially re-litigated snapshots · Federal and state legislative actions that improve CVP performance or financing · Grant, loan, cost-share, and public-private funding approaches (the Water Authority's funding strategy is housed here and serves all three Pillars) · Interagency agreements that align monitoring, implementation, and reporting
How progress is measured	Time to decision; external funding secured; permit duration; relevancy to operations; administrative cost; durable-instrument coverage of core operations; coordinated actions completed; partner commitments fulfilled.
Potential Partners	Congress; federal and state agencies; member agencies; local governments; financial institutions; regional coalitions.

3C — Enterprise Risk & Threat Readiness

Prepares the organization for shocks that cannot be scheduled.

Contribution to PBO	Prepare the Water Authority and its OM&R program to anticipate, withstand, and recover from low-probability, high-consequence events — the threats that cannot be scheduled — implementing Strategic Plan Objective 3.3 at the enterprise level.
Kinds of Actions	Enterprise risk management: a maintained risk register with executive staff owners, triggers, and review cadence, integrated with the annual portfolio cycle · Cybersecurity for operational and business systems · Emergency preparedness, response, and continuity-of-operations planning for infrastructure failure, seismic events, contamination, and extended outages · Horizon scanning for regulatory, legal, market, and supply-chain shocks · Financial risk transfer, insurance strategy, and reserve adequacy for extraordinary events
How progress is measured	Risk-register currency and closure rates; exercise and drill completion; recovery-time objectives met; cybersecurity posture assessments; reserve adequacy against modeled events.
Potential Partners	Water Authority operations and administration; member agencies; Reclamation; state and federal emergency-management and cybersecurity programs; insurers.

Appendix B — Action Card Template and Example

Portfolio field	Required content
1. Action	Clear action-oriented title and concise description.
2. Member need	Member-agency problem, beneficiaries and contract types affected, and consequence of inaction — the who and the so-what; the specific barrier addressed is described in field 3.
3. Constraint and opportunity	The CVP-performance barrier the Action addresses (operational, infrastructure, ecological, scientific, regulatory, institutional, or financial) — not constraints on executing the Action, which belong under field 8 — and the technology, science, funding, partnership, policy, or timing opportunity that makes action possible now.
4. Flexibility contribution	How the Action expands or improves operating choices — and whether the improvement is durable or temporary.
5. System value	Water-supply, environmental, infrastructure, economic, financial, or institutional value.
6. Three Themes	Reliability, Affordability, and Accountability claims with evidence.
7. Performance measures	Baseline, target, data source, reporting frequency, and responsible owner.
8. Risk and dependencies	Key uncertainties, tradeoffs, legal requirements, external decisions, and constraints on carrying out the Action.
9. Implementation plan	Horizon, milestones, partners, governance, staffing, and funding strategy.
10. Framework and Strategic Plan linkage	The Pillar and primary line of work (Section 02), co-benefiting Pillars, and the adopted 2023 Strategic Plan goal and objective the Action advances (Appendix F).

Example Action Card

Action	B.F. Sisk Dam Raise and San Luis Reservoir Expansion
Member need	Contractors lose wet-year supply they cannot store, which limits dry-year carryover.
Constraint and opportunity	Insufficient south-of-Delta storage to retain wet-year supplies; the federal safety-of-dams modification creates a cost-effective window to add storage capacity
Flexibility contribution	A durable increase in south-of-Delta storage (approximately 130 thousand acre-feet), enabling wet-year capture, carryover, and drought reserves less dependent on Delta conditions
Three Themes	Reliability: dry-year supply capability · Affordability: cost-share with the safety-of-dams modification and outside funding · Accountability: milestone, budget, and storage-performance reporting
Performance measures	Design and permitting milestones; external funding secured; storage capacity added; wet-year water stored · Mid- to long-term

Framework and Strategic Plan linkage	Pillar 1 — Water Supply Resilience / 1B Infrastructure Modernization (co-benefits: 1A storage and banking partnerships; 1C wet-year capture) · Goal 1 (Sustainable Water Resources), Objective 1.2; Goal 2 (Financial Management), Objective 2.3
--------------------------------------	--

DRAFT

Appendix C — Screening Criteria and Anchors

Stage 1 thresholds (pass/fail). (1) Advances an adopted 2023 Strategic Plan objective and CVP performance for members. (2) Relevant to the service area, with the benefiting contract types named. (3) Meets the Pillar 2 test if it involves environmental investment.

Stage 2 ranking criteria. Actions that pass are ordered under each criterion. The 0–5 anchors are a common scale for discussion and documentation, not inputs to a formula; quantitative bases (acre-feet, dry-year acre-feet, dollars, defined metrics) are used directly where they exist.

Criterion	0 = none · 3 = moderate · 5 = strong
Member-agency benefit (by contract type)	0: no identifiable beneficiary · 3: benefits some members or contract types · 5: tangible benefit across contract types, or strong contract-type-specific benefit with transparent, benefit-based cost alignment.
Contribution to operational flexibility	0: no change in operating options · 3: modest new option or timing · 5: materially expands lawful operating choices, durably — quantified in acre-feet or dry-year acre-feet where possible.
Measurable outcome benefit (species, ecosystem, or infrastructure)	0: none or unmeasurable · 3: plausible measurable benefit · 5: clear, quantified benefit with a defined metric.
Risk reduction and urgency	0: no risk addressed · 3: reduces a moderate or non-urgent risk · 5: reduces a severe, time-sensitive risk.
Readiness and partner leverage	0: no plan, capacity, or partner · 3: partial readiness or leverage · 5: ready to execute with committed partners, funding leverage, and a time-sensitive partner opportunity.

