



Progress Report Meeting

MEETING SUMMARY

CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN: UPDATE 2013

PROGRESS REPORT MEETING

NOVEMBER 19, 2012 1:00 P.M – 4:00 P.M.

CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR COLLABORATIVE POLICY- 815 S STREET, SACRAMENTO

Meeting Purpose:

The California Water Plan (CWP) Progress Report meeting materials can be found online here:

<http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm?subject=nov1912>

Meeting Goals:

- Review the filled out Objectives
- Create a technique for summing them up into a displayable result
- Draw lessons for writing the 2013 Objectives and Related Actions

Attendance: (See Attached)

Action Items:

#	Item	Owner	Due Date
1.	Take “Structure of Objectives-actions” to the State Agency Steering Committee for review.	Lisa B.	TBD
2.	Incorporate this meeting’s input into Progress Report content, and plug into other necessary parts of the California Water Plan.	Megan Fidell	1/31/13

Announcements:

- The Progress Reports document is due for public release on January 31, 2012.

Welcome and Introductions:

Lisa Beutler (Executive Facilitator for the California Water Plan) and Megan Fidell (DWR, Division of Statewide Integrated Water Management) began the meeting with opening remarks, an agenda review, and ground rules. Introductions were done for all meeting participants, including those who joined via webinar.

Overview of Progress Report:

- *Purpose*
- *Method*
- *Timeline*

Megan Fidell began with an overview of the Progress Reports, and an update of where the team is in the Progress Report process. This is a new document to the California Water Plan, and is released “off cycle” of the main document. The purpose of the Progress Report is to determine if the recommendations laid out in the 2009 Water Plan are being implemented.



Progress Report Meeting

The team has created spreadsheets populated with identified objectives for the various Water Plan caucuses to provide input. Ms. Fidell noted that there are challenges associated with this being the first progress report, and also because of the way that these objectives were worded in the Water Plan.

Push back from stakeholders on these spreadsheet evaluations led to a “Plan B”; in which DWR populate the matrixes. Each of the spreadsheets has been vetted subject matter experts. (*Many of these were available for viewing in this meeting as posters*). The data in these sheets will be combined, and used in the upcoming progress report. However, the timeline is constricted and it was noted that could be a major challenge for the team.

Kamyar Guivetchi (DWR) revisited the Progress Report, noting that recommendations from the previous cycle must be evaluated in order to help craft future Water Plan Objectives. He described the process as one that stakeholders have asked for in the past. Mr. Guivetchi explained that previous objectives were “quilted together” in part through the State Companion Plan, in some cases the Water Plan process modified them - but it should be noted that they were “assembled” sometimes out of context under the thirteen key Water Plan objectives. This can have impacts on DWR’s ability to measure them. This progress Report will help inform those Companion Plans. It will help assess the status of things as the team moves forward with the public review draft, and to help develop new recommendations for 2013. One additional challenge is that the recommendations, as stated, may not apply to every part of the State of California.

Lisa Buetler noted that this process is driven by a stakeholder desire to measure objectives, and represented an important process to understanding all of the great work going on as a result of the Water Plan Effort. Today participants are going to see the results and discuss key messages – because there is an important story embedded. The goal of the meeting today is to figure out how to message what is included in the spreadsheets, and figure out how to get this report done.

Questions of Clarification:

Meeting participants were invited to ask questions about the progress reports.

Q: How will the tables be used in the report?

A: The tables could be part of the report, but due to accessibility – they should likely be distilled into something more digestible. That will be one of our tasks today.

Comment: Two things, one concept: So there are the companion plans and the CWP – since 2009 we may have both convergence and divergence. Goals can change, and that can be difficult to capture. The second is dealing with sustainable communities and sustainability – we have both indicators and the metrics. The indicator could be water conservation, but the *metric* could be many different things.

Q: Is there a TOC yet?



Progress Report Meeting

A: No

Q: What is the timeline?

A: It is due January 31st to the Public?

Comment: There is a difference between grading the objectives and how well we are doing. Not all things are easily measurable either. Some of them may never be measurable.

Presentation of Objectives and Results:

Megan Fidell began an overview of the current progress report spreadsheets, and invited participants to walk around the room and look at presented results. She described the various inputs for the spreadsheets.

Comment: This may be too ambitious – trying to do the overview. The lesson learned may be that there are too many objectives in the Water Plan. For example, on a five year cycle – trying to measure these things is helpful – but not always necessary to give.

