

Focus Area: Drought Preparedness for Domestic Wells

Recommendation 3: **SB552 Language Update**

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

- Although SB 552 requires counties to create drought plans, to date only two counties have submitted. 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 the 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.*

Additional April 26th comments (submitted via the written worksheets)

- Alvar Escriva-Bou: Totally in support of this. Perhaps would be interesting to see how GSAs are integrated in this effort, as they are an important institution in charge of groundwater related efforts.
- Elea Becker-Lowe: OPR can support conversation about general plan updates. e.g. How can existing mandated elements includes these issues first? Consider connections to OPR's General Plan guidelines - is there a way to improve/update existing sections that are already mandated?
- Emily Rooney: Mandates & dates could be a challenge for all counties - "one size fits all" is a challenge. How much would this cost? If general fund dollars (or federal dollars) are available, that would be the preference & likely bring broader support to the table
- Katie Ruby: It would be helpful to understand why counties haven't yet submitted plans to make sure those underlying issues are addressed (e.g. resources, funding). I agree with adding more "teeth" to the law but want to avoid a situation where counties end up "checking the box" versus preparing an implementing meaningful plans
- Katy Landau: At which agency (DWR)? Most standalone action item
- Sierra Ryan: Funding. Clarity of role of taskforce. Make sure its implementable, not just a plan on a shelf
- Suzanne Pecci: Support oversight and needs reference to public being invited too
- Tim Worley: Monterey County has excellent planning doc. Would be nice to see or have a presentation on their document

Focus Area: Drought Preparedness for Domestic Wells

Recommendation 4: **Community Well Monitoring Program**

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

- 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.
- DRIP 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 GSAs?
- 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.*

[Additional April 26th comments \(submitted via the written worksheets\)](#)

- [Alvar Escriva-Bou](#): I like this idea a lot, as it could increase community organization and support for well dependent resilience. The only thing I would add is that maybe this is not enough to get "sufficient" well data (if for instance in some places there are not communities organizing themselves)
- [Elea Becker-Lowe](#): Chance to uplift community and existing conditions. Existing trust and relationships are invaluable. State-developed kits? Guidelines? No one-size fits all. Need \$/TA. Management informed by data? Privacy issues. Are there existing state grant programs that could be leveraged? Focus first as pilot program and then scale?
- [Emily Rooney](#): I like Sierra's thoughts on this idea - dealing with the next steps - and does that mean getting kits for folks to do this on their own? Good thoughts
- [Jason Colombini](#): Perhaps partnering or adding to the law already requiring nitrate testing of wells. If that is an annual requirement already teaching domestic well owners. How to measure their well water depth and requiring that as part of the reporting could give the data we're looking for
- [Justine Massey](#): How would the developed policies and actions developed or implemented by this group interact with GSAs? This could support GSA regulations and add rich data collection, ultimately to influence management decisions
- [Katy Landau](#): To keep at the local level, run via GSA's - maybe able to leverage their data QA/QC & management systems to house data. If the State is providing the TA and funding, would require a legislative proposal. GSAs would have more flexibility to provide support assuming relationships exist
- [Laura Ramos](#): Empowers well owners to be proactive in knowing the groundwater level in their well. DWR mentioned having kits at county libraries that they can check out
- [Sierra Ryan](#): Love this idea, need to clarify how this could be rolled out and what DRIP could do. Offer kits and training and a portal. Clarify how data is shared and used

Focus Area: Drought Preparedness for Domestic Wells

Recommendation 5: **Roles and Responsibilities**

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

- 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.*

[Additional April 26th comments \(submitted via the written worksheets\)](#)

- Alvar Escriva-Bou: I support the idea. I don't know if this is going too much into the weeds, but potentially having "emergency funding" from the State that could be quicker to release and that the responsible agency could "reimburse" later
- Elea Becker-Lowe: Consider the General Plan connections --> OPR
- Justine Massey: Need to identify funding, look into CSAC "at home" funding recommendations. Address climate change before drought solution step out of our hands due to scale of problem.
- Katy Landau: ID gaps in authority, data & funding. SAFER Advisory Committee should be involved
- Suzanne Pecci: Support as a priority focus area