

Comments on Water Use Efficiency: General Support

demand side management and water conservation is very important - greater emphasis on water reclamation on water reclamation state wide -only reclaiming 5%. P

Demand mgmt should be essential/core. SD County trying to increase reliability now through reclamation & conservation. Water pricing should not be dictated by CALFED solution. Should be local control. SD

League of Women Voters supports conservation and reclamation, they could be wider spread. Want drought management, incentive for crop shifts. Pricing. Consider user fee incentives to increase demand management. SAC

Q. Curious why Demand Management is also considered as a component in the other 9 alternatives?

A. Yes - some form of DM is in all. O

Conservation should be a major theme. BCH

Why isn't demand mgmt in all alternatives? It is in all but not at same level. BCH

Should have both ag and urban demand mgmt, with land retirement but focusing on retirement for water quality reasons. BCH

Really surprised that demand mgmt not part of all alternatives. Should be maximizing demand management. Like original CA urban conservation, should be a big emphasis. BCH

Plumas County: Alternative A, while very useful, should not be stand-alone but should be an aspect of all alts. WG

Contra Costa Water District: Everybody needs to do their bit in terms of demand management. WG

Demand-side elements are essential. WS6

Q: Demand management is implemented at a maximum level in Alternative A. Can you implement this with other alternatives? If not, why not.

A: Yes, but each alternative takes a different approach in resolving the conflicts associated with the Bay-Delta and components are selected based on that approach. WS6

DM essential part. Must recognize distinction between long-term conservation and shortage measures (R. Weiner)

95-39 DM actions should be common to all not specific alternative especially re: Urban BMP's

summary guidance to follow. See response. (B. Buck)

Comments on Water Use Efficiency: Land Retirement

Land Retire- what's the criteria land would be retired?

A - 3 levels possible: hot drainage, problem land e.g. saline groundwater demand management via incentives to retire. CALFED doesn't have to stipulate land retirement. P

EIR must thoroughly discuss aggressive demand mgmt (looking at broad range of alts) including socio-economic impacts and costs. Socio-economic analysis should be developed in conjunction with environmental document. SD

Retirement of ag lands would have significant impacts both primary and secondary, as to rural communities, e.g. timber harvest reduction. SD

RCRC: Extensive ag land retirement will have secondary and tertiary socio-economic effects. SD

How would ag land retirement be implemented? SAC

NRDC supports ag land retirement. Will go out of production in 10 - 20 years anyway. Concerned that CALFED might be backing away from ag land retirement. Don't. Conservation is not a substitute. Explore dry year contracts, offer crop shift incentives. Per acre feet user fee. SAC

State Water Contractors concerned with significant third party impacts of land fallowing. Historically has unintended wildlife impacts. SAC

CA Engineers Assoc.: Demand mgmt only emphasizes ag retirement. Designed to make ag hurt in some way. Should explore reduced urban & individual demand. SAC

CA Dairy Farmers: What's definition of higher value crop. Of least productive land? EIS should address fact that crops for animals can't be compared to crops for humans. Alfalfa feeds cows, which produce milk which has very high nutritional and economic value. SAC

Q. BJ Miller - S.J./Mendota - concerns of AG member

1- every alt includes land retirement and retiring marginally productive land, how about marg. Prod business, and marg people, major concerns what constitutes marginal. Productive land and should be some alter that provide for the agr. - why in every alt., Need alternative that supply the agric. o

Sierra Club Water Policy Committee: Happy that land fallowing is included in all alts. For marginal land, water so heavily subsidized there is room for a deal. Encourage you not to give into water districts because they're afraid of losing their allocations. o

What is meant by retirement? A: Government agency buys from willing seller. BCH

Land retirement sounds costly. Consider impacts to Delta with salt water intrusion and other toxics. BCH

The only net employment growth in State has been in agriculture. But all your alts affect agriculture. WG

Before taking farmland out of production, grind in some economics. Ag is lifeblood of CA. WG

Putting forth grossly inaccurate picture of what would actually happen in moderate demand mgmt range. Fallowing 400-800,000 acres your 1 year costs would be 6-7billion, not including socio-economic impacts. Mandatory that any document include full, detailed analysis. WG

Retiring ag land would erode the economic base of our industry as well as other businesses that rely on farm support personnel, would drive up the cost of farming in the Delta. WG

Land retirement can erode support for farm industries. WG

Purchase of land out of tax base needs analysis. WG

Kern County Supervisor Perez: Concern re land retirement and demand mgmt. CA farmers most efficient water users in world. 75% of water to crops. Significant improvement. Cannot save any more water. Put farmers out of business. Local economy not for sale. Violates solution principles. No proof it works. BK

