CALL TO ORDER

PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public may address the Board on any item that is within the jurisdiction of the Board; however, no action may be taken on any item not appearing on the agenda unless the action is otherwise authorized by Subdivision (b) of Section 54954.2 of the Government Code. Those persons wishing to address the Board on any matter, whether or not it appears on the agenda, are requested to complete and submit to the Board Secretary a "Request to Speak" form, which is available on the table in the Board Room. Comments will be limited to three minutes per speaker. Thank you.

ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA

In accordance with Section 54954.2 of the Government Code (Brown Act), additions to the agenda require two-thirds vote of the legislative body, or, if less than two-thirds of the members are present, a unanimous vote of those members present, that there is a need to take immediate action and that the need for action came to the attention of the local agency subsequent to the agenda being posted.

1. ACTION ITEMS

A. MINUTES
   The Committee will be asked to approve the Community and Legislative Affairs Committee meeting minutes of January 8, 2020.

2. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. DISCUSSION OF PROCESS FOR LEGISLATIVE ENGAGEMENT (WRITTEN)

B. CIVIC PUBLICATIONS (POWERPOINT)
C. PUBLIC OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATION (WRITTEN)

D. STATE LEGISLATIVE REPORT AND MATRIX – WEST COAST ADVISORS (WRITTEN)

E. FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE REPORT AND MATRIX – INNOVATIVE FEDERAL STRATEGIES (WRITTEN)

F. CALIFORNIA STRATEGIES MONTHLY REPORT (WRITTEN)

3. GENERAL MANAGER’S COMMENTS

4. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

5. COMMITTEE MEMBER REQUESTED FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

6. ADJOURN

*A Municipal Water District

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Board Secretary (909-993-1736), 48 hours prior to the scheduled meeting so that the Agency can make reasonable arrangements.

Proofed by: [Signature]

DECLARATION OF POSTING

I, April Woodruff, Board Secretary of the Inland Empire Utilities Agency, a Municipal Water District, hereby certify that a copy of this agenda has been posted by 5:30 p.m. in the foyer at the Agency’s main office, 6075 Kimball Avenue, Building A, Chino on Thursday, February 6, 2020.

April Woodruff
MINUTES
COMMUNITY AND LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS
COMMITTEE MEETING
INLAND EMPIRE UTILITIES AGENCY
AGENCY HEADQUARTERS, CHINO, CA

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2020
9:00 A.M.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT
Steven J. Elie, Chair
Kati Parker

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT
None

STAFF PRESENT
Shivaji Deshmukh, General Manager
Kathy Besser, Executive Manager of External Affairs & Policy Development/AGM
Christiana Daisy, Executive Manager of Engineering/AGM
Christina Valencia, Executive Manager of Finance & Administration/AGM
Andrea Carruthers, Manager of External Affairs
Ken Monfore, Deputy Manager of Maintenance
Cathleen Pieroni, Manager of Government Relations
John Scherck, Senior Project Manager
Daniel Solorzano, Technology Specialist I
Wilson To, Technology Specialist II
Teresa Velarde, Manager of Internal Audit
April Woodruff, Board Secretary/Office Manager

OTHERS PRESENT
Eric Grubb, CVWD
Socorro Panteleon, CVWD

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. There were no public comments received or additions to the agenda.

ACTION ITEMS
The Committee:

❖ Approved the Community and Legislative Affairs Committee meeting minutes of December 11, 2019.
Community and Legislative Affairs Committee
January 8, 2020
Page 2

• Recommended that the Board approve the 2020 Legislative Policy Principles;
  as an Action Item on the January 15, 2020 Board meeting agenda.

Director Elie requested that the wording in the first bullet point be revised to reflect water supply options to assist our customers and for the region. Director Elie suggested that under the titled "regulations/compliance" the Agency, revise the third bullet point, which starts with "oppose," to a positive statement. General Manager Shivaji Deshmukh reported that the 2020 Legislative Policy Principles will be revised with the Directors' feedback received and the updated principles will be presented at the Board meeting.

• Recommended that the Board:

  1. Adopt Resolution No. 2020-1-5, authorizing the Agency-wide organizational memberships and affiliations for Fiscal Year 2020/21; and

  2. Authorize the General Manager to approve all Agency-wide Membership fees that are $5,000 or less;

as a Consent Calendar Item on the January 15, 2020 Board meeting agenda.

INFORMATION ITEMS
The following information items were presented or received and filed by the Committee:

• Public Outreach and Communication

Director Parker requested to be added to the distribution list to receive E-Basin Update emails.

• State Legislative Report – West Coast Advisors

Director Elie requested to review IEUA comment letters, the Agency sends in response to legislation and policy. Manager of Government Relations Cathleen Pieroni stated she will provide the letters to Director Elie.

• Federal Legislative Report and Matrix – Innovative Federal Strategies
  • California Strategies Monthly Report

GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMENTS
General Manager Shivaji Deshmukh stated that staff is working on scheduling the final 2020 Rate Study Workshop at the end of January. General Manager Deshmukh stated there will be a joint workshop with the IEUA Board of Directors and the Regional Sewerage Policy Committee in February. On December 24, 2019, the Agency received the draft Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (WIFIA) agreement for the RP-5 Expansion. A general managers meeting with the member agencies and water retailers will take place on January 28, 2020. General Manager Deshmukh stated that staff will be scheduling CBP Ad Hoc committee meetings that will lead to potential joint meetings with CBWM.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS
Director Elie thanked staff for the great presentations and stated it was good to be back in the Community and Legislative Affairs Committee.
COMMUNITY MEMBER REQUESTED FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
There were no Committee member requests for future agenda items.

With no further business, Director Elie adjourned the meeting at 9:53 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

April Woodruff
Board Secretary/Office Manager

*A Municipal Water District

APPROVED: FEBRUARY 12, 2020
Community and Legislative Affairs Committee
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Date: February 19, 2020
To: The Honorable Board of Directors
From: Shivaji Deshmukh, General Manager
Committee: Community & Legislative Affairs

Executive Contact: Kathy Besser, Executive Manager of Ext. Aff. & Policy Dev./AGM
Subject: Discussion of Process for Legislative Engagement

Executive Summary:
With the beginning of the 2020 State and Federal legislative sessions, staff is looking for direction and guidance from the current Committee members on their preferences for legislative engagement that takes place outside of the established Committee process.

There are instances in which it would not be beneficial for the Agency to wait until the next Committee/Board meeting for direction on engaging in advocacy. Historically, at the July 17, 2013 meeting, the Board voted to authorize the General Manager to author and sign legislative position letters requiring immediate attention. Subsequently, it was changed to directing the General Manager to receive approval from the Committee Chair prior to taking a position, and then presenting the action taken as an information item at the following meeting. To further aid direction on taking positions on items, since 2018 the Board has approved Legislative Policy Principles to provide direction to the General Manager and staff on legislative priorities.

A flow chart of the current process is attached, and staff is looking for direction on how the Committee would like to proceed going forward with legislative engagement.

Staff’s Recommendation:
This is an informational item for the Board of Directors.

Budget Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgeted (Y/N)</th>
<th>Amendment (Y/N)</th>
<th>Amount for Requested Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Account/Project Name:

Fiscal Impact (explain if not budgeted):

Full account coding (internal AP purposes only): 

Project No.:
Prior Board Action:
On January 17, 2013, the Board voted to authorize the General Manager to author and sign legislative position letters requiring immediate attention.

Environmental Determination:
Not Applicable

Business Goal:
IEUA will support effective public outreach and education, and advocate for the development of policies, legislation and regulations that benefit the region.

Attachments:
Attachment 1 - Flow Chart
IEUA Process for Engagement on Legislation

1. Staff reviews bills for IEUA relevancy
   - If no relevancy or has political concerns, do not bring to Board

2. Reference Board-adopted Legislative Policy Guidelines
   - If no guiding policy
   - If yes
     - Staff confers with General Manager to determine urgency of Agency actions
     - If urgent
       - General Manager can authorize if within Legislative Policy Guidelines; immediate notification of Committee on actions taken
     - If not urgent
       - Bring bill to Committee meeting for consideration of position, explaining basis for recommended IEUA engagement
       - Bring ballot initiatives, constitutional amendments and high-profile bills to Committee and/or full Board for consideration

Last Updated 01/29/2020
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INFORMATION ITEM 2B
Background

- 2012: Civic Publications was formed

Civic Publications, Inc. provides communication outreach solutions for public agencies, providing factual content and bringing clarity to community and civic issues.

