

# Meeting Summary

## Drought Resilience Interagency & Partners (DRIP) Collaborative

### Spring 2024 Meeting

California Natural Resources Agency, Room 221 A/B

715 P Street, Sacramento

April 26, 2024 | 10:00 am - 5:00 pm

The meeting was live streamed and recorded. The recording can be viewed [here](#)

[Meeting materials](#) (including the presentation) are available online.

A list of Drought Resilience Interagency & Partnership (DRIP) Collaborative members (members) is included in [Appendix A](#). The DRIP staff development team includes:

- Anthony Navasero, California Department of Water Resources (DWR), Drought Coordinator
- Julie Ekstrom, DWR, Supervisor in the Water Use Efficiency Branch
- Zoe Kanavas, DWR
- Glen Low, Earth Genome
- Sam Magill, Sacramento State University Consensus and Collaboration Program

### Meeting Overview

Members of the DRIP collaborative met during the first meeting of 2024 on April 26 in Sacramento. The following bullet points provide a brief overview of meeting outcomes; additional detail is provided in the summary below. Key takeaways and outcomes include:

- Began the process of forming recommendations to address the current three focus areas and their problem statements.
- Formally established three workgroups and discussed how they will operate to refine the recommendations to ensure the process is transparent and consensus driven.
- Started the process of identifying the next set of focus areas and aligned that we will have detailed discussions in the July and October meetings (in preparation for 2025 recommendation development).

### Welcoming Remarks and Setting Intentions

John Andrew opened the meeting with a brief explanation of his previous work at the Division of Drinking Water at the State Health Department, the CALFED Bay Delta Program, and the Department of Water Resources. While working on the annual California Water Plan Update, John contributed to the *Californians without Safe Water* publication (report included in [California Water Plan Update 2005](#)) that was referenced often in the development of [AB 685](#), the legislation which made California the first state of the nation to legislatively recognize the human right to water.

Anthony Navasero reviewed the meeting agenda:

- Ensure we're all clear on the recommendation process and how that structure will help inform 2024 efforts for the DRIP Collaborative.
- Listen to DRIP member presentations on proposed recommendations within DRIP Collaborative focus areas and provide input for recommendation development.
- Discuss process for DRIP member extension.

Glen Low reviewed the 2023 DRIP Collaborative activities and the foundation it built for our work this year. He emphasized the importance of attending the three in-person DRIP Collaborative meetings. He also prefaced the recommendation discussion with an emphasis on the complex nature of the problems this group is trying to address, encouraging participation from all the members. After the presentation, the following question was received from a member (with DRIP staff answer also noted):

- Question: Are we "locked in" to the number of recommendations that this group will consider or are we going to continue to have opportunities to add? Answer: We will absolutely have opportunities to add. Recommendation submission is a rolling process.

Each member briefly introduced themselves with their name and organization/affiliation.

## Informational Updates

### Hydrological Update

Jeanine Jones, Interstate Resources Manager for DWR, provided an update on hydrology and current conditions. Jeanine presented California's 2024 water year data, noting precipitation at 106% of average with very wet conditions in the southern regions and the desert, leading to urban landslides in those regions. Statewide reservoir levels are at 118%, benefiting from water year 2023's carryover. Snowpack is at 110% of average as of April 1st. Groundwater levels show no significant changes over five years, reflecting delays in data reporting and subsurface movement. Runoff forecasts for Sierra-Cascades Rivers vary between 88-106%. Water project allocations include 40% from the State Water Project and up to 100% in some areas of the Central Valley Project. Lower wildfire risk is expected due to prolonged wet conditions. Overall, the 2024 water year has been abnormally average in terms of precipitation.

