



Meeting Notes

11020 White Rock Road, Suite 200
Rancho Cordova, CA, 95670

Prepared for: El Dorado Water Agency (EDWA)

Project Title: SB552 County Drought and Water Shortage Resilience Plan for El Dorado County

Project No.: 192538

Purpose of Meeting: County Drought and Water Shortage Task Force **Date:** November 19, 2024

Meeting Location: Microsoft Teams

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Notes Prepared by: Tim Lee and Melanie Holton (Brown and Caldwell)

Attendees:

Hannah Romero – EDWA

Kameisha Nichols – El Dorado County (County) Environmental Management Department (EMD)

Phil Jones – County Office of Education

Karen Bender – County EMD (South Tahoe)

Scott Bare – Office of Emergency Services

Carla Hass – County Chief Administration Office

Zoe Kanavas – DWR – Special Initiatives

Sarah Ko – DWR – Division of Regional Assistance

Kim Gustafson – Grizzly Flats Community Services District

Mike Ranalli – County Farm Bureau

Jennifer Lukins – Lukins Brothers Water Company and Tahoe Keys Property Owners Association

Jon Money – El Dorado Irrigation District

Jeffrey A. Warren – County EMD

Mark Seelos – South Tahoe Public Utilities District

Melanie Holton – Brown and Caldwell (BC)

Tim Lee – BC

Tess Sprague – BC

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- Previous Meeting Recap
- Key Definitions
- Meeting Objectives
- Drought and Water Shortage Contingency Plan (CDRP) Status
- How Risk and Vulnerability Assessment Informs Actions
- Short- and Long-term Actions (several sections)
- Task Force Roundtable
- Next Steps
- Meeting Adjourned

Meeting Notes

Round Table Notes:

1. Implementation/funding:

- a. Phil Jones comment: El Dorado County Office of Education has done a lot of county emergency planning with different agencies. Sometimes groups say they have funding sources to implement the plan. To address SB552 requirements, they would need metering on every building, backup generators, etc. Alternatively, if water from a large water purveyor such as EID were routed to these systems in the southern part of the county, there would be infrastructure costs. Who funds these projects?
 - i. Tess Sprague comment: Yes, that is a great concern. This will be evaluated as part of the next step (implementation plan), to determine the necessary funding/resources for implementation.
 - ii. Clarification: Phil Jones' comment pertains to Division 6 of the Water Code, Section 10609.62 regarding improvements to schools, as stated below. Please note that all of these requirements are only required when funding becomes available. None of the requirements come into play without a source of funding. If EID was to bring infrastructure to a point of connection close to the school, the school could either use this as a secondary source of water as stated in (d) below, or transfer to EID water service. If water service is transferred to EID, the school could possibly get out of the water supply business for the school and would not have to meet the requirements stated below.

Small water suppliers and nontransient noncommunity water systems that are schools shall implement, subject to funding availability, all of the following drought resiliency measures:

- (a) No later than January 1, 2023, implement monitoring systems sufficient to detect production well groundwater levels.*
- (b) Beginning no later than January 1, 2023, maintain membership in the California Water/Wastewater Agency Response Network (CaWARN) or similar mutual aid organization.*
- (c) No later than January 1, 2024, to ensure continuous operations during power failures, provide adequate backup electrical supply.*
- (d) No later than January 1, 2027, have at least one backup source of water supply, or a water system intertie, that meets current water quality requirements and is sufficient to meet average daily demand.*
- (e) No later than January 1, 2032, meter each service connection and monitor for water loss due to leakages.*
- (f) No later than January 1, 2032, have source system capacity, treatment system capacity if necessary, and distribution system capacity to meet fire flow requirements.*

- b. Zoe Kanavas (DWR) comment: The next California County Cafe event will be an office hour on December 18th from 9-10am. Please use this [registration link](#) to let us know the questions you'd like to discuss. Not focused on funding specifically but any question can be posed in the office hours.

