

Contents

Purpose of the Progress Report 2

 Caveats..... 3

Value of doing the Progress Report 3

Progress on the Implementation Plan of the 2009 Water Plan Update 4

 Overview of Thirteen Objectives 4

 Objective 1 – Expand Integrated Regional Water Management 5

 Objective 2 – Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently 6

 Objective 3 – Expand Conjunctive Management of Multiple Supplies..... 7

 Objective 4 – Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality 8

 Objective 5 – Expand Environmental Stewardship..... 9

 Objective 6 – Practice Integrated Flood Management..... 10

 Objective 7 – Manage a Sustainable California Delta 11

 Objective 8 – Prepare Prevention, Response, and Recovery Plans 12

 Objective 9 – Reduce Energy Consumption of Water Systems and Uses..... 13

 Objective 10 – Improve Data & Analysis for Decision-making 14

 Objective 11 – Invest in New Water Technology..... 15

 Objective 12 – Improve Tribal Water and Natural Resources 16

 Objective 13 – Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits..... 17

Findings 18

Method 18

Methodological Difficulties..... 20

Recommendations for Next Progress Report 21

Recommendations for Water Plan Update 2013 Objectives..... 21

Appendices..... 21

 Original Data for Each Objective..... 21

 List of Progress Evaluators 21

Purpose of the Progress Report

The California Water Plan sets out a strategic plan for achieving healthy watersheds and integrated, reliable, and secure water resources and management systems, and public safety by 2050. The California Water Plan is the strategic plan that addresses water issues for all State agencies, not only the Department of Water Resources. The intention of the Water Plan is to provide a guide for everyone participating in water management decisions, at the regional, local and personal level, to achieve this vision. Since 2005, hundreds of people spend thousands of hours collaborating on the Updates of the California Water Plan.

Lester Snow, Secretary of Resources in 2009:

It is my pleasure to introduce the 2009 California Water Plan Update (Update 2009), which sets forth a blueprint for sustainability and forges a new direction for water management in California.

California water management cannot be changed overnight, but Update 2009 and the momentum behind it provide the plan, tools, and strategies to achieve momentous change beginning now. I hope you will agree that Update 2009 is the state's blueprint for sustainability and integrated water management and marks a significant new chapter in the way California manages its water resources.

Mark Cowin, Director of the Department of Water Resources in 2009:

The California Water Plan Update 2009 will help chart our course toward more sustainable, integrated resources management. ... By doing so, we increase our chances of realizing the Water Plan's vision: a productive economy, healthy ecosystem, and desirable quality of life for all Californians.

Given the ambitious and inclusionary goals of the California Water Plan and the time and resources dedicated to it, it is fair to ask whether the Water Plan is being implemented. By statute, the California Water Plan has no powers to mandate that its recommendations be followed. It must be furthered by agencies or voting bodies that can implement its goals, tools and actions. Is that happening? Is there any progress towards the objectives of the Water Plan?

This Progress Report sets out to answer the question: Is the Water Plan being implemented? Are we making progress on the actions or recommendations in the Water Plan? If so, where? If not, what are the constraints and barriers blocking that progress? The results of the assessment of progress can be used to direct State policy and to improve the next Update of the Water Plan.

Caveats

- The Progress Report is evaluated at a statewide level. Because California contains many diverse regions that manage water resources very differently, the progress between regions could vary widely.
- This is the first Water Plan Progress Report. Developing the method for measuring progress and gathering data happened in parallel. As with the rest of the Water Plan, both depend heavily on stakeholder collaboration and feedback. As a first attempt, both the process for monitoring and assessing progress, and the data we gathered itself is open to stakeholder comment and revision. Since both of those are open for revision, this Progress Report draft is not a final word, but meant to stimulate conversation and feedback.
- Each Water Plan Update will have independent and developing recommendations and implementation plans. Because those may change from Update to Update, the data gathered will not establish a complete baseline for longitudinal tracking and evaluation of progress. Some elements may remain constant for several Water Plan Updates, and the Progress Reports will track those continuously.
- Much of the influence of the Water Plan Update is the effect of the collaborative process on the participants, which include water managers throughout the state. The 2012 Progress Report does not measure that.