After the presentation, these questions were asked by the members (Jeanine's answers are provided):

- Question: Are there long-term (10-20 year) projections of groundwater levels? Answer: Long-term groundwater level projections involve too many variables to accurately predict. However, SGMA staff have been exploring more short-term groundwater projections for mainly dry, shallow, private residential wells.
- Question: Despite recent wet conditions, why does the State Water Project only allocate 40%? Answer: Allocations are influenced by factors beyond just hydrology, including environmental protections and demands from all contractors, not solely the water availability.
- Question: For the groundwater projections, could you clarify what the definition of average is? Answer: The averages are based on a subset of wells that have a 10–20-year record.
- Question: Does the State provide two-year water projections like the Bureau's for Lake Mead? Answer: While SGMA staff use the same software package as the Bureau and produces projections for a variety of time steps for internal operational planning, the State does not use a standardized future projection process like the Bureau's for public release.

### SB 552 County Implementation Update

Julie provided an update on SB 552 County Task Forces and DWR's County Drought Resilience Planning Assistance Program. According to DWR staff discussions with counties to date, 27 (47%) of California Counties have convened drought task forces. Two counties have adopted a Drought Resilience Plan (Santa Cruz and Tulare Counties). Nearly all counties are participating in the Assistance program: 20 county grants have been awarded with one application pending, 35 counties are enrolled in Direct Technical Assistance, and one county is in discussion about enrolling in some form of assistance. Further updates on SB 552 implementation can be found [here](#)

#### Water Commission Presentation

Sandi Matsumoto from the California Water Commission presented the paper [Potential State Strategies for Protecting Communities and Fish and Wildlife in the Event of Drought](#), outlining four key strategies: scaling up groundwater recharge, watershed-level planning, positioning communities for drought emergencies, and enhancing coordination and communication. These strategies intersect with DRIP Collaborative focus areas, such as making climate disaster funding more accessible, improving SB 552 drought resilience plans, and identifying community-beneficial recharge opportunities. Additionally, the importance of managing drought-relevant data and creating public information campaigns on drought was emphasized. Strategies also include assessing ecosystem needs through the California Environmental Flows Framework and learning from past drought responses to enhance future ecosystem recovery efforts. Major takeaways from this presentation include (1) doing recharge in the right places, (2) need to build a decision-tree for who will do what when a drought emergency is declared, and (3) DRIP Collaborative members are invited to present recommendations & progress with the Commission.

Following this presentation, the following questions and comments were asked by the members (Sandi's responses are provided):

- Question: Was environmental water storage discussed in the context of drought protection for fish and wildlife? Were programs for multi-benefit land repurposing included in the land use planning recommendations? Answer: For the water storage investment program, one of the defined public benefits are ecosystem benefits, including flows for improving stream conditions. The Department of Fish and Wildlife is working with the project proponents to identify what those benefits are, and then to create a contractual obligation to deliver those in exchange for the public funding that we're investing through the water storage investment program. Also, the multi-benefit land repurposing program helps folks adjust to using less groundwater and finding different land uses that are less intensive than current irrigated agriculture – and yes, that program is addressed in the recommendations. Land fallowing came up both as a concern and an opportunity to think about what the future (especially for the San Joaquin Valley) will look like.
- Question: How does the Commission envision the implementation of its recommendations, and what role could the DRIP Collaborative play in advancing these strategies? Answer: The Commission's role was to draft the white paper, outlining recommendations rather than implementing them. The Commission aims to promote these ideas through outreach, hoping groups like the DRIP Collaborative will take these suggestions forward.
- Question: As we continue to consider better ways to plan for drought, was the use of emergency declarations part of the conversation considered by the Commission? Answer: Emergency declarations will continue as droughts occur, but the emphasis is on better planning for these emergencies, acknowledging their inevitability.

- Comment: I think it's more of a longer-term challenge. I mean, on one hand, we know drought is going to continue, and on the other we still need emergency declarations. It just seems like kind of a hard nut to crack. Response: The white paper suggests planning for emergencies using a decision-tree framework to better manage responses when they occur.
- Comment: Looking at the State Hazard Mitigation Program and even the State Emergency Plan now, we have shifted. The declaration process also allows us to surge up resources and to rapidly change things. We do reserve the emergency declarations for special events that really exceed the norm. Historically, California waits for an emergency to then respond to.
- Question: Did any of your discussions at the Commission around communications lead to any more specific ideas that that were not necessarily represented in the white paper? Answer: The white paper is comprehensive. We do address some new terminology, moving away from emergency response, and general mindset.