Since 2012, IEUA has continued to work with Civic Publications utilizing services for messaging and ad development including all aspects of print media and digital marketing.
Marketing through Civic Publications

- Ads
  - ¼ Page, ½ Page, Spadea
- Advertorials
- Targeted Email Marketing
- Added Value
  - Editorial Boards
  - Op-Ed Placement
  - Design
- Upcoming Marketing
  - Earth Day Spadea
  - ½ Page Earth Day Ad
  - Email Blast: Annual Report
  - Water Awareness Month
  - Compost Awareness Week

**New Year New Habit**

FREE WATER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

**NEW HABITS FOR THE NEW YEAR**

Turf Replacement Rebate Program

Residential customers are eligible to receive up to $5.00 per sq. ft. of turf removed for a max of 5,000 sq. ft.

High Efficiency Clothes Washer Rebates

Net a great price on the best in two residential rebates offered.
- High Efficiency Clothes Washer Rebates available starting at $65.
- Premium High Efficiency Tires Rebates available starting at $50

**New Year New Habit**

**CASH FOR THE HOLIDAYS**

Water softener removal rebate

Protecting your hard water supply is critical. Residential softening water softener, the best home water softener available. This system is easy to install and maintain. For more information, please call 1-888-700-7700.

**Targeted Email Blast**

January 29
Next Steps

- Provide recommendation on advertising/outreach support

Business Goal: IEUA will be ethical, cost-effective and apply environmentally sustainable regional planning principles in all aspects of business and public service.
Objective: IEUA will support effective public outreach and education.
Date: February 19, 2020
To: The Honorable Board of Directors
From: Shivaji Deshmukh, General Manager
Committee: Community & Legislative Affairs

Executive Contact: Kathy Besser, Executive Manager of Ext. Aff. & Policy Dev./AGM
Subject: Public Outreach and Communication

Executive Summary:

• February 2, World Wetlands Day

• February 13, IEUA Water Quality Laboratory Dedication, 10:00 a.m., Water Quality Laboratory (Sun Deck)

• February 15-22, National Engineer’s Week

• February 18, Upland Sierra Club Presentation (with CVWD), 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m., Senior Center @ Rancho Cucamonga Central Park: 11200 Baseline Road, Rancho Cucamonga

• February 19, IEUA Blood Drive, 8:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., IEUA HQB Event Room

• February 25, Project W.E.T. (Water Education for Teachers) and Garden in Every School Workshop, 8:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m., IEUA HQB Event Room

Staff’s Recommendation:
This is an informational item for the Board of Directors to receive and file.

Budget Impact  Budgeted (Y/N): Y  Amendment (Y/N): N  Amount for Requested Approval:
Account/Project Name:

Fiscal Impact (explain if not budgeted):

Full account coding (internal AP purposes only):  -  -  -  Project No.:  -  -  -
Prior Board Action:

N/A

Environmental Determination:
Statutory Exemption

N/A

Business Goal:
IEUA is committed to providing a reliable and cost-effective water supply and promoting sustainable water use throughout the region.

IEUA is committed to enhancing and promoting environmental sustainability and the preservation of the region's heritage.

Attachments:
Attachment 1 - Background
Background

Subject: Public Outreach and Communication

February
- February 2, World Wetlands Day
- February 13, IEUA Water Quality Laboratory Dedication, 10:00 a.m., Water Quality Laboratory (Sun Deck)
- February 15-22, National Engineer’s Week
- February 18, Upland Sierra Club Presentation (with CVWD), 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m., Senior Center @ Rancho Cucamonga Central Park: 11200 Baseline Road, Rancho Cucamonga
- February 19, IEUA Blood Drive, 8:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., IEUA HQB Event Room
- February 25, Project W.E.T. (Water Education for Teachers) and Garden in Every School® Workshop, 8:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m., IEUA HQB

March
- March 8-14, Groundwater Awareness Week
- March 16, Association of San Bernardino County Special Districts Dinner, 6:00 p.m., Panda Inn: 3223 E. North Centre Lake Drive, Ontario
- March 16-22, Fix a Leak Week
- March 22, World Water Day

April
- April 15, Earth Day – Student Day, 9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m., Chino Creek Wetlands and Educational Park
- April 16, Earth Day – Community Day, 4:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m., Chino Creek Wetlands and Educational Park
- April 22, Earth Day – Celebrating 50 Years
- April 22, Administrative Professional’s Day
- April 25, National Prescription Drug Take Back Day
- April 29, IEUA Blood Drive, 8:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., HQB Event Room

May
- Water Awareness Month
- May 15-17, MWD Solar Cup Competition, Lake Skinner: 37701 Warren Road, Winchester, 92596

Media and Outreach
- The website redesign project is in the final phase of review.
- IEUA staff hosted a booth at the Women in Water event on January 16. Staff developed a video still short that highlighted IEUA employees.
- IEUA staff hosted a booth at the Caramel Connections Uni-Tea event on January 18.
- The Agency’s Annual Report is in the final phase of review and print.
• Staff is in the process of completing a timeline handout for the Agency’s 70th Anniversary.
• IEUA staff released the first in a series of posts dedicated to promoting the Project W.E.T. workshop scheduled for February 25.
• January: 20 posts were published to the IEUA Facebook page, 20 posts were published to IEUA’s Instagram page and 24 tweets were sent on the @IEUAwater Twitter handle.
  o The top three Facebook posts, based on reach and engagement, in the month of January were:
    ▪ 1/6: IEUA is hiring (Deputy Manager Engineering)
    ▪ 1/2: Press Release- IEUA Elects Officers
    ▪ 1/24: IEUA Presenting sponsor for Southern California Water Coalition Quarterly Luncheon
  o The top three tweets, based on reach and engagement, in the month of January were:
    ▪ 1/15: Press Release- IEUA Board Member Michael Camacho joins MWD Board
    ▪ 1/15: Kathy Tiegs and Oscar Gonzalez commendation resolutions
    ▪ 1/22: CASA 2020 Winter Conference panel
  o The top three Instagram posts, based on reach and engagement, in the month of January were:
    ▪ 1/14: IEUA’s 70th Anniversary GIF
    ▪ 1/16: Throwback to the Agency’s first three employees
    ▪ 1/2: Throwback to the Agency’s first vehicle

• A Kick the Habit will run in the Champion’s Chino Connection Magazine section on March 14.
• A targeted email blast was distributed on January 29 featuring the upcoming Project W.E.T. and Garden in Every School® Workshop scheduled for February 25.
• The Kick the Habit digital banner ad continues to run in the Fontana Herald News.

For the month of January, there were 5,753 searches for a park in IEUA’s service area on Yelp, where Chino Creek Wetlands and Education Park was viewed 672 times on a mobile device.

Education and Outreach Updates
• The Water Discovery Program has reached 1,199 students and 29 schools for this current school year. We currently have a total of 67 schools and 2,834 students scheduled for the 19/20 school year.
• IEUA has been working on developing partnerships with local water providers to continue obtaining busing grants/sponsorships for schools outside of IEUA’s service area for the Water Discovery Program. San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District and Western Municipal Water District has partnered with IEUA to sponsor schools within their areas to participate in the Water Discovery Program.
• The participating Garden in Every School® sites are currently in the design phase. St. Joseph School in Upland has applied for a turf removal rebate through SoCal WaterSmart. Randall Pepper Elementary will receive a grant from Fontana Water Company to assist with the cost of removing turf. Loving Savior in Chino Hills is preparing their garden site for planting in early February 2020.
• IEUA staff began outreach for the 2020 Water is Life poster contest. Submissions are due to IEUA by March 12, 2020.
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January 30, 2020

To: Inland Empire Utilities Agency

From: Michael Boccadoro
Beth Olhasso
Maddie Munson

RE: January Report

Overview:

After a relatively dry late-fall, December renewed faith that a robust snowpack would once again grace the state. However, recent dry conditions have reversed the above average precipitation seen last month. In December, the snowpack was at 109 percent of normal. Currently, the statewide snowpack is only at 75 percent of normal. Good news is that most of California’s reservoirs are at or above average for this time of year. San Luis Reservoir, the main south-of-Delta storage facility for the State Water Project, is at 95 percent of average and 73 percent capacity for this time of the year. Oroville is also at 95 percent of average and 62 percent capacity.

