

Part 0. Recommendation Declaration

To be submitted to the DRIP support team prior to commencing work on Part I.

Recommendation Proposer

DRIP Member name, member type (state/non-state) and any partners (DRIP members or external) in development of proposed recommendation.

Ben McMahan & Elea Becker Lowe, on behalf of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research.

Recommendation Idea

Provide a brief (no more than 150 words) description of the idea for a recommendation.

Conduct an evaluation of programs and initiatives relevant to California drought issues, to ensure strategic alignment with existing federal, state or regional efforts, and rapid action to address outstanding questions. This should include an evaluation of information gaps in drought related tools (e.g., [National Integrated Drought Information System](#)), and may include a summary of relevant monitoring or research already underway to address drought related research questions (e.g., California's Fifth Climate Change Assessment research and data products). Filling these knowledge gaps should be done strategically to uplift and complement existing efforts while leveraging federal efforts such as the NIDIS CA-NV Drought Early Warning System or other experimental drought monitoring tools (e.g. [EDDI](#)), and exploring partnerships with drought technical experts already grappling with drought challenges (State/non-State).

Partners should include technical experts (State/non-State).

Focus Area

☒ **Drought Relevant Data** ☐ Drought Narrative ☐ Drought Preparedness for Domestic Wells

Intended Benefit to the Drought Risk Management Cycle (Please check all that apply)

- ☐ Mitigation, Preparation and Capacity
- ☒ **Forecasting and Monitoring**
- ☒ **Response**
- ☐ Recovery

Part I: Recommendation Overview

Recommendation Title

Provide a concise title for your recommendation in fewer than ten words.

Rapid Inventory of Drought Related Tools & Resources Relevant to California

Description

In one or two paragraphs, please provide a brief overview of the recommendation and how it addresses the Focus Area problem statement. Supporting documentation to include an overview of existing trends, the reasons for urgent action, and people currently impacted.

This is a revision of the initial recommendation to focus less on a formal or in-depth evaluation of drought data and resources. The updated recommendation is in support of a rapid inventory of drought related resources relevant to California. The purpose of this effort would be to ensure that we are broadly aware of existing drought tools and resources, with a general sense what gaps might remain in the decision support these tools and resources provide. The process would include identifying the key attributes to track for each of the resources (geography, timescale, relevant sector(s), etc.), sorting known tools and resources into this schema (items to be included in any inventory), and some limited research to document unknown tools and resources. The outcome of this effort would be a summary of the resources that are relevant to drought related decision making in California, with a simple schema that describes their area(s) of focus (re: sector, geography, etc.), in a format that could support ongoing evaluation and assessment of how they do or don't address drought related issues in CA, and any gaps in data, tools, or indicators that might address CA related drought. The schema could be a discussion item for future DRIP meetings, and we could use a simple referral process (email, a form, etc.) to elevate or highlight resources to ensure their inclusion in this process.

Impacts

What are the expected outcomes or benefits of this recommendation, and how will it specifically enhance drought resiliency in California?

This process would 1) ensure we are broadly aware of drought resources that already exist to avoid any redundancy, 2) elevate existing tools and resources that are relevant or useful in California, and 3) identify gaps in the data/resources landscape based on known or emergent need, specific to the California drought context. The outcome or benefit of this overall process would be to serve as a baseline to support subsequent recommendations and effort and could be developed into a standalone resource that summarizes drought relevant tools and resources.

What are the anticipated impacts or consequences of not adopting this recommendation?

No major consequences for this 'homework' which will support other DRIP Collaborative recommendations/efforts and will help ensure more efficient use of existing resources. Any gaps we identify would help prioritize future efforts framed around these gaps/needs.

Implementing Parties and Partners

Who would be the implementing agency or entity (potentially multiple)?

OPR could help coordinate this effort, as it mirrors a similar process conducted in response to the Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resilience Program (ICARP) Technical Advisory Council's (TAC's) development of a definition of climate vulnerability (which included a cross walk of existing tools, and some assessment of gaps/needs that resulted from that process), and the Vulnerable Communities Platform (VCP) team has been assembling similar information as part of interagency coordination (VCP

Interagency Technical Working Group). Would welcome any additional support from DRIP members and drought focused agencies (SWB, DWR, DSC, etc.) and this has strong alignment potential with the drought indicators recommendation, as well as the drought definition/narrative recommendations.

Which existing entities (e.g., departments or other agencies, private or nonprofit groups, community-based organizations) will the implementing agency or entity need to partner with for successful implementation of this recommendation?

No mandatory participation to implement, but there are 2 important touchpoints in this process: developing the schema for the inventory and reviewing the list to identify any missing tools/resources. The schema review could take place as a discussion item for the DRIP Collaborative and doesn't need to be over-complicated. The goal would be to identify the baseline attributes required to have this be a worthwhile effort, while still feasible in a shorter turnaround. In the Drought-Relevant Data Workgroup Meeting held on June 17th, 2024, sector, geography, timescale, and links to vulnerable populations/communities were all mentioned as possible attributes to include. There may be other attributes to consider. It would also be helpful for Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) and users outside of the DRIP to review the list/inventory for completeness and to suggest additional tools/resources.

