Drought workgroup

Workgroup Charges:
1. The WPC, through its committees, could develop a template for interpreting statewide drought indices to local risk levels and response measures for use by utilities at the local level, based on storage, demand levels, type of system, etc.
2. At present, the Drought Plan and the Interagency Drought Workgroup exist in an ad hoc capacity under the collective executive branch authority of the Water Planning Council. The Council should consider developing legislative recommendations to improve the authority and implementation of the Drought Plan for consideration during a future legislative session
3. The WPC should consider collaborating with municipalities and public water suppliers to improve and promote the model water use restriction ordinance.
4. Would the current state drought plan have been effective during the 2016-2017 drought?

1.01	**Recommendation:**	Look at new methods for forecasting water supplies during dry periods and droughts – e.g. look at what Aquarion is doing. Also determine if 100 year of record is good given climate change? A standard should be set for what data is used as with stormwater calculations	**Findings:**	It appears that there is no standard for predicting supply and specifically what rainfall predictions models to use. Although it is recognized that all systems vary, the rainfall data use for projections should be standardized and reflect the newest data given climate change. It is noted that weather patterns including precipitation amounts and intensity have been changing. UConn CLEAR has the latest recommendations for rainfall data for stormwater management, is this something that can be used for water supply?

Q1. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		1
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 04:57 PM	Not all systems need a reservoir forecasting model. Reservoir forecasts are not needed by the IDW.	

Q2. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		1
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 04:57 PM	I agree that there is no standard for predicting supply, but don't agree that one is always needed or that rainfall data are required.	

Q3. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	66.67%	4
No	33.33%	2
If no, where does it belong?		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:55 AM	Doesn't fit squarely in any of them. Doesn't relate to "local risk level"	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:20 PM	4	

Q4. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	16.67%	1
No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 04:57 PM	4.06	

Q5. Additional comments.

Answered	**1**
Skipped	**5**

Respondents	Response Date	Responses	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 08:47 AM	This recommendation is insightful, however the enormity of the task would be too much to develop and continually implement by and across the State. Aquarion's models help them to determine the state of the capacity in the future. Doing such modeling would be difficult with the differences between the sources of supply and the watersheds for each system. Each model would have to be tailored for each system.	

1.02	**Recommendation:**	A template for evaluating drought indices at a local level is not necessary.	**Findings:**	Individual PWS drought risk is to site specific to manage with statewide templates

Q6. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	33.33%	2

Neither agree n		16.67%	1
Disagree		50.00%	3
Comment			3
	Answered		**6**
	Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 04:59 PM	Need clarification on the templates referred to in the charge.	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:55 AM	I think an effor should be made to make drought indices as ganular as possible in order to apply them to as local a level as possible	
3	Sep 28 2020 08:55 AM	Drought indicators/measures can be developed in at regional level with a focus below the county level..	

Q7. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	33.33%	2
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	50.00%	3
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:55 AM	Finding is anthithical to recommendation. No one is recommending a "Statewide Template"	
2	Sep 28 2020 08:55 AM	The template would be for a range of utilities, not for individual PWSs	

Q8. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q9. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	16.67%	1
No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1

Answered	**6**
Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 04:59 PM	1.04	

Q10. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

1.03	**Recommendation:**	Increase number of stream gages and groundwater stations to improve ability to monitor conditions locally	**Findings:**	The IDW appears to have focused on statewide review and response in 2016-2017, and with some exceptions did not appear to consider conditions/response on a more local level

Q11. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree		100.00%
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q12. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:56 AM	IDW currently making drought level designations on county levels	
2	Sep 28 2020 09:01 AM	The finding perhaps should be that if the IDW had more stream gauges and GW stations the IDW could make more regional specific decisions.	

Q13. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0

Answered	**6**
Skipped	**0**

Q14. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q15. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

1.04	**Recommendation:**	Develop committee through the Water Planning Counsel to determine the need for a template for interpreting statewide drought indices and if needed to engage subject matter experts and stakeholders to develop a template for interpreting statewide drought indices. More localized templates may then be able to be developed but without making the resolution so narrow that it becomes an overwhelming task.	**Findings:**	The drought indices that are the most appropriate should be continually monitored for effectiveness and a template should be developed to help develope those indices and utilize them at varying levels throughout the state and by various stakeholders. Some small public water systems do not have the means to develop those indice on their own.

Q16. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:03 PM	I don't understand what the localized template is or how it would be used? Is this different than recently developed by IDW?	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:21 PM	We are the committee	

Q17. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	0.00%	0

Disagree	33.33%		2
Comment			0
	Answered		**6**
	Skipped		**0**

Q18. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses	
Yes	100.00%		6
No	0.00%		0
If no, where does it belong?			0
	Answered		**6**
	Skipped		**0**

Q19. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses	
Yes	16.67%		1
No	83.33%		5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)			1
	Answered		**6**
	Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:03 PM	1.01,1.02	

Q20. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

1.05	**Recommendation:**	The State in coordination with Federal partners should develop an online portal for public water systems to report their various surface water and ground water capacities as well as the other metrics required by regulation.	**Findings:**	The data can be used to develop an early warning system of deteriorating capacity based on supply and demand information to allow for significant response time to an emerging threat.

Q21. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses	
Agree	100.00%		6
Neither agree n	0.00%		0
Disagree	0.00%		0
Comment			2
	Answered		**6**
	Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:06 PM	Defer to DPH opinion to whether an online portal and/or Federal partners are needed. If the data is available online and our federal partners develop more tools (which has been requested), utilities woulb be better equiped and informed to make more timely and better decision	
2	Sep 28 2020 09:05 AM	on when to enact mitigation efforts and establish better triggers.	

Q22. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		2
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:06 PM	Was this a finding from our discussions? Need more info.	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:22 PM	Finding should be changed to problems with frequency of current reporting	

Q23. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	60.00%	3
No	40.00%	2
If no, where does it belong?		2
	Answered	**5**
	Skipped	**1**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:56 AM	Doesn't fit squarely in any of them	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:22 PM	4	

Q24. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	16.67%	1
No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags

1	Sep 30 2020 05:06 PM	1.1,1.04	

Q25. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

1.06	**Recommendation: Communication, may be Charge 4**	Instead of a template, which may be too prescriptive, develop a checklist for press releases, messaging, and public outreach materials that will be issued by the IDWG or lead agency. Examples of messaging that should be included: •Clear messaging about the status of regions effected (or not) by dry conditions or drought. •Language encouraging those on public water supply to pay close attention to their providers as conditions and restrictions will vary depending on the source. •Information about the status of groundwater supplies and instructions for residents on private wells.	**Findings:**	The workgroup acknowledges that regional droughts and variability of supply conditions across utilities as well as the difficulty in messaging when a significant portion of residents rely on wells for supply makes blanket statements about drought conditions impossible and sometimes unhelpful.

Q26. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		1
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 09:06 AM	Agree with the development of the messaging and outreach templates, but the drought indices templates should still be developed.	

Q27. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 02:25 PM	I agree to a point. We need regional messaging but there is more to consider than just the water utility perspective	

Q28. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	83.33%	5
No	16.67%	1
If no, where does it belong?		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:56 AM	Doesn't fit squarely in any of them	

Q29. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	16.67%	1
No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 02:25 PM	1.04	

Q30. Additional comments.

Answered	**2**
Skipped	**4**

Respondents	Response Date	Responses	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 02:25 PM	Add this to the 1.04 recommendaiton	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:56 AM	I don't think this applies to a template for drought indices, but a template for press releases	

1.07	**Recommendation:**	Maintain allowances for regional declarations and professional judgement in the State Drought Plan	**Findings:**	Analysis of IDWG discussions and actions prove that declaring drought by region is advantageous. The current State Drought Plan allows for regional declarations as well as professional judgement.

