WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES


2. Provide opportunities for comments and questions regarding the new updates.

PURPOSE OF THIS SUMMARY

On September 16, California Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a public meeting via webinar to update the public regarding the release of the draft Urban Water Management Plan Guidebook, revised based on legislative mandates from Assembly Bill (AB) 1668 and Senate Bill (SB) 606. 516 participants joined the meeting. This summary document is a supplement to the recording of the meeting and summarizes participant comments and questions with responses from DWR. Questions that DWR was not able to respond to in the meeting are provided in a separate section for DWR to address as they continue to develop guidance for the urban water management planning.

The meeting Recording can be found here: https://csus.zoom.us/rec/share/dCHOP2KMFsX1rlRrD28c1iA41FDnD13agbzZQ3NGdtXF1cRm-gOKn-GQj3I7OFJu.cQyZo3mmDu7Wlx9?startTime=1600278973000

The PowerPoint presentation for this meeting has been posted on a DWR stakeholder SharePoint site along with past meeting materials. To request access to the SharePoint or request that DWR email you the meeting materials, please contact wue@water.ca.gov.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS REGARDING UWMP GUIDEBOOK KEY UPDATES BY CHAPTER

The following are questions and comments posed by participants during the public meeting. Where possible, questions and comments are sorted by topic under the chapter groupings in which DWR provided the update. Unless otherwise indicated, responses are from DWR staff.

CHAPTERS 1-3: INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW, PLAN PREPARATION, AND SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

- Does Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance apply only to the UWMP Guidebook or to the UWMPs themselves?

  Response: Everything that DWR posts to its website must be ADA accessible. However, DWR will not post UWMPs to their website. They will be posting them to the Open Data Library or the DWR Water Use Efficiency (WUE) Data Portal, neither of those needs to be ADA compliant at this time. Each agency will have to determine for themselves what the requirements are to post their plans on their own sites.
• If the retailer contract operates the wholesaler, can both be consolidated into a single plan?
  **Response:** Yes, there is explanation in the guidebook about how to do that, and in what cases one might be considered a wholesaler, a retailer, or both. The Guidebook tables are for both retailers and wholesalers unless specifically marked “retailer” or “wholesaler”.

**POPULATION**

• Is the population tool going to be similar to last year’s tool?
  **Response:** We are updating the population tool in the WUE Data Portal. The Guidebook offers several suggested methods for estimating population. Urban Water suppliers will not be required to use 2020 Census data, though it may benefit suppliers to revise their plans when that data becomes available, in order to do the best planning possible.

**SUGGESTED UWMP DEVELOPMENT BEST PRACTICES**

• We plan to add a “lay person” synopsis section at the start of each chapter. This would summarize the chapter contents.
• For the Covid-19 pandemic, we suggest adding a discussion about changes in water use patterns, in section 3.4.2 “Other Social, Economic, and Demographic Factors”.

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

• The use of “required” and “recommended” throughout the Guidebook is helpful, but in many places the “required” seems to also touch on recommendations. It would be helpful in the final guidebook to make it very clear what is required in the UWMP and which tables are required.
• Six months to prepare and adopt a UWMP does not feel reasonable.
• Once the Guidebook is final, it would be helpful to have a separate webinar to just walk through the changes in the Water Shortage Contingency Plan (WSCP) chapter, and how to appropriately address them.
• I strongly support and commend DWR for the inclusion of Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) coordination and land-use designation in the new guidebook!

**CHAPTERS 4-6: WATER USE CHARACTERIZATION, SBX7-7 BASELINE AND TARGETS (CONSERVATION TARGET COMPLIANCE), AND WATER SUPPLY ANALYSIS**

• Does the UWMP need to address non-potable use by other entities within their service area? For example, landscape irrigation by a Homeowners Association using groundwater or surface water.
  **Response:** If the customer is receiving non-potable water from a different water supplier, then you do not need to report that. However, it would benefit the UWMP writer to have an understanding of how changes in these water supply conditions could affect potential demand in your service area.
  **Participant Response:** When we assess water demands and projections, we always remove demands met by other/private sources.
SB X7-7 COMPLIANCE

- You mentioned that there was an SB X7-7 verification form due December 2020. Where is that spreadsheet available?
  