Value of doing the Progress Report

The value of doing the Progress Report is that it draws attention to whether and how much the Objectives of the Water Plan Update 2009 have been implemented. Within the Objectives, the Progress Report data shows progress for individual Related Actions. This information can be used to direct attention and resources to actions that aren't progressing.

Evaluating the progress of each Objective and Related Actions meant that stakeholders in caucuses and agency staff had to read the implementation chapter of the Water Plan Update 2009 closely. Their careful attention to the 2009 Objectives and Related Actions made many want to be involved in writing the implementation chapter of the 2013 Update.

Creating the Progress Report upholds one of the statements of the Water Plan 2009 Update.

A comprehensive list of progress toward implementing Update 2005 recommendations can be found in **Volume 4 Reference Guide**. Meanwhile, more actions, reports, policies, and coordination are planned and will be monitored as a part of future Water Plan updates.
(Volume 1, Ch 1, pg 20)

Progress on the Implementation Plan of the 2009 Water Plan Update

Overview of Thirteen Objectives

Update 2009 Objective	Status	Trend
1 – Integrated Regional Water Management	Good	Neutral
2 – Water Use Efficiency	Requires Attention	Good
3 – Conjunctive Management	Requires Attention	Good
4 – Water Quality	Requires Attention	Good
5 – Environmental Stewardship	Requires Attention	Neutral
6 – Flood	Good	Good
7 – Delta	Good	Good
8 – Emergency Response	Neutral	Requires Attention
9 – Energy	Neutral	Neutral
10 – Data	Good	Good
11 – Technology	Good	Good
12 – Tribal	Neutral	Requires Attention
13 – Ensuring Equitable Distribution of Benefits	(in progress)	(in progress)

Note: This evaluation is of the progress of implementing the Related Actions of each Objective.

Of the thirteen Objectives, the statewide status of five of them is reported to be Good. The status of three more of them is Neutral. For four of the thirteen objectives, the statewide status is reported as Requires Attention. Although the current status for the thirteen Objectives is split fairly evenly between Good, Neutral and Requires Attention, the trend for the Objectives is more optimistic. In slightly more than half, the trend was reported as Good. Three of the thirteen are reported as Neutral. For only two of the thirteen Objectives the trend is neither neutral nor good, and Requires Attention.

Four Objectives (6 – Flood, 7 – Delta, 10 – Data, and 11 – Technology) reported both a Good Status and a Good Trend. Three other Objectives (2 – Water Use Efficiency, 3 – Conjunctive Management, 4 – Water Quality) reported that the ongoing Status Requires Attention, but the Trend is Good. Two Objectives (8 – Emergency Response and 12 – Tribal) reported that the current Status is Neutral, but that the trend is moving in the wrong direction and Requires Attention. Objective 9 – Energy, reports that both the Status and the Trend are Neutral. Objective 5 – Environmental Stewardship reports that the Status Requires Attention and that the Trend is Neutral.

Objective 1 – Expand Integrated Regional Water Management

Promote, improve, and expand Integrated Regional Water Management to create and build on partnerships that are essential for California water resources planning, sustainable watershed and floodplain management, and increasing regional self-sufficiency.

Progress:

Status: **Good**

N=16, No Answer = 5

Poor or Fair: 1

Good or Excellent: 10

Trend: **Neutral**

N = 16, No Answer = 6

Slow or No Progress: 5

Medium or Fast Progress: 5

Successful Actions:

Actions that are related to Grant Guidelines are met, as is the goal of establishing and approving IRWM Regions. Items that DWR could include in their own grant guidelines have been incorporated.

Delayed Actions:

Actions that specify that “counties and cities” should incorporate assessments of climate change risk into their general plan couldn’t be assessed.

Prominent Barriers:

Regions may need additional funding to assess climate change risk and incorporate that into their IRWM Plans.

Figuring out how to continue IRWM after final round of funding is granted.

Objective 2 – Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently

Use water more efficiently with significantly greater water conservation, recycling, and reuse to help meet future water demands and adapt to climate change.

Progress:

Status: **Requires Attention**

N = 21, No Answer = 5

Poor or Fair: 10

Good or Excellent: 6

Trend: **Good**

N = 21, No Answer = 5

Slow or No Progress: 7

Medium or Fast Progress: 9

Successful Actions:

Model Landscape Ordinance adopted.