In early January, the Governor released his proposed 2020-2021 state budget. Notably he included a $4.7 billion Climate Resilience Bond proposal which aligns with the draft Water Resilience Portfolio released in December. The bond, proposed for the November ballot, is a mix of initiatives aimed at reducing specific climate risks across the state through long-term investment in natural and built infrastructure, with 62 percent ($2.9 billion) of the funds providing for drinking water, flood, drought, water conservation and supply. One billion of those funds are allocated broadly toward “Regional and Inter-regional Water Resilience.”

Delta issues remain a hot topic in Sacramento on several separate, yet intersecting fronts. The Administration has initiated its environmental review of the single tunnel option. They are scheduling stakeholder listening sessions around the state on the new EIR. The standoff between the state and federal government over operational criteria in the Delta remains unresolved, with the state threatening to challenge the federal plan in court (although this has not yet materialized) while also creating their own operational criteria for the first time. The State Water Project stands to lose the most if the federal government ends up with less stringent operational criteria than the state. And finally, all signs are pointing towards the finalization of Voluntary Agreements in the Delta concerning state effort to mandate “unimpaired flows.” The VAs will likely address an adaptive management approach to managing the delta rather than the “more water” approach suggested by the State Water Resources Control Board in their unimpaired flows proceedings from 2018.

The second year of the two-year session has been slow to ramp up. With only a handful of bills introduced to date, the water community remains focused on the Governor’s proposed bond. Bill introductions will increase as the February 21 deadline to introduce bills nears. Budget sub committees will soon start meeting to discuss and debate the merits of the Governor’s budget proposal, with final budget adoption required by June 15.
**Water Supply Conditions**

After a relatively dry late-fall, December renewed faith that a robust snowpack would once again grace the state. However, recent dry conditions have the average snowpack levels seen last month. In December, the snowpack was at 109 percent of normal. Currently, the statewide snowpack has dropped to 75 percent of normal. Forecasters are not predicting any significant storms in the next several weeks, leaving water managers hoping for a late-winter/early-spring rally. Good news is that most of California’s reservoirs are at or above average for this time of year. San Luis Reservoir, the main south-of-Delta storage facility for the State Water Project, is at 95 percent of average and 73 percent capacity for this time of the year. Oroville is also at 95 percent of average and 62 percent capacity.

**Statewide Average: 43% / 75%**
Governor Releases Proposed 2020-2021 State Budget/Proposes Climate Resilience Bond
On January 10 Governor Newsom released his proposed $222 billion budget. This includes $153 million in General Funds with the remaining $69 million coming from special funds and proposed bond funds.

Notably, the Governor is proposing a $12.5 billion "Climate Budget." Components of the climate budget includes Cap and Trade funds, a new Climate Catalyst Fund, and a $4.7 billion Climate Resilience Bond.

The Climate Resilience Bond proposal aligns with the draft Water Resilience Portfolio discussed above. The bond, proposed for the November ballot, is a mix of initiatives aimed at reducing specific climate risks across the state through long-term investment in natural and built infrastructure, with 62 percent ($2.9 billion) of the funds providing for drinking water, flood, drought, water conservation and supply. One billion of those funds are allocated broadly toward "Regional and Inter-regional Water Resilience." Those funds are to support projects included, but not limited to: IRWM, multi-benefit stormwater management; wastewater treatment; water reuse and recycling; efficiency, conservation; storage; conveyance; watershed protection, restoration and management; and water quality. The budget notes that this funding specifically supports the regional resilience approach identified in the draft Water Resilience Portfolio. A full breakdown of the bond is below.
## Climate Resilience Bond

(Dollars in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Category</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drought/Flood/Water</td>
<td>Department of Water Resources / State Water Resources Control Board</td>
<td>Regional and Inter-regional Water Resilience</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Water Resources</td>
<td>Sustainable Groundwater Management</td>
<td>$365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
<td>Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>$360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Water Resources</td>
<td>Flood - Urban/USACE Projects</td>
<td>$340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Resources Agency</td>
<td>Salton Sea</td>
<td>$220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California Department of Food and Agriculture</td>
<td>Environmental Farming Incentive Program</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>Enhanced Stream Flows and Fish Passage</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Resources Agency, CAL FIRE, and Office of Emergency Services</td>
<td>Hardening of Critical Community Infrastructure</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAL FIRE</td>
<td>Forest Health</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ocean Protection Council</td>
<td>Coastal Wetland Resilience</td>
<td>$320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ocean Protection Council</td>
<td>Nature-Based Solutions to Build Resilience</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ocean Protection Council</td>
<td>Demonstration Projects to Protect Critical Infrastructure</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Resources Agency</td>
<td>Urban Greening and Forestry</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Growth Council</td>
<td>Cool Surface Materials</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Growth Council</td>
<td>Community Resilience Planning</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Growth Council</td>
<td>Community Resiliency Centers</td>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This proposal will be heard and debated in the Senate and Assembly Budget Sub Committees on Resources likely in mid-February. It is anticipated that the Assembly will use the Governor’s proposal as a draft for their efforts. However, the Senate is rumored to be coalescing around AB 45 (Allen). With the Governor’s proposal still fresh, it remains to be seen if the Senate will stand firm behind SB 45, or if they will work with the Assembly on the Governor’s proposal.
Delta Update

Conveyance: The Administration has initiated its environmental review of the single tunnel option. They are scheduling stakeholder listening sessions around the state on the new EIR.

BiOps: As reported last month, Governor Newsom has announced that the state will sue the Trump Administration over the recently released Biological Opinions (BiOps). However, the state has yet to file suit and no further detail has been given on what grounds will be included in the suit. Tom Birmingham, General Manager of Westlands Water District, recently sent a letter to Natural Resources Secretary Wade Crowfoot and CalEPA secretary Jared Blumenfeld outlining how such a lawsuit would result in Westlands to pull out of the Voluntary Agreements. Birmingham notes that without certainty that comes with the BiOps, it would be impossible to reach an agreement with on the Voluntary Agreements. And Senator Diane Feinstein has sent a letter urging the Governor to work with Interior Secretary David Bernhardt to avoid “disastrous” consequences.

The state remains so concerned about the federal government easing flow criteria in Delta, that they have started their own environmental assessment and operational criteria development. State Water Contractors are concerned that if the state has more stringent criteria than the federal government, the SWP would have to “make up” for the “extra” flows the feds would allow the CVP contractors to take.

Voluntary Agreements: The Voluntary Agreements (VAs) are extremely important to Governor Newsom and Secretary Crowfoot. Newsom weighed in on the matter when he was still Governor-elect, and concerns of impacts to the Voluntary Agreements is the reason the Governor vetoed SB 1 (Atkins). It is rumored that the final pieces of the agreements are coming into place and will be released soon.

As a reminder, the VA process was started when the SWRCB initiated their unimpaired flows proceeding. Water users throughout the state came together with state regulators to create an adaptive management program that would leverage multiple tools like habitat management and restoration to better manage the Delta.

Legislative Update
The second year of the two-year session has been slow to ramp up. With only a handful of bills introduced to date, the water community remains focused on the Governor’s proposed bond. Bill introductions will increase as the February 21 deadline to introduce bills nears. Budget sub committees will soon start meeting to discuss and debate the merits of the Governor’s budget proposal, with final budget adoption required by June 15.