Describe the coordination required by federal, state, local and tribal governments to successfully implement this recommendation.

n/a other than if any state/local/Tribal governments would like to submit a resource for inclusion.

Alignment with Other Initiatives

How does the recommendation align with and/or leverage existing state efforts, concurrent public or private initiatives?

This aligns with the Drought Indicators & Metrics recommendation, serving as a precursor to identify the baseline or landscape of existing resources. It would also align with the Drought Definition and Narrative Focus Area recommendations, as many of these tools and resources are either used in defining different flavors of drought, or as examples of data that help illustrate drought narrative case studies. The 'strategic' literature review discussed at the June 17th meeting could also be a shared resource across the DRIP Collaborative recommendations and working group or made available publicly (strategic = the short list of academic resources or technical white papers that are essential resources in the drought impacts space and show we have reviewed crucial prior work in defining/characterizing/mapping drought to inform our recommendations).

This aligns with the Interagency Technical Working Group (ITWG) for the ICARP VCP at OPR, which will be coordinating with agencies on drought related vulnerability later this summer. Any public facing summaries or inventories of drought relevant information could be hosted on the Adaptation Clearinghouse and tagged with relevant sector/hazard information in the database.

Implementation Time Frame

Approximately how quickly could the proposed recommendation be implemented? Factor time needed to develop, design, permit, construct (if applicable). Select one timeframe:

☒ **Short term (1-2 yrs.)** ☐ Medium term (2-4 yrs.) ☐ Long term (4-5+ yrs.)

Part II: Implementation Considerations

Necessary Steps & Measuring Success

What are the key steps to adopt and implement action?

To help monitor progress and success, what thresholds and reporting can be identified to reflect successful implementation?

- (DRIP Leads) Coordinate with OPR VCP team on any existing work to inventory drought/vulnerability related resources
- (DRIP/Interagency/ITWG) Expand search/review based on agency and external input (other literature or tools on drought characterization)
- (DRIP) Review any information produced as part of this effort
- (DRIP) Suggest other information or provide feedback on the inventory and any inventory documents produced
- (DRIP Leads in collaboration with VCP team) Explore how to document this information in an easy to review/update format

Potential Challenges

What issues or challenges might arise during implementation (e.g. authority or need for additional authority, funding or revenue streams, public awareness and perception, technical, interagency coordination)? List these hurdles and offer a brief description of how to address/mitigate them.

- VCP team's effort is already underway, and while aligned with DRIP Collaborative input, has internal mandates and deliverables for platform development (i.e. where we can leverage that effort, it's a great opportunity for alignment, but there is limited space to alter their workstream).
- The breadth of tools and resources that exist, may require some filtering – either for overall inclusion, or based on limitations of a given resource
 - For example, some may not be statewide in coverage (e.g. an San Joaquin Valley drought assessment), while others may not be updated recently or regularly. This challenge will become more apparent as the inventory proceeds.

Are there foreseeable potential negative consequences or unintended impacts associated with implementing this recommendation?

- No obvious negative consequences, but given the complexity of drought – it will be crucial that this is presented as an overview/inventory of drought/vulnerability tools, and not a definitive answer (not fully comprehensive) to that question (given the complexity of different sectors, geographies, timescales, and drivers of drought)

Funding

What are the potential (estimated) costs to implement the recommendation? Is there both an implementation cost and ongoing costs? Briefly describe any assumptions behind the estimate.

What potential existing and/or future funding sources or mechanisms are available (e.g., grants, general fund, bond funds, rate payers, philanthropic foundations, etc.)? Does the recommendation require funding from the state and potentially matching funds?

- VCP team leverage is cost neutral, but we are subject to what that team can do given their internal mandates (i.e. how can this leverage their existing work), and what we can gather via DRIP member submissions or recommendations. This seems feasible to complete within that constraint, but important to note that we are tapping into existing effort/work, not scoping a new project.
- If there were ambition to scope this beyond leveraging existing efforts and coordination, we could revisit potential cost estimates, but this exceeds the initial intent of this recommendation (e.g. a quick inventory to organize the most relevant information and resources, to make sure we're up to speed on the 'landscape' or resources/info on drought – thereby informing subsequent effort/recommendations).

Equity and Outreach

How does this recommendation align with established agency equity policies and how might the recommendation address any specific equity or justice concerns, as defined by the DWR Racial Equity Vision, during its implementation?

- VCP works is framed around equity considerations, and these efforts could broaden our understanding/definition of drought related vulnerability (i.e. social and community factors that exacerbate drought and water supply vulnerabilities)

What sort of outreach is necessary for the successful implementation of the recommendation? Describe the target audience and the methods of outreach needed (e.g., communication, technical or financial assistance, partnering assistance).

- Direct coordination with VCP team – should be relatively easy to coordinate, as DWR staff sit on the VCP ITWG, so some of this coordination is already underway.