DWR has reported to the Legislature about Agricultural EWMPs.

2009 Recycled Water Survey completed.

Salt and Nutrient Plans being developed though the state.

20 x 2020 program is established.

DWR adopted the "Agricultural Water Measurement Regulation" on July 11, 2012. The regulation set accuracy standards and

provides for a range of options that suppliers may use.

Delayed Actions:

Agricultural Water Districts will not have much time to develop AWM Plans by the deadline after the Guidebook is released. This will also delay reporting to the Legislature on results of Ag Water EWMPs.

Recycled Water projects are coming up against financial and physical constraints, including a wide variance in water quality.

Some communities don't have the financial resources to re-use municipal wastewater.

Prominent Barriers:

Some communities don't have the financial resources to re-use municipal wastewater.

The primary constraints to widespread reuse of recycled water are availability, storage, water quality and lack of financial resources

Objective 3 – Expand Conjunctive Management of Multiple Supplies

Advance and expand conjunctive management of multiple water supply sources with existing and new surface and groundwater storage to prepare for future droughts, floods, and climate change.

Progress:

Status: **Requires Attention**

N = 52, No Answer = 26

Poor or Fair: 16

Good or Excellent: 10

Trend: **Good**

N = 52, No Answer = 21

Slow or No Progress: 14

Medium or Fast Progress: 17

Successful Actions:

DWR is providing technical assistance for monitoring compliance, but limited by staff availability.

DWR is working to create a priority schedule for monitoring groundwater basins, but limited by staff and data availability.

DWR and others have developed a system for electronic reporting, storage, and retrieval of groundwater monitoring data in useful formats. (CASGEM)

Many groundwater quality protection measures have been incorporated into the State Water Board's Strategic Plan.

Delayed Actions:

Actions that require plans of other entities (regional, local and Tribal governments) were unreportable or reported poor progress in this report.

Developing a water budget for all groundwater basins was delayed by financial, technical, political, and institutional constraints. Lack of a clear guidance document highlighting multiple examples and best management practices. Lack of a requirement to consistently report the status of GW resource planning.

Streamlining the State Water Resources Control Board water rights permitting process to facilitate water transfers associated with the development of statewide and basin-wide conjunctive water management strategies.

Prominent Barriers:

Some of these Related Actions haven't been prioritized by DWR and other agencies.

Some have technical and financial barriers.

Objective 4 – Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality

Protect and restore surface water and groundwater quality to safeguard public and environmental health and secure California’s water supplies for beneficial uses.

Progress:

Status: **Requires Attention**

N = 15, No Answer = 3

Poor or Fair: 11

Good or Excellent: 4

Trend: **Good**

N = 15, No Answer = 3

Slow or No Progress: 5

Medium or Fast Progress: 10

Successful Actions:

Actions that coincide with priorities for the Bay-Delta are seeing progress.

Increase sustainable local water supplies available for meeting existing and future beneficial uses by 1,725,000 acre-feet per year, and ensure adequate flows for fish and wildlife habitat.

Increase the public acceptance and promote the use of recycled water and the reuse of storm water and gray water as locally available, sustainable water supplies consistent with the Climate Change Draft Scoping Plan developed pursuant to the

California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) and other relevant State and regional efforts.

Delayed Actions:

Comprehensively address water quality protection and restoration, and the relationship between water supply and water quality, and describe the connections between water quality, water quantity, and climate change, throughout California’s water planning processes.

Implement a statewide strategy to efficiently prepare, adopt, and implement total maximum daily loads (TMDLs), which result in water bodies meeting water quality standards, and adopt and begin implementation of TMDLs for all 2006-listed water bodies.

Prominent Barriers:

Priorities have gotten shifted from the items in the State Water Control Board’s 2008 Strategic Plan to the items prioritized by the 2009 water legislation and the items being developed for the 2013 Delta Plan.

Objective 5 – Expand Environmental Stewardship

Practice, promote, improve, and expand environmental stewardship to protect and enhance the environment by improving watershed, floodplain, and instream functions and to sustain water and flood management systems.