While not yet scheduled, the Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee is expected to soon hold a hearing on the effects of the IOU Public Safety Power Shutoff (PSPS) program has had on water agencies specifically.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Author/Sponsor</th>
<th>Title and/or Summary</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>IEUA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 292</td>
<td>Quirk</td>
<td>Recycled water: raw water and groundwater augmentation</td>
<td>This bill would eliminate the definition of “direct potable reuse” and instead would substitute the term “groundwater augmentation” for “indirect potable reuse for groundwater recharge” in these definitions. The bill would revise the definition of “treated drinking water augmentation.”</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 841</td>
<td>Ting</td>
<td>Drinking water: contaminants: perfluorooalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances</td>
<td>Would require the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment to adopt and complete a work plan within prescribed timeframes to assess which substances in the class of perfluorooalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances should be identified as a potential risk to human health, as provided. The bill would require the office, as part of those assessments, to determine which of the substances are appropriate candidates for notification levels to be adopted by the state board. The bill would require the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, by January 1, 2022, to provide to the Legislature an update on the assessment.</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1672</td>
<td>Bloom</td>
<td>Product labeling: flushable products</td>
<td>Current law regulates the labeling requirements on various consumer products. This bill would express the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation to prohibit the sale or advertisement of any nonwoven disposable product labeled as “flushable” or “sewer and septic safe” if that product fails to meet specified performance standards.</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 1</td>
<td>Aguiar-Curry</td>
<td>Local government financing: affordable housing and public infrastructure: voter approval</td>
<td>The California Constitution prohibits the ad valorem tax rate on real property from exceeding 1% of the full cash value of the property, subject to certain exceptions. This measure would create an additional exception to the 1% limit that would authorize a city, county, city and county, or special district to levy an ad valorem tax to service bonded indebtedness incurred to fund the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public infrastructure, affordable housing, or permanent supportive housing, or the acquisition or lease of real property for those purposes, if the proposition proposing that tax is approved by 55% of the voters.</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-year bill  
Senate Floor  
2- Year Bill  
Senate Env. Quality Comm.  
Senate Rules Committee  
Assembly Floor- first vote failed, can be acted upon Jan 2020
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 204</td>
<td>Dodd</td>
<td><strong>State Water Project: Contracts</strong> Would require the Department of Water Resources to provide at least 10 days’ notice to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and relevant policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature before holding public sessions to negotiate any potential amendment of a long-term water supply contract that is of project-wide significance with substantially similar terms intended to be offered to all contractors, or that would permanently transfer a contractual water amount between contractors.</td>
<td>WATCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 414</td>
<td>Caballero</td>
<td><strong>Small System Water Authority Act of 2019</strong> Would create the Small System Water Authority Act of 2019 and state legislative findings and declarations relating to authorizing the creation of small system water authorities that will have powers to absorb, improve, and competently operate noncompliant public water systems. The bill, no later than March 1, 2020, would require the state board to provide written notice to cure to all public agencies, private water companies, or mutual water companies that operate a public water system that has either less than 3,000 service connections or that serves less than 10,000 people, and are not in compliance, for the period from July 1, 2018, through December 31, 2019, with one or more state or federal primary drinking water standard maximum contaminant levels, as specified.</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 667</td>
<td>Hueso</td>
<td><strong>Would require the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery to develop, on or before January 1, 2021, and would authorize the department to amend, a 5-year needs assessment to support innovation and technological and infrastructure development, in order to meet specified organic waste reduction and recycling targets, as provided. The bill would require, on or before June 1, 2021, the department, in coordination with the Treasurer and the California Pollution Control Financing Authority, to develop financial incentive mechanisms, including, among other mechanisms, loans and incentive payments, to fund and accelerate public and private capital towards organic waste diversion and recycling infrastructure.</strong></td>
<td>SUPPORT IF AMENDED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2- year bill
Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife

2- year bill
Assembly Approps

2-year bill
Assembly Approps
MEMORANDUM

To: IEUA Community & Legislative Committee
From: Letitia White, Jean Denton, Drew Tatum, Shavenor Winters
Date: January 31, 2020
Re: January Monthly Legislative Update

House Democrats Prepare for Trump’s FY21 Request
House Democrats are preparing to move quickly on fiscal year 2021 appropriations bills, with party leaders planning for the vast majority of spending measures to be out of the House Appropriations Committee, through the House floor, and to the Senate before the end of June.

House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-MD) said he was hopeful that the ten appropriation bills that passed in fiscal year 2020 would be passed by June. Hoyer did not say Democrats will try to pass all twelve annual spending bills on the floor this summer, suggesting some may be left behind.

The fiscal year 2020 Homeland Security spending measure never made it to the floor last year, bogged down by President Donald Trump’s request for funds to build a wall along the southern U.S. border. The Homeland Security Subcommittee’s bill could again present a challenge. The panel’s chairwoman, Representative Lucille Roybal-Allard (D-CA) said she expects another battle over Trump’s bid for billions in border wall money. The President’s Budget Request for fiscal year 2021 has not yet been delivered to Congress, so it is unclear how much President Trump will request.

The Legislative Branch bill was also held from the floor, tripped up by debate about whether to allow a cost of living adjustment (COLA) for lawmakers take effect. Lawmaker pay has been frozen for the last decade. While Democrats sought to allow the COLA in the FY20 bill by removing a rider that prohibited it, a bipartisan group of lawmakers filed amendments to include the prohibition, potentially striking a contentious debate and vote on the floor.

Aiding House appropriators’ work is the expectation that Trump this year will send his budget in February, with the administration indicating it will be delivered on the 10th, just one week after this year’s statutory deadline of February 3. That contrasts to previous years when the budget blueprint arrived late, delaying the start of committee hearings and markups. While the topline numbers are expected to be delivered on the 10th, it is unclear if federal agencies will deliver their budget justifications the same day.

Appropriations Committee Chairwoman Nita Lowey (D-NY) and the subcommittee “cardinals” responsible for shepherding the bills said the completion of the fiscal year 2020 bills in December and an on-time budget is helpful. The two-year budget caps agreement setting
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spending levels for both defense and non-defense discretionary programs for 2021 also could help lighten this fiscal year’s workload.

“That’s critical for us so we have a budget we can mark to,” Energy and Water Subcommittee Chairman Marcy Kaptur (D-Ohio) said about the topline spending figure. “We know what the parameters are. One of the problems we had last time is we had nothing to go on.”

Chairman Betty McCollum (D-MN), who leads the Interior-Environment Subcommittee, said her panel is kicking off hearings even before the Administration submits his budget request. Her panel is planning to hold a public witness hearing on February 6. The panel also announced February 11th and 12th hearings for tribal programs.

Lawmakers still face the challenge of negotiating the spending levels for each of the 12 bills between the House and Senate.

Cabinet secretaries could begin heading to Capitol Hill as soon as the week of February 10 to begin defending the budget submission. The hearings before the House and Senate Appropriations committees could accelerate after lawmakers return from the week-long President’s Day recess on February 24. Subcommittee markups of the bills could then begin in April.

While Congress will begin fiscal year 2021 with a deal to lift the budget caps for the final year of budget sequestration, appropriators are feeling pressure from competing priorities with only a $5 billion increase over the fiscal year 2020 appropriations caps.

In August 2019, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019 was signed into law by President Trump, which set the topline appropriation caps for both fiscal year 2020 and 2021. While there was a significant adjustment from the caps set in the 2011 Budget Control Act, there was a less significant adjustment made between the two fiscal years.

In fiscal year 2021, Congress will only have an additional $5 billion in funding in spending allocated under the caps. For that reason, the House and Senate Appropriations Committees are experiencing pressure from differing priorities to allocate that funding.

Without a special cap adjustment for veterans health care accounts that provide access to private care in certain situations, observers say, other nondefense programs could suffer cuts to their budgets next year. Congress has resisted previous efforts to make special adjustments for the program. Many Congressional aides believe that without an adjustment, most other spending accounts will be held flat or cut in the upcoming fiscal year.

The VA funding problem is tied to the popular VA Choice program that allowed veterans to seek care outside of the VA system. The program proved so popular that in 2017, Congress had to provide an additional $4.2 billion. The following year, lawmakers overhauled the program and replaced Choice with broader 'community care' services and added $5.2 billion more, in what was dubbed the VA MISSION Act.
The increase in VA MISSION costs alone eats up nearly all of the additional $2.5 billion nondefense funding for fiscal 2021 allotted under the new budget caps. Some advocate for making the veteran's program exempt from the spending caps, but not all appropriators support the idea.

Senator James Lankford (R-OK) is one Appropriations Committee member who doesn't believe total spending should go up any more than planned. "We should always look for other areas where we can spend less, if we've got to spend more. And VA MISSION is one of those areas we've got to be able to spend more. We've all agreed on that," Lankford said.