Q31. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q32. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 25 2020 04:23 PM	I don't think our work prove this, although intuitively correct	

Q33. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	80.00%	4
No	20.00%	1
If no, where does it belong?		2
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:07 PM	4	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:56 AM	Not entirely	

Q34. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q35. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

1.08	**Recommendation:**	Direction should be included in the current drought plan under Stage 1 actions that local authorities should be alerted to a Stage 1 declaration in order to communicate and coordinate with their local water supplier(s) and be prepared to take action if conditions progress to Stage 2.	**Findings:**	The current drought plan does not have specific provisions for outreach to local authorities by the IDWG for Stage 1. Current dry conditions have proved this “pre drought” stage beneficial in preparing the agencies to act if conditions progress to drought.

Q36. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	50.00%	3
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:56 AM	Plan already requires "Municipal water coordinators provide DPH with up-to-date municipal water coordinator contact information. If no municipal water coordinator exists, designate a local official competent in water supply issues as the municipal water coordinator and provide contact information. Municipal water coordinator maintains regular communications flow with local emergency management director" at stage 1	
2	Sep 28 2020 09:22 AM	Stage 1 does begin the process of reaching out to municipal water coordinator and begin the flow of information.	

Q37. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:56 AM	It does require outreach to water coordinators. See above	
2	Sep 28 2020 09:22 AM	In the current drought plan Stage 2 is when IDW begins alerting local leaders. If this is the begining or emerging drought then this stage should be entered into much sooner.	

Q38. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	50.00%	3
No	50.00%	3
If no, where does it belong?		3
Answered		**6**

Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:08 PM	4	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:56 AM	Not fully applicabale to any.	
3	Sep 28 2020 09:22 AM	I think this should be in 4	

Q39. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q40. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

1.09	**Recommendation:**	Criterion should be not by majority criteria but by the bottom line in either type of drought indicator.	**Findings:**	For example: If ground water was below 25th percentile, than should have triggered drought, even if precipitation or reservoir levels were above normal. Of course if both in same region.

Q41. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	16.67%	1
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	66.67%	4
Comment		4
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 02:28 PM	We should better weight criteria to determine.	
2	Sep 30 2020 05:11 PM	I think IDW judgement needs to be applied to the overall picture based on the indices and other knowledge.	
3	Sep 29 2020 08:56 AM	Need to preserve professional judgement regarding how all criterea fit together to create total picture	

4	Sep 28 2020 09:32 AM	I think this is where professional judgement comes into play in the current drought plan. Some criteria are better indicators for different types of drought and the demarcations of where the region is in that drought type. Precip deficiets, streamflow, and crop moisture may be early indicators with reservoirs showing a little later on depending on demand. Groundwater is a later indicator and takes longer to recover. The IDW must be aware of these differences in the indicators to make better and more informed decisions.

Q42. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	16.67%	1
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	83.33%	5
Comment		4
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 02:28 PM	Should also include that seasonality is important	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:56 AM	see above	
3	Sep 28 2020 09:32 AM	Not sure this in a finding.	
4	Sep 25 2020 04:25 PM	Not discussed by workgroup	

Q43. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	83.33%	5
No	16.67%	1
If no, where does it belong?		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:56 AM	not completely	

Q44. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Q45. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

1.10	**Recommendation:**	Reporting should be consistent and clear, "below normal" and "dryer" should follow with numbers; what ever is relevant, if inches or percentiles.	**Findings:**	For example in minutes from Sep 8th 2016, report of precipitaion: Rainfall deficit of X inches below normal.

Q46. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 09:34 AM	Indicators should be reported in metrics that are easily understood.	

Q47. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 25 2020 04:26 PM	Finding should be changed to note lack of specifics in IDW meeting minutes	

Q48. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	40.00%	2
No	60.00%	3
If no, where does it belong?		3
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags

1	Sep 29 2020 08:56 AM	none applicable
2	Sep 28 2020 09:34 AM	4
3	Sep 25 2020 04:26 PM	4

Q49. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q50. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

1.11	**Recommendation:**	Climate change drought patterns and predictions should be included in how we define drought - long term sustainability should be included.	**Findings:**	Ct has to rethink if we can still be considered water abundance or rich in water in face of climate change.

Q51. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		3
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:14 PM	Climate change impacts drought planning, but not how we define drought.	

2	Sep 29 2020 08:56 AM	Difficult to specifically determine if a particular drought is related to climate change. Climate change predicts moer extreme weather patterns, but can't get specific for a particular drought event. Current drought plan now mentions: "As mentioned in the 2011 Connecticut Climate Change Preparedness Plan, recent climate change studies predict that drought—as well as flooding rains—will become increasingly frequent and severe in the future. Although much less sudden than a hurricane or earthquake, droughts can have similar widespread social, economic, and environmental consequences, requiring the response of numerous parties." Not sure what "long term sustainability" means here.
3	Sep 28 2020 09:39 AM	I agree with the rec but the IDW does not have the resources nor the techinal knowledge to incorporate climate change patterns and predictions in defining drought, nor is it their purpose. Long-term sustainability is needed across the state but that should be done in a different group such as GC3. The IDW is not tasked with developing long-term sustainability.

Q52. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		4
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:14 PM	I agree that climate change is important but not sure of the finding	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:56 AM	Current models predict a wetter NE US. However, timing and intensity of precip will increase. State drought pan should be modified to include this type of discussion.	
3	Sep 28 2020 09:39 AM	Again, I agree with the statement but that should be considered at the WPC or other state group working on that topic. This is not what the IDW was formed to do.	
4	Sep 25 2020 04:26 PM	Workgroup did not review this	

Q53. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	40.00%	2
No	60.00%	3

If no, where does it belong?	3
Answered	**5**
Skipped	**1**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:56 AM	None applicable	
2	Sep 28 2020 09:39 AM	Not sure this rec or finding adresses any of the 4 categories.	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:26 PM	2	

Q54. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q55. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

1.12	**Recommendation:**	Needs to be a way to distinguish between a supply problem and a consumption problem	**Findings:**	The reservoir indicator is prone to be triggered due to excessive water use rather than a lack of adequate supply

Q56. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	16.67%	1
Neither agree n	50.00%	3
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		4
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:17 PM	I agree, but only supply problems are relevant to this group. Already are ways to do this through consumption analysis. But this info should could be included as part of water company reports to DPH. Also, would be helpful to includ reservoir size and contributing watershed as part of DPH reservoir reporting to more fully describe its "flashiness".	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:57 AM	This rec does not address the 4 categories. Drought conditions can increase demand and hasten the triggering of a drought stage for the PWS.	
3	Sep 28 2020 09:46 AM		

4	Sep 25 2020 04:28 PM	This should be left to individual PWS water supply plans

Q57. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	33.33%	2
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	66.67%	4
Comment		3
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:17 PM	Supply and demand are related.	
2	Sep 28 2020 09:46 AM	Excessive water use along with drought impacted supply causes the trigger to be hit and not just excessive demand.	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:28 PM	Workgroup did not study; no consensus on what is "excessive"	

Q58. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	40.00%	2
No	60.00%	3
If no, where does it belong?		3
	Answered	**5**
	Skipped	**1**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:57 AM	none applicable	
2	Sep 28 2020 09:46 AM	The rec and findings don't seem to fit any of the 4 categories.	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:28 PM	2	

Q59. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	16.67%	1
No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Q60. Additional comments.

Answered	**1**

Skipped	**5**

Respondents	Response Date	Responses	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 02:33 PM	Disagree that excessive demand on a given day impacts reservoir levels. If reservoir levels are high, excessive demand may just be impacting the ability of the system to deliver. The question is whether or not excessive demand should be part of drought response and/or how the two may relate.	