### DRIP Inaugural Report

Anthony announced the publication of the [Inaugural DRIP report](#) which discusses the establishment of DRIP, the development of focus areas, and the start of the recommendation development process.

## Recommendation Discussion

Glen Low provided a recap of the recommendation development process, how members will provide feedback, and an overview of recommendations submitted for consideration. Recommendations were grouped by focus area, as categorized below:

- Drought-Relevant Data
  - Recommendation 1: Drought Indicators and Metrics
  - Recommendation 2: Program and Information/Tools Evaluation
- Drought Preparedness for Domestic Wells
  - Recommendation 3: SB 552 Language Updates
  - Recommendation 4: Community Well Monitoring Program
  - Recommendation 5: Roles and Responsibilities
- Drought Definition and Narrative
  - Recommendation 6: Drought Definition White Paper
  - Recommendation 7: Communication Program
  - Recommendation 8: Drought Case Studies

Before member led presentations, Glen provided a recap of the focus areas. The recommendation leads then presented their recommendations to the full DRIP Collaborative for consideration. A summary of each recommendation and subsequent member input is provided below.

### Drought Indicators and Metrics

Alvar Escrivá-Bou, University of California, Los Angeles, provided a summary of the Drought Indicators and Metrics recommendation. The purpose of this recommendation is to improve how we measure drought conditions in California to better integrate data from a wide variety of sources (i.e., local, state, and federal government; private landowners; community involvement; etc.) with the goal of developing more informative systems to make decisions during drought times or even in advance of drought conditions (an early warning system). In addition, Alvar briefly mentioned thresholds for the to-be

developed indicators and metrics. While thresholds were considered to be included in this recommendation, they were ultimately excluded to keep the recommendation focused on developing metrics. After the introduction, the following input was provided:

- Did you consider how drought impacts different areas of the state?
  - The end goal of this process will be to get each user's water supply portfolio.
- Need to address vulnerability/risks and impacts.
- Important to factor in usability of any sort of tools.
- Using only a "top-down" approach (that is mandating collection and dissemination of water user information by the state) may not be effective; a "bottom-up", community focused approach to gather data may be useful to ensure impacted users are brought along in the process.
- Modeling for groundwater and surface water are very different and may be challenging to reconcile. Moreover, timescales for predicting drought from groundwater are very different than surface water (generally groundwater lag surface water in most basins).
- This should be used to trigger assistance rather than for only restrictions or consequences.
- The members present were generally highly supportive of the recommendation.

#### Program and Information/Tools Evaluation

Saharnaz Mirzazad, Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR), led a discussion of a recommendation for the development of an evaluation program for initiatives relevant to California drought issues. This recommendation seeks to create strategic alignment between existing federal, state, and regional efforts to better support rapid action for drought response. A major component of the recommendation is identifying and filling knowledge gaps between these efforts. After the introduction, the following input was provided:

- Under this recommendation, who would conduct the literature review and evaluation?
  - The DRIP Collaborative itself could conduct a lit review. Members acknowledged, however, that this body may not have the resources or expertise to carry the work out.
- The DRIP Collaborative could be useful in identifying the universe of currently available tools/information. A lot of programs are already in place at all levels of government. This recommendation seems to align with the Drought Indicators and Metrics recommendation.
- Identifying data gaps as a standalone task can be challenging (other work underway to streamline data reporting). It could be useful to conduct programmatic evaluations first.
- The members were generally supportive of this recommendation while noting it could be made a component of the Drought Indicators and Metrics recommendation.