**House Democrats Eye Limited Return of Congressionally Directed Spending**

House Democrats have floated the idea of returning earmarks in a narrower version of the practice of directing funds directly to projects than what was in place a decade ago. While there were talks of examining the practice for the fiscal year 2020 process, House Appropriations Committee Chairwoman Nita Lowey (D-CA) sent a Dear Colleague to lawmakers in the spring of 2019 noting that while they would not return for the FY20 appropriations cycle, she hoped conversations would continue.

In late January, the House Appropriations Subcommittee clerks were instructed to draw up plans for the potential return of earmarks in fiscal year 2021. The outline, which is currently in its early stages, could potentially fund a limited number of lawmakers' local projects from limited appropriations accounts.

The draft outline would also see earmarks governed by a new set of rules designed to keep the system in check, likely barring any money from flowing to for-profit businesses.

The House Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress, which was instituted under the Rules of the House when Democrats gained the majority in 2019, has itself looked at the practice. No official recommendation on the practice has been put forward by that Committee.

While some members of House leadership, including Majority Leader Steny Hoyer have called for their return, support within the Democratic caucus and among Republicans isn't unanimous. Democratic lawmaker have noted that there is more interest than heartburn at this point when it comes to the idea, but there is a growing concern by some swing-seat members that a return to the practice could hurt them in the November elections.

"We're not going to have a majority if we bring back earmarks," said a top aide to a freshman Democrat who flipped a GOP-held seat in 2018. "This is not what we came to Congress to do. Voters made it clear years ago that they were tired of pork and special interest spending in Washington and sweetheart deals."

Challenges could also emerge in the Senate, where the majority of Republicans have called for a permanent ban of the practice.
Chairwoman Lowey has said she expects a final decision on the process for fiscal year 2021 will come early in February.

**Infrastructure Discussion Gains Momentum**

Democrats plan to jump-start work on an infrastructure package with only about eight months until the current federal surface transportation authorization (FAST Act) expires on September 30, 2020.

So far only the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee has successfully advanced a measure (S. 2302) to reauthorize highway and related environment programs through fiscal 2025. The Senate version included $600 million from the general fund and $600 million in from the Highway Trust Fund in fiscal 2021 for bridge repair and replacement, with increases in subsequent years and $500 million annually through fiscal 2025 for safety incentive grants.

The Senate measure also created climate change programs to improve infrastructure resiliency, reduce road-related carbon emissions, and would fund alternative vehicle charging stations. The legislation also sought to expedite regulatory approval for infrastructure reviews and would codify the Administration’s “one federal decision policy”.

This Congress, House Democrats have introduced several other infrastructure proposals, including legislation to fund school, energy, and water infrastructure.

Late this month House Democrats proposed a $760 billion infrastructure blueprint that would cover highways, rail, wastewater, and broadband over five years, without offering a plan to pay for it. The outline, called the “Moving Forward Framework”, calls for spending in the following areas:

- Highway and Highway Safety Investments - $329 billion
- Transit - $105 billion
- Rail - $55 billion
- Airports - $30 billion
- Clean Water and Wastewater Infrastructure - $50.5 billion
- Water Infrastructure (flood protection, navigation, etc.) - $10 billion
- Harbor Infrastructure - $19.7 billion
- Brownfield Restoration - $2.7 billion
- Drinking Water - $25.4 billion
- Clean Energy - $34.3 billion
- Broadband & Communication - $86 billion
- Public Safety Communication - $12 billion

Ultimately, three other Senate committees and two House committees will need to be involved in crafting the final authorizing legislation.

The toughest challenge may be for the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance committee to determine the best means to cover the cost of the reauthorization. The 18.3 cents per gallon federal tax on gasoline, which supplies the bulk of Highway Trust Fund revenue, hasn’t been
increased since 1993. Options for potential funding streams were discussed at the House Ways and Means Committee’s hearing on January 29. Generally, the House’s “Moving Forward Framework” calls for the exploration of user-based mechanisms.

Infrastructure is one of the rare policy areas where Democrats and President Trump share mutual interest in pursuing change. But efforts by Democratic leaders last year to engage with Trump failed after the president walked out of a May meeting and declared he wouldn’t work with lawmakers while they investigate him.

Pelosi expressed hope for a path forward pointing to recent bipartisan agreement on the revamped trade pact with Mexico and Canada which the President signed into law.

Debate on Forever Chemicals Continued into the New Year
PFAS and PFOS ‘Forever Chemicals’ have remained a continued topic of discussion on Capitol Hill and in the administration after a flurry of activity in 2019 produced limited legislative results.

On Friday, December 20, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued interim recommendations for addressing groundwater contaminated with perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctanesulfonate (PFOS). As part of the PFAS Action Plan, the EPA says that it will continue to assess toxicity information, test methods, laboratory methods, analytical methods, exposure models, and treatment methods, among other research efforts to improve knowledge about this class of chemicals. The agency has said it will consider additional recommendations as the agency advances its knowledge of these other substances as new information becomes available.

While last year Democrats lost on their efforts to include provisions in the annual defense policy bill that would regulate “forever chemicals” this month the House Energy and Commerce Committee compiled a package from 12 separate PFAS-focused bills that would take several steps to regulate and mitigate pollution from per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances. The package, H.R. 535, would require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 and the measure would require the agency to take several steps to regulate and mitigate pollution from per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances.

The bill would effectively bar the manufacture of new PFAS chemicals by requiring the EPA to automatically designate any processing notice regarding PFAS as posing an “unreasonable risk” to human health or the environment and to issue an order blocking the activity. The requirement would end five years after the bill’s enactment.

The measure would also permanently disqualify PFAS processing or manufacturing from exemptions to EPA notification requirements. The EPA, within one year of the bill’s enactment, would have to designate perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA), perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS), and any salts that produce them as hazardous substances under 1980 Comprehensive
Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), which governs the Superfund program. Salts refer to solids that produce the acids when dissolved.

Within five years of enactment, the agency would have to determine whether all PFAS chemicals should be designated as hazardous substances under CERCLA individually or in groups.

Designation under CERCLA triggers reporting requirements related to the chemicals and enables federal response—including assessment and treatment—to releases or threatened releases. The EPA would issue a primary drinking water regulation for PFAS under the 1974 Safe Drinking Water Act within two years of the bill’s enactment. At a minimum it would have to include standards for PFOA and PFOS.

Under the measure, the EPA would publish a health advisory of PFAS, or for any class of the chemicals, not subject to a drinking water regulation within one year of finalizing a toxicity value for PFAS or validating an effective control and testing procedure, whichever is later. It could forgo the requirement if it determines that an advisory isn’t justified because contamination is unlikely.

The bill would authorize $100 million per year for fiscal 2020 through 2024 for capitalization grants to Drinking Water State Revolving Funds to provide financial support for addressing “emerging contaminants” with a focus on PFAS.

At least 25% of any funding provided to a state under the bill would have to be used for grants to disadvantaged communities and public water systems serving fewer than 25,000 people. States couldn’t use the funding to pay for or secure bonds. In addition, the measure would direct the EPA to establish a grant program to support community water systems that implement PFAS treatment technologies. It would authorize $100 million in each of fiscal 2020 and 2021.

To be eligible, water systems would have to demonstrate that their water contains PFAS and certify that current treatment technology isn’t sufficient to remove all detectable PFAS. The agency would publish a list of eligible technologies every two years. Funding for water systems that serve disadvantaged communities, will cover at least 10% of the costs, or demonstrate capacity to maintain the treatment technology would be prioritized.

The measure ultimately passed the House by a vote of 247 – 159; however, the Senate is not likely to consider the measure as is. In addition, the White House has threatened to veto the measure should it pass the Senate- arguing the legislation would unduly and irresponsible increase industry liability and it would not be cost-effective.

Despite legislation stalling, late this month the EPA released a list of 160 “forever chemicals” that companies and federal facilities must for the first-time report to the agency’s Toxics Release Inventory. The per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, or PFAS, met specific criteria included in the 2020 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), which became law on December 20, 2019.
Impeachment Likely Near Conclusion in the Senate

House Democrats finished their opening arguments in President Trump's impeachment trial Friday, January 24 after making their last, best effort to convince Republican Senators that the President's behavior merits his removal from office. The House Democratic Managers used around 23 of the 24 hours they had allotted over three days to present their case to Senators.

The lead House Manager and Chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, Adam Schiff (D-CA), wrapped up the House managers' case on the first article of impeachment, abuse of power, with an argument about character. Whether this closing argument convinces the handful of Republicans that they need to hear more from the witnesses Democrats want to call remains an open question.