Comment: Agreed, that is consistent with my opinion. We can group each one of these lists by accessibility, and ones that are hard to tell how we could measure them.

Q: Who exactly was supposed to start implementing these? Would we like to talk about what we would like to do about this?

A: A lot of these things have a mandate for certain groups and regions, that ownership is very important. It is difficult to motivate participants otherwise. Maybe we should prioritize these and think realistically what can be done – i.e. get some successes.

Turning Data into Results:

Meeting participants participated in a detailed mind map session (Attachment 1). Discussion focused around developing a table of contents for the document, and organization.

Megan Fidell shared the following questions for discussion:

1. Does this data support being consolidated into one metric? “Grade”
2. Is it legitimate to use the first categories? (New, Status, Trend, Area)
3. If so, which method?
 - a. Ratio, Mode, scored other?
 - b. If not, how?
4. Do the related actions need to be weighted?

Participants reviewed the current spreadsheets, and discussed. Highlight comments and discussion included:

Q: Given the data, which approach seems the most justified?



Progress Report Meeting

A: This method is fuzzy enough considering the data that we do have. Letter grades were not very popular at the plenary session. The red/yellow/green method is an option that seems to have value. It seems less problematic than letter grades.

Comment: One issue is that it treats all of these methods as if they are equally important. However, that is likely not the case – I am unclear how to actually weight them.

Comment: We have to consider the readers reaction to these scales. There is no normalization of this input based on realistic assessment. You cannot leave that unsaid in the overall narrative.

Comment: Many of these grades are too premature. I would eliminate the “red” because it frames this in the negative. We are not trying to lay blame or criticize; I would like to frame this in a positive note considering the limitations.

Comment: I suggest a “Blue/Green/Yellow” palette for the rating system.

Comment: We need to define our ranges, like “substantial progress”, “progress”, ect.

Q: Is there some weight we want to assign to “ownership” for actions. Is there any way to cut that? Is it important?

A: I think it is. Identifying those agencies/organizations is an important exercise.

Comment: Maybe we suggest the “who” in the responsibility section of the Progress Report document.

Comment: Would it help if all thirteen objectives are posed in the meeting minutes in the December fourth State Agency Steering Committee meeting? That may be a good point to ask for input, and current recommendations. We can get valuable input on “re-do’s”.

Response: This goes back to the Volume 1 Strategic Plan.

Lessons Learned:

After a short break, Meagan Fidell brought the discussion back to Objectives. These are recommendations for future iterations of the Water Plan – i.e. “How can we write better related actions”?

Comment: The wording of the actions is either helpful or unhelpful to the action, so we need to come up with a guide to show what works.

Comment: We need balance. The water plan cannot get too specific, otherwise it triggers the CEQA.

Comment: Some of these probably fit better as vision statements rather than actions. Not everybody is going to be happy with these.



Progress Report Meeting

Q: Do we need to get the message out more about the possibility of triggering CEQA?

A: (Added to the mindmap) The Water Plan is roughly equivalent to a “Programmatic” type of evaluation for the State of California. It is important to frame it based around the idea that a decision has not already been made.

Comment: We have a Strategic Plan. If something that has been called an “action” is determined to be closer to vision, then maybe we should elevate it.

After discussion, Lisa Beutler led an exercise mapping out the Structure of Objectives and actions (*Attachment 2*). Individual actions were considered in a comparison with identified categories, and the group began to define new criteria that could be useful in making future stated objectives more measurable.

As is the practice for Water Plan sessions, the meeting was **Adjourned** at the scheduled time.



Progress Report Meeting

Attendance:

Note: (W) = Attended via Web

Participants

1. Jim Atherstone (W), SSJID
2. Rachel Ballanti (W), Water Boards
3. David Bolland (W), ACWA
4. Troy Boone (W), Santa Cruz County
5. Grace Chan (W), Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
6. Tom Farr (W), NASA JPL
7. Megan Fidell, DWR
8. Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR
9. Bruce Gwynne, DOC
10. Don Hodge (W), EPA
11. John Kingsbury, MCWRA
12. Denise Landstedt (W), Rancho Cordova
13. Hoa Ly, DWR
14. Lew Moller, DWR
15. Vickie Newlin (W), Butte County
16. Juan Perez, CalEMA
17. Jason Wen (W), Downey Brand
18. Evon Willhoff (W), PCL
19. Betty Yee (W), Water Boards

Meeting Staff

20. Lisa Beutler, Executive Facilitator
21. Joshua Biggs, Note Taker