#### SB 552 Language Updates

Justine Massey, Community Water Center, introduced the SB 552 Language Updates recommendation. The purpose of the recommendation is to provide amendments to SB 552 (2021) to streamline requirements and promote effective execution of the law by state and local governments. Key provisions of the recommendation include mandate (through enforced deadlines) counties develop and update drought resilience plans, the State (1) review the submitted plans, (2) submit an implementation report, and (3) appoint staff as a point-of-contact for counties, and, complimentarily, the legislature commission a study to assess the implementation of SB 552 and better understand evolving county needs.

After the presentation, the following discussion was recorded:

- Although SB 552 requires counties to create drought resilience plans, to date only two counties have submitted them. SB 552 needs specific mandates and deadlines for plan submission.
- Not all counties have the resources needed to develop comprehensive plans. State support should be included as part of language updates to give counties the resources they need to complete planning activities. Language updates could also include where these state resources could be derived from (i.e., bond, general fund, fees, etc.).
- Any additional planning activities should be tied to assurances the counties' drought resilience plans will be used.
- Tribes should be brought into the development of or be notified about county drought resilience plans.
- The involvement of community members in the development of these plans is critical to create a broad base of support for eventual plan implementation.
- The members were generally supportive of the recommendation.

#### Community Well Monitoring Program

Suzanne Pecci, Domestic Well Planning Group, South American Subbasin, presented the recommendation. This work seeks to create and support a network of community-based well monitoring to improve data collection on domestic wells. In particular, the recommendation seeks to educate the public on the importance of collecting well data/conserving water and provide the financial and material resources needed to support the development and implementation of domestic well monitoring networks. After the presentation, the following input was provided:

- This recommendation is similar to some community-driven air quality monitoring efforts. This model could be considered to help develop the specifics for the recommendation.
- The DRIP Collaborative could help determine what the state needs to do to support the effort, such as providing kits to communities, informational materials, financial assistance, etc.
- How could this effort connect to existing requirements for Groundwater Sustainability Agencies?
  - This is intended to serve as a pilot program to show how community-driven monitoring could be scaled up throughout the state.
- How can this recommendation be applied to rural areas throughout the state? There are often trust issues when it comes to asking for private well data.
  - Trust is definitely an issue. The state could start by providing the technology needed to implement well monitoring to show a high level of support.
- The members were generally highly supportive of the recommendation.

#### Roles and Responsibilities

Sierra Ryan, Santa Cruz County, and Justine Massey provided a presentation on the Roles and Responsibilities recommendation. This recommendation seeks to clearly delineate responsibilities at the local and state level to determine who is required to take action on specific issues. In addition to mapping responsibilities for key players in water supply issues, the recommendation also suggests identifying funding and technical assistance options when domestic wells experience challenges.

- Multiple parties, including local, county, and State Agencies (such as SWRCB SAFER, OPR, and DWR), must be included to delineate the responsibilities.
- Funding for water/sewer infrastructure is a challenge in many rural communities.
  - We need to think about the funding needed, not just existing policies and programs.
- General note: members commented that funding needs must be incorporated into every recommendation as a cross-cutting issue. Moreover, some members noted that not all recommendations can/should be funded and implemented at the same time.
- The recommendation as currently written focuses primarily on groundwater supply issues. Water quality concerns should also be incorporated.
- The members were generally highly supportive of the recommendation.

### Drought Definition White Paper

Katie Ruby, California Urban Water Association (CUWA), provided a presentation on the Drought Definition White Paper recommendation. This recommendation seeks to develop a document to clarify definitions of “drought”. The recommendation includes a literature review of existing definitions, a discussion of impacts each user group may experience during drought, and an identification of gaps in current definitions. After the presentation, the following discussion was recorded:

- Both a narrative and mathematical definition of drought may be needed.
- The terms “water availability” and “water scarcity” may be more useful than “drought” when communicating with different water users.
- The process of acknowledging current definitions, conducting a literature review, and identifying gaps is very useful in this recommendation.
- The members were generally supportive of the recommendation.

