

## **Climate Action Report Feedback**

Water Board - 7.20.20

| Recommendation            |                             | Voting           | Comments  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|---|
| Adaptation and Resilience | AR.2) Water<br>Conservation | 4 Do not approve | The Water Board is not in support of the CATF goal because it believes the water conservation goal is unattainable within the stated timeframe without extreme impacts to the residents of Longmont and that this level of conservation is unnecessary given the design of Longmont's raw water system and existing conservation plans. In addition, the Water Board believes analysis of the environmental, economic, and social impacts of extreme conservation measures designed to reach very high levels of demand reduction would need to be determined. The Water Board is concerned about the impact of extreme conservation measures to economic development, water rates (especially for low-income households), the local environment (e.g. trees and parks), local agriculture (e.g. large scale and residential scale), downstream water rights, return flows, and the overall quality of life for Longmont residents.  The Water Board supports evaluating increased water conservation levels beyond current planning levels and has been in support of the Water Efficiency Master Plan and Drought Management Plan that has prepared the community for drought in the past. The City of Longmont has a history of reliable water supply; and since the passing of the first water conservation plan in 1996, has decreased water usage even as the population has increased. During the 2002 drought, the City stayed within a Level 1 drought |

response until August of that year and only went to a Level 2 drought response for a short time. Conversely, other cities had much more serious shortages based upon different water supplies. The City also has already factored in the impacts of climate change into future water supply planning and is basing its water programs to meet future uncertainty and drought.

Evaluation of a more ambitious water conservation and drought response goal, if necessary, will require the City to perform an extensive technical analysis and public input process. This analysis should focus on the impacts of future drought and the environmental, social equity, quality of life, and economic impacts of different proposed solutions.

If City Council votes to pursue a more ambitious water conservation goal, Water Board proposes that staff complete an analysis within 12-18 months of City Council direction. Until then, the City should follow the goals stated in the Water Efficiency Master Plan and Water Supply and Drought Management Plan.

Any other comments?