



REGIONAL WASTEWATER RECLAMATION DEPARTMENT

201 NORTH STONE AVENUE
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701-1207

JACKSON JENKINS
DIRECTOR

PH: (520) 724-6500
FAX: (520) 724-9635

PIMA COUNTY LOCAL DROUGHT IMPACT GROUP

(LDIG)

Wednesday, July 8, 2015

Public Works Building

RECAP

Attendance: Erin Boyle (NWS), Colby Bowser (RWRD), Lilian von Rago (RWRD), Candice Rupprecht (Tucson Water), Mead Mier (PAG), Dylan Huber-Heidorn (PAG), Bill Schock (Santa Cruz Natural Resources Conservation District)

1. Welcome and Introductions -Welcome and Introductions were made
2. Updates
 - a. Recap of May 20, 2015 LDIG meeting
 - b. Drought Status Maps:
 - i. Short Term Map indicates bands of Moderate drought in eastern Pima County, Abnormally Dry in central and no drought in western Pima County. Long Term Map, reflecting January through March conditions and updated in April, shows Moderate drought in both the Santa Cruz and San Simon watersheds, with no drought in eastern Pima County's portion of the Lower Gila watershed.
 - ii. Other conditions were reviewed; improvement from drought maps one year ago, GRACE satellite and vegetation monitoring, wildfire danger rating, Lake Mead and Powell elevation, "Miracle May" weather pattern forestalling drought declaration and projected Mead elevation.
 1. EBoyle discussed stronger El Nino signal and expectations for condition to last through winter and into next year.
 - c. Member Updates:
 - i. CRupprecht discussed declining GPCD trend, outdoor water use has declined from 45% of consumption to 27%.
3. Drought Response Plan Comparison
 - a. MMier and DHuber-Heidorn introduced a PAG effort to document and compare each municipality's drought preparedness plan.
 - b. PAG traditionally does similar comparative analysis of stormwater regulations in order to better inform the public and development community of differing requirements across jurisdictions- this helps a developer fully understand responsibilities for stormwater management.

- c. The drought comparative analysis is part of larger PAG integrated watershed planning; understanding differences in drought planning can help improve outreach and messaging across the region.
 - d. Differences in drought planning range from different terminology for the same stage, surcharges and fines, and voluntary and mandatory actions. The City of Tucson's drought plan differs the most from other plans, likely because of its larger CAP allocation and reliance, and greater availability of detail.
 - e. Invitation has been extended to the region's water providers and jurisdictions for comment. The analysis is being fashioned to provide information to the water providers responsible for drought planning- a catalog of drought planning and conservation effort by jurisdiction to encourage regional discussion and collaboration, and accessible information for the public.
 - f. A full report with findings and recommendations will be presented in several months. One recommendation is greater visibility and availability of information. A water customer may not know what stage a jurisdiction is in or what to expect from the next stage. More visible drought plans and ordinances on each respective website would help.
 - g. BSchock offered priorities for water management: conservation, recharge and well monitoring. From a perspective of the well owner/agriculture sector, more education and outreach is needed. Wells are going dry in his region for the first time in 100 years. Municipals should emphasize well depth, drought triggering should include well depth monitoring. Outreach; water use is ingrained in the long term population, new population has no drought education. Significant problem in his region is well deepening, many are having to increase well depth to sustain water supply.
 - i. Discussion continued on best forum for education and outreach; schools, trade groups, similar forums.
4. Adjournment and next meeting – September 9th.