



# **DROUGHT CONTINGENCY PLAN WORKSHOP**

**AUGUST 10, 2010**

**1:00 PM-4:30 P.M.**

*Cal EPA Building, Klamath Training Room,  
1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814*

Name	Organization
------	--------------

## **1. Welcome and Introductions**

Meeting facilitator, Lisa Beutler, CSUS; Center for Collaborative Policy welcomed participants to the CWP: Drought Contingency Plan Workshop. She reviewed the meeting ground rules and the agenda. And noted that the purpose for the meeting was not to get consensus about the plan, but rather to gain feedback and input.

Wendy Martin, Statewide Drought Coordinator, Department of Water Resources opened the meeting with some remarks. She thanked the group for their ongoing participation and acknowledged Vic Nguyen, DWR and Lew Moeller, DWR who were the principle coordinators to the draft plan. She noted that in 2007, the state of California entered, what is being called, a 3 year drought with many people under the impression that the drought is currently over given last year's average rainfall. Unfortunately, she added, that may not be the case but forecasters are still uncertain what is to be expected in the future. She said that there possibly could be a continual drying period in the future. She noted that this guide is meant to be a desk manual that can be referenced in the future, if such a drought continues.

Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, addressed participants, noting that he had been working as part of the California Water Plan (CWP) since 2000 and in 2005 it was suggested that drought events should be addressed in the 2009 plan. He added that the plan was to update the Drought Contingency Plan every 5 years with the CWP. He noted that the focus of the actions within the plan was how State agencies can improve response, recovery and preparation for a drought.

## **2. Overview**

An overview of the Drought Contingency plan was given and is available [http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/docs/meeting\\_materials/drought/2010.08.10/CA\\_Drought\\_Contingency\\_Plan-Public\\_Review\\_Draft-081010.pdf](http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/docs/meeting_materials/drought/2010.08.10/CA_Drought_Contingency_Plan-Public_Review_Draft-081010.pdf)

### **Questions and Comments:**

Q: Where is California with mobile desalination?

A: There are a lot of current mobile desalination efforts particularly within the military but you do need a brackish water source.

Q: The National Drought Mitigation Center has detailed information about what constitutes and drought and what is water shortage. Was that mentioned in the plan?

A: Part of the Contingency Plan is about understanding the difference between drought, scarcity, water shortage, etc. At this point we don't really have indicators but we have flagged that as something to look at in the future. We are uncertain if we were to have drought indicators how we would use them. It could create a lot more bureaucratic steps.

Q: Taking the knowledge that we have about drought, what are some better ways that we can anticipate drought?

A: That is referenced in Table 1.

**Comments:**

- It was noted that there are efforts in Australia that can be looked at.
- It was noted that often, funding is a public/private partnership.
- In 2007, DWR partially funded work that was done assisting local agencies with their drought plan. That is being used to create a national drought manual.
- There is a difference between adapting to circumstances and adapting to water culture. There is a wariness of being so flexible that it becomes meaningless. Fundamentally, if we come up with a plan based on assumptions that agencies can cherry pick could be a serious flaw.
- It was suggested that the plan address "institutional drought".
- It was suggested that there should be mention of how local agencies, most notably water agencies, will be used in the organizational and planned development process.

**3. Review of Action Tables:**

Mr. Moeller reviewed the Plan's Action Table's, graphics included in the plan that addressed the most effective ways for preparing for, responding to and recovering from a drought. He noted that the graphic was primarily from the perspective of a state agency but that there was a desire to add more information pertinent to local agencies, water transfers and other water-related issues.

**Comments:**

- It was suggested that the droughts be looked at from a historical perspective, particularly the “during’ phase of a drought and one would find a conservation decline. They noted that this is the sort of thing that needs to be better understood.
- There was a suggestion to include pricing structures, noting that rate structures should be built ahead of time. If an area knows that they are headed for drought, knowing this type of things ahead of time can help justify investment in capital and yield technology changes.
- It was suggested that vector control be addressed.
- There was the issue of conservation techniques during good times compared to the rationing of dry times addressed.
- There was concern with the name of the plan, noting that people don’t think of something that can happen quickly but an earthquake or spill can cause a shortage very quickly.
- It was noted that the Governor has a lot of regulations that need to be adopted regarding landscaping, etc. It was suggested that DWR could leverage these regulations to make sure that agencies and regions are making steps. There is a need for a performance metric.
- It was suggested that diversification of water supply should be addressed.
- Standardized record keeping for water use needs to be addressed.
- In regards to conservation, maintaining drought restriction and maintaining ongoing conservation should be two different ideas.

#### **Bin Items- For future consideration**

- Explicitly address Drought in the RMS of that Water Plan.
- Preparatory pricing structures at the local level.
- USBR program to get fast financial service.
- Address how to justify investment in capital/infrastructure.
- Increased focus on banking water.
- Address what to do in case of a shortage (perhaps pipeline break emergency rather than hydrologic drought). This would add a sense of urgency.
- Create a report card for regional preparedness. i.e. compliance with model ordinance.
- Collect data about performance of drought recovery.
- Water Banking

## **4. Discussion of Local Agency Support and Next Steps for Improvement**

A. What should local agencies do to support implementation of the plan?

- Coordination between State agencies has no bearing because all of the ground work is done at the local level.
- I would like that flipped to ask, “what can DWR do to assist local agencies in implementing the Drought Contingency Plan, once it is finalized.

B. What are the next steps in improving the Drought Contingency Plan?

- Let local agencies have a seat at the table.
- Interconnectivity of moving water.
- Conservation at the local level.
- Report Cards for local agencies.
- Allow local agencies to make recommendations to State agencies.
- Recognize that the State is biting off a large chunk of the important issues.
- There needs to be State support in overcoming hurdles dealing with diversification of water supplies and transfers.
- Include conservation rate structures.
- The ability to transfer water in a non-drought period is important.
- Water Transfers are not only what is needed for consumptive use but also what is needed for environmental components.
- It needs to change from a learning process to the State contributing real time action.
- ACWA is a great organization for larger agencies, but some are too small to have drought management. DWR needs to be the driving force to get things done.
- Smaller agencies can get left behind when talking about water banking and transfers.
- The largest problem with smaller agencies is that they don't fall under urban water management and therefore run out of water.
- Public/Private partnership should be encouraged
- The role of agencies in relation to drought and Prop 50 needs to be addressed further.

## **5. Closing Remarks and Adjourn**

Vic Nguyen, DWR, and Lew Moeller, DWR, thanked the group for their input and feedback. They encouraged any additional comments to be sent by September 20, 2010 to [cwpc@water.ca.gov](mailto:cwpc@water.ca.gov).

Name	Organization
Joe Tam	EBMUD
Katie Cox	CCP
Margie Graham	DWR
Kevin Clanky	Bureau of Reclamation
Vic Nguyen	DWR
Scott Nielson	DCSS/EFAPP
John Mason	CDSS/EFAPP
Mark Johnson	Cal EMA
Paul Weghorst	IRWD
Clay Rosen	Rubicon Systems
Carl Ligenhoske	CDPH
Elizabeth Betancourt	CUWCC
Megan Fidell	DWR
Kamyar Guivetchi	DWR
Chris Brown	CUWCC
Adam Ortega	State Board of Food and Agriculture
Wendy Martin	DWR
Larry Rodriguez	KCWA
Mark Rentz	ACWA
David Pegos	CDFA
Charlie Kraten	DWR
Sheri Blankenheim	Cal EMA
Tom Filler	DWR
Elizabeth Patterson	DWR

Al Vargas	DWR
-----------	-----