### Communication Program

Tim Worley, CalMutuals, provided a presentation on the development of a communication program for sharing drought information with the public. The goal is to create an understandable, statewide, symbols-based messaging platform (similar to weather reports) to provide water supply information to audiences as the state, regional, local, and even water district-specific level. A color-coded warning system similar to air quality alerts could be useful to communicate to a wide audience. After the presentation, the following discussion was recorded:

- One jurisdiction or water district may report information differently than their neighbor across the street. Addressing this disparity could be challenging for the color-coded system.
- Intensive outreach will be needed for the adoption of such a system at all levels (state, regional, local, etc.).
- The average person may not understand the existing tier structure from established urban water suppliers’ water shortage contingency plans. This will help standardize messaging.
- This recommendation integrates well with all the drought definition and narrative recommendations, as well as indicators and metrics.
- To be successful, the communication system would have to be shown continuously (similar to weather reports), even in non-drought periods, to acclimate all Californians.
- People want direct communication. As we develop this communication system, we should be sure that the communication is direct and communicates how serious the situation is.

- The members were generally supportive of this recommendation.

### Drought Case Studies

Elea Becker Lowe, OPR, provided a presentation on the Drought Case Studies recommendation. This recommendation suggests compiling a suite of drought-related case studies across sectors and geographies of California to highlight the complex nature of drought and how it impacts parts of the state differently. After the presentation, the following discussion was recorded:

- This could be very useful to show the differences between places like the Russian River and Coachella- both represent very different ecosystems and water needs.
- This could be combined with the Drought Definition White Paper recommendation as a standalone section.
- The case studies should highlight both stories of success and potential major concerns/issues in drought situations.
- The DRIP Collaborative could be well situated to develop the case studies.
- The members were generally supportive of the recommendation.

## **Expectations Moving Forward**

### Decision-Making Process

Sam presented the polling/decision making process for the DRIP Collaborative. Using this proposed polling system will help put the official "stamp of approval" on DRIP decisions. The polling process will be used for any formal reports and all recommendations to indicate consensus amongst the DRIP Collaborative. Decision-making through formal polls will be based on the concept of "consensus with accountability", meaning that through this polling process one cannot simply vote no, rather the voting member will voice what they do and don't like about a particular idea and what changes should be made. All feedback from polls will be memorialized for the record.

Polls will be based on a 3-point spectrum (instead of yes/no votes) defined as:

- 1 → I have significant concerns about the recommendation and can't support it at this time.
- 2 → I have some concerns but believe these can be addressed through further iteration and discussion.
- 3 → I support the recommendation as is.

For all polls, the facilitator will go around the room to record each member's level of support. Members voting 1 or 2 will be asked to provide additional clarification on their vote or modifications to address their concerns. Straw polls will be held for all recommendations during the July meeting, these results will help modify recommendations between meetings. During the October meeting, a final vote will be taken to show the level of consensus for any subsequent reports.

Following this presentation, it was asked whether there is any real difference between state and non-state votes. There were some ideas floated about possibly having the State abstain from votes, but that was eventually dismissed given members desire to see how each organization would vote. Each DRIP Collaborative member's vote is counted equally with only the chair's vote to count as two for breaking any stalemate votes. This is also critical to ensure we have a sufficient quorum for all votes and our perspectives are shared and transparent.



## Workgroup Formation

Glen presented the proposed process to move the recommendations forward by forming workgroups. Three workgroups, centered around each initial focus area, will be created. The 2-3 recommendations for each focus area will be discussed to ensure they are complementary and directly address the problem statements. Each workgroup is voluntary, and member-driven with assistance from the support team. The main purpose of each workgroup is to prepare [Part I and Part II templates](#) for each recommendation. All work products will be reviewed in DRIP Collaborative group meetings in July and October. Workgroup meetings must conform to [the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act \(Bagley- Keene Act\)](#). Workgroups will continue to exist for as long as they are deemed valuable by members.

Anthony conducted a roll call to establish the quorum, below are the results of the roll call with the member's name and association.