2.01	**Recommendation:**	Better define the role of the IDW as a whole, not just by agency. Statewide only? Regional? What is its primary role during a drought? E.g. – DPH is the lead in terms of dealing with local water utility. How does the IDW support this.	**Findings:**	Upon review of the workings of the IDW during the 2016 drought, the role is somewhat unclear in terms of drought preparedness. DPH is the main contact with the water utilities and towns. Is the IDW there only to determine the level of drought. Now that DEMHS is involved, is there a role for better communications/coordination with Towns.

Q61. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 10:02 AM	The current drought plan clearly address its role and purpose.	

Q62. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 10:02 AM	The current drought plan clearly address its role and purpose.	

Q63. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices	Responses

Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 02:36 PM	Although could under #4	

Q64. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q65. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

2.02	**Recommendation:**	A regular schedule of IDW meetings should be established and	**Findings:**	Meetings of the IDW were irregular during the 2016-2017 drought.

Q66. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:57 AM	Agree that within a drought, a regular meeting schedule should be established to affect better attendance by IDW members at called meetings, however, not sure why they need to be published, as they are not public meetings.	

Q67. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0

Comment		0
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Q68. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	66.67%	4
No	33.33%	2
If no, where does it belong?		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:18 PM	4	
2	Sep 28 2020 10:11 AM	4	

Q69. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 10:11 AM	Not sure. Thought it was but couldn't find one.	

Q70. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

2.03	**Recommendation:**	The IDW should have clearly designated leader.	**Findings:**	IDW representation and attendance at meetings were inconsistent during the 2016-2017 drought

Q71. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		3
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:19 PM	Is OPM the leader?	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:57 AM	Currently it is OPM Undersecretary Heft	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:08 PM	IT's now OPM Undersecretary Heft	

Q72. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:57 AM	Efforts have more recently been made to formalize representation at IDW	

Q73. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	66.67%	4
No	33.33%	2
If no, where does it belong?		2
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:19 PM	4	
2	Sep 28 2020 10:12 AM	4, it may be a 1 if we are recommending that a designated leader be established by statute.	

Q74. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
	Answered	**5**
	Skipped	**1**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 10:12 AM	Not sure	

Q75. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

2.04	**Recommendation:**	A lead and backup member should be designated for each agency on the IDW	**Findings:**	IDW representation and attendance at meetings were inconsistent during the 2016-2017 drought

Q76. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:57 AM	already done	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:08 PM	already done	

Q77. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q78. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	66.67%	4
No	33.33%	2
If no, where does it belong?		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:20 PM	4	
2	Sep 28 2020 10:15 AM	4	

Q79. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	16.67%	1

No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 10:15 AM	4.15	

Q80. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

2.05	**Recommendation:**	All towns should be required through statue or regulation to have an official drought coordinator. Using an established position like Emergency Management should be considered before creating a new position.	**Findings:**	Public messages issued during the 2016-2017 drought may not have been effective

Q81. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		3
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 02:40 PM	Agree that need a local coordinator - but may not need legislation. Could just be part of Hazard Mitigation Planning	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:57 AM	I think DEMHS is making good headway for the IDW in getting a Municipal Water Coordinator established for each town. If that effort fails, perhaps legislation will be needed.	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:09 PM	already being done	

Q82. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags

1	Oct 02 2020 02:40 PM	I would say communication was not as effective as should be
2	Sep 29 2020 08:57 AM	Could always be better!

Q83. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	83.33%	5
No	16.67%	1
If no, where does it belong?		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 10:16 AM	4	

Q84. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	16.67%	1
No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 10:16 AM	4.16	

Q85. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

Put in Charge 4	**Recommendation:**	Reporting frequency of water levels and actions taken by water utilities should be increased to weekly during a drought	**Findings:**	Data reporting from water utilities in 2016-2017 generally met regulatory requirements, but timing of reporting was not adequate for timely decisions by the IDW

Q86. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		4
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags

1	Sep 29 2020 08:57 AM	Thought that was happening already at DPH
2	Sep 28 2020 10:23 AM	This is currently done.
3	Sep 25 2020 04:31 PM	However, there may be a cost to this
4	Sep 25 2020 04:10 PM	already done

Q87. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	50.00%	3
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:23 PM	Did DPH not have timely data or IDW? These data are more important for DPH.	
2	Sep 28 2020 10:23 AM	Most utilities reported weekly in 2016 drought	

Q88. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	50.00%	3
No	50.00%	3
If no, where does it belong?		3
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 02:42 PM	4	
2	Sep 30 2020 05:23 PM	4	
3	Sep 28 2020 10:23 AM	4	

Q89. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q90. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**

Skipped	**6**

2.07	**Recommendation:**	The required authorities to implement the plan would need to be identified and a significant effort would be needed to draft statutory language and be enacted if the authorities were part of the statute to establish the IDW.	**Findings:**	If the State Drought Plan and the IDW are authorized in statute, it would still rely on the authorities of the agencies that make up the group to enact the different aspects of the drought plan.

Q91. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	33.33%	2
Neither agree n	50.00%	3
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 02:43 PM	I don't believe that all actions of the State need to be set in statute.	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:57 AM	Don't understand this one. Not a clear recommendation. Authority ti implement plan currently under Water Planning Council. Agree that significant effort would be needed to statutorily authorize IDW.	

Q92. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	33.33%	2
Neither agree n	66.67%	4
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q93. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q94. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses

Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q95. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

2.08	**Recommendation:**	The agencies that make up the IDW have a mandate and an obligation to follow while implementing the drought plan without any real consideration to the politics of such actions. Their actions are to enforce their regulations, protect public health and the environment and to ensure an adequate supply of safe drinking water.	**Findings:**	If the IDW was to be authorized by statute, there is a concern that the make-up of the group would include political entities whose mandate and responsibilities are not that of the agencies and may contradict the regulatory requirements of each agency creating conflicts.

Q96. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	33.33%	2
Neither agree n	66.67%	4
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		4
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:27 PM	I need more detail on the recommendation	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:57 AM	Agree in theory, but in reality, it's impossible to divorce IDW and politics should it happen.	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:33 PM	Not sure what is being recommended?	
4	Sep 25 2020 04:12 PM	this is not a recommendation	

Q97. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	16.67%	1
Neither agree n	50.00%	3
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		4
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags

1	Oct 02 2020 02:46 PM	I don't think we talked about the political makeup of the group. I do share some of the concerns. Not sure I understand the need for that action of the IDW to be codified in statute.
2	Sep 30 2020 05:27 PM	It seems like the IDW could be authorized by statute without changing its membership.
3	Sep 29 2020 08:57 AM	Not aware of this concern to date
4	Sep 25 2020 04:33 PM	Possibly true, but not reviewed by workgroup

Q98. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q99. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q100. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

2.09	**Recommendation:**	Codify the Interagency Drought Workgroup. But take care not to make the official membership too prescriptive as the need to expertise and perspectives necessary to make informed decisions about drought conditions may change.	**Findings:**	Since the development of the final report of the State Drought Plan was developed, the Water Planning Council has adopted the plan. The focus should be on codifying the Interagency Drought Workgroup. There are many benefits, particularly in the realm of accountability and the public's access to information and decision making around drought management. From the accountability standpoint, one of the findings of the workgroup's review of the 2016-2017 drought was that the group went months without meeting even as conditions deteriorated. In addition, decisions were made during an IDWG meeting but were not carried out when decisions were overridden by the Governor. From the standpoint of the public tracking actions of the IDWG, there would be no explanation or reason behind the decision change.