Progress:

Status: **Requires Attention**

N = 10, No Answer = 4

Poor or Fair: 4

Good or Excellent: 2

Trend: **Neutral**

N = 10, No Answer = 4

Slow or No Progress: 3

Medium or Fast Progress: 3

Successful Actions:

DWR has adopted an Environmental Stewardship Policy (DAM 2140), a Water Resource Engineering Memo -58b providing guidance on implementing the Policy, and a Sustainability Policy (DAM 8001). These policies include stated commitments to create net environmental benefits (i.e. improvements beyond mitigation requirements), sustainability of public trust resources, protection of natural resources and ecosystems that ensure they are available for future generations, and a set of 7 environmental principles. The Sustainability Policy states DWR intent to be a State leader in sustainability and

ecosystem stewardship. DWR has included stewardship considerations in project management templates. DWR has adopted a Climate Change Action Plan and is reporting its carbon footprint to the carbon registry.

Contribute to AB 32 GHG reduction goals related to water and flood systems operations through enhancing carbon sequestration mechanisms by re-establishing 500,000 acres of historic vegetated floodplain corridors and restoring 500,000 acres of upper watershed forests.

Delayed Actions:

IRWM and regional flood management plans that incorporate corridor connectivity and restoration of native aquatic and terrestrial habitats to support increased biodiversity and resilience for adapting to a changing climate should receive additional credits in State government water and flood grant programs.

Prominent Barriers:

Difficulty in practicing multi-benefit decision making. Program inertia and culture that has not fully embraced new policies. Difficulty in building meaningful partnerships with entities outside the Department and across programs within the Department.

Delays in project funding, DWR funding now secured; however, federal cost share is uncertain. Delays in federal cost share agreement for the Project Feasibility Study has significantly delayed project implementation.

Objective 6 – Practice Integrated Flood Management

Promote and practice integrated flood management to provide multiple benefits including better emergency preparedness and response, higher flood protection, more sustainable flood and water management systems, and enhanced floodplain ecosystems.

Progress:

Status: **Good**

N = 20, No Answer = 0

Poor or Fair: 6

Good or Excellent: 14

Trend: **Good**

N = 20, No Answer = 0

Slow or No Progress: 5

Medium or Fast Progress: 15

Successful Actions:

DWR will collaboratively develop a multi-objective Central Valley Flood Protection Plan that includes actions to improve integrated flood management in the Central Valley and accounts for the expected impacts of climate change. The plan will provide strategies for greater flood protection and environmental resilience.

DWR will complete a FloodSAFE report that identifies and characterizes significant flood risks throughout each of California's regions

and documents needs and opportunities to improve integrated flood management statewide.

Local governments should implement land use policies that consider flood risk.

Delayed Actions:

Improve tools and observations to better support decision-making for individual events and seasonal and inter-annual operations, including water transfers and stream gage data.

Local governments should utilize Low Impact Development techniques that store and infiltrate urban and storm water runoff while protecting groundwater.

Prominent Barriers:

Cost and agency alignment (internal and external) for developing tools to support decision-making.

Cost, opposition from developers, agency coordination to statewide use of LID techniques that infiltrate urban and storm water runoff.

As FloodSAFE and the Central Valley Flood Prevention Plan are developed, new priorities and recommendations are replacing the recommendation of the 2009 Water Plan Update.

Objective 7 – Manage a Sustainable California Delta

Set as co-equal goals a healthy Delta ecosystem and a reliable water supply for California and recognize the Delta as a unique and valued community and ecosystem to promote and practice management for a sustainable California Delta.

Progress:

Status: **Good**

N = 33, No Answer = 23

Poor or Fair: 2

Good or Excellent: 8

Trend: **Good**

N = 33, No Answer = 23

Slow or No Progress: 2

Medium or Fast Progress: 8

Successful Actions:

Continue a strong and consistent investment in science and engineering important to the Delta through a robust, well-coordinated Delta Science and Engineering Program with transparent oversight and review from a Delta Science and Engineering Board.

Establish the Delta Stewardship Council. The council will be composed of seven voting members, four appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate, one

appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules, one appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, and the Chair of the Delta Protection Commission.

Enhance the Delta Protection Commission. The mission of the Delta Protection Commission was modified to focus its efforts in the areas of land use and economic development.

Establish the Delta Stewardship Council. The council will be composed of seven voting members, four appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate, one appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules, one appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, and the Chair of the Delta Protection Commission.