1. Nate Ortiz, CalOES
2. Katie Landau, CalEPA
3. Laura Ramos, California Water Institute
4. Katie Ruby, California Urban Water Agencies
5. Tim Worley, California Association of Mutual Water Companies
6. Justine Massey, Community Water Center
7. Jason Colombini, Jay Colombini Ranch
8. Sierra Ryan, Santa Cruz County
9. John Andrew, DWR
10. Elea Becker-Lowe, OPR
11. Suzanne Pecci, Domestic Well Planning Group, South American Subbasin
12. Alvar Escriva-Bou, UCLA
13. Andrew Altevoigt, State Water Resources Control Board
14. Ramy Gindi, LA County Public Works
15. Matessa Martin, Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians

**With 15 members present, a quorum was established.**

Erick Soderlund, legal counsel from DWR, discussed how workgroups would have to conform to Bagley-Keene Act. The major points of this discussion include (1) Bagley-Keene Act will apply to the workgroups such as public open meetings, public noticing, and transparency (2) communications amongst these workgroups will need to meet Bagley-Keene Act requirements. Erick offered himself as a resource to answer questions from the DRIP Collaborative members. For a comprehensive discussion about Bagley-Keene Act, please refer to the guidance recently put out by the California Department of Justice: [2024 Bagley-Keene Act Open Meeting Act Guide \(ca.gov\)](#).

Following this presentation, the following questions and comments were asked by the members (Erick and Staff responses are provided). Please note that there is additional context and nuance to this discussion that cannot be adequately captured in summary format; individuals are encouraged to refer to [the meeting recording](#) where appropriate.

- Question: To better understand quorum and compliance requirements, consider the following hypothetical situation: in a 5-person subcommittee, if person A speaks with person B alone, it's

compliant, but adding person C to discuss the same topics creates a Bagley-Keene issue, correct? Answer: Yes, that's correct. In smaller groups, the scope for compliant conversations outside public meetings narrows. A discussion involving a quorum (three members in a 5-person group) outside a public meeting breaches Bagley-Keene rules.

- Question: Does having individuals in multiple workgroups risk serial meetings under Bagley-Keene? Answer: Serving on multiple workgroups increases the risk of serial meetings. It's crucial to keep discussions within each workgroup focused and isolated to its specific area to avoid compliance issues.
- Question: Given the interrelated nature of workgroup topics, how can we manage effective feedback across groups without violating Bagley-Keene? Answer: To ensure compliance and effective recommendation development, participate in a workgroup. Cross-group feedback can be handled at the larger DRIP Collaborative meetings scheduled for July and October. Non-workgroup members can attend other group meetings as observers but cannot engage in deliberative discussions.
- Question: Could we have joint meetings between 2 of the workgroups? Answer: Joint meetings of multiple workgroups are unlikely unless it's a full Collaborative meeting. Each workgroup will report back to the Collaborative at the in-person meetings in July and October.
- Question: Does a Bagley-Keene compliant meeting we have as a workgroup have to be in-person? Answer: No, workgroups of advisory bodies (until 2026) can meet remotely as long as a quorum is present, and the public is given access to a physical location where the meeting is hosted by at least one staff member.
- Question: Will staff or legal counsel remind us of these requirements during smaller meetings? Answer: Yes, once workgroups are established, a virtual meeting will be held to go over logistics, meeting operations, and Bagley-Keene Act compliance, with a detailed explanation provided by legal counsel.
- Question: Can a DRIP member outside a workgroup contribute to its discussions? Answer: Non-workgroup members may attend meetings without participating in the substantive discussion.
- Question: Related to workgroup membership amendments, does that allow for members to leave workgroups as well as add new members? Answer: Yes.
- Question: When will workgroup reports be presented to members before the July meeting? Answer: Currently, there's no scheduled plan for pre-July meeting workgroup report-outs.