Candidacy and weighting. Top third on at least three criteria, or first on any one, makes an Action a candidate, subject to the balancing rules (Section 02) and capacity. No fixed weights; if the Committee wants numerical weighting in a given year, staff propose and the Committee confirms the weights at the start of the cycle. Timeliness is considered explicitly.

Risk categories used on cards: hydrologic (variability, drought, flood, forecast uncertainty); operational (outages, coordination failures); biological (species response, habitat performance); regulatory and legal (permits, consultation, litigation); financial (cost escalation, funding gaps, lifecycle obligations); institutional (decision rights, capacity, partner alignment); reputational (public confidence, credibility).

Appendix D — Scorecard Measures

All measures are reported quarterly, grouped by theme. Where underlying data update annually, the quarterly report carries the latest value and notes its status. “Control” means the Water Authority delivers the result; “influence” means it materially affects a result others own; “monitor” means context.

Theme	Measure	Water Authority role
Reliability	Operational flexibility milestones — durable rule or instrument changes advanced	Control / influence
Reliability	Critical asset availability; conveyance capacity restored	Control / influence
Reliability	Reliability of conveyance by contract type, including refuge supplies (Level 2 / Incremental Level 4 conveyed vs. scheduled)	Control / influence
Reliability	Operational forecast performance — forecast vs. actual demands, Delta outflow, releases, exports, and storage; persistent bias identified and corrected	Influence
Reliability (long-run outcome)	CVP allocation and delivery by contract type — trend in average annual allocation	Monitor / influence
Affordability	External funding secured and obligated	Control / influence
Affordability	Cost avoidance and total-cost-of-ownership savings	Influence
Affordability	Energy and operating efficiency	Control / influence
Accountability	Coordinated positions and filings advanced for members	Control
Accountability	Projects on schedule and budget	Control / influence
Accountability	Stewardship commitments funded, on schedule, and publicly reported	Control
Accountability	Adaptive-management actions completed; findings adopted into operations or policy	Influence
Accountability	Enterprise risk register current; exercises completed; recovery objectives met	Control

Annual narrative. Reliability: what changed in the CVP's ability to deliver, and what the Water Authority did about it. Affordability: what costs were reduced, avoided, or leveraged. Accountability: what was promised, what was delivered, what evidence supports it, and what will be corrected.

Appendix E — Communications Crosswalk and Message Template

Consistent with the Strategic Communications Framework adopted in March 2026, external communication is organized around three themes. Each Action names its primary theme and records co-benefits.

Theme	Meaning	Test
Reliability	Dependable water deliveries and system performance across variable conditions.	Does it improve the ability to deliver water or operate the CVP under a wider range of conditions?
Affordability	Sustaining service through efficient operations, prudent investment, cost avoidance, outside funding, and lifecycle stewardship.	Does it improve efficiency, avoid costs, extend asset life, or bring in outside funding?
Accountability	Transparent responsibility for decisions, resources, implementation, measurement, and corrective action.	Can outcomes, spending, responsibilities, and progress be measured and reported?

Line of work	Reliability	Affordability	Accountability
1A Portfolio development	More dry-year options	Choices based on cost and avoided shortage	Transparent contracts, costs, volumes
1B Infrastructure	Fewer outages; more capacity	Lifecycle savings; outside funding	Asset condition; schedule and budget
1C Variability & climate	Readiness across extremes	Wet-year water captured; dry-year costs avoided	Documented decision rules; forecast review
2A Ecosystem recovery	Healthier watershed; more certainty	Investments tied to measured outcomes	Habitat, refuge-delivery, and water-quality metrics
2B Species recovery	Fewer biological constraints	Investments tied to milestones	Survival and abundance metrics; downlisting
3A Science & evidence	Better forecasts; less uncertainty	Efficient monitoring; avoided unnecessary action	Transparent methods; data governance
3B Regulatory & institutional	Faster coordination; lasting rules	Lower transaction costs; leveraged funding	Defined roles, milestones, decision records
3C Risk & readiness	Deliveries continue through disruption	Losses avoided; reserves right-sized	Register, exercises, and recovery reported

Message template. Need → Action → what it changes in operations → benefit to members by contract type → reliability, affordability, accountability → evidence. Use this sequence for briefings, fact sheets, and Board materials.

Appendix F — Crosswalk to the 2023 Strategic Plan

Each framework element is mapped to the Strategic Plan goal(s) and objective(s) it advances, so that annual workplans carry dual traceability — Board-adopted authority and framework method³.