The Delta Stewardship Council will adopt a Delta Management Plan (Delta Plan) that will be informed by and incorporate information, actions and recommendations from Delta and Suisun planning efforts.

Delayed Actions:

Update Bay-Delta regulatory flow and water quality standards to protect beneficial uses of water. Fully implement these new standards as well as the existing standards.

Prominent Barriers:

Political controversy and local opposition to the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan remain.

Objective 8 – Prepare Prevention, Response, and Recovery Plans

Prepare prevention, response, and recovery plans for floods, droughts, and catastrophic events to help residents and communities, particularly disadvantaged communities, make decisions that reduce the consequences and recovery time of these events when they occur.

Progress:

Status: **Neutral**

N = 14, No Answer = 5

Poor or Fair: 5

Good or Excellent: 4

Trend: **Requires Attention**

N = 14, No Answer = 2

Slow or No Progress: 11

Medium or Fast Progress: 2

Successful Actions:

DWR will develop a long-term California Drought Contingency Plan; there has been progress on the subsections:

- identification of needed improvements to real-time surface water and groundwater monitoring programs; and
- identification of needed research in drought forecasting.

DWR will work with the California Emergency Management Agency to develop preparedness plans to respond to other catastrophic events that would disrupt water resources and infrastructure; events like earthquakes, wildfires, chemical spills, facility malfunctions, and intentional disruption.

The California Emergency Management Agency, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, and the California Natural Resources Agency should lead an effort to update the State Emergency Plan and State Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan to strengthen consideration of climate impacts to hazard assessment planning, implementation priorities, and emergency responses.

Delayed Actions:

Communities in floodplains should consider the consequences of flooding and should develop, adopt, practice, and regularly evaluate formal flood emergency preparedness, response, evacuation, and recovery plans.

Many aspects of the California Drought Contingency Plan have not been implemented.

Prominent Barriers:

Cost, agency resource capability and availability

Lack of interest during two normal/wet years. Lack of drought staff to implement the Drought Plan.

Objective 9 – Reduce Energy Consumption of Water Systems and Uses

Reduce the energy consumption of water and wastewater management systems by implementing the water-related strategies in AB 32 Scoping Plan to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions.

Progress:

Status: **Neutral**

N = 23, No Answer = 10

Poor or Fair: 6

Good or Excellent: 7

Trend: **Good**

N = 23, No Answer = 13

Slow or No Progress: 4

Medium or Fast Progress: 6

Successful Actions:

Local agencies and governments should implement cost effective, energy efficiency measures in water system infrastructure projects.

Several recommendations that came from the 2009 water legislation have seen good progress, including:

- CII task Force was established and report was completed;
- Urban Technical Methodologies;
- Fourth Target Method;

Process Water Regulations Update UWMP Guidebook

Delayed Actions:

The State Water Board will (a) implement its Recycled Water Policy to encourage the use of recycled water while protecting beneficial uses of water resources and the environment, and (b) require the use of recycled water where the use of potable water would be considered a waste or an unreasonable use of water.

State government will establish a public goods charge for funding investments in Integrated Regional Water Management strategies that will help mitigate and adapt to climate change.

Prominent Barriers:

No requirement to report RW numbers to anyone; cost of salt/nutrient planning; RW not a priority in all Regions; DPH underfunded and understaffed.

Objective 10 – Improve Data & Analysis for Decision-making

Improve and expand monitoring, data management, and analysis to support decision-making, especially in light of uncertainties, that support Integrated Regional Water Management and flood and water resources management systems

Progress:

Status: **Good**

N = 22, No Answer = 8

Poor or Fair: 6

Good or Excellent: 8

Trend: **Good**

N = 22, No Answer = 8

Slow or No Progress: 6

Medium or Fast Progress: 8

Successful Actions:

DWR will participate with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and Scripps Institute of Oceanography in implementing the Hydrometeorological Test Bed program which enhances off-shore and land measurements of weather variables.

State government should establish an interim range of sea level rise projections for short-term planning purposes for local, regional, and statewide projects and activities.

The Natural Resources Agency, in coordination with other State agencies, will convene and support a scientific panel of the National Research Council (NRC) to provide expert guidance regarding long-range sea level rise estimates and their application to specific California planning issues. These estimates should be revisited and revised regularly to reflect updated science.