  **Participant Response:** The SB X7-7 form link: https://wuedata.water.ca.gov/manage_resources.asp?reportType=urban

- Is the Methodologies document that was provided with the 2010 UWMP the correct document to reference to inform how to comply with SB X7-7 for an agency that has merged with another agency or annexed areas?
  
  **Response:** The methods document was updated in 2016. It includes mechanisms for updating the target type information in the case of a factor (such as a merger or annexation) that would result in a significant change to your service area and how to prorate the differences in your targets. There is also relevant information in Chapter 5. Those are the only kinds of situations where you may revisit baselines and targets.

WORKSHEETS AND REPORTING TABLES

- Is reporting of potable vs. non-potable optional, or is just the use of the planning tool tables optional?
  
  **Response:** Reporting of potable/non-potable is optional.

- Can yearly reporting be recorded by water year (vs. calendar year)?
  
  **Response:** Yes, that is why the optional planning tool labels columns as “month 1, month 2, and month 3” so that users can decide what kind of year to use.

- Are the Excel spreadsheets for the optional planning tool and the required submittal tables available now? If not, when will they be available?
  
  **Response:** The Excel draft versions of the tables are available via the public WUE data portal https://wuedata.water.ca.gov/manage_resources.asp?reportType=urban

CLIMATE CHANGE

- Can you expand on climate change information required?
  
  **Response:** Several new places in the California Water Code (CWC) now refer to the incorporation of climate change; that is part of the premise of doing a UWMP and assessing reliability. The law is not specific about how to calculate climate change considerations or what projections to use. This is left to the discretion of the supplier. Appendix I provides some options to help the user.

GROUNDWATER

- Regarding coordination with GSAs, for many areas Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs) aren’t due until 2022, after the UWMP is due, so presumably that doesn’t apply to those areas. Please confirm.
  
  **Response:** If the GSP hasn’t been developed by the time the UWMP is developed, it would be good practice to coordinate with the GSA and describe that coordination in the Plan, but it is up to the discretion of the supplier. Coordinating between UWMPs and GSPs will only help with
both processes in the long term.

- Is an aquifer or a well considered an independent source for supply reporting? How granular should groundwater reporting be?

  \textbf{Response:} If you have multiple wells within a single basin overseen by the same GSA, then you can treat those as one source. If you have wells that cross GSA boundaries or are in different basins, you will want to include them as separate sources.

- Related participant question: Does that logic apply to private pumping?

  \textbf{Response:} Private pumping is a question in some urban retail service areas. To the extent you can provide information in your supply and demand assessment, it will be beneficial, but DWR understands that this may be difficult. If this situation will make a significant difference in your overall reliability, you will want to identify that in your planning for your own benefit.

\textbf{ENERGY INTENSITY ANALYSIS}

- How does a retailer that relies 100\% on a wholesaler complete the energy intensity analysis? How far up stream in the water supply process do we need to consider the energy use?

  \textbf{Response:} You do it to the extent that the information is available. If the wholesaler does not have that information, the retailer can explain that in the UWMP.

- At least one of our sources (Hetch Hetchy) is completely gravity fed to our service District and is a net energy producer. Any guidance on how to include this?

  \textbf{Response:} You can explain that in your plan, and enter it in the tables.

  \textbf{Participant response:} Enter that information as negative energy consumption.

\textbf{CHAPTERS 7-9: WATER SERVICE RELIABILITY AND DROUGHT RISK ASSESSMENT (DRA), WATER SHORTAGE CONTINGENCY PLAN (WSCP), AND DEMAND MANAGEMENT MEASURES}

- Regarding source reliability, what would you suggest if you’re a SWP or Central Valley Project (CVP) contractor? Is it best to reference reports we have, if any?

  \textbf{Response:} There is a requirement that if there is a retail/wholesale relationship, the wholesaler must share their reliability and supply projection information with the retailer, and the retailer share their demand information with the wholesaler.