Q101. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 02:49 PM	Don't see the reason for codifying this activity. The WPC was created to oversee water planning in the State. I believe that they have the authority to put together a guidance document to oversee the IWD, perhaps as part of a Drought Preparedness Plan.	
2	Sep 30 2020 05:28 PM	I don't understand the implications of codifying the group.	

Q102. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q103. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6

No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q104. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q105. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

2.10	**Recommendation:**	Further discussion needs to be had about the need to legislate the State Drought Plan. It is my own personal opinion that the document itself should only need the blessing of the WPC has it should remain dynamic as we learn lessons from each successive drought.	**Findings:**	Since the development of the final report of the State Drought Plan was developed, the Water Planning Council has adopted the plan. The focus should be on codifying the Interagency Drought Workgroup. There are many benefits, particularly in the realm of accountability and the public's access to information and decision making around drought management. From the accountability standpoint, one of the findings of the workgroup's review of the 2016-2017 drought was that the group went months without meeting even as conditions deteriorated. In addition, decisions were made during an IDWG meeting but were not carried out when decisions were overridden by the Governor. From the standpoint of the public tracking actions of the IDWG, there would be no explanation or reason behind the decision change.

Q106. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags

1	Sep 30 2020 05:30 PM	Is further discussion needed? By who?
2	Sep 25 2020 04:35 PM	Legislation does not necessarily mean that the WPC would not have a role overseeing the drought plan

Q107. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q108. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q109. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q110. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

2.11	**Recommendation:**	IDWG meeting minutes should include the status of each defining criteria either as an attachment of reports submitted for consideration or in the heading of each criteria category in the minutes.	**Findings:**	Since the development of the final report of the State Drought Plan was developed, the Water Planning Council has adopted the plan. The focus should be on codifying the Interagency Drought Workgroup. There are many benefits, particularly in the realm of accountability and the public's access to information and decision making around drought management. From the accountability standpoint, one of the findings of the workgroup's review of the 2016-2017 drought was that the group went months without meeting even as conditions deteriorated. In addition, decisions were made during an IDWG meeting but were not carried out when decisions were overridden by the Governor. From the standpoint of the public tracking actions of the IDWG, there would be no explanation or reason behind the decision change.

Q111. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:58 AM	IDW has done this already to a large extent	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:14 PM	already done	

Q112. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q113. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	66.67%	4
No	33.33%	2
If no, where does it belong?		3
Answered		**6**

Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:31 PM	could also relate to 1 or 4	
2	Sep 28 2020 10:30 AM	4	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:37 PM	4	

Q114. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	16.67%	1
No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 25 2020 04:37 PM	4.07	

Q115. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

2.12	**Recommendation:**	Consider that the responsibilities of the Interagency Drought Workgroup (IDW), will be delegated to one office/agency or maybe one authority.	**Findings:**	It is not enough that different agencies have reported below normal conditions and their was no action taken.

Q116. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	16.67%	1
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	66.67%	4
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:32 PM	Is the suggestion that the IDW only be represented by one agency or that their be one lead agency?	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:39 PM	The different agencies bring different perspectives and expertise.	

Q117. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	0.00%	0

Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	66.67%	4
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:32 PM	More explanation needed.	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:39 PM	Needs to be re-worded - agencies reached decisions that governor's office did not support	

Q118. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q119. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Q120. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

2.13	**Recommendation:**	Non-essential water use and or different water use should be prioritized or redifined.	**Findings:**	

Q121. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	0.00%	0
Neither agree n	83.33%	5
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		4
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:33 PM	More explanation needed	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:58 AM	Don't fully understand this one	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:39 PM	Not reviewed by workgroup	
4	Sep 25 2020 04:17 PM	don't understand question	

Q122. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	0.00%	0
Neither agree n	80.00%	4
Disagree	20.00%	1
Comment		1
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 25 2020 04:39 PM	No supporting finding	

Q123. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	50.00%	3
No	50.00%	3
If no, where does it belong?		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 10:32 AM	Possibly 4, not sure it address any of the categories	

Q124. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Q125. Additional comments.

Answered	**1**
Skipped	**5**

Respondents	Response Date	Responses	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 02:53 PM	Not sure where this fits.	

2.14	**Recommendation:**	Declaration of drought should not be political	**Findings:**	ref above, row 54; comparing to response to Covid: the difference between having politicians giving instructions and guideness vs. CDC and public health officials.

Q126. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 25 2020 04:42 PM	Declaration will always be at least somewhat political.	

Q127. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	50.00%	3
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:58 AM	Not really a finding	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:42 PM	Agree with the comparison, but finding should point to a specific drought related political decision by the IDW or the governor	

Q128. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	83.33%	5
No	16.67%	1
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q129. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses

Yes	20.00%	1
No	80.00%	4
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 10:33 AM	2.08	

Q130. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

3.01	**Recommendation:**	Public water suppliers should have the authority to implement and enforce water use restrictions on their customers in accordance with their approved drought response plans wihtout the need for enacting ordinances in each municipality served..	**Findings:**	Requiring water suppliers to get approval from one or multiple municipal boards before implementing drought restrictions can cause delay and inconsistent response

Q131. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		3
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:00 PM	It think we need a bigger discussion on this issue. Municipalities should not rely solely on water utilities to protect water supplies during drought. And given that fact that often water utility watersheds often do not serve customers in the watershed is important.	
2	Sep 28 2020 10:39 AM	I agree with the premise but the only authority is for PURA regulated systems using a PURA regulation that allows for shutting off a customers water. Other PWS do not have that authority and must rely on their parternership with the municipality. Municipalities may not have that authority without an ordinance.to enforce water restrictions.	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:43 PM	Generally agree, although some water utils may prefer or need to rely on towns to enforce	

Q132. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses

Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		3
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:00 PM	Water utilities need to work with local and state authorities, the Drought plan could give better guidance on this.	
2	Sep 28 2020 10:39 AM	I agree but that is not the reality and an ordinance at the local level is the best path forward at this time.	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:43 PM	Generally agree, but workgroup did not cover, and no specific examples reviewed	

Q133. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q134. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	16.67%	1
No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:00 PM	3.02	

Q135. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

3.02	**Recommendation:**	The IDW should work with all municipalities to adopt water use ordinances to implement restrictions for all users in response to each phase of IDW declared droughts. PWS could use the same restrictions for each phase of their drought plans.	**Findings:**	IDW drought declarations should result in water use restrictions for all users in the region

Q136. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		2
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:58 AM	IDW's charge is to implement drought plan and act as a technical arm of the WPC, not to get involved in policy matters per se	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:45 PM	Generally agree, but need to address multi-town utils, and who is in charge (water util or several indiv towns) - could be a nightmare to enforce	

Q137. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		3
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:01 PM	Generally agree	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:58 AM	Not necessarily all users. Need to be discerning in application of restrictions based on rational	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:45 PM	Sentiment is correct, but not a finding of our work	

Q138. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Q139. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	33.33%	2

No	66.67%	4
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:01 PM	3.01	
2	Sep 28 2020 10:44 AM	3.03 and 3.05	

Q140. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

3.03	**Recommendation:**	A new set of model ordinances should be developed to better fit the towns. There are many different scenarios in a town regarding water supplies and model ordinances should be developed to meet the different set of conditions. A task force should be convened to develop model ordinances for the different town/water supply configurations.	**Findings:**	The model ordinance provided in the drought plan is inadequate.