Framework element	Primary 2023 Strategic Plan linkage
1A Water supply portfolio development	Goal 1 (Obj. 1.1, 1.2)
1B Infrastructure modernization	Goal 3 (Obj. 3.1, 3.2, 3.4); Goal 1 (Obj. 1.2); Goal 2 (Obj. 2.3)
1C Hydrologic variability & climate resilience	Goal 1 (Obj. 1.1, 1.2)
2A Bay-Delta watershed ecosystem recovery	Goal 1 (Obj. 1.3, 1.4)
2B Listed species recovery	Goal 1 (Obj. 1.3, 1.4)
3A Science & evidence leadership	Goal 1 (Obj. 1.4)
3B Regulatory & institutional modernization	Goal 1 (Obj. 1.3, 1.6); Goal 2 (Obj. 2.3, 2.5)
3C Enterprise risk & threat readiness	Goal 3 (Obj. 3.3)
Policy workplan (stream)	Goal 1 (Obj. 1.1, 1.3, 1.6); Goal 2 (Obj. 2.5)
Communications workplan (stream)	Goal 4 (Obj. 4.1–4.4); Goal 1 (Obj. 1.4)
Science workplan (stream)	Goal 1 (Obj. 1.4); lines 2A, 2B, 3A
Coordination (Section 00)	Goal 1 (Obj. 1.3, 1.6); Goal 4 (Obj. 4.3); Goal 5 (Obj. 5.3, 5.4)

Appendix G — Relationship Among Planning Documents



³ Strategic Plan Goal 5 (a high-performing staff and Board) and much of Goal 3 (routine operations, maintenance, and replacement) sit largely outside the three policy/communications/science workplans, but they bound what those workplans can realistically deliver. Organizational capacity is not a pillar of this framework because it is governed directly by the Strategic Plan; portfolio sizing must respect it.

Appendix H — Plain-Language Summary

The Central Valley Project Performance Framework provides a consistent approach for developing, evaluating, and measuring actions intended to improve CVP performance for San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority member agencies. It applies Performance-Based Operations as an overarching management approach and organizes the Water Authority's policy and operational work around three Pillars: Water Supply Resilience, Environmental Stewardship, and Science, Governance & Readiness.

Developed to support Board and member-agency decision-making, the framework helps the Water Authority prioritize actions, coordinate shared interests, and measure results based on reliability, affordability, and accountability. It serves as a management and planning tool; it does not independently authorize any project, expenditure, regulatory position, or contractual commitment.

Appendix I — Change Log from the Committee Draft

This appendix compares the Committee Discussion Draft distributed for Water Resources Committee review in September 2026 with this Board Discussion Draft. The Committee draft ran about 7,300 words, 6,100 of them in twelve numbered sections. This draft, excluding this appendix, runs about 6,000 words: a five-section body of about 2,600 words and eight supporting appendices. The changes respond to written comments received through September 28, 2026, and to staff review.

Table I-1 shows where each part of the Committee draft now appears. Table I-2 records each substantive change to content and its basis. Table I-3 lists material removed without a replacement, so that any reader looking for a passage from the Committee draft can find what became of it.

Table I-1. Where each part of the Committee draft now appears

Committee draft	Board draft	What changed
Cover	Cover	Status line changed to “Board Discussion Draft — October 2026.”
Document Status: purpose, decision path, relationship to the Strategic Plan, how to use this document, internal objective and external narrative, review questions	Decision memorandum; Section 00; Appendix G	Removed from the framework. The decision path, the scope of acceptance, and the matters for direction are in the accompanying decision memorandum. The relationship to the Strategic Plan is stated in Section 00 and Appendix G.
00 Executive Summary	00 Executive Summary	Opening rewritten; allocation record updated; two-pressure box and management-logic table removed; paragraph added on how the Pillars fit together; service-area and coordination paragraphs moved in from Sections 01 and 11; the Committee request moved to the memorandum.
01 Member Agencies and Service-Area Focus	00 Executive Summary; 03 (Stage 1 screening)	Service area kept as one paragraph. Beneficiary table and contract-class detail removed. The service-area test became the second Stage 1 threshold.

Committee draft	Board draft	What changed
02 Strategic Management Approach	01 The Approach — Performance-Based Operations	Combined with Sections 03 and 04. One definition of Performance-Based Operations.
03 CVP Performance Model	01; Appendix G	Diagram removed. The paragraph on whose decisions the approach seeks to improve and the line-of-sight text kept in Section 01. The planning-document chain kept in Appendix G.
04 Management Principles	01 (one sentence)	Reduce constraints, capture opportunities, and create system value kept as one sentence, with the preference for a corrective Action over another study. Key-question boxes removed.
05 Pillars and Lines of Work	02 Three Pillars, Seven Lines of Work; Appendix A	Body reduced to a summary table, with a one-line description of each line, and one paragraph per Pillar. Contributions, kinds of Actions, measures, and partners for each line moved to Appendix A.
06 Communications Crosswalk	01 (Three words for the public); Appendix E	Theme definitions and the line-of-work table moved to Appendix E and shortened.
07 Policy Action Portfolio Architecture	03 Action Portfolio Architecture; Appendix B	Action card described in one paragraph; template and example moved to Appendix B.
08 Prioritization and Risk	03; Appendix C	Weighted scoring replaced by two-stage screening (Table I-2). Criteria, scoring anchors, and risk categories in Appendix C.
09 Annual CVP Performance Scorecard	03; Appendix D	One paragraph in the body; measures in Appendix D.
10 Implementation Roadmap	04 Implementation Roadmap (Timeline)	Four phases and the first-year deliverables list replaced by a four-item timeline.
11 Framework Administration and Continuous Improvement	04; 00	Signposts and roles kept in Section 04. The seven-step cycle became one timeline item. Coordination reduced to one paragraph in Section 00. Other subsections removed (Table I-3).
Conclusion	—	Removed.
Appendix A — Action Review Checklist	Appendix B	Folded into the Action card template.
Appendix B — Communications Message Template	Appendix E	Reduced to a one-line message sequence.
Appendix C — Relationship Among Planning Documents	Appendix G	Kept.