\textbf{WATER SHORTAGE CONTINGENCY PLAN}

- Are the WSCP elements applicable to both retailers and wholesalers?

  \textbf{Response:} Per Water Code, Wholesale Suppliers are required to submit a WSCP as part of their UWMP. Note that the wholesaler’s WSCP may not include planning elements as part of their UWMP that would apply to other water suppliers without the consent of those other suppliers. In other words, a wholesaler without permission from the applicable suppliers still must develop a WSCP composed of the elements listed below. However, their planned actions cannot order other suppliers to take specific actions, such as through demand management measures that the wholesaler has no authority to implement on the other supplier’s customers. The following elements are required to be included in the wholesaler’s WSCP:

  1. Water supply reliability assessment
2. Annual WSDA procedures
3. Shortage response levels
4. Shortage response actions
5. Communication plan for shortage levels
6. Not applicable for wholesale only suppliers - Requirement only for retailers
7. Description of legal authorities used to implement shortage response actions
   a. This is where a wholesaler could include whether or not its member agencies have given permission for the wholesaler to develop certain planning elements related to their system.
8. Financial impact analysis of water shortage conditions
9. Not applicable for wholesale only suppliers - Requirement only for retailers

• It is unclear what wholesale suppliers are required to report on per Section 8.0 “WHOLESALE ONLY: This chapter may not apply to Wholesale Suppliers if they have not received the consent of all their member agencies” (p. 8-6). Can you plainly state or list what is required for a wholesale agency in this section specifically?

Response: There is Water Code that says wholesalers must receive the consent of their customer agencies. So a wholesaler cannot do a WSCP without the input and buy in from their customers. A wholesaler cannot require their retailer to implement demand management restrictions. They need buy-in from retailers to have an overall WSCP.

Please note: the above response has been updated from the discussion during the meeting.

ADOPTION OF THE WSCP

• It took my client 2 years to prepare and adopt the WSCP as required in the 2010 & 2015 UWMPs. I suspect it will take a similar amount of time for this cycle. Because the WSCP provides legal authority, it must be go through multiple committees and legal review by the City attorney before being enacted by the City Council. The WSCP will be based on UWMP analysis, which leaves very little time to conduct a rigorous legal process. I don’t see a reasonable method to complete this process by July 1, 2020.

Response: In the UWMP WSCP you submit in 2020, you describe the legal authorities that empower you to make the legal decisions and enforcements. Those might not be in place yet, in which case you can describe what you plan to do. When your legal structures are in place, you can update the WSCP with those regulations and ordinances that provide the necessary legal authority.

• Can the WSCP be adopted as a chapter of the UWMP, rather than a standalone?
  Response: Yes. It has to be part of your UWMP, but it can be amended and adopted outside of the UWMP. It could be used as a separate chapter or an appendix to the UWMP.

• If the WSCP is adopted as a chapter of the UWMP, is a separate Board adoption action required?
  Response: The WSCP is supposed to be bundled with the UWMP, but also can be written as a standalone document. Both are due on July 1, 2021. However, as Chapter 10 in the Guidance describes, if you approve the WSCP in the same meeting as the rest of the UWMP, you will need to list it separately in the formal agenda to have evidence that both the UWMP and the WSCP are approved. The purpose is to allow you to update the documents separately.
Participant Response: Our City adopts them in one Resolution, but calls them out separately in that Resolution.

- Earlier slides said the WSCP must be a standalone document, but the presenter said it could be in the UWMP only. What does the Water Code cite?
  Response: The CWC 10632 says the WSCP must be part of the UWMP.

CHAPTER 10 AND APPENDICES (EXCEPT APPENDIX C): PLAN ADOPTION, SUBMITTAL, AND IMPLEMENTATION

- Will the Appendices be released for review, and if so, when?
  Response: The appendices are posted online with the main guidebook: https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Water-Use-And-Efficiency/Urban-Water-Use-Efficiency/Urban-Water-Management-Plans

- I don’t see the appendix for guidance on how to write up our procedures for the Annual Water Supply and Demand Assessments (WSDA). Is that appendix coming out soon?
  Response: DWR is working on guidance for the annual WSDAs, which will be provided as an addendum to this guidebook.

