



California Water Plan, Update 2009
Agricultural (AG) Water Use Efficiency Workshop
November 24, 2009
1:00 pm-5:00pm
CCP, 815 S Street, Sacramento CA 95811

WELCOME, INTRODUCTION AND GROUNDRULES

Meeting Facilitator, Lisa Beutler, thanked participants for attending and did a round of introductions. She reviewed the agenda and meeting handouts, noting that the primary purpose of the meeting was to complete a “walk-through” of the Agricultural Water Use Efficiency (AGWUE) chapter in the California Water Plan: Update 2009.

DOCUMENT WALK THROUGH: AG WATER USE EFFICIENCY CHAPTER, CWP 2009

Baryohay Davidoff, DWR, introduced a revised Ag WUE document to the group that included updated calculations, new legislation, definitions and data provided by the Pacific Institute. He welcomed all comments and feedback from meeting participants.

General Comments

- It was noted that the numbers being used were the same numbers from 2005 and that new numbers should be used in future updates.

2.1 Agricultural Water Use Efficiency Efforts in California

- It was suggested that the term “signatory AG water suppliers” be changed.
- It was suggested that there be footnotes defining what “retail acres” are.

2.2 Agricultural Water Management Efficient Water Management Practices (EWMPs) (From Ag MOU)

- It was pointed out that the number “9.6 acres” is used in one section and “8.2 acres” is used in another, and that the difference should be reconciled.
 - It was clarified that the “9.6 acre” measurement, includes double cropping, irrigated land, and irrigated crop average. It was mentioned that there will be a diagram provided in the future.
- It was suggested that the section include a footnote explaining that there are federal mandates that are updated every two years.
- It was noted that, in terms of irrigation, half of the water comes from rain water so applied irrigation would be less in areas with less rain. It was suggested that this be appropriately represented.
- It was suggested that where “working landscapes” were addressed, rainfall and climate change should be included.

2.6 Potential Costs and Benefits of Agricultural Water Use Efficiency

- There were questions about the use of the “2004 study” which some participants thought might have been an internal draft of the 2006 study. It was agreed that data from the 200 study should be used.

- There was clarification needed regarding whether the 2000 ROD numbers were separate numbers or subsets.
 - It was clarified that the numbers reflected a combined amount.
- It was suggested that the data be put into a table and in chronological order for better organization.

2.7 Potential Benefits of Agricultural Water Use Efficiency

- It was noted that the flows that are designated irrecoverable will flow down to the Mexi-Cali valley.
 - It was clarified that with the Mexico treaty, the water would not be wasted.
- It was noted that, in the 4th paragraph, “Water savings in coastal areas...”, that the data is from different hydrologic regions, therefore coastal is included.
- The use of the Colorado River data was thought to be inaccurate and it was suggested that it be subtracted from the final data set.
 - There was agreement that the Co. River data be included in a reference chart.
- It was suggested that the “1.59 billion” include clarifications stating that it was an annualized number. It was also advised that citations be included.

2.9 Inter-relation between On-farm and regional efficiencies and role of water reuse

- It was suggested that managed wetlands be included in the discussion regarding defining recoverable and irrecoverable flows.
 - It was noted that the numbers be revised to reflect the changes.
- It was proposed that a graph depicting marginal costs be included.
- It was also, proposed that there be visual representation for recoverable and irrecoverable flow.

Table 2.2: On-farm and water supplier recoverable and irrecoverable flow reductions

- Clarification was needed as to whether the table implied 1.6 billion over 6 years, to which the answer was “no”.
- It was noted, that the data used was supposed to act as a reference point, as it is not a plausible or achievable number. The number was obtained by using the cost for locals to grow, as a baseline, and then the technical potential- which assessed cost and savings.
- There were concerns for the use of data provided by a non-governmental organization.
 - Pacific Institute defended its findings and assumptions stating that they used the same modeling as DWR and followed the same methodologies.
- It was suggested that the term “savings” be replaced with the word “flows”

2.10 Water Supplier, Water Use Efficiency

- It was noted that the paragraph beginning with “On farm...” was out of place, and it was suggested that it be moved to the following paragraph and given a new heading.
- It was suggested that side boxes with options for a 500 acre farm be included, adding that it would become an application and not an abstract piece.
- It was suggested that within the last paragraph, “thermal loading” be changed.
- It was suggested that when referencing reduced pumping cost and crops that do better with less water, more citations be provided.