Kern County Water Agency: Don't like term demand mgmt. Enviornmental interests want to solve Delta problems through fallowing. Oppose wide use of fallowing in alts. Though economy is growing, some farmers might fallow for the money. Already fallowing in Kern County because of droughts. Take fallowing out of demand mgmt. Local informal poll shows no interest in fallowing drainage lands. Look at cost to full economy, not just single farmer who is made whole. Better not to study it at all. The State's policy has been to provide an adequate water supply for a growing economy. BK

Tulare Basin and SJ Basin have annual overdraft. Region will already have to fallow land to meet current water supply. Underlying question is will state supply enough water for the economy. BK

To what extent does analysis include land that will have to be fallowed due to inadequate supply?
A: 1st and 2nd tiers yes. 3rd tier might be double hit for some. BK

Land retirement just postpones the shortage 10 years. Just provides wanter to So CA. BK

Permanent crops not necessarily top priority. BK

Is there ag land on the islands to be used for storage and if so will those numbers go toward total number of ag land retirement? BK

Land retirement won't fix drainage problems. BK

CA Farm Bureau: US depends on ag. Can't depend on other countries to produce our food. Need to export food. Fallowing won't help cities or fish. Alt A is worst. BK

Federal gov't has violated law by not building drain. Farmer's land ruined by gov't that now wants to pay "fair market value." Unlikely farmers will sell voluntarily. BK

Need a model to analyze 3rd party impacts of land retirement. BK

96-111 Land retirement may not produce wildlife benefits in all cases. (F&G)

Del Puerto Water District no rational basis for 800,000 af?

Answer: 7ST = drainage; 300,000 af = 800,000 af = willing sellers to lower demand. BAN

Mr. Petry- can't accept willing sellers idea. Currently 1,000 per year Mendota poor. Mendota pool = too much salt, eventually will get bad enough for you to care. Not fair to retire land without hearing local concerns. Need more storage. 1986 levee break Mendota. Too little capacity. Need maintenance. More attention to upper San Joaquin. BAN

Fresno County Farm Bureau 1 week/ 80 acres loss 10,000 jobs. 100 farmers and families. Commerce impacts. School Districts extremely negative impacts on education. Mad dash to protect environment- people as important. Want eco analysis. Agriculture is being ignored. We're endangered species. Total grain supply worldwide for 40 days now. World population rising. Need more food. BAN

Westlands water District? Among most valuable agricultural land in U.S. Among highest yield. 50 plus different crops \$1.00 on farm = \$3.50 state economy. \$4 billion in U.S. major contributions to taxes. Rely on water. CVP water. U.S. fails meet contracted allocation. 1996 85% of contract. Environment regulations. U.S. puts fix environmental problems on farmers. Can't be long term. Agriculture drop in all alternatives. Wrong assumption that can solve water problems with land retirement. BAN

Eir: Social/eco impacts. (Already 13-19% unemployed). Taxes. Balance of trade. (Agriculture one of few non SVC industries) 1/10 California jobs agriculture related. Already chronic water shortages. 800,000 af Delta water already over committed. If Westlands land retired, water should stay in district. Must compensate farmers and governments for loss. Westlands already

v. Efficient. BAN

No preferred alternative rule broken. All to include land retirement. Credibility damage. What about urban demand management? BAN

Congressman condit's reps this meeting long overdue. Get impress. Many decisions already made. People here most heavily impacted by alternatives. Received many calls re impact of ind. Incomes. Should be looking for consensus. "A" scares people - doubt good faith. Reasonable (not equal) drastic. Water supply plan gives priority to eco and water quality. CF should gain full understanding this area's historic impacts. Dire eco consequences. Any water supply component includes more storage to serve this area. Eco impact analysis required area. Eco impact analysis required by Pres order above cert amt. Applies here. Have another meeting in westside. BAN

Oppose Alternative A and land retirement in all alternatives. Does anyone listen? BAN

"Marginally - productive agriculture acreage" - what is it? Where (at what point) profitable to sell? BAN

Q: There are problems with the notion that acquisitions of certain acreage of land equate to fixed quantities of water to be saved. People need to see demonstrations of the actual savings to buy into this idea. What are the baseline demands and how were they derived? We need to clarify assumptions.

A: Estimates of demand reduction in relation to land retirement were made using the gross assumption of 2 acre-feet of water per acre. This value is assumed to equate to the reduction in evapotranspiration when land is taken out of production. More detailed analysis of demand reduction potential will be analyzed during Phase II of this Program. WS6

Q: How is CALFED judging the realism and likelihood of "volunteer actions" including land fallowing? May get people to sell you lands but they may not have control of the water rights to do anything about it. Overall, the estimates of lands to take out of production are unrealistically high especially in the San Joaquin Valley. Will there be a ceiling on the price of the lands to purchase? Voluntary participation will depend very much on the price.