Q141. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:36 PM	more explanation needed.	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:47 PM	We are the task force - at a minimum, we should develop recommendations for changes to present to the WPC	

Q142. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags

1	Sep 29 2020 08:58 AM	Could always be improved
2	Sep 25 2020 04:47 PM	Strengthen finding with stats of number of towns that have adopted/used

Q143. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q144. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	33.33%	2
No	66.67%	4
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:02 PM	3.01 and 3.02 could be discussed with 3.03	
2	Sep 28 2020 10:44 AM	3.02 and 3.05	

Q145. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

3.04	**Recommendation:**	The WPC/IDW are currently finalizing the initial list of water coordinators. Each town will have a water coordinator to help facilitate communications between each of the responsible entities to aid in the messaging for water restrictions among other drought coordination efforts.	**Findings:**	Indentification of each town's water coordinator needs to be completed.

Q146. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		3
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags

		to be a recommendation we should change "are currently
1	Sep 30 2020 05:37 PM	finalizing" to "should develop"
2	Sep 29 2020 08:58 AM	This is not a recommendation
3	Sep 25 2020 04:20 PM	this is not a recommendation

Q147. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q148. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	50.00%	3
No	50.00%	3
If no, where does it belong?		3
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:02 PM	4	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:58 AM	2	
3	Sep 28 2020 10:45 AM	4	

Q149. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 10:45 AM	Not sure	

Q150. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

3.05	**Recommendation:**	Revisit municipal ordinance	**Findings:**	This has still not been widely adopted. And doesn't include wells. Need to revisit how it fits into Hazard Mitigation Planning.

Q151. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 25 2020 04:48 PM	We are charged with doing this now.	

Q152. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Q153. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Q154. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	50.00%	3
No	50.00%	3
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		3
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:04 PM	3.01 3.02 & 3.04	

2	Sep 29 2020 08:59 AM	3.03
3	Sep 28 2020 10:45 AM	3.02 and 3.03

Q155. Additional comments.

Answered **1**
Skipped **5**

Respondents	Response Date	Responses	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:04 PM	All comments on the drought ordinance should be brought together for a subcommittee to explore	

4.01	**Recommendation:**	Identify/demarcate drought regions for the state in the Drought Plan and analyze data on a regional basis (recommend counties as this has been a precedent)	**Findings:**	Droughts can occur locally/regionally and the Drought Plan, although offering the ability for the IDW to declare drought on a regional basis, makes no attempt to define regions and to specify which data should be analyzed regionally

Q156. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:59 AM	This is currently being done for current drought actions	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:21 PM	current practice	

Q157. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 10:46 AM	IDW is currently reviewing and declaring droughts on a regional basis.	

Q158. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	83.33%	5

No	16.67%		1
If no, where does it belong?			1
	Answered		**6**
	Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 25 2020 04:48 PM	2	

Q159. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Q160. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.02	**Recommendation:**	Need to maintain a record of data analysis/drought status for each IDW meeting, in order to provide a record and context for the meeting minutes and any decisions that were made	**Findings:**	Difficult to acertain historical conditions from reading minutes alone

Q161. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:59 AM	This is now being done for current drought action	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:21 PM	current practice	

Q162. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0

Comment		0
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Q163. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Q164. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	33.33%	2
No	66.67%	4
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		2
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:10 PM	4.07	
2	Sep 28 2020 10:52 AM	4.07, 4.09, and 4.13	

Q165. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.03	**Recommendation:**	Make sure plan has a focus on mitigation not just response by focusing on statewide water conservation, especially outdoor water use. Hazard Mitigation Planning isn't only about response but mitigation and resiliency.	**Findings:**	Part of the successful response to the 2016-17 drought was to adopt outdoor water restrictions and keep them in place to be pro-active about drough preparedness. The current plan still looks at only the response to an emergency and not mitigating for the emergency.

Q166. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		4
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:42 PM	From a public water supply perspective is requiring a larger margin of safety (in some circumstances) the goal of conservation as a mitigation measure? If so, should it be stated more directly??	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:59 AM	Don't understand this recommendation	
3	Sep 28 2020 10:58 AM	It is the drought response plan. I agree with the need for hazard mitigation planning but this plan and the IDW are not necesarily the best place to do this type of planning. We could make a recommendation that this effort be taken up by the WPC or at other State body or taskforce.	
4	Sep 25 2020 04:49 PM	Mitigation is important, but should not be part of the drought plan	

Q167. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:59 AM	Don't understand	
2	Sep 28 2020 10:58 AM	I agree that the plan focuses on the response and not mitigation. That is the purpose of the plan. Mitigation should be worked on but not in this plan or the IDW.	

Q168. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q169. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**

Skipped	**0**

Q170. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.04	**Recommendation:**	Make sure private wells are part of the decision making process for the preparing for and responding to droughts. Determine IDW role supporting local government with wells and making sure that communication is not just directed by water utilitlies.	**Findings:**	For the most part, water utilities take the lead on drought management under direction of DPH. But they don't address private wells. Interestingly, most source water areas and publc water supply reservoirs are in areas where people are served by wells. Unless state or local government steps in, no one is looking at the groundwater.

Q171. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		4
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Check with Charge 3. Private well restrictions needed; additional montioring needed as well?

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:59 AM	This is now being done for current drought action	
2	Sep 28 2020 11:03 AM	It is being looked at currently, but the mechanism for aquiring the private well data has not been well established with each town providing information.	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:51 PM	Recommendation needs to fleshed out - how should IDW make private wells part of process? What data should they review, or are additional measuring tools needed?	
4	Sep 25 2020 04:23 PM	current practice	

Q172. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags

1	Sep 28 2020 11:03 AM	I do think private wells are being considered. However, homeowners should be paying attention to conditions and adjusting their water use appropriately. Water utilities serve the large majority of the people in the state and should have an appropriate voice.	

Q173. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q174. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q175. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.05	**Recommendation:**	The IDW should better define the relationship between State and public water supply drought preparedness and response and its role in both. This should include goals for response to each drought phase.	**Findings:**	The IDW, with OPM as the lead agency, is the appropriate group to manage the State's drought preparedness and response and the DPH is the appropriate agency to manage public water supply drought preparedness and response

Q176. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Expand finding to indicate the problem with the above relationship

Confusion between PWS drought planning and state drought planning

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags

1	Sep 28 2020 11:10 AM	The current drought plan tries to better defien the roles. PWs have their responsibilities and the State has its own. The current drought plan attempts to bring in the utilites to better share and coordinate messaging. However, utilities will still put out their own message even if it is contrary to the State's message. There is no way to stop that.

Q177. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 25 2020 04:52 PM	Not supported by our work to-date	

Q178. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	5
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Q179. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Q180. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.06	**Recommendation:**	DPH should require public water suppliers to demonstrate the effectiveness of their drought response plans (this may be difficult for groundwater systems)	**Findings:**	The 2016 drought had significant public water supply risk that would/should not be managed throught the IDW

Q181. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Additional documentation of PWS drought management issues in 2016 needed
After action review of drought plan needed PWS and IDW
Are regulatory PWS drought demand cutbacks realistic?

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 11:14 AM	Not sure hoe this is feasible. You don't know if it effective until you use it. DPH can review and make recommendations but in the end it is the PWS's drought plan.	

Q182. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	33.33%	2
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		2
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 11:14 AM	PWS are responsible for their own management of their water supplies.	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:52 PM	Finding should be changed to note specific issues with some PWS	

Q183. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	83.33%	5
No	16.67%	1
If no, where does it belong?		1
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 25 2020 04:52 PM	2	

Q184. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses

Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q185. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.07	**Recommendation:**	IDW meeting minutes should include copies of all indicators and records reviewed.	**Findings:**	IDW meeting records do not include sufficient information to document the rationale for decisions reached and actions taken.

Q186. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Note IDW proactive addressing this

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:59 AM	This is now being done for current drought action	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:25 PM	current practice	

Q187. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:59 AM	This is now being done for current drought action	

Q188. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		1

Answered	**6**
Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:47 PM	maybe 1?	