Sam conducted a roll call poll to address the question: Do you want to form workgroups? The 15 members noted above all voted 3. **With 15 members voting in favor, workgroups were formed.**

Sam conducted a roll call poll to address the question: Do you want workgroups to be able to amend membership? The 15 members noted above all voted 3. **With 15 members voting in favor, the formed workgroups can amend their membership after today's meeting.**

Anthony conducted a call for volunteers for each workgroup. The volunteer DRIP members for each workgroup are noted below with the member's name and affiliation.

Drought-Relevant Data

- Alvar Escrivá-Bou, UCLA
- Elea Becker Low, OPR
- Katie Ruby, California Urban Water Agencies
- Laura Ramos, California Water Institute

#### Drought Preparedness for Domestic Wells

- Sierra Ryan, Santa Cruz County
- Justine Massey, Community Water Center
- Jason Colombini, Jay Colombini Ranch
- Suzanne Pecci, Domestic Well Planning Group, South American Subbasin
- Andrew Altevogt, State Water Resources Control Board
- Ramy Gindi, LA County Public Works

#### Drought Definition and Narrative

- Nate Ortiz, CalOES
- Laura Ramos, California Water Institute
- Katie Ruby, California Urban Water Agencies
- Tim Worley, California Association of Mutual Water Companies
- Elea Becker Lowe, OPR
- Suzanne Pecci, Domestic Well Planning Group, South American Subbasin
- Matessa Martin, Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians

DRIP Collaborative staff will reach out to the individuals who volunteered for the workgroups to set up a virtual meeting to discuss logistics and Bagley-Keene Act requirements in more detail.

#### Sequencing other Focus Area for 2025 Recommendations

Glen presented about the need to begin sequencing [other focus areas](#) identified by the DRIP Collaborative in 2023. Of the many focus areas previously identified, the next round of potential focus areas include:

- Integrating Climate Change Adaptation into Drought Resilience
- Implementation of Nature-based Solutions for Drought Resilience
- Reducing Ecosystem Impacts of Drought
- Water Resources & Operations
- Infrastructure & Planning
- Land Use Planning

Akin to the process done for the initial three focus areas, knowledge development sessions for shared information and problem statements development will be defined for these broad topics. Development of draft problem statements is projected at the July 2024 in-person meeting and potentially finalized in October 2024 in-person meeting. This will enable the development of specific and actionable recommendations in 2025 to address these problem statements.

Glen asked for comments from the members on which of the 6 potential focus areas should be sequenced for 2025; member comments are noted below:

- A few focus areas could be combined, emphasizing how many topics are interconnected.
- I agree with that comment, and especially with respect to nature-based solutions and land use. For example, in the South American Subbasin area, farmland is being fallowed in watershed areas, many of those fallowed fields could be very well repurposed to environmental areas.
- I advocate for a conversation around land use planning, especially when it comes to housing. A lot of local jurisdictions are reeling from the last regional housing needs assessment numbers and have done all these urban water management plans that are now meaningless because the jurisdiction's growth potential has suddenly increased. There's a lot of disconnect between the

utilities that are needed to support folks in new housing and how many houses are being required to meet demand. In addition, it might be time to kind of think if there's a way to become more integrated with the work that the Water Commission has put together.

- I could picture a nature-based solution recommendation within the domestic well preparedness workgroup. There are also a lot of interconnections with land use and climate change adaptation. My initial recommendation is to pull the nature-based solution focus area out and, rather than use it as a focus area, incorporate nature-based solutions into the recommendations we make.
- There are a lot of crosscutting themes. I would suggest we consider what potential focus areas are already a part of everything that we're doing. For example, climate adaptation can be considered in each of the current focus areas and could be enveloped similar with the nature-based solutions. In essence, we can think about what focus areas make sense to unpack individually or should be considered a cross-cutting theme. In addition, I'd like to second, bringing a housing element in the land use and planning focus area.
- I think that communication can be education and could touch on all the focus areas in some way. It would be good to have this list of focus areas in front of us as we start to meet in the Drought Definition and Narrative workgroup.