Committee draft	Board draft	What changed
Appendix D — Crosswalk to the 2023 Strategic Plan	Appendix F	Kept; line 3A renamed.
—	Appendix H	New: plain-language summary for external use.
—	Appendix I	New: this change log.

Table I-2. Substantive changes

Topic	Committee draft	Board draft	Basis
Allocation record	2014–2023 averages of about 35 percent (agricultural water service) and 65 percent (municipal and industrial), from the 2023 Strategic Plan.	2012–2026 averages of about 36 percent and 67 percent, from Reclamation allocation records.	Staff
Scope	The framework “applies that mission to the Central Valley Project.”	The framework covers the Water Authority’s CVP work, described as a portion of the Board’s 2023 Strategic Plan.	Staff
Definition of Performance-Based Operations	Three different definitions (front matter, Section 00, Section 02). One committed the Water Authority to apply the same test to its own commitments; one contrasted outcomes with “temporary, case-by-case relief.”	One definition: Performance-Based Operations asks of each CVP operational requirement whether it is achieving its intended outcome. The self-commitment sentence and the “case-by-case relief” clause removed.	Committee comment and staff
Pillar 3 title	Adaptive Governance & Readiness.	Science, Governance & Readiness.	Committee comment
Line 3A title	Science, Data & Evidence Leadership.	Science & Evidence Leadership.	Committee comment
Line-of-work descriptions	Names only.	Each line carries a plain one-line description (Section 02 table and Appendix A).	Staff
How the parts fit together	Not stated.	New paragraph: Pillars organize the work, lines of work plan and measure it, Actions carry it out, and the public-value themes explain what it delivered.	Committee comment
Pillar 1 outcome	Not stated.	Long-run test: whether average annual CVP allocations and deliveries to members improve, tracked by contract type as the principal long-run measure.	Committee comment

Topic	Committee draft	Board draft	Basis
Pillar 2 principle	Not stated.	Reductions in water supply should not be the first, last, or only measure for species; priority goes to habitat, facility, and operational actions that use water already dedicated to the environment.	Committee comment
Pillar 2 test	Box: no Pillar 2 Action advances without a defined metric, a link to a member constraint or obligation, and instrumentation sufficient to determine whether it worked.	Retained in Section 02 under “Discipline against ineffectual spending,” framed as proportional investment and measured results; third element restated as monitoring to assess effectiveness; applied as a Stage 1 threshold (Section 03; Appendix C).	Committee comment and staff
Refuges under both Pillars	Not addressed.	New paragraph: supply reliability for refuges is Pillar 1; the Water Authority’s delivery performance and the habitat it supports are Pillar 2.	Committee comment
Meaning of “readiness”	Not defined.	Defined as enterprise preparedness for disruption, not only emergency response.	Committee comment
Operational forecasting	Not addressed.	New practice in Section 01: test operating forecasts for accuracy and bias and reconcile material differences during the year. New line 1C Action and measure; new scorecard measure.	Committee comment
Allocation methods	Not addressed.	New line 3B Action: work with Reclamation on how south-of-Delta allocations are forecast, set, and updated.	Committee comment
Prioritization	Seven criteria scored 0–5 and weighted 20, 20, 15, 15, 10, 10, and 10 percent.	Two-stage screening. Stage 1: pass/fail thresholds (advances a Strategic Plan objective; relevant to the service area, with benefiting contract types named; meets the Pillar 2 test). Stage 2: ranking on five criteria, using acre-feet and dollars directly where available. No fixed weights; the Committee may set weights for a given year. Candidacy rule and timeliness stated. Mission alignment and public-value themes no longer scored.	Committee comment

Topic	Committee draft	Board draft	Basis
Action card	Twelve fields.	Ten fields. Constraint and opportunity combined; Pillar and line of work combined with Strategic Plan linkage; member need and the barrier addressed defined separately, with constraints on carrying out the Action assigned to risks and dependencies. The example card follows the same fields.	Committee comment
Portfolio name	Annual Policy Action Portfolio.	Annual Action Portfolio.	Committee comment
Multi-year Actions	Not addressed.	Carried as standing commitments with annual milestones, re-confirmed rather than re-opened each year.	Committee comment
Scorecard	Mixed quarterly and annual reporting; measures not grouped; refuge conveyance measure; allocation reported as context.	All measures quarterly, grouped as Reliability, Affordability, and Accountability. Refuge measure broadened to reliability of conveyance by contract type, including refuge supplies. Allocation trend by contract type reported as the long-run outcome. Operational forecast performance added. First four baseline measures named.	Committee comment and staff
First portfolio	Within 90 days of acceptance, with three staff workplans (policy, communications, science).	Within 60 days of acceptance, with the three staff workplans, baseline measures, and the enterprise risk register.	Staff
Water Resources Committee role	Preliminary review and recommendation.	Adds screening of candidate Actions and oversight on behalf of the Board.	Committee comment
Contract types	“Contract class” and “contract type” both used.	“Contract type” used throughout; the uneven distribution of benefits, costs, and reliability risks across members restated.	Committee comment and staff
Communication s rules	Two rules: pair every public-value claim with an environmental result, and define accountability as applying to the Water Authority as well as regulators.	Both removed. The themes are described as how results are explained to the public; the message sequence simplified.	Staff