Managers spent a considerable amount of time walking through the chronology of their case and actions they say warrant President Trump's removal from office. They also took turns walking through both articles of impeachment, finishing with their case that the President obstructed Congress unlike any past administration in connection with its impeachment investigation.

The President's legal team began its opening arguments on Saturday January 25, but Trump's attorneys only used around 2 hours of the 24 available to his legal team. Arguments resumed on Monday, January 27 at 1pm. Between Monday and Tuesday, the Defense presented its case, but fell well short of using the entire 24 hours allotted to their side.

On Wednesday, January 29 and Thursday, January 30 Senators submitted questions to the House Managers and President's counsel through Chief Justice John Roberts. Roberts read questions over two days in eight hour periods.

On Friday, January 31, the Senate is expected to have four hours of debate divided between the House Managers and President Trump's counsel on whether or not additional witnesses are needed. It is possible that the Senate will meet in closed session, where all media, guest, and most staff are removed from the chamber, so that Senators can debate. During an impeachment trial, Senators are not permitted to debate on the floor unless they are in closed session.

Depending what the Senate decides during that phase of the trial, it could stretch on several more weeks to allow witnesses to be deposed and heard from or end quickly if no witnesses are called and no documents are subpoenaed. With an announcement from Senator Lamar Alexander (R-TN) that he will vote against calling additional witnesses, it is likely that the Senate will not vote to call additional witnesses.

There have been growing calls among Democratic lawmakers to subpoena witnesses—especially in light of a New York Times article published that states that former National Security Advisor John Bolton plans to say in an upcoming book that President Trump did seek to condition aid to Ukraine on the announcement of investigations into Joe and Hunter Biden and possible interference in the 2016 presidential election.
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Provided that the Senate does not call additional witnesses and there are no procedural delays, the Senate could take final votes on the Articles of Impeachment exhibited by the House on Friday or early into Saturday morning.

Regardless of the timing of the vote, President Trump is expected to be acquitted in the Senate, as a 2/3 majority would be needed to convict and remove him from office. Dispensing with the trial before Monday, February 3 would allow Democratic Senators running for President to return to the campaign trail ahead of the Iowa Caucuses. Further, it would mean that President Trump would no longer be facing a trial when he is scheduled to deliver his State of the Union address on Tuesday.

Trump Issues New Rule Replacing Obama-Era Waterway Protections

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced a major rule change to regulations for streams and other smaller bodies of water on Thursday, January 23 with the Administration saying the change would institute a new rule advocated by farmers and other industry groups.

The new rule would replace the already-repealed Waters of the United States rule (WOTUS), crafted under President Obama, which expanded the types of waterways protected by federal law.

In creating the WOTUS rule, the Obama Administration argued smaller bodies of water, even some seasonal ones caused by snowmelt, must be protected in order to stop pollution from reaching larger sources, including those used for drinking water.

Critics of the proposed Trump era rule argued the changes will eviscerate the protections guaranteed by the Clean Water Act, not just reversing Obama-era protections but setting the U.S even further back.

Late this month, President Trump touted his plans to roll back the rule in front of farmer coalitions and others.

Farmers and other groups have argued that the Obama-era law was too far-reaching, requiring grand efforts to protect relatively small bodies of water that run through their property, ultimately subjecting large swaths of land to federal oversight.

Trump’s latest rule, the Navigable Waters Protection Rule, will be implemented in the coming weeks and critics argue that the rule is likely to increase the amount of pesticides and other industrial chemicals that leach into streams, wetlands and underground water sources, leaving much environmental regulation to state and local authorities.

Critics say the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) water policy unveiled Thursday, January 23 is one of the biggest rollbacks to water policy in decades, but it’s tough to know the extent of its impact because of challenges that come with mapping America’s waterways.
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The new rule cements a campaign promise from Trump to repeal the Obama-era Waters of the United States (WOTUS) rule and replace it with something more friendly to industry.

"President Trump is delivering on his promise to give Americans clean water and clear rules. Regulations must follow the law and be easy for Americans to understand," Senator John Barrasso (R-WY), chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee, said in a statement.

Groups Request More Time to Comment on NEPA Changes

A coalition of more than 320 groups is asking the White House to extend its comment period on planned changes to a bedrock environmental law.

President Trump, earlier this month, announced the proposed changes to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), which would allow greater industry involvement in environmental reviews of projects and reduce the role climate change plays in those assessments.

The first major overhaul of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in 40 years would make it easier for major federal construction projects to move forward, proponents say, but legal challenges are expected from environmental groups who say proposed changes would gut the project environmental review process and exacerbate the effects of climate change.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), signed into law in 1970, is a procedural statute that requires Federal agencies to assess the environmental impacts of proposed major Federal actions. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) issued regulations for Federal agencies to implement NEPA in 1978. CEQ has not comprehensively updated these regulations in over 40 years, and has made only one limited substantive amendment in 1986.

In 2017, President Trump issued Executive Order 13807 establishing a One Federal Decision policy, including a two-year goal for completing environmental reviews for major infrastructure projects, and directing CEQ to consider revisions to modernize its regulations. In 2018, CEQ issued an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) requesting comment on potential updates to its regulations. CEQ received over 12,500 comments, which informed CEQ’s proposed rule.

CEQ has found that the average length of an EIS is over 600 pages, and that the average time for Federal agencies to conduct these NEPA reviews is four and a half years. However, reviews for some projects have taken much longer. NEPA analyses are frequently challenged in the courts, and while Federal agencies ultimately prevail in many cases, litigation can unnecessarily delay and increase costs for important projects such as needed transportation, water, and other infrastructure that benefit States, Tribes, and local communities. The increased costs and complexity of NEPA reviews and litigation make it very challenging for large and small businesses to plan, finance, and build projects in the United States.

The Administration released on Thursday, December 9 a draft of its notice of proposed rulemaking in response to a 2017 executive order from President Donald Trump calling for a NEPA review and modernization to enable more infrastructure projects to be built.
The proposed rule in general is expected to establish presumptive time limits of two years for completion of environmental impact statements (EISs) and one year for completion of environmental assessments (EAs), specify presumptive page limits, require joint schedules, a single EIS, and a single record of decision (ROD), where appropriate, for EISs involving multiple agencies, promote use of modern technologies for information sharing and public outreach, and clarify terms, application and scope of NEPA Review.

The coalition of 320 will send a letter to the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) asking for the extension. Currently CEQ is requesting public comment on or before March 10, 2020.

"Currently, the Trump administration is offering an extremely short 60-day public comment period and mere two public hearings," said a statement from the groups.

Major opponents of the changes have included environmental groups, who argue that it would allow the government to turn a blind eye when projects emit large quantities of greenhouse gases.

"The Trump administration is silencing the people’s voices for the sake of polluters’ profits," said Stephen Schima, Senior Legislative Counsel for Earthjustice, in the statement. "Rushed comment periods, hearings held at odd daytime hours to discourage working families from attending, and space so limited that the room fills up in five minutes – it all adds up to a concerted effort to sideline communities."

"Shutting out public input on this latest egregious attack on our environmental protections adds insult to injury," said Matthew Gravatt, deputy legislative director for Sierra Club. “Our communities will not be silenced about the threats posed by this administration’s dangerous pro-polluter agenda.”

Meanwhile, proponents of the changes to NEPA have argued that the current law has slowed down construction and infrastructure projects.

“From day one, my administration has made fixing this regulatory nightmare a top priority. And we want to build new roads, bridges, tunnels, highways bigger, better, faster, and we want to build them at less cost,” President Trump said this month.

**California Sues Trump Administration Over Fracking**
California is suing the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) over its plan to open up public lands in the state to oil and gas drilling including fracking, California Attorney General Xavier Becerra (D) announced Friday, January 17.

The lawsuit, filed in federal court in California, claims that the administration's environmental impacts statement ignores possible effects on people living near oil and gas wells.
"BLM's analysis of impacts from increased air pollution and groundwater contamination on disadvantaged communities living near federal oil and gas operations was particularly deficient," it said.

House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy (R-CA) criticized his home state over the lawsuit.