Glen briefly discussed the running list of knowledge development sessions (also called the 101 informational sessions) that will be used to narrow down these broad topics and ensure a common knowledge base of all DRIP members.

#### DRIP Collaborative Membership Extension

Anthony discussed the non-state agency membership extension process. The initial membership for non-state members is for a 2-year period and is scheduled to end in 2024. There are two representatives for each non-state agency category (local government, community-based organization, technical assistance provider, the public, environment, agriculture, tribal experts in land use or water, and public water systems). The extension process entails one of the representatives signing on for a one-year extension (to end in 2025) and the other signing on for a two-year extension (to end in 2026). This will ensure overlap of non-state agency membership and provide continuity for the consistent development and adoption of recommendations. Note that there may be additional extensions in future years.

Following this presentation, the following questions and comments were asked by the members (staff responses are provided):

- Question: Does this mean, for the person that extends for one year can reapply for another 2-year term from there? Answer: Maybe. We have not determined if term limits will be applied to non-state agency membership.

#### **Public Comment**

- Question from Zoom chat: What were the titles of the workgroups? Answer: Drought Relevant Data, Drought Preparedness for Domestic Wells, and Drought Definition and Narrative.
- [Comment from Zoom audience member] My name is Angela Islas. I am the water projects coordinator with Central California Environmental Justice Network. I'd like to bring to the attention of the Drought Preparedness for Domestic Wells workgroup that it has been difficult

to support some well owners that have been impacted by drought or contamination due to various program eligibility requirements.

### **Action Item Review and Next Steps**

Sam reviewed a list of action items and next steps, including:

1. Members are encouraged to fill out the meeting evaluation forms and recommendation worksheets.
2. DRIP Collaborative staff will communicate with the workgroup volunteers to set up virtual meetings to give members a more thorough understanding of Bagley-Keene Act requirements.
3. Erick will follow-up on whether DRIP members' organizations can have agenda items in workgroup meetings even if the DRIP member is not part of that workgroup.
4. Erick will also follow up if joint sessions between workgroups could be held (given that the total DRIP Collaborative membership attendance is less than quorum).
5. Members will bring any additional topics to the potential focus area list to DRIP Collaborative staff ahead of the July meeting.

After the action item review, Anthony thanked participants for attending and John provided brief closing comments and formally adjourned the meeting.

**ADJOURN**

## Appendix A. Meeting Participation

### *Drought Resilience Interagency Partnership & Collaborative Members*

#### Present

- Alvar Escriva-Bou, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)
- Andrew Altevogt, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) – Alternate for Joaquin Esquivel
- Brent Hastey, Plumas Lake Self Storage
- Catherine Freeman, California State Association of Counties (CSAC)
- Elea Becker Lowe, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) – Alternate for Saharnaz Mirzazad
- Emily Rooney, Agricultural Council of California
- Jason Colombini, Jay Colombini Ranch
- John Andrew, Department of Water Resources (DWR) – Alternate for Karla Nemeth
- Justine Massey, Community Water Center (CWC)
- Katie Ruby, California Urban Water Agencies (CUWA)
- Katy Landau, California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) – Alternate for Anna Naimark
- Laura Ramos, California Water Institute, Fresno State
- Matessa Martin, Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians
- Nate Ortiz, California Office of Emergency Service (CalOES) – Alternate for Christina Curry
- Ramy Gindi, LA County Public Works
- Robyn Grimm, Environmental Defense Fund (EDF)
- Saharnaz Mirzazad, OPR
- Sierra Ryan, Santa Cruz County
- Suzanne Pecci, Domestic Well Planning Group, South American Subbasin
- Tim Worley, California Association of Mutual Water Companies

#### Absent

- Grace Person, CivicWell
- Josh Grover, Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
- Michael Gerace, Yurok Tribe
- Nancy Vogel, California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA)
- Redgie Collins, California Trout, Inc.
- Tami McVay, Self Help Enterprises
- Virginia Jameson, California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)