

## Focus Area: Drought Relevant Data

### Recommendation 1: **Drought Indicators and Metrics**

Recap of April 26<sup>th</sup> conversation on this recommendation, per the [Meeting Summary](#)

- 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.*

Additional April 26<sup>th</sup> comments (submitted via the written worksheets)

- Elea Becker-Lowe: Great need for more focused tools and resources, but I caution against duplicative efforts. Many tools already exist, consider a clearer first step (merging with OPR's recommendation) to consider existing resources first, then consider gaps and actions. Consider merging with other data/tools recommendation. Before actions, ensure existing resources are fully exhausted. If gaps exist after that analysis, define scope.
- Jason Colombini: The party that is disseminating the information is important too. For example, some farmers may trust their local Farm Bureau if that informing them on the drought. Early warning system and drought conditions themselves, versus say DWR or the SWRCB.
- Katie Ruby: I agree the scope of this recommendation. I don't think we as the DRIP Collaborative should be defining thresholds. Start with metrics/indicators and then go from there. Consider leveraging the information submitted in urban agencies AWSDA (annual water supply & demand assessment, due to DWR July 1). This is essentially an early warning system for each urban area. This recommendation definitely ties to the communication piece. We'll want to be clear on scope and coordinate these two recs so that their scopes are complementary.
- Katy Landau: Focus is visualization, not ID/filling data gaps. If move forward with rec, would recommend CA Water Data Consortium be the lead. Use as basis for the communication/messaging actions.
- Matessa Martin: Emphasize what was said in the Water Commission's drought white paper. Recommend some kind of interagency group. Scope: In DRIP, I don't think this collaborative

## Focus Area: Drought Relevant Data

should undertake the "meat" of this work. Maybe pass off to State (DWR, collab with SWRCB) with requirement of public outreach and informed by counties, public, including tribes.

- Ramy Gindi: With early warning comes false warnings that can cause public fatigue of conservation messaging. Allow local agencies to use as a tool. Allow water agencies to further prepare and message based on their outreach plans accordingly.
- Sierra Ryan: Make sure the end use is defined. Bad for mandating action at the local level, locals know better. Good for triggers at the state to activate the technical assistance programs
- Suzanne Pecci: Support the recommendation and suggest coordinating with recommendation 2 (evaluate programs, info, tools).
- Tim Worley: Should DRIP define threshold levels of water availability? Who would do this? As a first step, state agencies need to make sure the data already requested/collected from local agencies is shared/used and not duplicated.

## Focus Area: Drought Relevant Data

### Recommendation 2: **Program and Info/Tools Evaluation**

Recap of April 26<sup>th</sup> conversation on this recommendation, per the [Meeting Summary](#)

- 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.*

Additional April 26<sup>th</sup> comments (submitted via the written worksheets)

- Alvar Escriva-Bou: I think this would be complementary to rec #1. I see even that they could be combined, and this rec serves as a background to rec #1, we want to ensure the potential early warning system is taking into account all pre-existing information.
- Elea Becker-Lowe: Consider aligning with rec #1. Merge with other data/tools recommendation to ensure reducing duplicative efforts.
- Katie Ruby: Suggest starting with landscape review to identify areas of overlap/redundancy and coordination needs. Identification of gaps can happen as part of this, but I would suggest stopping short of filling those gaps until we determine which gaps are highest priority/most meaningful
- Katy Landau: Is this a DRIP led activity (bandwidth)? Like the idea but think this should happen after some of the other efforts. Could then meaningful incorporate those data gaps analysis/lit reviews.
- Sierra Ryan: Pulling together data resources is valuable. I'm a little unclear how this relates to recommendation #1. I would propose combining - Combine with rec #1 and clearly define depth.
- Suzanne Pecci: I think this would be challenging to delegate to the DRIP taskforce, given we lack required expertise. I think this rec links with rec #1
- Tim Worley: Bring more info to DRIP about the CA Water Data Consortium's effort to coordinate data already existing and collected, as this is essential to ensure data is not duplicated and used efficiently.