Topic	Committee draft	Board draft	Basis
Line 1A	CVP supply described as one component of each member's total supply.	Described as one component of each member's overall supply portfolio, alongside local, groundwater, and other imported sources.	Committee comment
Line 2A	—	Adds hatchery strategies; connects restoration to the landscape that supports species; habitat and facility improvements; refuge conveyance in partnership with member agencies; monitoring that can change in response to new information.	Committee comment
Line 2B	—	Species milestones developed with the fishery agencies and agreed in advance; recovery collaboration with environmental organizations and Tribes; environmental organizations added as partners.	Committee comment
Line 3A	—	Adds remote sensing to emerging monitoring methods.	Committee comment
Line 3B	—	Adds relevance to operations as a measure; drops the priority on decision rights, schedules, and escalation pathways for joint Actions.	Committee comment and staff
Line 3C	Applied to the Water Authority and its program.	Applied to the Water Authority and its operations, maintenance, and replacement program; risk-register owners identified as executive staff.	Staff

Table I-3. Material removed without replacement

Item	Committee draft section	Note
How to use this document (six-item list)	Document Status	—
Internal objective, external narrative box	Document Status	Communications rules removed (Table I-2).
Recommended review questions	Document Status	Matters for direction are in the decision memorandum.
Two-pressure box	00	Substance kept in “The Challenge This Framework Addresses.”
Management-logic table	00	Kept as one sentence in Section 01.
What the Committee is asked to do	00	In the decision memorandum.
Beneficiary table	01	—

Item	Committee draft section	Note
Contract-class exposure paragraph and differentiation box	01	Contract-type analysis kept in Section 00 and Stage 1 screening.
CVP Performance Model diagram	03	—
Three management principles with key questions	04	One sentence in Section 01.
Terminology note	05	—
Boundary rules within Pillar 1, within Pillar 2, and between lines 1C and 3C	05	One-line descriptions now distinguish the lines.
Pillar 3 title box	05	Title resolved (Table I-2).
Themes as a value test (paragraph)	06	—
Portfolio discipline box	08	Capacity limit stated in the candidacy rule and portfolio balancing.
Scorecard introduction on control and influence	09	Definitions of control, influence, and monitor in Appendix D.
Four implementation phases and first-year deliverables	10	Replaced by the timeline in Section 04.
Seven-step governance cycle	11	One timeline item in Section 04.
Coordination architecture (five elements)	11	One paragraph in Section 00.
Managing divergence among members	11	—
Assignment of day-to-day framework administration	11	—
Conclusion and closing statement	—	—
Action review checklist	Appendix A	Folded into the Action card template (Appendix B).
Communications message template (question table)	Appendix B	One-line sequence in Appendix E.

Section numbers in the Committee draft column refer to that draft's numbering (00–11).



Official Memorandum

PO Box 2157
Los Banos, CA 93635
sldmwa.org

To: SLDMWA Water Resources Committee Members and Alternates

From: Scott Petersen, Chief Strategic and Administrative Officer

Date: October 5, 2026

RE: Update on Water Policy/Resources Activities

This memorandum summarizes water policy developments since the last report across the standing topic areas within the Committee's purview. It opens with a one-page dashboard and the items requiring Committee attention; detailed reporting follows, and standing program backgrounds are consolidated in Appendix A.

This Month at a Glance

Topic	Development this period	Authority action	Next milestone
1. CVP/SWP Long-Term Operations	Green Sturgeon cumulative salvage reached 40 fish against the 14-fish incidental take limit (Sep. 6 assessment ¹) — the second consecutive year exceeded; consultation with NMFS reinitiated; effects assessed as non-lethal, all fish released alive. Analysis of further Action 5 operational refinements continues.	Monitoring via Fish and Water Operations Group; coordinating with Reclamation.	ITL threshold resets Sept. 30, 2026
2. State Water Board – Bay-Delta Plan	Written comments on the Aug. 19 final draft Plan were filed by the Sept. 18 deadline and posted publicly; the Board has stated it remains committed to the HRL framework. Phase 1 Tuolumne VA staff report pending.	Water Authority and member agency comments submitted; coordination with member agencies and HRL partners continues.	Board hearing Oct. 28–29, 2026
3. State Water Board – Tribal Beneficial Uses	Comment period on draft TBU designation guidance closed Aug. 31; Board is reviewing comments received.	Comments submitted ²	State Water Board consideration and finalization of guidance
4. CV Regional Water Quality Control Board	No activity to report this period.	—	—
5. SJR Restoration Program	2026 Restoration Allocation set at 281,739 AF at Gravelly Ford (Normal-Dry year type).	Reviewing recommended flow schedule.	Reclamation action on flow schedule
6. Delta Conveyance / Delta Stewardship Council	USACE finalized its NEPA Record of Decision (July 8); DWR submitted a Revised Certification of Consistency on remanded items (July 24). Three appeals of the revised certification were filed (effective Aug. 24).	Monitoring appeal window and permitting phase.	DSC appeal hearing and determination
7. Reclamation Manual	No documents out for comment.	—	—