Delayed Actions:

The University of California should establish a system-wide Climate Change Adaptation Research Center.

DWR will implement pilot studies in different areas of the state to explore how information can be more effectively integrated among local, regional, and statewide water planning and management activities. The initial focus of this effort will be to improve how information produced for urban water management plans can be used to more effectively support Integrated Regional Water Management plans and the California Water Plan while streamlining reporting requirements.

Prominent Barriers:

No initiative on this action by UC, or by the State Legislature (for funding).

Objective 11 – Invest in New Water Technology

Identify and fund applied research and pilot studies on emerging water technology to make them attainable and more cost effective.

Progress:

Status: **Good**

N = 3 , No Answer = 0

Poor or Fair: 0

Good or Excellent: 3

Trend: **Good**

N = 3, No Answer = 0

Slow or No Progress: 0

Medium or Fast Progress: 3

Successful Actions:

State government will work with California research and academic institutions to identify, prioritize, and begin funding applied research projects as part of a broad and diverse scientific agenda to fill gaps in knowledge about California's water resources.

State government will invest in pilot projects to help local agencies and governments and regional partnerships implement promising water technologies—to improve water use efficiency, water recycling and reuse, water supplies and

quality, water and wastewater treatment, storm water capture and reuse, desalination, and others—more cost effectively with knowledge and experience specific to each region.

The California Energy Commission through its PIER Program (Public Interest Energy Research) will conduct research and demonstration projects that explore ways to reduce the energy intensity of the water use cycle and to better manage the energy demand of water systems.

Delayed Actions:

None.

Prominent Barriers:

Cost, Funding, Outreach & Education, time and energy for collaboration

Objective 12 – Improve Tribal Water and Natural Resources

Develop Tribal consultation, collaboration, and access to funding for water programs and projects to better sustain Tribal water and natural resources.

Progress:

Status: **Requires Attention**

N = 46 , No Answer = 4

Poor or Fair: 23

Good or Excellent: 19

Trend: **Requires Attention**

N = 37, No Answer = 1

Slow or No Progress: 34

Medium or Fast Progress: 2

Successful Actions:

Creation of the Tribal Advisory Committee to incorporate Tribal perspectives on water, culture and land are incorporated into the CWP. The first California Tribal Water Summit occurred in Nov. 2009 with a second Summit scheduled for April 2013. The development of a new Resource Management Strategy that will discuss tribal and non-tribal cultural significance of water. IRWM guidelines includes Native American Tribes to be contacted as part of the planning process. With Prop 50 money, the Agricultural Water Use Efficiency Proposal Solicitation Package listed Tribes

as eligible applicants. Pursuant to Executive Order B-10-11, the California Natural Resources Agency adopts a final tribal consultation policy.

Delayed Actions:

Due to Executive Order B-06-011 all Tribal Advisory Committee meetings must be in Sacramento, discouraging Tribes who live too far to participate. Improvement in some areas of concern and slow or no action in others. Recommendations from the 2009 Tribal Water Summit have not all been fully addressed. More work to be done to improve Objective 12. In response to the Resources Agency consultation policy, DWR is developing a department specific consultation policy.

Prominent Barriers:

Some Tribes have limited resources to participate in the Water Plan process. Capacity varies from Tribes to utilize the (CWP) reports. Lack of government-to-government relationship. Some Tribes have a distrust towards State government. The ability to participate and receive funding through IRWM's is restrictive to Tribes – unable to be the lead applicant. Delays for Tribes to receive funding. There are no mandates requiring local agencies to communicate with Tribes. Majority of the funding available is only to federally recognized Tribes. Staff need to be trained on cultural sensitivity and how to effectively communicate with Tribes. Varying abilities for DWR and Tribes to share information.

Objective 13 – Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Increase the participation of small and disadvantaged communities in State processes and programs to achieve fair and equitable distribution of benefits. Consider mitigation of impacts from the implementation of State government programs and policies to provide safe drinking water and wastewater treatment to all California communities and to ensure that these programs and policies address the most critical public health threats in disadvantaged communities.