"The state's decision to once again sue the Trump Administration - this time by refusing to accept the BLM's science-based analysis - is another political stunt that will adversely impact the people who call California home," McCarthy said in a statement. "The oil and gas industry annually contribute over 350,000 jobs to California's economy."

In December, the administration approved new oil and gas leases across more than 1 million acres of land in California, ending a five-year moratorium.

BLM has defended opening up lands to fracking, saying that it will create jobs and generate tax revenue.

**Trump Plans to Divert Additional Funding from Pentagon for Border Wall**
President Trump is preparing to divert an additional $7.2 billion in Pentagon funding for border wall construction this year, five times what Congress authorized him to spend on the project in the 2020 budget. The Pentagon funds would be extracted, for the second year in a row, from military construction projects and counternarcotics funding.

The move would bring the total amount of federal funds allocated to border fencing to $18.4 billion under Trump, who made the border barrier a priority during his campaign for the presidency in 2016.

The Trump administration has completed 101 miles of new barriers so far, according to the latest figures, far less than the 450 miles the president has promised to erect by the end of the year. But construction along the border — largely on land the federal government already owns — has been continuing even as legal challenges have aimed to disrupt it.

A federal-district court in El Paso ruled last month that the White House broke the law when it commandeered funds for the border wall that had been authorized by Congress for another purpose. The court froze $3.6 billion the administration budgeted for new barriers.

The Trump administration appealed that ruling, and a federal appeals court late Wednesday, January 8 lifted a lower court's order blocking the administration from tapping into military funds to help construct President Trump's long-sought wall along the southern border. The president and his administration viewed that ruling as additional encouragement to utilize the money again this year.

In its decision, to stay the lower court's ruling the 5th Circuit Court noted that the Supreme Court stayed a similar injunction last year to allow Trump to begin using military funds for the border wall. The most recent ruling applies to a separate set of funds.
Trump hailed the court's decision in a tweet saying, “Entire Wall is under construction or getting ready to start!”

Last September, Defense Secretary Mark Esper authorized moving $3.6 billion in military construction funds to 11 projects pertaining to the wall along the U.S.-Mexico border. The Defense Department said that about half of the funds were coming from international projects, and that the other half had been set for use in the United States.