- c. Sarah Ko (DWR) comment: Prop 4 was passed and might be able to provide funding in the future. USBR also has WaterSMART funding for water infrastructure projects.
 - i. Hannah Romero comment: The WaterSMART Drought Response Program application period has closed but any future opportunities will be posted on the site linked here: <https://www.usbr.gov/drought/>

2. Dry Well Reporting

- a. Karen Bender and Carla Hass comments: Up in Echo Summit, when wells go dry, folks do not reach out to EMD. The County finds out later that they received hauled water. Folks in this area reported that they have been ok since Caldor fire – but it seems like every year they run dry in middle of the summer.

3. Domestic Wells – Local Needs & Concerns

- a. Tess Sprague & Hannah Romero comment: An anecdote was shared in the previous meeting about a domestic well owner on a fixed income who had severe problems with their pump. This brought up the discussion of how to best support needs of domestic well owners.
- b. Scott Bare comment: There is sensitivity around domestic wells, and any regulation will be problematic.
 - i. Jeffrey A. Warren: Agreed with above statement.
 - ii. Carla Hass comment: This is why it's critical that the messaging be primarily through the County and shared by the Agency and other partners.

4. Water Hauling

- a. Mike Ranalli comment: Is there quantitative information on water hauler data? Is there a way to know if there is a significant number of parcels or properties that are receiving a significant amount of water deliveries (especially in year 4 of a drought). If there was an opportunity to know volume and where areas that water is being delivered it would be good.
 - i. Tess Sprague comment: There is a list of the county approved water hauling companies, but we do not have information on volume and location readily available. We could reach out to some providers to find out if they could share information on general areas where they deliver water.
 - ii. BC to look into getting the rough area and volume of delivery.
- b. Kameisha Nichols comment: On a similar note, one of things under consideration to add to the well permitting system is whether there are any easements. Kameisha can talk to Jeff to see what options there are to collect more data on wells.
 - i. Tess Sprague comment: Would be good to also ask the Planning and Building Department how a property owner coordinates with them to discuss the process of finding a solution to a property that might be deemed uninhabitable.

5. Feedback on the Actions Presented

- a. Task Force members will review and send comments via email. Deadline for comments extended to 12/13 given Thanksgiving week and this is the first time many Task Force members will have seen the list of actions.
- b. Phil Jones comment: There might be some confusion on the definition of short- vs long-term actions (clarification provided). Also, is there going to be any statewide coordination for long-term actions? For example, if we wanted to build more dams to keep more water in our county, how would it impact flows in other regions and what restrictions would the state impose?

- i. Tess Sprague comment: That is definitely an issue the Agency and the County have to deal with. Management of headwaters plays a crucial role in the county's supply.
- ii. Hannah Romero comment: There is a County Water Reliability Project, and the draft environmental impact report is currently under review for public comment. This effort works to secure up to 40,000 AF for the county and includes working on state approval for those water rights. We will still need more than that based on our long-term planning analysis, but this is the first step to working to secure and ensure the county has sufficient resources.
- iii. Jon Money comment: Unfortunately, all water if not captured ends up in Folsom Lake. Once it hits there it turns itself over to the state. The Bureau manages the allocations out of Folsom Lake and down the canal. For instance, this year there was quite a bit of excess water (it was a good water year). However, the county was not able to take advantage of that. The state did not have need of this water given other available resources and no state conveyance availability, which meant that the excess water from the county this year went out to the Bay. It gets complicated to be able to posture for uses downstream unless it is part of a water transfer. During the last drought, the county had little to say on the state's regulations. The best option is to plan proactively on how to manage the water locally.
- iv. Hannah Romero and Melanie Holton comment: For the definitions, short-term represents the actions that help meet immediate needs. For example, providing bottled water or hauled water. An extended drought may go on for months and short-term actions provide a reactive response during this time, whereas long-term actions are more proactive responses in planning and preparation. Long-term actions typically require preparation in advanced and help reduce the impact of drought or water shortage.

Action Items

- BC to look into getting the rough area and volume of delivery for hauled water.
- EDWA to send out slide deck and request for feedback via email.
- Task Force members to review existing list of short- and long-term actions and provide feedback via email by 12/13/24.