Progress:

Successful Actions:

Delayed Actions:

Prominent Barriers:

DRAFT

Findings

- Related Actions that could be completed within State government often saw rapid progress, especially if they originated in legislation. For example, DWR's IRWM branch incorporated the listed grant guidelines. The State created the Delta Stewardship Council. DWR set up a Water Use Efficiency Task Force.
- The Related Actions that had "local and regional governments" as the agents couldn't be tracked. There are too many local governments for a project with limited resources to survey.
- Land Use connection to water wasn't effectively evaluated, because of way the Objectives were set up for '09. Although land and water use are closely linked, Land Use as a topic did not have an independent Objective.
- When the Objectives and Related Actions were gathered or written in Update 2009, they were not written to be measured. Many don't clearly tie a single distinct action to a clear performance metric.
- During the close look at the Update 2009 Objectives required for tracking progress, the overall choice of Objectives and structure was affirmed., although Related Actions could be changed. Heard a call for new objectives.
- Many evaluators were surprised by the breadth of the Implementation Plans Objectives and Related Actions.

Method

When Water Plan staff began to develop the Progress Report, the first decision was "measure progress on which section of the Water Plan?" There were a few options. The second volume of Water Plan Update '09 contains 28 Resource Management Strategies, all of which have many recommendations. Should the Progress Report attempt to follow the implementation of all of those recommendations? The Strategic Plan of Update '09 has two sections that potentially could be tracked. In Chapter 2, the Water Plan lists nine crosscutting recommendations. Chapter 7 is the implementation plan for the Water Plan, with thirteen Objectives, each with Related Actions.

After looking at the sections and consulting our advisory groups, we decided that Chapter 7 was the best measure of whether the Water Plan is being implemented. First, it is called, and meant to be the Implementation Plan for achieving the Water Plan. Second, thirteen Objectives with 115 Related Actions offered a level of specificity that could be tracked. The nine cross-cutting recommendations were broader and correspondingly harder to track. We decided against monitoring and reporting on the recommendations in the Resource Management Strategies after counting more than 435 of them.

Once we decided to report progress on the thirteen Objectives and their 115 Related Actions, we went to the text of chapter 7. We created a spreadsheet with a tab for every Objective. Every Related Action has a row and can be reported on individually. Before we finalized them, we vetted the spreadsheets with two of our stakeholder groups and incorporated their suggestions.

The columns allow for different kinds of reporting. The first four columns are standardized. If the program is new, a dropdown menu allows the respondent to choose between No Action, Authorized, Initiated, Planned, In Progress (early), In Progress (mid), In Progress (late) or completed. If the program is an existing, on-going program, the respondent can choose whether the status is Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent or Unreportable. The next column asks whether the trend for that Related Action is No progress/regressing, Slow progress toward implementation, Medium progress toward implementation, Fast progress toward implementation, or Unreportable. The last standardized column acknowledges that progress may be uneven throughout California, and asks whether the progress on the Related Action covers Parts of California, Most of California or is Statewide.

The next four columns ask for unconstrained, narrative descriptions of progress. The first of the non-standardized columns asks for a description of activities (What has been initiated, completed, implemented, in pursuit of this objective?). The second asks for a listing of the barriers or constraints on progress, if there are any. (What has been initiated, completed, implemented, in pursuit of this objective?) The next column asks how this Related Action can be refined for the upcoming Water Plan. (How can this recommendation be more relevant, implementable, specific, and/or trackable?) The final column asks for future reporting metrics to help craft Update 2013 Objectives and associated actions. The intent of these column headings was to give respondents different ways to evaluate progress, and to report on relevant factors in greater detail as a narrative if they desired.

Once the spreadsheets were complete, we asked for our collaboration groups to fill out the spreadsheets on the topics they were familiar with. Five Objectives align well with the topic-based caucuses formed for Update 2013. Our Tribal Advisory Committee has the requisite knowledge to fill out Objective 12: Improve Tribal Water and Natural Resources. The groundwater caucus has the expertise to respond to Objective 3: Expand Conjunctive Management and Objective 4: Surface and Groundwater Quality. The Land Use Caucus could evaluate the Related Actions in each Objective that involve Land Use. The Technology Caucus could evaluate Objective 10: Technology. In late Spring of 2012, we brought the spreadsheets to each relevant caucus, both giving presentations and holding lengthy phone calls. The Tribal Advisory Committee filled out the spreadsheet for Objective 12. The Technology Caucus evaluated Objective 10. The other caucuses ran into the methodological difficulties of evaluating each Related Action. After much discussion, they believed they could not report accurately on progress and declined to fill out the spreadsheets.