- The current Appendix P available online is a different topic
  Response: DWR will correct that, thank you for your feedback.

APPENDIX C: REDUCED DELTA RELIANCE

- Where does the Appendix C information go in the UWMP itself?
  Response: You can provide it in Chapter 7.2.4 in the description of management tools and options, or as a separate attachment or appendix. You could report overall results in the body of the plan and report methodologies in an appendix.

- When SWP water is sold to another contractor, there is a return amount of water required. How will this be handled in the plan?
  Response: If you receive water from a SWP contractor or from any entity that gets Delta water, it is a good idea for you to include this in your plan. This is required by the Delta Plan and by California code of regulations. We believe our UWMP guidance will help you to align with the Delta Plan requirements, but ultimately that determination will come from the Delta Stewardship Council.

If you receive water from the Delta, either directly or indirectly, you are considered part of a covered action and that information will be expected in your plan when the Delta Stewardship Council determines whether or not that action is approved. It’s up to the project proponent of that covered action to submit a certification of consistency with the Delta Plan. They would need the data from any water suppliers that might receive water from the project. So it may not be an action that the water supplier themselves is undertaking, but they’re related to that project in that way.

There are obviously other policies under the Delta Plan that the covered action would need to demonstrate consistency with, and there are other parts of the reduced reliance policy that would require other documentation that’s specific to the covered action rather than the
quantifications themselves. These are in the UWMP Guidebook because the information is explicitly required to be in the UWMPs for the consistency determination.

**FURTHER QUESTIONS FOR UWMP GUIDANCE**

Due to the volume of questions during the meeting, DWR was not able to provide responses to all of the public’s questions. The following questions will be addressed by DWR as they continue to develop UWMP guidance.

- What are the current consequences if a water purveyor declines to re-adopt and revise its UWMP? In the context that SB 606/AB 1668 prescribe state fines for purveyors who fail to achieve efficient water use, why are UWMPs needed?
- What changes (to the draft) do you anticipate for the final 2020 UWMP Guidebook?
- Would going back and amending the 2015 UWMP potentially negatively impact developers who prepared Environmental Impact Reports and Water Supply Assessments relying on the 2015 UWMP?
- Can you elaborate on the population tool versus Department of Finance (DOF) versus local resources, such as San Diego Association of Governments?
- Regarding 2020 population calculations, it appears that various methods can be used “until the 2020 Census data is released” (p. 5-7). If a supplier uses one interim method, will they have to replace it eventually with 2020 Census data? If so, when is the Census data and DWR’s Population Tool expected to be available? The Guidebook’s indication of a tool “in adequate time for 2020 UWMP preparation” (p. 5-8) is not clear.
- It appears that the 2020 population can be calculated using American Communities Survey (ACS) and DOF estimates if an agency overlaps more than 95% of the boundary (p. 5-8). Can an agency, not overlapping more than 95%, use ACS data to inform a better persons-per-connection factor than using the 2010 census per connection factor?
- When sections are not applicable to a supplier, such as groundwater, recycled water, and delta supplies, what is the preferred way to specify that these are not applicable? Could we simply add a statement under each section as “not applicable”?
- Appendix L California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Section 638.5 Section 638.5, Audit Reporting Requirements (c) states, “In the cast of urban retail suppliers with two or more separate public potable water system, the urban retail water supplier shall submit a separate American Water Works Association Free Water Audit Software spreadsheet... for each potable water system.” Should it be for each potable water system that meets the water supply/population threshold for an urban water supplier?
- Is WUE ‘supply volume’ the amount of water a reporting agency determines to be its estimated water savings attributed to WUE (conservation) efforts?
- Guidebook Section 2.5 only has options for Fiscal Year or Calendar Year. If the supplier typically tracks their water system using Water Year (October 1 - September 30), and it doesn't coincide with the supplier's fiscal year, will Water Year reporting be accepted?
- Will all Excel tables be posted and available for download in the near term (including Appendix O - Energy)? Or will some of the tables not be available to use until the spring.
- Will there be a discussion of climate change impacts on the State Water Project (SWP)
Deliveries? This should be done at the state level for consistency.

