From:	Toby Goddard
To:	DWR Water Use Efficiency
Subject:	FW: October 3 webinar
Date:	Monday, October 3, 2016 4:12:34 PM
Attachments:	image002.png image001.png

Good afternoon,

This email is directed to Kent Frame and Peter Brostrom in response to the October 3, 2016 webinar, specifically the 2:15 section on Risk Analysis and WSCP Annual Assessments. Please see my comments below.

Thank you for your consideration.

Toby Goddard
Santa Cruz Water Department

Celebrating 150 Years of Creating Community

From: Toby Goddard
Sent: Monday, October 03, 2016 3:40 PM
To: 'Paul Helliker'
Subject: October 3 webinar

Hi Paul –

I am listening to the conversation via webinar. I agree with your support for Option No. 3. Kent Frame asked for reasons why No.2 doesn't make sense. Here are some that come to mind:

1) **Speculative.** No one can predict the weather over the next five years and the chances every year that the following five years will all be classified as dry or critically dry in succession is extremely small.
2) **Produces nonsense results.** If an agency's annual assessment shows supply would be adequate in the current year (i.e., no shortage), but the 5-year forward outlook is unrealistically and artificially dire, does the agency call for cutbacks and trigger a water shortage response when none is warranted? This would be result in a bureaucratic shortage, not an actual shortage that the public would not support or understand.
3) **It is Long-Term Planning,** as you have already eloquently pointed out.

On the other hand, if the annual assessment indicates a shortage is likely in the current year, (which is usually done fairly late in the wet season) it does help an agency to consider what would happen

to its available supplies if the next winter season were to continue to be dry. Given the value of water to public health and well-being of a community, an agency has a responsibility to take a bit of a longer view, just not 5 years!

Best,

Toby Goddard
Santa Cruz Water Department

Celebrating 150 Years of Creating Community

From: Paul Helliker [mailto:helliker@hbmwd.com]
Sent: Monday, October 03, 2016 9:33 AM
To: Dave Bolland; Alex Coate; Allen Carlisle; Alt. Ellen Levin; Alt: Tim Barr; Andree Johnson; Brent Hastey; CathyPieroni; Chip Close ; Chris Dundon; Cindy Tuck; Dana Friehauf; DaveEggerton; David Pedersen - Las Virgenes Municipal Water District; David Pettijohn; Devendra Upadhyay; Drew Atwater; DustinCooper; Einar Maisch; Fiona Sanchez; Gary Arant; GeorgeBarber; GrantDavis; Jennifer Persike; JenniferBurke; Jerry Brown; Jevon Lam ; Jim Barrett; JimPeifer; Joe Berg; John Rossi; John Woodling; JooneLopez; KathyTiegs; KatieRuark; Lili Vogelsang; Lisa Lien-Mager; MarthaDavis; Maureen Stapleton; MichaelMarkus; Nicole M. Sandkulla; Paula Kehoe; PaulJones; Penny Falcon; RemlehScherzinger; RobertRoscoe; Sue Mosburg; Thomas Esqueda ; ThomasCumpston; Tim Quinn; Toby Goddard; ShaunaLorance
Subject:

Greetings:

This story came out Friday in the L.A. Times about the 2015-16 water year:

http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-water-year-20160930-snap-story.html

DWR's spokesperson, Doug Carlson, talks about precipitation "flatlining" and California being in "cardiac arrest." There are also various comments about California having a "snow drought" in 2015-16. And, once again, the drought monitor is invoked, which both the drought monitor managers and DWR's senior drought managers consider to be inapplicable to urban water supplies. All of this just illuminates our challenge in addressing any proposed emergency regulations in 2017. The good news is that it snowed in the Sierra this weekend. Let's hope that is a harbinger of more.

Here are some facts:

Precipitation for water year 2015-16:
Sacramento Valley: 116% of average - a "below normal" runoff year (due to the influence in the formula of 2014-15 data)
San Joaquin Valley: 98% of average - a "dry" runoff year
Tulare Lake basin: 88% of average - a "dry" runoff year

Snowpack:
March 15: Northern Sierra - 100% of April 1 average, Central - 92%, Southern - 77% Statewide - 90%
April 1: Northern Sierra - 94% of April 1 average, Central 88%, Southern 73%, Statewide - 86%

Reservoir storage on 10/2/16:
Shasta - 103% of average, Oroville 74% of average, Folsom 55% of average, total for all three: 86% of average

USBR and DWR released the following amounts of water from Shasta, Oroville and Folsom between March 6 and April 7, for flood control purposes: Shasta: 185,000 AF, Oroville: 87,000 AF, Folsom: 367,000 AF (Total: 639,000 AF).

If DWR and USBR had had better forecast-based operations, they would have been able to retain some of this water - all of these reservoirs exceeded their top of conservation pool storage limits, but none filled completely.

Paul