¹ Request from Authority staff

² Request from Authority staff



Topic	Development this period	Authority action	Next milestone
8. SJV Water Blueprint	Unified Water Plan publicly released Sept. 3 with the California Water Institute at Fresno State; board strategic planning session held Sept. 16; Metropolitan groundwater banking study underway.	Participating in planning and study efforts.	Report to Congress; 2027 program scoping
9. SJV Collaborative Action Program	“Vision for the San Joaquin Valley” released May 29; Phase II work groups continuing.	Participating in work groups.	Work group products; prioritization tool criteria

Upcoming Deadlines and Milestones

- September 30: Green Sturgeon cumulative incidental take threshold resets for the new water year.
- October 28–29: State Water Board consideration of adoption of the final draft Bay-Delta Plan (Sacramento).
- October 29: Reclamation Manual Comments Due - [WTR 11-01 Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program Projects, Desalination Construction Projects, and Large-Scale Water Recycling and Desalination Projects Feasibility Study Review Process](#)

Policy Items

1. Federal Actions – CVP/SWP Long-Term Operations

Green Sturgeon Incidental Take and Reinitiation of Consultation

What happened: Cumulative expanded salvage for Water Year 2026 first exceeded the 14-fish annual incidental take limit in the 2024 NMFS Biological Opinion on June 13 and, following a series of additional salvage events in August, reached 40 fish as of September 29 (13 fish collected — 5 at CVP and 8 at SWP facilities — with expanded totals reflecting sampling protocols). This is the second consecutive water year the limit has been exceeded (WY 2025 expanded salvage: 20 fish). Salvaged fish measured 347–597 mm, corresponding to Ages 1–3. Reclamation issued an updated Green Sturgeon assessment on September 6 and has reinitiated consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service.

Why it matters: Exceeding an incidental take limit is a compliance trigger that reopens ESA consultation on Project operations, and the limit has now been exceeded in the last two years. The August 24 assessment attributes the increase to higher juvenile production following favorable hydrology in Water Years 2023–2025 — Red Bluff monitoring has recorded its highest juvenile index in 26 years — and to warming South Delta temperatures hypothesized to shift juveniles toward more saline habitats. During the most recent salvage events, the export zone of influence was within the medium-low range under more negative Old and Middle River flows, extending up the OMR corridor as far north as Holland Cut and Mildred Island — a larger footprint than during the springtime events. Salvage effects remain non-lethal — no mortalities have been observed, and all fish salvaged in WY 2026 were released alive — and the assessment concludes that no information suggests the additional salvage poses risks to the population beyond those considered in the December 2025 Action 5 Record of Decision. The consultation outcome nonetheless bears watching for potential operational implications.



Authority action: Staff is monitoring through the Fish and Water Operations Group and coordinating with Reclamation.

Next steps: Based on historical patterns, additional salvage through the summer and fall months is possible. The cumulative salvage threshold resets on September 30, 2026. Staff will report on the consultation path forward with NMFS.

Action 5 Record of Decision (Executive Order 14181 Implementation)

What happened: In January 2025, President Trump issued Executive Order 14181, directing analysis of potential changes to operations under the December 2024 Record of Decision. On December 4, 2025, Reclamation executed a Record of Decision on the Long-Term Operations of the CVP and SWP ("Action 5"), updating the operations adopted in the December 2024 ROD and associated Biological Opinions. Action 5:³⁴

- Removes the Delta Smelt Summer and Fall Habitat Action (Fall X2), based on U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service findings that the action is not anticipated to have observable effects on delta smelt survival;
- Removes the early-implementation Delta export reduction associated with the Healthy Rivers and Landscapes (HRL) program, given uncertainty in the timing of potential State Water Board adoption of the HRL Program; and
- Updates Delta operating criteria to expand Old and Middle River (OMR) management to no more negative than -5,000 cfs, with a storm-flex action to -6,500 cfs, supported by predictive tools for real-time assessment of environmental conditions.

Why it matters: Modeling estimates a 250–400 TAF improvement in combined CVP/SWP export capability under Action 5, with the SWP share uncertain pending how the SWP operates under its Incidental Take Permit for California Endangered Species Act compliance. These changes bear directly on South-of-Delta supply reliability for member agencies.

Next steps: Additional analysis is underway on further operational changes that could improve water supply while maintaining species protections, and on alternative methods to address effects on ESA-listed species and advance recovery.

Trinity River Division ESA Consultation

What happened: On June 5, Reclamation transmitted a Cooperating Agency draft Supplemental EIS for the 2021 Reinitiation of Consultation on Long-Term Operation of the CVP and SWP – Trinity River Division.

Authority action: The Water Authority submitted comments in coordination with member agencies.

