

- DEMAND MANAGEMENT - Planning For Uncertainty

Eastside Subbasin Committee Survey Results

September 27, 2024

Dave Ceppos Process Facilitator

Survey Review

- 10 responses out of 11 members
- 14 Questions
- Focus on:
 - Feasibility / Infeasibility of Demand Management Options
 - Information Needs
 - Uncertainty Conditions
 - Past Impacts and Actions



- Review of Past Workshop Videos (October 2022 / Spring 2024)
 - 80% (8) All
 - 20% (2) Some

- General Feasibility of Demand Management Options (desirable / undesirable)
 - 90% (9) Yes
 - 10% (1) No



- Perspectives on Feasible Options
 - Land Repurposing
 - Tiered Irrigation Fees
 - Reduced Pumping (voluntary and mandatory)
 - Enhanced Irrigation Practices
 - Enhanced Urban Efficiencies / Conservation
 - Rotational Fallowing (voluntary and mandatory)
 - Fallow Banking (voluntary)
 - Recharge



- Perspectives on Demand Management
 - Based on Accurate Water Budget
 - Based on Basin/Subbasin Sustainable Yield
 - Based on Historic Use
 - Based on Grower Needs and Willingness to Adjust to Water Conditions
 - Growers Need Maximum Flexibility to address Market Needs
 - DM needs to be Basin Scale, not Subbasin Scale
 - Need Mixed Portfolio of Voluntary and Mandatory



- Perspectives on Demand Management (cont.)
 - GSA be Lead to Access Help From Ag / Conservation Specialists
 - Repurposing Should be More than Just Different Crops
 - Flood Plain / Flood Risk Reduction
 - Water Quality / Recharge / Treatment Wetlands
 - Tiered Fees Implemented in Drought Conditions Only
 - Earmark Fee Revenues to Subsidize Fallow Bank, Others
 - Everything Voluntary Must Include Incentives



- Perspectives on Infeasibility
 - Subbasin Scale Discussions / Solutions Not Acceptable
 - Tiered Fees
 - Risk of Adjudication
 - Rain Barrels



- Information Needs to Support DM Discussions Decisions
 - Costs and benefit-assessment calculations
 - Economic Impacts (personal, industrywide, County and community)
 - Water savings and methods to increase/decrease based on water year
 - Programs / research the GSA can leverage
 - Statewide examples (successes / challenges)



- Uncertainty Conditions Primary
 - Declining Groundwater Levels (6 of 10)
 - Recharge Infeasibility (4 of 10)
 - Flood Risks (3 of 10)
 - Loss of Groundwater Storage (3 of 10)
 - Groundwater Quality (3 of 10)



- Uncertainty Conditions Additional (1 each)
 - Extreme Climate Conditions
 - Governmental/Regulatory Restrictions / Politics
 - Well Instability
 - Seawater Intrusion



- Negative Impacts to Groundwater Users in the Subbasin
 - Yes 80% (8)
 - No 20% (2)

- Of the 8 Respondents that ID'd Negative Impacts
 - Declining GW Levels (5)
 - Water Quality (4)
 - Loss / Abandonment of Wells / Production (2)



- Conditions That Could Require Water Use Reduction (Urban / Agricultural)
 - Declining Groundwater Levels 7
 - Drought 4
 - Water Quality 3
 - Loss of Storage 3
 - Recharge Infeasibility 3
 - Well Instability 2
 - Seawater Intrusion 1
 - Regulatory/Govt Interference 1



- IF Demand Management were employed, Sequential or All at Once
 - Sequential 100% (10)



- Pumping Adjustments If Operating Well / Water System (drought years since 2000)
 - No-1
 - Yes 5
 - NA 4



- Pumping Adjustments If Operating Well / Water System (drought years since 2000)
 - No 7
 - Yes 4
 - NA 2
- Of Respondents that Made Adjustments
 - Deeper /new well
 - Reduced well production / water budgeting
 - Well rehabilitation
 - Enhance irrigation practices



- Application of Water Use Efficiency Measures
 - Yes 80% (8)
 - NA 20% (2)
- Of Respondents Answering "Yes"
 - Urban / Municipal 2
 - Low Flow Appliances
 - Landscape Changes
 - Agriculture 6
 - Irrigation Technologies (drip, computer and data support)
 - Irrigation Efficiency Audits
 - Crop rotations / Modifications



- Other Water Use Efficiency Measures You Would Like To Deploy
 - Conservation 1
 - Surface Water Supply 1
 - Reduce Irrigation 1
 - Not Applicable 3
 - No-2
 - Yes 1

