

## The Nature of Water Conservation Planning: “Water Management Planning”

### Current situation:

- [State law on water conservation planning](#)<sup>1</sup> is fairly weak, but section 2.a.i requires “clearly stated overall *water use reduction goal* and an *implementation plan* for each of the water conservation measures it chooses to use, including a timeline for action and an evaluation process to measure progress” (italics added to highlight 3 key phrases)
- Water conservation is not defined, but we assume it to be an action that will reduce demand of water or increase the efficiency or use of the supply, but not the actual increase of supply
- [DWRe Template for Water Conservation Plans](#)<sup>2</sup> requires only descriptive materials and listings of conservation measures that could be used, less than even the weak requirements of the state law, and water districts and cities follow that template
- This does not result in executable projects (tasks, schedules, responsibilities, budgets) that can be measured to decrease water demand over a defined time period, and it excludes planning required to increase effective supply
- The rather complex synergistic relationship between water suppliers (water districts) and water users (cities and end customers) is not addressed

### What is the nature of the scope - what should the plan cover?

- The term “water conservation” is often focused on reducing supply loss and reducing demand, but these should be considered in the larger scope of managing supply and demand, that is, of “managing water”.
- For water, management of the supply (the full supply chain: wholesaler (water district) and retailer (cities)) and the demand is in a not-for-profit monopoly public utility environment

### What method/process should be used?

- The scope requires integrated [program management](#)<sup>3</sup> and [project management](#)<sup>4</sup>, covering planning and management of the execution and accountability of both developmental/improvement and sustaining/maintenance activities
- This involves executable plans at two levels:
  - The Program Plan, defining long-term goals, methods to achieve those goals, cost-benefit and prioritization criteria for each method, and projects to implement the methods and to operate/sustain the system (project name, scope, objective, timing/sequence and budget estimate)
  - Project plans, defining measurable objectives, tasks, schedules, responsibilities, allocated budget, accountability
- Plans should be integrated for a supply-demand “market” (suppliers and demanders)
  - The relationships within the market are so integrated that it makes more sense to create an integrated plan than separate ones for a water district and cities being supplied by it.
  - The planning effort itself is complex and resource-intensive enough that it is unrealistic to expect cities to be able to create their own
- See [Comparison of Standard Planning with Utah Water Conservation Plans](#)<sup>5</sup>

### References:

<sup>1</sup> <https://le.utah.gov/xcode/Title73/Chapter10/73-10-S32.html>

<sup>2</sup> <https://conservewater.utah.gov/pdf/MaterialsResources/Templates/Water%20Management%20Conservation.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Program\\_management](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Program_management)

<sup>4</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Project\\_management](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Project_management)

<sup>5</sup> <https://conservewu.org/wp-content/uploads/Comparison-of-Standard-Planning-with-Utah-Water-Conservation-Plans.pdf>