A: Specific strategies for developing the agricultural, municipal and industrial conservation will be identified during subsequent phases of the Program. WS6

Q: In the breakout session, Lester (Snow) said he was thinking of buying out water contracts rather than using land retirement. Is that what you are thinking?

A: It is one option among many water conservation actions we are examining. WS6

Q: How is water pricing considered? How will land be fallowed; just during droughts?

A: Water pricing is mentioned in the Detailed Descriptions of Alternatives in Appendix B of the April CALFED workshop packet. See the Water Supply Management module under Operational and Management Features for mention of implementing wholesale inclined block rates and water pricing structures for water users to encourage conservation activities. Land fallowing will occur both

temporarily during drought periods and permanently. See the Water Supply Management module under Operational and Management Features in Appendix B. All of the alternatives have combinations of both temporary and permanent land fallowing. However, detailed analysis during Phase II of the Program will define how water pricing and fallowing would work. WS6

Q: What will be the process to acquire lands?

A: From willing sellers to extent possible. WS6

Additional information on voluntary land retirement is needed (such as how much land is available, how and where land will be retired, etc.). In addition, this information should be documented to allow for verification of references.

R: Where possible CALFED would like to avoid taking of private land especially where these actions would affect individual property owners. The feasibility of land retirement remains unstudied. WS6

If you retire land, you don't necessarily reduce the amount of water being used on that land. Sometimes the user gets water from somewhere else.

R: We would buy the land with the water. We are also looking for a more locally autonomous approach. WS6

Third party impacts remain unaddressed. DWR water-banking information indicates that third party land retirement impacts are substantial. WS6

Basis for land retirement from the Rainbow Report (San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program) are based on faulty assumptions.

R: Assumptions are generally based on past programs and references. Additional references are important, please send them in. WS6

Land retirement should have upper and lower limits. Options should consider 0 retirement. WS6

Comments on Water Use Efficiency: Urban

BMP's should be consistent with CUWA. Go beyond BMP's. SD

Look to Urban Water Conservation Council for help with urban demand mgmt. Council could evaluate what can be saved in next 20 years, evaluate performance, provide annual reports. Don't create bureaucracy. SD

Have I missed the word conservation? - gray water management should be worked into new construction -hard time justifying using drinking water to water lawns and to use for toilets - close attention to conservation matters- we must do wtr conservation - San Diego has most outrageous enviro ethic he's ever seen in his life - like to Southern Calif in general do a lot more SD

City of SF: Many alts want to increase waste water reclamation. Concern about the rough numbers. Should determine available reclamation opportunities and costs. 20 Bay-Area agencies are studying reclamation and ways to eliminate roadblocks. Want to connect their study to CALFED. SAC

EBMUD: Take closer look at reclamation opportunities. Electric utilities use tiered pricing to get conservation. Tool should be controlled locally. SAC

Water use in Bay Area continues to decrease on a percentage basis. Getting harder to achieve further reductions. What is the benchmark? O

EBMUD: Committed to developing tools to assess Demand Management. Tiered rates should be at local discretion. O

Concern about relationship between CALFED and MET's Integrated resource Plan for demand management. BCH

MWD can't be only one doing conservation. BCH

Have done a lot in So CA to reduce consumption since 1978 level, with addition of 5 million more people. BCH

Urban Kern County has already achieved significant accomplishments in conservation. Demand hardening will result. Will affect quality of life, hit poorer classes harder e.g. poor people won't be able to water lawns. Decrease in ag will have significant affect in urban Kern County. Would gut SJ Valley economy. Would create food shortage, would have to import from places like Chile. Would thereby redirect impacts to 3rd world. Food embargo against US

would be possible. Environmental extremism hurts our cause. BK

Sierra Club: Urbans should use native plans. Population increasing by 50,000 yearly. Encourage to limit families to 2 or fewer kids. Ag should only grow crops that prosper here more than elsewhere. Biggest waste is urbanizing prime farm land. Kern continuing to grow. BK