³ <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2025-01-31/pdf/2025-02174.pdf>

⁴ https://www.usbr.gov/mp/nepa/nepa_project_details.php?Project_ID=54661



2. State Water Resources Control Board

Bay-Delta Plan – Phase 1 (Lower San Joaquin River and Southern Delta Salinity)

What happened: Following the Board’s September 19, 2025 notice on the Draft Scientific Basis Report Supplement for the Tuolumne River Voluntary Agreement, the Water Authority provided comments. Procedural history for Phase 1 is summarized in Appendix A.⁵

Next steps: (i) final draft Staff Report for the Tuolumne River VA; (ii) Board workshop and consideration of the Tuolumne River VA; (iii) final draft EIR and regulation implementing Lower San Joaquin River flows and Southern Delta salinity; and (iv) Board consideration of the implementing regulation.

Bay-Delta Plan – Phase 2 (Sacramento/Delta)

What happened: On August 19, the Board released the final draft Bay-Delta Plan, the final Staff Report/Substitute Environmental Document, and the Final Scientific Basis Report Supplement supporting the Voluntary Agreements. The final draft carries forward the dual-pathway structure, pairing the Healthy Rivers and Landscapes (HRL) program — through which participating water users could satisfy new requirements with a combination of flow and habitat measures — with an enforceable regulatory pathway for non-participants or in the event HRL does not deliver required results, and retains the proposed Tribal Tradition and Culture (CUL) beneficial use designation. Written comments are due September 18, 2026, and the Board will consider adoption at a public meeting on October 28–29, 2026.

Why it matters: The Phase 2 framework will set the regulatory baseline — or the VA alternative to it — governing Delta outflows and interior flows that shape member agencies’ supplies. The scope of VA participation will determine which pathway applies to which water rights. On September 4, Reclamation released a letter commenting on the draft Final Bay-Delta Plan, detailing key concerns, and Westlands Water District issued a press statement.

Authority action: On August 19, the Water Authority, Westlands Water District, and Friant Water Authority issued a joint statement that the HRL Program could be the best path forward for California if key concerns are addressed, emphasizing sound science, operational flexibility, and protection of both natural resources and water supply reliability. Staff is preparing provision-by-provision comments on the final draft, coordinated with member agencies and HRL partners, for submission by September 18.

Next steps: Written comments due September 18, 2026; Board consideration of adoption October 28–29, 2026, in Sacramento.

Draft Guidance on Designating Tribal Beneficial Uses

What happened: On June 17, the Board invited participation in review of its Draft Guidance on Designating Tribal Beneficial Uses (TBUs), which explains the history of TBUs, how they are designated into water quality control plans, and how to engage. The Board held a public workshop on July 22, and the written comment period closed at 12:00 p.m. on August 31, 2026.

⁵ Request from Authority staff



Authority action: The Authority coordinated with member agencies and submitted comments⁶.

Next steps: State Water Board consideration and finalization of the guidance. Staff will monitor TBU designation activity relevant to the Bay-Delta Plan's proposed Tribal Tradition and Culture (CUL) beneficial use designation.

3. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

No activity to report this period.

4. San Joaquin River Restoration Program

No activity to report this period.

5. Delta Conveyance Project and Delta Stewardship Council

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Record of Decision

What happened: On July 8, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District, finalized its Record of Decision for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project, completing the agency's programmatic environmental review under NEPA. The decision allows USACE to begin evaluating future permit applications — including under Clean Water Act Section 404 and Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 — for project components within its jurisdiction.

Delta Plan Certification of Consistency – Remanded Items

What happened: Following the Delta Stewardship Council's April 23, 2026 determination — which dismissed or denied most appeals and remanded two policy areas — DWR submitted a Revised Certification of Consistency on July 24, 2026. For Delta Plan Policy ER P5, DWR describes its consideration and avoidance or mitigation of the potential for DCP facilities to improve habitat conditions for the invasive golden mussel; for Policy DP P2, DWR describes how it considered and reduced conflicts between the Twin Cities Complex and Sac Sewer's Harvest Water project. DWR has determined the covered action is consistent with both policies.

Next steps: Three appeals of the revised certification (C20262) were filed, including by the Counties of San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo, Central Delta Water Agency, and Local Agencies of the North Delta, with an effective date of August 24, 2026. The Council will hold an appeal hearing followed by a determination. Staff is monitoring the appeal proceedings and the federal permitting phase.

6. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation – Reclamation Manual

No documents out for comment this period.

7. San Joaquin Valley Water Blueprint

Organizational background, mission, and strategic priorities appear in Appendix A. Developments this period:

⁶ Request from Authority staff

- **Unified Water Plan:** A full administrative draft is complete. The Plan consolidates existing water plans and strategies into one valley-wide framework and quantifies a water supply gap of 2.5–3 million acre-feet by 2040, incorporating SGMA compliance, climate impacts, and environmental flow requirements. Even the most optimistic scenario — combining restored canal capacity, local recharge, and increased Delta access — leaves approximately 0.5–0.9 million acre-feet unmet and 200,000–400,000 acres requiring repurposing, at an estimated infrastructure cost of \$13–20 billion. The companion Bureau of Reclamation Report to Congress outline (Chapters 1–6) is available on request⁷.
- **Board strategic planning:** A planning session is set for September 16, 2026, following completion of the Unified Water Plan, to define the scope of future organizational activities — legislative advocacy, policy, and communications — for 2027 and beyond.
- **SB 72 / California Water Plan:** Senate Bill 72 (Caballero) directs DWR to identify and evaluate climate adaptation strategies to help meet water supply targets in the California Water Plan. The Blueprint has been invited to participate in DWR’s Adaptation Strategies “Test of Concept,” a pilot for the regional planning, technical evaluation, and engagement approach to be applied statewide for CWP 2033.
- **Groundwater banking study with Metropolitan Water District:** Metropolitan has approved the scope of work and budget; final task order execution is targeted for the end of the month, with a mid-July kickoff aligned to completion of the Unified Water Plan work.
- **Gubernatorial priorities letter:** A draft letter proposes a two-term water agenda for the next California administration, identifying an approximately 2.5 million acre-foot annual structural shortfall in the Valley and recommending a coordinated Unified Water Plan approach: drinking water reliability for disadvantaged communities; restored capacity in the California Aqueduct, Delta-Mendota Canal, and Friant-Kern Canal; groundwater recharge and demand reduction; large-scale storage and supply infrastructure; flood reduction; habitat restoration; farmland repurposing; and economic transition support — alongside streamlined permitting, sustainable funding, and science-based decision-making.⁸

8. San Joaquin Valley Water Collaborative Action Program

What happened: On May 29, the CAP released its “Vision for the San Joaquin Valley,” detailing desired outcomes, investment strategies, and policy reforms to transition the region toward sustainable water management for people, agriculture, and the environment. Phase II work groups (Safe Drinking Water; Sustainable Water Supplies; Ecosystem Health; Land Use, Demand Reduction and Land Repurposing; Implementation) continue meeting, and a Steering Committee subgroup is reviewing example prioritization tools to craft a work plan and initial criteria. Program background appears in Appendix A.

⁷ <https://waterblueprintca.com/information/the-unified-water-plan/>

⁸ Request from Authority staff



Attachments



Appendix A – Program Backgrounds (Standing Reference)

This appendix consolidates procedural history and organizational background that previously appeared in the body of each monthly report. It is refreshed quarterly or as programs materially change.

Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan Update

The State Water Board is updating its 2006 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta Estuary in two phases: Phase 1 (San Joaquin River flows and southern Delta salinity) and Phase 2 (Sacramento River and tributaries, Delta eastside tributaries, Delta outflows, and interior Delta flows). At its December 12, 2018 meeting, the Board adopted the Phase 1 amendments and Final Substitute Environmental Document⁹; at the same meeting, DWR and the Department of Fish and Wildlife presented proposed Voluntary Settlement Agreements on behalf of Reclamation, DWR, and the public water agencies they serve¹⁰. The Board did not adopt the proposals in lieu of the Phase 1 amendments, but directed staff to incorporate a Delta watershed-wide agreement as an alternative in a future comprehensive Plan update.

On July 18, 2022, the Board issued a Notice of Preparation and CEQA scoping for the regulation implementing Lower San Joaquin River flow and Southern Delta salinity objectives¹¹; the Authority and member agencies provided scoping comments¹². Phase 1 implementation was then delayed by litigation. On the Phase 2 side, the Board released a draft Plan in October 2024 and a revised draft in July 2025 reflecting public input; on September 16, 2025, the Board rescinded its noticed hearing, and subsequent workshops and a written comment period concluded in early 2026 (see body of report for current status).

San Joaquin Valley Water Blueprint

The Water Blueprint represents water users, districts, farmers, and municipalities across the Central Valley. Its problem statement: California faces a major water supply shortfall that could affect one million acres and cost \$7.2 billion in farm revenue and 85,000 jobs statewide. The Blueprint advocates a combination of infrastructure investment and policy change to capture excess wet-year flows and replenish aquifers. Mission: “Unifying the San Joaquin Valley’s voice to advance an accessible, reliable solution for a balanced water future for all.” Strategic priorities (current plan period, running through 2026): advocacy; groundwater quality and disadvantaged communities; land use and environmental planning; outreach and communications; SGMA implementation; water supply goals; and governance, operations, and finance.

⁹ Available at https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/resolutions/2018/rs2018_0059.pdf.

¹⁰ Available at <https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Blogs/Voluntary-Settlement-Agreement-Meeting-Materials-Dec-12-2018-DWR-CDFW-CNRA.pdf>.

¹¹ Available at https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/notices/20220715-implementation-nop-and-scoping-dwr-baydelta.pdf

¹² Request from Authority staff



San Joaquin Valley Water Collaborative Action Program

The CAP Plenary Group adopted work groups to implement the CAP Term Sheet, adopted November 22, 2022¹³. The Bureau of Reclamation currently funds the CAP, supporting overall process management and facilitation and development of a prioritization tool for use by CAP participants, agencies, stakeholders, and the public in evaluating policy recommendations, programmatic changes, and projects to achieve sustainable water management in the San Joaquin Valley.

San Joaquin River Restoration Program – Resources

Restoration Flows information: restoresjr.net/flows. Restoration Administrator recommendations: restoresjr.net/flows/flow-scheduling.

¹³ Request from Authority staff