- Is it a requirement to calculate the energy intensity within their service area?
- Are SWP and CVP not doing UWMPs?
- While Chapter 9 remains the same, the California Urban Water Conservation Council Best Management Practices reports are no longer completed or useable. Therefore, many suppliers will need to build an entirely new chapter. This should be emphasized in the Guidebook. It’s currently silent to this.
- Can you please clarify what is required for the WSCP by December 31, 2020?
- If an agency proposes certain measures in their adopted WSCP, but does not codify them, is that acceptable? I assume this would serve in the place of the old requirement to provide a "draft water shortage contingency resolution or ordinance".
- For suppliers who have already enacted permanent conservation measures, is it at the supplier’s discretion to determine the appropriate shortage level that is considered normal?
- Existing Local Hazard Mitigation Plans (LHMPs) and Mitigation Monitoring Plans (MMPs) can be used to satisfy the seismic requirement (p. 8-18). Is there a central location where an agency can look up if there are existing LHMPs overlapping their service area?
- For the reliability analysis, is the definition for the single dry year (lowest water supply year) a new standard or interpretation by DWR? This definition is not specified in the CWC.
- Does everyone have to have the same six shortage criteria/action levels? I thought it was up to the local plans to establish their own levels and actions that went with them.
- If we keep our current stages of our WSCP, do we need to include the crosswalk as part of the stand alone WSCP or should it be in the UWMP document?
- California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) agencies “need prior approval by the CPUC before adopting regulations and restrictions of this type” (CWC Section 357). Perhaps CPUC regulated agencies can weigh in, is this achievable before July 2021, and does it require inclusion in a rate case or other time-bound process? If it is not achievable by July 21, can a CPUC regulated agency submit a draft WSCP that is not yet adopted, with indication that it is being considered by the CPUC and will be amended once approved?
- Are the requirements/procedures to adopt a WSCP the same as a UWMP?
- In Chapter 10, you’re noting that the WSCP adoption should be documented. However, DWR stated that the WSCP could be approved after July 2021, as necessary. Can you please clarify? Can the WSCP in fact be adopted after July 2021?
- If the agency has a WSCP already as a standalone document, do we just have to evaluate it (not re-invent it) and attach it as an appendix?
- When will guidance on the WSDA be finalized? How can we incorporate it by July 1?
- Will there be an opportunity to comment on Appendix P before it is finalized?
- Do we have to use Appendix C if we participate in Delta Conveyance and Sites Reservoir?
- If an Agency receives water from the SWP, does that automatically define the Agency as participating in or receiving water from a 'covered action'? 
- Is the update of the 2015 plan only recommended for those using water from the Delta?
- Are other transfers, exchanges, or imports considered waters that contribute to regional self-reliance (e.g., all non-Delta supplies)?

**RELEVANT LINKS**


Supporting materials including the bulleted list below:
[https://wuedata.water.ca.gov/manage_resources.asp?reportType=urban](https://wuedata.water.ca.gov/manage_resources.asp?reportType=urban)

- Methodologies Document
- Excel spreadsheets for the optional planning tool
- Required submittal tables
- SB X7-7 2020 verification form

**MEETING POLLS**

Participants responded to introductory polls to open the meeting and evaluative polls to close the meeting. The results of those polls are below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll 1: What Perspective do you represent?</th>
<th>Vote (out of 305)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Supplier</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government/Agency</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agency</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Public</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe in the chat)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribes</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants provided the following comments to expand upon their selection of “Other”:

- Federal government
- Municipal 30K connections
- Special District
### Poll 2: What region in California do you primarily work in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Vote (out of 305)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Coast</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay/Central Coast</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento River</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado River</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Counties</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin River</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare Lake</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poll 3: I feel that the workshop was informative and a good use of my time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Vote (out of 184)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poll 4: Are you interested in attending follow-up workshops about how to prepare a UWMP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Vote (out of 145)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>