President Trump last February declared a national emergency to bypass Congress and spend roughly $6 billion in military funds to start building a border wall. The President is also expected to divert funds from the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bills for the wall. While Congress had contemplated limiting the administration’s transfer authority, no such prohibitions were included in the final bills.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor/ Cosponsor</th>
<th>Title and/or Summary</th>
<th>Summary/Status</th>
<th>Latest Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.1932</td>
<td>Sen. Cory Gardner (R-CO) / Sen. Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Drought Resiliency and Water Supply Infrastructure Act</td>
<td>This legislation would authorize and/or reauthorize surface and groundwater storage and supporting projects, water recycling and reuse projects, and desalination projects. It would also establish an infrastructure finance and innovation pilot program at the Bureau of Reclamation. The legislation would also establish a process to deauthorize Bureau of Reclamation projects that have failed to receive a minimum federal investment or initiate construction.</td>
<td>The legislation was introduced on June 20, 2019. The Water and Power Subcommittee of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee held hearings on 7/18/2019. A markup has not been scheduled due to disagreements between the Ranking Member and Sponsors of the legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 2356</td>
<td>Sen. Mike Braun (R-IN)</td>
<td>Define WOTUS Act of 2019</td>
<td>The measure would create a new WOTUS definition the void the previous Obama era definition that is currently tied up in litigation.</td>
<td>The legislation was introduced on July 31 and referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 1097</td>
<td>Sen. John Barrasso (R-WY)</td>
<td>Water Quality Certification Improvement Act of 2019</td>
<td>The measure would amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to make changes with respect to water quality certification.</td>
<td>The measure was introduced in the Senate on April 19 and was referred to Committee on Environment and Public Works. On November 19 the committee held a hearing to discuss impacts of the act if implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1764</td>
<td>Rep. John Garamendi (D-CA)</td>
<td>The bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Act</td>
<td>The legislation would amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to permitting terms, and for other purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced on March 15 and then referred to the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment. This legislation has bipartisan cosponsorship and hearings were held on the measure in November 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1497</td>
<td>Rep. Peter DeFazio (D-OR)</td>
<td>Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2019</td>
<td>Requires a report to Congress on the current and future workforce needs for publicly owned treatment works and information on steps taken to meet those needs. Reauthorizes sections of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act that provide grants to States and interstate agencies, including: State Management Assistance: Section 106(a); Watershed Pilot Projects: Section 122(c); Alternative Water Source Projects Pilot Program: Section 220(d); Sewer Overflow and Stormwater Reuse Municipal Grants: Section 221(f1); and State Water Pollution Control Revolving Funds. Changes the length of permits for NPDES permits to not exceeding 10 years in certain circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced on March 6 and referred to the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment of the House Transportation Committee. The Committee marked up the legislation and reported it with an amendment in the nature of a substitute--expanding the scope of the legislation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Sponsor(s)</td>
<td>Act</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1508 / S. 146</td>
<td>Rep. Blumenauer (D-OR) / Sen. John Hoeven (R-ND)</td>
<td>Move America Act of 2019</td>
<td>The measure would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Move America bonds and Move America credits which would be applicable to projects relating to flood diversions, inland waterways, sewage facilities.</td>
<td>The House bill was introduced on March 5 and then referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means. Note: All tax issues are likely to be addressed as part of a larger tax package. The Ways and Means Committee is considering forming a tax extenders package, which would be the most likely venue for this legislation. The Senate bill was introduced in the Senate on January 16th and referred to the Senate Committee on Finance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R.1162</td>
<td>Rep. Grace Napolitano (D-CA)</td>
<td>Water Recycling Investment and Improvement Act</td>
<td>This legislation would create a competitive grant program for the funding of water recycling and reuse projects by raising the authorization cap for the Title XVI program from $50 million to $500 million. The legislation would also raise the authorization cap from $20 million to $30 million for the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act.</td>
<td>Introduced in the House on February 13. The House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife held a hearing on the legislation on June 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 361 / H.R. 807</td>
<td>Sen. Cory Gardner (R-CO) / Rep. Keri Buck (R-CO)</td>
<td>Water and Agriculture Tax Reform Act of 2019</td>
<td>The measure would work to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to facilitate water leasing and water transfers to promote conservation and efficiency.</td>
<td>Introduced and referred to the Committee on Finance (Senate) and Ways and Means Committee (House). Neither chamber has recently engaged on the measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R.579</td>
<td>Rep. Scott Tipton (R-CO)</td>
<td><strong>Water Rights Protection Act of 2019</strong></td>
<td>Introduced in the House on January 15th. Referred to the Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee on 2/7 and to the Water, Oceans, and Wildlife Subcommittee of the House Natural Resources Committee on 2/4. A similar amendment was submitted to the House Rules Committee for consideration in the Interior-Environment Appropriations bill, but was not made in order by the Committee for floor consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R.34</td>
<td>Rep. Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX)</td>
<td><strong>Energy and Water Research Integration Act of 2019</strong></td>
<td>The bill was introduced in the House on January 3rd. It was marked up and ordered to be reported by the House Science and Technology Committee on May 1, 2019 and was passed by the House on July 23, 2019 by voice vote. On July 24, the bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2313</td>
<td>Rep. Jared Huffman (D-CA)</td>
<td><strong>Water Conservation Rebate Tax Parity Act</strong></td>
<td>The bill was introduced in the House on April 12 and then referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. Note: All tax issues are likely to be addressed as part of a larger tax package. The Ways and Means Committee is considering forming a tax extenders package, which would be the most likely venue for this legislation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R.1747</td>
<td>Rep. Rob Whittman (R-VA)</td>
<td>National Fish Habitat Conservation Through Partnerships Act</td>
<td>The measure aims to achieve measurable habitat conservation results through strategic actions of Fish Habitat Partnerships that lead to better fish habitat conditions and increased fishing opportunities, establish a consensus set of national conservation strategies as a framework to guide future actions and investment by Fish Habitat Partnerships, broaden the community of support for fish habitat conservation, fill gaps in the National Fish Habitat Assessment and the associated database of the National Fish Habitat Assessment, and communicate to the public and conservation partners.</td>
<td>A hearing has been held in the House Natural Resources Committee on the legislation and the legislation was ordered to be reported out of committee on September 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1419</td>
<td>Sen. James Lankford (R-OK)</td>
<td>Early Participation in Regulations Act</td>
<td>The legislation would direct agencies to issue advanced notices for rules costing more than $100 million annually. The bill would require agencies to outline the problem the rule intends to solve and listen to the public's input on the subject. On May 13, the bill was introduced into the Senate. It was then referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. Hearings on the bill were held in both the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Small Business. On July 19 the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs ordered the measure to be reported favorably with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. On September 10, the bill was placed on the Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders. However, the bill has yet to be considered on the Senate floor. The legislation has bipartisan cosponsorship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 1097</td>
<td>Sen. John Barrasso (R-WY)</td>
<td>Water Quality Certification Improvement Act of 2019</td>
<td>The measure would amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to make changes with respect to water quality certification. The measure was introduced in the Senate on April 19 and was referred to Committee on Environment and Public Works. On November 19 the committee held a hearing to discuss impacts of the act if implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1695</td>
<td>Rep. Betty McCollum (D-MN)</td>
<td>Community Services Block Grant Reauthorization Act of 2019</td>
<td>The legislation would amend the Community Services Block Grant Act to reauthorize and modernize the Act. The measure was introduced in the House on March 12, 2019 to the House Committee on Education and Labor. The legislation has bipartisan cosponsorship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Referred Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1744</td>
<td>Rep. Mark Takano</td>
<td>S.T.O.R.A.G.E. Act (Storage Technology for Operational Readiness And Generating</td>
<td>The bill would provide for the consideration of energy storage systems by electric utilities as part of a supply side resource process, and for other purposes.</td>
<td>The bill was introduced on March 13 and the referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Subcommittee on Energy of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D-CA)</td>
<td>Energy Act)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Energy Storage Systems by Electric Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 579</td>
<td>Rep. Scott Tipton</td>
<td>Water Rights Protection Act of 2019</td>
<td>This bill would prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, and for other purposes.</td>
<td>Introduced in the House on January 15th. Referred to the Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee on 2/7 and to the Water, Oceans, and Wildlife Subcommittee of the House Natural Resources Committee on 2/4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(R-CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. R. 855</td>
<td>Rep. Scott Peters</td>
<td>STRONG (Strengthening the Resiliency of our Nation on the Ground Act) Act</td>
<td>The bill would work to minimize the economic and social costs resulting from losses of life, property, well-being, business activity, and economic growth associated with extreme weather events by ensuring that the United States is more resilient to the impacts of extreme weather events in the short- and long-term, and for other purpose</td>
<td>Introduced in the House and referred to the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management of the House Transportation Committee on February 7th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D-CA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D-OR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.420 / H.R. 1120</td>
<td>Sen. Ron Wyden (D-OR) / Rep. Earl Blumenauer (D-OR)</td>
<td>Marijuana Revenue and Regulation Act</td>
<td>A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the taxation and regulation of marijuana products, and for other purposes.</td>
<td>The bill was introduced in the Senate on February 7th and was referred to the Finance Committee. Introduced in the House on February 8th and was referred to the Committees on Judiciary, Agriculture, and Natural Resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 3794</td>
<td>Rep. Paul A. Gosar (R-AZ)</td>
<td>Public Land Renewable Energy Development Act of 2019</td>
<td>The bill would work to promote the development of renewable energy on public lands</td>
<td>The measure was introduced in the House on July 17, 2019 and was then referred to both the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture. A hearing on the bill was held on July 25 by the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources. On August 9th, the bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Conservation and Energy of the House Agriculture Committee. The measure was later referred to the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources were a hearing was held on the legislation. On November 20th, a Mark-up session was held and the bill was ordered to be Reported by Voice Vote. The legislation has bipartisan cosponsorship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Sponsor(s)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 1344</td>
<td>Sen. Cory Booker (D-NJ) and Tim Scott (R-SC)</td>
<td>Reinstall Opportunity Zone Data Mandates</td>
<td>The bill would require the Secretary of the Treasury to collect data and issue a report on the opportunity zone tax incentives enacted by the 2017 tax reform legislation. The reporting requirements were part of the original legislation as introduced, but they were not incorporated in H.R.1 (the tax package) when it was advanced in the House and Senate. The legislation was introduced in the Senate on May 7, 2019 and referred to the Finance Committee. The legislation has bipartisan cosponsorship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R.535</td>
<td>Rep. Debbie Dingell (D-MI)</td>
<td>PFAS Action Act of 2019</td>
<td>The legislation combines 12 different bills that had previously been introduced into one legislative package that would change the way the federal government regulates “forever chemicals” known as PFAS. The consolidated version of H.R. 535 would place these chemicals on the Superfund hazards substances list from the Environmental Protection Agency, force the agency to set nationwide drinking water standards for PFAS, and block companies from producing new chemicals in this class. The legislation was reported out of the House Energy and Commerce Committee on November 20, 2019 by a vote of 31 to 19, largely along party lines. The bill passed the House on January 10, 2020 by a vote of 247 - 159. The bill was received in the Senate on January 13, 2020 and referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R.4236</td>
<td>Rep. Quigley, Mike (D-IL)</td>
<td>Reducing Waste in National Parks Act</td>
<td>The legislation would encourage recycling and reduction of disposable plastic bottles in units of the National Park System,</td>
<td>The bill was introduced on September 6 and was referred to the House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Draft (not yet introduced)</td>
<td>Sen. Tom Udall (D-N.M.) and Rep. Alan Lowenthal (D-CA)</td>
<td>Legislation to Address the Global Plastic Waste Crisis</td>
<td>Sen. Tom Udall and Rep. Alan Lowenthal have released a discussion draft of legislation that seeks to address the global plastic waste crisis. They are currently seeking feedback on the legislation before introducing a bill. The draft would require plastic producers to take responsibility for collecting and recycling materials, require nationwide container deposits, ban certain pollutant products, impose a fee on the distribution of non-reusable carryout bags, create a new minimum recycled content requirement, protect state and local governments by allowing them to enact more stringent standards, requirements, and additional product bans, and give environmental agencies the valuable time needed to investigate the cumulative impacts of new plastic-producing facilities on the air, water, and climate.</td>
<td>Open comments were taken until November 21, 2019. A final bill has not yet been introduced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enacted Legislation (removed from report after 2 months)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. 1790</th>
<th>Sen. Jim Inhofe (R-OK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Defense Authorization Act, 2020</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note: Included a rider on PFAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This year, the legislation included legislation aimed at addressing the risks and challenges associated with per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). This provision will ensure that the EPA sets a national drinking water standard for PFAS and PFOS. It will also require industrial manufactures and users to notify the public when PFAS chemicals are released into the environment. The EPA will also have to issue guidance on how to dispose of and destroy PFAS. The legislation also provides authorization for funding for monitoring and sampling, and requires better interagency coordination on PFAS chemicals.

Passed the Senate on Thursday, June 27, 2019, though an amendment vote was held the following day.

On December 9, 2019, a Conference report was filed, and on December 11, the Conference report was agreed to in the House by a vote of 377 to 48.

On December 17, the Conference report was agreed to in the Senate by a vote of 86 to 8.

The President signed the measure into law on December 20.
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ITEM
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Date: January 29, 2020
To: Inland Empire Utilities Agency
From: John Withers, Jim Brulte
Re: California Strategies, LLC January 2020 Activity Report

1. This month Jim Brulte and John Withers participated in the monthly senior staff meeting which was attended by senior Executive Management Team members on January 6th.

2. Regional Contract
   - A meeting with a subgroup is planned 1/6 to review two Santa Ana River options

3. Chino Basin Program
   - 11/21 DWR, CWC, FW meeting on project description and local challenges. Cost evaluations. Present to local agencies February

4. Rate Study (Carollo)
   - Joint workshop planned Feb 5
   - Sewer rates adopted in November. Other rates to be adopted by March.
   - Ongoing discussion on recycled water rates (fixed vs. volumetric)
   - Rate increases in the 2-3% range.

5. Discussed regional personnel changes

6. Member Questions and Answers
   - Attended SCWC Board meeting in Ontario with staff and Director Elie.
   - Answered questions from IEUA Board members and the GM since the meeting including ongoing leadership changes at City of Fontana