Over the summer, State agency staff, primarily DWR staff filled out the spreadsheets. We asked staff familiar with programs in each Objective to report on progress. The perspective is therefore that of State-level staff in Sacramento.

As the spreadsheets were completed, we presented them to the public at two public workshops. We held a Progress Report workshop at the Water Plan's September Plenary, presenting two-thirds of the completed Objective spreadsheets, and asking stakeholders to review and add to the materials in the spreadsheets. We incorporated their responses and additional information from DWR's Climate Change program. We presented that material and further completed spreadsheets at a public workshop on November 19th. Both workshops garnered some additional comment, but not substantial revisions.

At the November 19th 2012 workshop, we compiled the existing data and proposed three ways to compile the data on the spreadsheets into one evaluation of Progress. The stakeholders at the November 19th workshop chose a relatively simple metric that compares counts of No or Slow Progress to counts of Medium or Fast Progress. If there are more “No Progress” and “Slow Progress” than “Medium Progress” and “Fast Progress”, the assessment is that the Objective requires attention. If there are about the same number of “No Progress” and “Slow Progress” as “Medium Progress” and “Fast Progress”, the assessment is that progress on the Objective is neutral. If there are more “Medium Progress” or “Fast Progress” than “No Progress” or “Slow Progress”, the assessment is that progress on the Objective is good. The stakeholders believed that the precision of this metric appropriately matches the level of precision in the underlying data.

We summarized the progress for each Objective into 13 one-page summaries and an overall summary. We presented those to the State Agency Steering Committee in January 2013, asking for comments and revisions. These summaries were presented to our Public Advisory Committee on February 14th, 2013 for final comment and feedback for the Progress Report.

Methodological Difficulties

The primary difficulty tracking progress of the Water Plan Update 2009 Objectives and Related Actions was that when they were originally written, they were not written to be measured. The Related Actions for each Objective came from different sources. Some came from stakeholder comment. Some were brought in from Companion Plans written by other state agencies. Some originated in state legislation. They were written for many purposes, and were not originally tied to a measurable performance metric. Other difficulties with measuring progress of the Related Actions include:

- Some require multiple actions to multiple targets, creating a matrix of possible actions. For example, one Related Action in Objective 6 – Integrated Flood Management is:
Improve communications and coordination during emergencies, such as floods and droughts.
This can be parsed into four actions. (1. improving communications during flood;; 2. improving communications during droughts, 3. improving coordination during floods and 4. improving coordination during droughts.) Many of the original Related Actions are similarly compounded.
- Some have open-ended, long-term time frames that are intended to achieve the vision of the Water Plan in 2050. Three years after Water Plan Update '09, it is difficult to say whether we have made significant progress on Related Actions that may take decades to implement.
- Some require actions to be taken by local or regional governments. With sufficient resources, it is possible to track whether, for example, local governments have included flood-resistant design requirements in local building codes. But without the resources to survey all local building codes, it is difficult to track progress on this Related Action.

Many of the Related Actions were taken from the existing companion plans to the Water Plan. Since then, those plans have been revised, creating new goals and implementation strategies. The original goals are maintained in our Water Plan from 2009, but not with the people who would be responsible for implementing them. They have objected to being evaluated by the actions they are no longer trying to implement.

Recommendations for Next Progress Report

Recommendations for Water Plan Update 2013 Objectives

- If tracking the progress of the Objectives and Related Actions is important, write the Related Actions to be measurable.
- Separate Related Actions into visionary and measurable actions. A longterm strategic plan can appropriately contain actions that are intended to be visionary or inspirational rather than immediately acted upon. If so, indicate that they aren't intended to be measured in the Progress Report. Actions whose progress should be measured should include a performance metric.
- Incorporate the feedback from progress evaluators into the Objectives and Related Actions for Water Plan Update 2013. The spreadsheets included a column for suggested revisions; the evaluators made many such suggestions.

Appendices

Original Data for Each Objective

List of Progress Evaluators