Comments on Water Use Efficiency: General

- 95-1 Historically defined as tech problem, ethic of supply expansion, continue to plan with outdated assumptions - plans project future demands instead of (S. Gomez)
- 95-28 Oct. 12, 1995 Workshop. Same as SWCs above; conservation etc. should be applied to all alts not stand along option - use water recycling not reclamation (S. Sprague)
- 95-30 Oct. 12, 1995 Workshop. CALFED should link supply development and demand management together more effectively with bias toward actions with least environmental impact. Need better definition of demand management actions - three areas 1) actions used on short-term basis 2) used to replace current supply loss due to reg reallocations 3) actions used to attenuate future demand due to population and growth. Desal. Is viewed as a supply rather than demand tool; pricing will influence selection of both supply and demand actions. (J. Myers)
- 95-31 Managing demand beyond scope of Program reductions will not lessen need for reliable supplies from demand exports within contract amounts especially during drought years. (S. Pyle)
- 95-42 DM not panacea, use D 1485 as baseline. See response. (D. Alladjem)
- 95-49 December 4 Workshop. Need explicit supply and demand forecasts with opportunity to comment on forecast efforts. Need minimum levels of conflict resolution as part of program-specifics. (P. Gleick)
- 95-51 December 4 Workshop - Alternatives Formulation. Must do demand forecast and set criteria for alternative evaluation. Demand forecast would estimate future demand under "no action" no way to evaluate need for actions (ie new storage) without demand forecast. Fear we are relying on B-160-93 and implied need for new facilities. Screening criteria for alternatives must be public process. (R. Weiner, A. Notthoff, H. Candee)
- 96-111 Demand management may not reduce exports nor is it likely to last long before the benefits are cancelled by increased demand. (F&G)

Water Marketing is here now. P

Won't necessarily need high water quantities from northern CA,. Improve irrigation higher water marketing opportunities. Transfers higher importance. P

Southern CA Water Committee supports saving water wisely, not at any cost. Want efficient water mgmt. SD

Water marketing reallocates water to higher economic use. Should be actively pursued. There are sufficient benefits to pay for direct and indirect harm to area of origin. SD

RCRC: Water transfers not a solution for source counties. Add to problem. SD

Avocado production uses a lot of water, may need to look at other type of ag to reduce water usage. Need long range forecasts. Water demands may be different in future. SD

Reclamation and conservation are not necessarily the same. SD

Need higher level of water management. Transfers should be in all alternatives. SAC

Combine demand management with ecosystem restoration and save money by building fewer new structures. Do a cost-benefit analysis relating to general public and private landowners. There's a difference between corporate ag and family farms. SAC

Fresno Chamber of Commerce: In Central Valley, Conservation & conjunctive use in conflict. Pricing can discourage conjunctive use. Concern with impacts of valley. Historically farmers stop buying and switch to ground water, with impacts on the the ground water table. SAC

Only support conjunctive use and transfers within basin. RB

When raise water price, disaster. Cause irrigators to go back to wells, the waer tables goes down. Deliver water at a reasonable price. RB

In re block pricing, our water cost has increased 300% with great harm in the ag economy. RB

Who would manage wholesale locked water rates? How much water can you get from this? RB

Which alts include water transfers? Tiered rates should be considered. O

Consider putting two pipes in every home so that water can be reused. O

CALFED should improve our ability to transfer. O

Should increase ability to pursue transfers. O

Much more waer is available north of Delta for transfer, but need reliable means of export across Delta. O

Been conserving for many years of So CA. Doubt more can be done. Reuse should be pursued, costly so need federal or state money to help. BCH

No more can be done to conserve water in urban areas. BCH

Does Alt I enhance ability to transfer? BCH

Are transfers considered an option in all alternatives? Would have to address institutional issues, be operated properly. BCH

All alts rely heavily on demand reduction. That is flawed. As population increases, demand will increase. WG

Even if farmers do everything to reduce water use, eventually there will not be enough water in any of these alternatives to satisfy anyone. WG

One section of Corps cannot get permit from another section, so they want to take land out of production and breach levees to get around permit problems. WG

Sierra Club of Kern County don't agree we can't increase conservation. Seen puddles of water on farm roads, irrigation at high temps. BK

Every SJ Valley district short of water. Alts won't decrease demand on Delta. BK

Water transfer moves the shortage from one place to another. BK

Farmers are using urban run-off and oil field waste water. BK

Maricopa Water Storage District: Demand management in ag is unrealistic. Because of water cost increases, have developed own demand mgmt. Efficiency now greater than 80%. Tulare Basin 95% efficient. Marginal land already retired. Same in all SWP districts, similar in CVP districts. There's no effort to increase efficiency in water used for environment. 800,000 acres = 20,000 jobs. Conjunctive use already practiced, will expand to deal with current shortages. Don't want transfer mandates. BK

Public doesn't understand ag conservation. Everything now recovered. Very little overuse. No room for more ag conservation. Irrigating in hot weather wastes no more than evapotranspiration. BK