2.11 Potential Costs of Agricultural Water Use Efficiency

It was noted that the costs and benefits were “jumbled”, and that the data on the 4th line “34,000 to 620,000...” needed proper citation.

2.12 Major Issues Facing Agricultural Water Use Efficiency

Funding

- It was suggested that the language better reflect the law.

Climate Change

- It was suggested that the data for 2050 reduction should be checked for accuracy.
- It was suggested cropping patterns and multi-cropping be included.

Water Rights

- It was suggested that the data provided was oversimplified and misrepresented.
- It was proposed that more legal language be included.
- It was suggested that funding be the number one issue from the AG perspective.
- It was suggested that more consideration for whether or not growers could use water more efficiently.
- It was noted that most people that are afraid of losing water rights are upstream.
- It was suggested that regulatory restrictions be included in the language.
- It was noted that information needs to be provided in an educational context.

Energy and Water Relationship

- It was suggested that the language “mitigating strategy” be changed to “con-benefit”.
- It was noted that “on farm” did not read well and should be rewritten.
- It was suggested that for the relationship, it should be specified that it is “in California”.
- It was noted that “GHG’s” and “CO2” should be spelled out.

- It was noted that one participant felt that the language consisted of redundancies and inconsistencies and should be re-written.
- There was clarification provided that the numbers were based on pre-Wanger.
- It was noted that the numbers being used were too high and that it would be more useful to use more realistic figures.
- It was suggested that a graph be provided to illustrate the actual ranges.
 - It was agreed by the group that a graph would be beneficial.

Bookends

- It was noted that most participants were ok with the bookends with a lower number of 4. The “6” range was controversial.
- Several participants did not believe that a number should be used.

Recommendations

- There was clarification needed regarding 89% of farmers or respondents.
- It was suggested that an additional data source be used.

Next Steps

Baryohay thanked participants for their valuable feedback and said that he would go back and make as many revisions as he could.

Adjourn

Attendance- In Person

Baryohay Davidoff, DWR
Dave Todd, DWR
Ray Hoagland, DWR
Tito Cervantes, DWR
Steve Hatchett, Ch2m Hill
Bruce Gwynne, DCRP
Ray Hoagland, DWR
Jim Tischer, CA Water Justice
Peter Canessa, CSU Fresno
Danny Merkley, Ca. Farm Bureau
Kathy Manion, RCRC
Denise Sagarce, YC Farm Buerau
Justin Oldfind, California Cattlemens
Valerie Nera, California Chamber
Heather Cooley, Pacific Institute
Juliet Christian- Smith, Pacific Institute
Michael Taey, Bureau of Reclamation
Megan Fidell, DWR
Lisa Beutler, CCP
Katie Cox, CCP

Attendance- Webinar

Tom Filler, DWR
Dale Schafer, CCP
Mark Rivera, DWR
Jennifer Kofoid, DWR
David Bolland, ACWA
Carolyn Schafer, MWDH
Dong Chen, DWR
Hossein Ashktorab, Valley Water
Harley Lukenbill, PCWA
Dick Bennett, EBMUD
Bob Siegfried, Valley Water
Roger Reynolds, Summerseng
Anisa Divine, IID
Mike Wade, Farm Water
Dick Tzou, Madera-ID
Mike Nichol, PCWA
David Zoldoske, CSU Fresno
Debbie Liebersbach, IID
Ed Morris, DWR
Bruce Houdesheldt, Nor Cal Water
Erin Field Huston- Irrigation
David Scruggs, DWR
Elaine Archibald, CUWA
Jennifer Gray, ARB