Q189. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	50.00%	3
No	50.00%	3
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		3
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:10 PM	4.02	
2	Sep 30 2020 05:47 PM	1.10	
3	Sep 28 2020 11:16 AM	4.02 and 4.13	

Q190. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.08	**Recommendation:**	A single member of the IDW should be charged with drafting of public drought messages.	**Findings:**	IDW procedures for public communication of drought stages are inconsistent

Q191. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	16.67%	1
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	50.00%	3
Comment		3
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Templates should be drafted

Procedures for communications (timing and responsibility) defined

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:11 PM	I procedures should be consistent but not if one agency needs to do it. It could be rotated following protocol.	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:59 AM	There are others in state government more adept at crafting public drought messages. IDW has been reviewing and commenting on all press releases	
3	Sep 28 2020 11:18 AM	Many different perspectives makes a better document.	

Q192. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses

Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:59 AM	Getting better though!	
2	Sep 28 2020 11:18 AM	Better coordination in communications should be done and it would help if there were established templates to work from.	

Q193. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q194. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	16.67%	1
No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 11:18 AM	4.21	

Q195. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.09	**Recommendation:**	The rationale for decisons taken by the Governor's office, when contrary to IDW recommendations, should be officially documented by the IDW	**Findings:**	IDW procedures for public communication of drought stages are inconsistent

Q196. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0

Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Q197. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:59 AM	Getting better though!	

Q198. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Q199. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Q200. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.10	**Recommendation:**	The IDW should consider adopting winter drought triggers	**Findings:**	Current drought plan indicators may not be appropriate for decisions during a winter drought

Q201. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:51 PM	How would they be different? Can we use the same indicators but allow IDW to apply judgement to which are most seasonally appropriate or if any other information should be considered in a specific drought.	
2	Sep 28 2020 11:20 AM	The current drought criteria can be evaluated for winter droughts. The IDW should evaluate the criteria while keeping in mind specific conditions in winter.	

Q202. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:51 PM	Is the issue more about response actions or triggers?	

Q203. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	83.33%	5
No	16.67%	1
If no, where does it belong?		0
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Q204. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
	Answered	**6**

Skipped	**0**

Q205. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.11	**Recommendation:**	IDW meetings should be scheduled on a regular basis even when not in drought conditions.	**Findings:**	IDW meetings not held regularly

Q206. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q207. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q208. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	5
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Q209. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	66.67%	4
No	33.33%	2
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		3

Answered	**6**
Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:13 PM	Similar in section 1	
2	Sep 29 2020 08:59 AM	2.02	
3	Sep 28 2020 11:22 AM	2.02	

Q210. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.12	**Recommendation:**	Records should be kept and drafted even when a meeting is not held but email conversations were used to implement actions or make decisions.	**Findings:**	Meeting minutes, actions, and drought criteria were not taken or provided for all meetings. Records were not kept of decisions that were made via emails instead of actual meetings.

Q211. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Decisions should be documented, not every conversation

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:55 PM	It is too onerous to expect records of all email conversations, but major decisions should be made at meetings.	

Q212. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q213. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0

Answered	**6**
Skipped	**0**

Q214. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	16.67%	1
No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 11:23 AM	4.02, 4.07	

Q215. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.13	**Recommendation:**	Regular drought criteria summaries should be provided, distributed, and evaluated on a regular basis.	**Findings:**	Meeting minutes, actions, and drought criteria were not taken or provided for all meetings.

Q216. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

IDW proactively addressed

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 25 2020 04:29 PM	current prqctice	

Q217. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q218. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q219. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	50.00%	3
No	50.00%	3
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		3
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 08:59 AM	4.02	
2	Sep 28 2020 11:24 AM	4.02, 4.07, 4.12	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:55 PM	4.02	

Q220. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.14	**Recommendation:**	Although OPM is the lead agency for the IDW, there is a need to have one person responsible for the coordination of the IDW and state drought plan implementation.	**Findings:**	Without this lead person, preparation efforts and drought stage actions may not be carried out in a timely fashion. The drought plan has significant actions and preparations for each stage and those efforts and actions need a motivated passionate person to ensure these actions are completed.

Q221. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

OPM appropriate lead agency

OPM should designate position in charge of IDW

Lead person should be involved in the process as career staff (vs political staff)

This should be "codified", is current practice, but could change

Could be added to job description

OPM may need additional hydrologic staff

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	Need has been met - Current leader is OPM Undersecretary Heft	

2	Sep 25 2020 04:29 PM	currently opm undersecretary heft

Q222. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 25 2020 04:56 PM	Should be modified to note specific problems in 2016 with no lead	

Q223. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	83.33%	5
No	16.67%	1
If no, where does it belong?		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	2	

Q224. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	33.33%	2
No	66.67%	4
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:57 PM	2.03	
2	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	2.03	

Q225. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.15	**Recommendation:**	Members and alternates should be determined who have the authority to make decisions for their agency or branch and can regularly attend meetings.	**Findings:**	The IDW membership can be unstable.

Q226. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

The IDW membership can be inconsistent
Should be written in plan, and updated periodically

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	Current IDW practice	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:30 PM	current practice	

Q227. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		3
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	Currently stable	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:56 PM	Finding should be modifed to note specifics of inconsistent attendance in 2016	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:30 PM	not currently	

Q228. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Q229. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	33.33%	2

No	66.67%	4
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 05:58 PM	2.04	
2	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	2.04	

Q230. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.16	**Recommendation:**	Communication documents and messaging templates should be developed and maintained prior to a drought. Communication strategies should also be developed that looks towards uniform messages for a town, water system, or region.	**Findings:**	Communications/messaging were an issue and remain and issue.

Q231. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	100.00%	6
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q232. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 25 2020 04:57 PM	Finding should be modified to note specifics in 2016	

Q233. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0

If no, where does it belong?	0
Answered	**6**
Skipped	**0**

Q234. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	16.67%	1
No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 11:26 AM	4.04, 4.21	

Q235. Additional comments.

Answered	**1**
Skipped	**5**

Respondents	Response Date	Responses	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:15 PM	Perhaps should look at all communication recommendations together	

4.17	**Recommendation:**	The IDW should convene a larger group of local government organizations such as the COGS and regional water suppliers such as the 3 WUCCs to establish communications and ascertain local/regional conditions.	**Findings:**	The IDW may not have all of the necessary information it may need to make informed decisions on a regional or local level.

Q236. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses		
Agree	50.00%	3	Change recommendation, focus on more data needed: stream gaging, wells
Neither agree n	50.00%	3	USGS may be able to give an opinion on data source improvements
Disagree	0.00%	0	
Comment		5	
Answered		**6**	
Skipped		**0**	

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:16 PM	Not sure this is the solution to the finding	
2	Sep 30 2020 06:00 PM	could be helpful in planning/mitigation but too cumbersome for drought monitoring and response.	
3	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	This was the idea behind the Task Force activated at higher drought levels in previous drought plan	

4	Sep 25 2020 04:58 PM	Not sure more members is the way to address the finding. More measurements, and dedicated staff focused on the task may be a better way to improve.
5	Sep 25 2020 04:31 PM	only at higher drought stages

Q237. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q238. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	80.00%	4
No	20.00%	1
If no, where does it belong?		1
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	2	

Q239. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q240. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.18	**Recommendation:**	The IDW should regularly review and evaluate drought criteria on a regional or localized level instead of the statewide level.	**Findings:**	Drought has been evaluated at a state wide level and not usually at local level.

Q241. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		3
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Local/regional level lacking?
Regional being looked at today to a greater extent

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	This is now being done for current drought action	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:59 PM	Recommendation should be changed to address limits in local/regional data	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:32 PM	current practice	

Q242. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		1
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 06:01 PM	Local is too small Regional is appropriate and called for in the current Plan	

Q243. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Q244. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	33.33%	2
No	66.67%	4
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		2
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	1.07, 4.01	
2	Sep 28 2020 11:29 AM	4.01	

Q245. Additional comments.

