

3. ANALYSIS OF OUTCOMES

3.1 OUTCOME SUMMARY

It was indeed a triumph that the tabletop exercise brought together so many of the diverse stakeholders who would be involved with a drought event in the Pomperaug River Watershed. There was fruitful and productive collaboration throughout the exercise, which included enthusiasm for continued interaction and progress.

3.2 EVALUATOR FEEDBACK

Immediately after the tabletop exercise, a hot wash with the evaluators and controllers was held. The purpose of the hot wash was to collect observations and thoughts about what happened during the exercise and how well the participants think it went. The hot wash also provided the evaluators with the opportunity to clarify points or collect any missing information. The evaluators and facilitators continued their hot wash discussion on January 14, 2009 in a conference call. The issues identified in the hot wash discussions are provided in Section 3.4 of this report.

3.3 PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK

Every participant was asked to fill out an evaluation form before leaving the exercise, and 31 completed forms were submitted. These completed forms are provided in Appendix D of this report.

3.4 CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

Ten corrective actions were distilled from the evaluator's notes, hot wash meetings, and evaluation forms and are presented in Table 3-1 below. These corrective actions provide a road map developed through the tabletop exercise process to address the issues posed by severe drought in the Pomperaug River watershed. Implementing these actions will enable the Pomperaug River watershed community to manage and mitigate severe drought risks, although such an initiative requires adequate funding to move forward. It is recommended that these issues and corrective actions be provided to local and state stakeholders and to begin a dialogue begin to identify responsibilities and timelines for these corrective actions.

Table 3-1: Corrective Actions

NO.	ISSUE	CORRECTIVE ACTION
1	Development of local ordinances to restrict the use of water supplied by a water company or via a private well	Each city or town needs to promulgate their own ordinance to establish enforceable limitations on the use of water during emergencies. The State of Connecticut has developed a model water use restriction ordinance.
2	Integration of drought emergencies into the municipal emergency planning process	Municipal emergency operations plans presently lack a drought emergency as a scenario to be assessed and preplanned for. As a catalyst for mandating this action, there needs to be proactive communication with state representatives proposing that such legislation be enacted.
3	Implementation of the Incident Command System by all stakeholders in the water community	All stakeholders, e.g., water suppliers, municipalities, state government, need to implement the Incident Command System to facilitate collaboration and improve efficiency during water emergencies. This

NO.	ISSUE	CORRECTIVE ACTION
		should include training to involved parties on a formal and periodic basis.
4	Revisions/updates to the Connecticut Drought Preparedness and Response Plan published in 2003	<p>Response planning is an iterative process. To ensure the suitability and accuracy of the different plan elements, the plan should be reviewed and updated annually or after a major event, an exercise, or major organizational changes.</p> <p>The plan should include a region-specific process for drought declaration and response procedures; including a clear procedure for declaring drought stages and identifying response actions; and identifying agency and water system responsibilities.</p> <p>Once the state plan is updated, individual water utility plans (i.e., Emergency Contingency Plans) should be updated to coordinate with the state plan.</p>
5	Development of Risk Communication Plans	All stakeholders, e.g., water suppliers, municipalities, state government need to develop a risk communications plan including message maps to facilitate the timely and accurate dissemination of information during each drought stage.
6	Assessment of risks to prioritize critical water users and lay the foundation for a water allocation plan	In support of the development of a water allocation plan, a risk assessment based on life safety, property protection, public perception, and business continuity needs to be conducted.
7	Assessment of risks to balance critical water needs versus natural resource protection	As a component of the risk assessment, balance the need to provide water in support of life safety, property protection, and business continuity with natural resource protection and environmental stewardship.
8	Development of a regional water allocation process plan for deployment during drought conditions	As a catalyst for the emergency resolution of water scarcity conflict, a water allocation process plan needs to be developed. A first step would be the development of a white paper, which would present challenges and opportunities for collaborative positive change. The latter needs to be reviewed and agreed upon by interested stakeholders. As part of the process plan, there could be the execution of Memoranda of Understanding.
9	Water Allocation Process Plan Testing, Review and Updates	Response planning is an iterative process. The subject plan needs to be tested regularly and reviewed at least annually or after a major event or exercise to help ensure an efficient response and minimal conflict.
10	Establishment of an Interagency Council of Stakeholders	In the spirit of positive motivation and oversight, a stakeholder council needs to be established to monitor and support the implementation of the corrective actions proposed herein. Such action will be a catalyst for enhanced stakeholder

NO.	ISSUE	CORRECTIVE ACTION
		communication, synergy and accountability.

4. THE PATH FORWARD

Throughout the tabletop exercise and, particularly at the conclusion when all participants shared final thoughts, there was universal support for the exercise. It was heralded as an initial step in “bringing together the diverse and complementary group of stakeholders”. There was an expressed desire to “keep momentum strong” to improve the process for responding to a severe drought emergency, including the utilization of a risk-based approach for managing the competing priorities and the respective stakeholder challenges.

The Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition proposed their preparation of a white paper to clarify and document the needs for a process to reduce potential water scarcity conflict in case of a drought emergency. More importantly, it would present a risk-based process to manage competing priorities in the spirit of collaboration and mutual aid. A related process for public communication will also be addressed. The draft of this document would be circulated to stakeholders for review and comment with the hope that the final document will be mutually agreed upon and formally committed to. Such action will be a strong and integral part of the efficient and equitable response to a severe drought emergency in the Pomperaug River Watershed.

APPENDIX A: TABLETOP EXERCISE POWERPOINT PRESENTATION



APPENDIX B: EVALUATOR NOTES (FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY)



APPENDIX C: MOCK NEWSPAPER STORY



**APPENDIX D: PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK FORMS (FOR OFFICIAL
USE ONLY)**