Answered	**1**
Skipped	**5**

Respondents	Response Date	Responses	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:17 PM	This is in the new drought plan and needs to be reinforced	

4.19	**Recommendation:**	The IDW should participate and advise the Governor's Council on Climate Change (GC3).	**Findings:**	The Governor's Council on Climate Change (GC3) is determining action items regarding climate change and drought resiliency as part of their effort.

Q246. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
		Not only the IDW but we need to understand how the State	
1	Oct 02 2020 03:20 PM	Water Plan fits into the GC3 planning effort	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:59 PM	Not covered by our work	

Q247. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 25 2020 04:59 PM	Not covered by our work	

Q248. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	80.00%	4

No	20.00%	1
If no, where does it belong?		1
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	Not sure, 2? Pretty sure this council wasn't around in 2016.	

Q249. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q250. Additional comments.

Answered	**1**
Skipped	**5**

Respondents	Response Date	Responses	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:20 PM	Drought planning needs to be part of the GC3 and need to be fully understood by the GC3 in terms of resililiency.	

4.20	**Recommendation:**	Make sure private wells are part of the decision-making process.	**Findings:**	There really is no focus on groundwater wells. Although there is a groundwater metric, it does not translate into how to deal with private wells

Q251. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		3
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	This is now being done for current drought action	
2	Sep 25 2020 05:00 PM	Recommendation should be expanded to include how they should be monitored, who will do it	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:33 PM	current practice	

Similar to 4.04

Private well data lacking

Change "groundwater wells" in finding to "private wells" first sentence

IDW could reach out to private well towns based on streamflow data

IDW this year obtained new well data from health districts, but not part of current plan or regs

Q252. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q253. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q254. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	33.33%	2
No	66.67%	4
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	4.04	
2	Sep 28 2020 11:29 AM	4.04	

Q255. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.21	**Recommendation:**	Review IDW communications process and interactions with munis and utilities. Does it make sense? Does it go both ways or is it top heavy?	**Findings:**	Most of communications of IDW were one way. During true emergencies, communications go both ways. Although plan calls for a liaison with Towns, it is unclear in plan what is expected. Similarly, what is relationship with water utilties and IDW from a communications perspective.

Q256. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses

Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	cuurently being addressed by Drought Action Team	
2	Sep 25 2020 05:02 PM	We have established that communication was an issue; recommendation should include concrete steps to address	

Q257. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 11:31 AM	This may have been the case in 2016, but the current plan focuses on two-way communication.	
2	Sep 25 2020 04:33 PM	under development	

Q258. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	83.33%	5
No	16.67%	1
If no, where does it belong?		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	2	

Q259. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	16.67%	1
No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 11:31 AM	4.16, 4.17, 4.24	

Q260. Additional comments.

Answered **0**
Skipped **6**

4.22	**Recommendation:**	Revisit IDW membership? Is there a role for utilities and/or munis?	**Findings:**	Communications has been identified as a problem. Would expanded membership help or can ths be addressed by improving communications

Q261. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses	
Agree	66.67%	4	Consider adding "advisory" non-voting members
Neither agree n	16.67%	1	Need to limit size for functionality, also avoid too many dissenting voices
Disagree	16.67%	1	Unified command structure has helped
Comment		4	Review unified command structure for this finding
Answered		**6**	
Skipped		**0**	

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	This was idea behind Task Force required at higher drought stages under old plan	
2	Sep 28 2020 11:32 AM	I larger group could be established, however the ultimate decision making rests with the IDW and the agencies that make up the group.	
3	Sep 25 2020 05:03 PM	Needs to be expanded - how many utils and munis? How would it work?	
4	Sep 25 2020 04:34 PM	at higher risk levels via Task Force	

Q262. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 06:04 PM	I agree it is a communication issue - as long as the role of the IDW in public water supply drought response is monitoring only.	

Q263. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	83.33%	5
No	16.67%	1
If no, where does it belong?		1
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	2	

Q264. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	40.00%	2
No	60.00%	3
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
	Answered	**5**
	Skipped	**1**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	4.17	

Q265. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.23	**Recommendation:**	Plan should look at how water utilities are setting trigger levels	**Findings:**	During 2016 drought review, discussion ensued about need to look at trigger levels in water supply plans. Is there a standard? Are they using most recent rainfall data. The drought plan doesn't address this. Should it or should it be addressed elsewhere.

Q266. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	16.67%	1
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	83.33%	5
Comment		3
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 06:06 PM	I agree with looking at the issue, but don't think it should be in the Plan.	

2	Sep 28 2020 11:37 AM	Drought triggers are set by the PWS based on their particular system and their operational management. It is also based in regulation. The drought plan cannot account for every individual system and has no authority to apply any conditions on setting PWS triggers.
3	Sep 25 2020 05:04 PM	PWS trigger levels may need revisiting, but this should be done thru water supply plan process

Q267. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	20.00%	1
Neither agree n	40.00%	2
Disagree	40.00%	2
Comment		4
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 06:06 PM	I agree with addressing it elsewhere - in Water Supply Plans.	
2	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	This should be done outside of IDW at DPH probably	
3	Sep 28 2020 11:37 AM	The PWS should review their drought stage triggers continuously after each drought to determine if they were effective. The drought plan is not the conduit for this effort nor does it have the authority to do so.	
4	Sep 25 2020 04:35 PM	not a finding. but answer is it should be addressed elsewhere	

Q268. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	5
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Q269. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	16.67%	1
No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 06:06 PM	1.01	

Q270. Additional comments.

Answered **0**
Skipped **6**

4.24	**Recommendation:**	Drought plan needs to establish an "action team" or "task force" beginning at Stage 2 or 3 that is set up outside the IDW specifically to coordinate and implement mitigation actions and public communications as recommended by the plan	**Findings:**	There was a lack of coordination during the 2016 drought

Q271. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		3
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Similar to 4.22

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:23 PM	Not sure if new teams are needed or just a better determination of what each agency is doing	
2	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	This was included in old plan	
3	Sep 28 2020 11:39 AM	I am not sure that adding another layer to this effort will have the intended outcome. Another layer of authority and communication does not add in the effort.	

Q272. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	33.33%	2
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	always could be better	
2	Sep 25 2020 05:04 PM	Expand, lack of coordination between munis and IDW?	

Q273. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	6
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q274. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	16.67%	1
No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	4.17	

Q275. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

4.25	**Recommendation:**	Drought plan should be broken into two modes: flash (short-term) drought response, and long-term drought response. Currently, the plan puts equal weight on long-term and short-term indicators for both types of drought. During flash or short-term droughts, short-term indicators such as soil moisture are reflective of conditions but long term indicators (groundwater, streamflow, precip, reservoirs) are not. The reverse is often true when dealing with long-term droughts. Response to flash drought and long-term drought often needs to be different.	**Findings:**	Drought indicators are a mix of long-term and short-term. Indicators when considered all togteher equally can paint a confusing picture of the situation.

Q276. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	16.67%	1
Neither agree n	50.00%	3
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		5
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags

Respondents	Response Date	Comment
1	Sep 30 2020 06:08 PM	Can this be handled by how the IDW interprets the data in deciding when to declare a drought stage?
2	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	Should discuss flash drought concept further. Droughts need to be persistant and long term to deserve response. Short-term or flash droughts may dissipate without significant effect.
3	Sep 28 2020 11:42 AM	The criteria are evaluated with the knowledge that the drought may be a short or long-term drought.
4	Sep 25 2020 05:05 PM	Generally agree, but think this needs to be expanded with specific thoughts that IDW could adopt
5	Sep 25 2020 04:38 PM	plan should more fully address implication of flash drought though

Q277. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		3
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	IDW has the professional judgement to split out indicators and focus on them when needed	
2	Sep 28 2020 11:42 AM	There is currently effort made to evaluate the criteria when the indicator show a short or long-term drought is happening.	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:38 PM	professional judgement can tease them apart	

Q278. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	66.67%	4
No	33.33%	2
If no, where does it belong?		1
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	2	

Q279. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0

No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q280. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

Other 1	**Recommendation:**	Consider a plan for hydrologic drought and a plan for agricultural drought	**Findings:**	Both types of drought can happen simultaneously or one at a time. Plan needs to have the flexibility to distinguish and respond appropriately for the type of impact being felt.

Q281. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	33.33%	2
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	50.00%	3
Comment		3
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

2020 drought was flashy

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 11:44 AM	The plan talks about both. Multiple plans add a level of complexity that will not be helpful. Evaluations are done with these types of drought in mind.	
2	Sep 25 2020 05:06 PM	Agree, but recommendation needs more specifics	
3	Sep 25 2020 04:39 PM	professional judgement can account for both under current plan	

Q282. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 11:44 AM	I think the current plan takes these into account. Perhaps more refinement is needed vs a whole new plan for each.	

Q283. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	5
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Q284. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	16.67%	1
No	83.33%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q285. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

Other 2	**Recommendation:**	How does Drought Plan relate to Demand Emergencies?	**Findings:**	The ongoing drought in 2020 , during which this review is taking place exposed the fact that there are times when demand exceeds utilties abiility to produce water, even if reservoirs are OK. Should drought plan address demand side or just supply side water emergencies especially when they overlap. If we see excessive demand in public utilties, how does that impact wells?

Q286. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	16.67%	1
Neither agree n	50.00%	3
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		4
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 06:11 PM	High demand is different than drought and the IDW does not need to be involved.	
2	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	This is not a recommendation.	
3	Sep 28 2020 11:52 AM	Should it when it is not related to drought?	
4	Sep 25 2020 04:42 PM	not a recommendation	

Q287. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	16.67%	1
Neither agree n	50.00%	3
Disagree	33.33%	2
Comment		4
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	Plan already addresses demand issues	
2	Sep 28 2020 11:52 AM	In a time of well above average demands, it is up to the PWS to increase messaging and put in place restrictions to lower demands. The State through DPH can make those recommendations but it is up to the utility to lower demands .	
3	Sep 25 2020 05:08 PM	No consensus on what is excessive demand, in some cases transmission issues may be due to inadeqaute pipe or pumps. Best handled by PWS water supply plan	
4	Sep 25 2020 04:42 PM	Not a finding, but answer is plan not appropriate venue to consider utilities ability to produce water	

Q288. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	100.00%	5
No	0.00%	0
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Q289. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Q290. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

Other 3	**Recommendation:**	General recommendations on Drought and public engagement on water management issues Implement a public process for portions of a utility's emergency response plan that will allow the public to weigh in on equity issues that may arise when water becomes scarce due to drought conditions.	**Findings:**	The general public has the right to know what the drought triggers are for their water supply. Who must reduce and when. This information should be available in a public domain. Furthermore, the public should have the right to comment and weigh in on elements of an emergency or drought response plan that would impact availability of water to ensure that equity is given due consideration. In addition, this may foster better compliance with water use restrictions as the public will be better educated as to the content and necessary actions to continue service during an emergency.

Q291. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	50.00%	3
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		4
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 06:14 PM	Public input is not needed on trigger setting.	
2	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	I beleive some utilities have there drought plans available publicly, but probably could do better re public participation in formulation of thier plan.	
3	Sep 28 2020 11:56 AM	I am not sure public participation would provide a better PWS emergency response plan.	
4	Sep 25 2020 05:10 PM	Agree with concept, but not really part of IDW. Should be considered as part of PWS water supply plan process	

Q292. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	66.67%	4
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	16.67%	1
Comment		2
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 11:56 AM	I am not sure public engagement in the plan drafting process would help in the public by in of water restrictions.	
2	Sep 25 2020 05:10 PM	As drafted, this is an opinion, not a finding backed by any of our work	

Q293. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses	
Yes	83.33%		5
No	16.67%		1
If no, where does it belong?			0
	Answered		**6**
	Skipped		**0**

Q294. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses	
Yes	0.00%		0
No	100.00%		6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)			0
	Answered		**6**
	Skipped		**0**

Q295. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

Other 4	**Recommendation:**	General recommendations on Drought and public engagement on water management issues Implement a public process for portions of a utility's emergency response plan that will allow the public to weigh in on equity issues that may arise when water becomes scarce due to drought conditions.	**Findings:**	While the majority of utilities and providers follow their emergency response plans closely, there remains a financial incentive (or perhaps political incentives) to delay actions to respond to drought conditions when triggers are reached.

Q296. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses	
Agree	20.00%		1
Neither agree n	40.00%		2
Disagree	40.00%		2
Comment			4
	Answered		**5**
	Skipped		**1**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 06:16 PM	The recommendation does not address the finding.	
2	Sep 28 2020 11:57 AM	See previous comments on Other 3	
3	Sep 25 2020 05:11 PM	Should be considered as part of the water supply plan process. Also needs to be expanded to consider why their is a finanical component, and how to mitigate that.	

4	Sep 25 2020 04:43 PM	not a recommendation

Q297. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	100.00%	4
Neither agree n	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**4**
Skipped		**2**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 06:16 PM	Similar to conservation, this is no longer true for privates.	
2	Sep 28 2020 11:57 AM	See previous comments on Other 3	

Q298. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	80.00%	4
No	20.00%	1
If no, where does it belong?		0
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Q299. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	5
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		1
Answered		**5**
Skipped		**1**

Respondents	Response Date	If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 11:57 AM	Other 3	

Q300. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

5.00	**Recommendation:**	IDW – need to have stable membership especially during a drought. Membership should be expanded. Codify the role the DEMHS plays especially helpful with state contac	**Findings:**	During 2016 drought, membership was unstable and attendance at meetings inconsistent. DEMHS didn't play a role. This is changing but needs to be codified as to roles of each agency .

Q301. Do you agree with this recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	50.00%	3
Neither agree n	50.00%	3
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		4
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 30 2020 06:16 PM	Not sure about role of DEMHS This was the idea behind task force in old plan which was to take
2	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	over plan implementation during higher drought stages.
3	Sep 25 2020 05:12 PM	Agree with stable membership, disagree with remainder
4	Sep 25 2020 04:45 PM	agree membership should be stable, could consider expansion, agree DEMHS role should be codified

Q302. Do you agree with the finding?

Answer Choices		Responses
Agree	83.33%	5
Neither agree n	16.67%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	Comment	Tags
1	Sep 28 2020 11:58 AM	DEMHS currently has a role but it does not need any further statute.

Q303. Is this placed in the right category (1,2,3,4,)?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	33.33%	2
No	66.67%	4
If no, where does it belong?		3
	Answered	**6**
	Skipped	**0**

Respondents	Response Date	If no, where does it belong?	Tags
1	Oct 02 2020 03:27 PM	1
2	Sep 29 2020 09:00 AM	2 or 4
3	Sep 25 2020 05:12 PM	2

Q304. Is this a duplicate or similar recommendation?

Answer Choices		Responses
Yes	0.00%	0
No	100.00%	6
If yes, which recommendation (eg 1.01)		0
Answered		**6**
Skipped		**0**

Q305. Additional comments.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**

Q306. Please share any other comments here.

Answered	**0**
Skipped	**6**