

From: [Brownlee, Sasha J.@DWR](mailto:Brownlee.Sasha.J@DWR)
To: [DWR Water Use Efficiency](#)
Subject: FW: Comments regarding the Proposed Framework and Draft Recommendations for Updating AWMP Requirements
Date: Friday, October 21, 2016 8:51:05 AM

Sasha Brownlee

Office Assistant

Department of Water Resources

Division of Statewide Integrated Water Management

Drought Contingency Planning and Special Projects

Office: (916) 651-9671

Sasha.Brownlee@water.ca.gov

From: Lucero, Stephanie [mailto:slucero@ccp.csus.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2016 8:46 AM
To: Brownlee, Sasha J.@DWR; Avila, Andria@DWR
Subject: Fwd: Comments regarding the Proposed Framework and Draft Recommendations for Updating AWMP Requirements

*Sent from my cellphone, please excuse brevity and typos.
Stephanie Lucero (916) 628-1042*

----- Original Message -----

Subject: FW: Comments regarding the Proposed Framework and Draft Recommendations for Updating AWMP Requirements

From: "Benjemaa, Fethi@DWR" <Fethi.Jemaa@water.ca.gov>

To: "Lucero, Stephanie" <slucero@ccp.csus.edu>, "Horii, Stephanie S" <shorii@ccp.csus.edu>, "Avila, Andria@DWR" <Andria.Avila@water.ca.gov>

CC:

Please save/post the AAG comment below.

Thanks

Fethi

From: Sheridan Nicholas [mailto:snicholas@wrmwsd.com]

Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2016 6:09 PM

To: Agriculture Water Use Efficiency@DWR; Brostrom, Peter@DWR; Benjemaa, Fethi@DWR

Subject: Comments regarding the Proposed Framework and Draft Recommendations for Updating AWMP Requirements

Fethi and Peter -

I am extremely concerned regarding the proposed modifications to the "Annual Reporting" as detailed in the October 17, 2016 "Proposed Framework and Draft Recommendations for

Updating AWMP Requirements" (Draft Framework). These proposed modifications would both change the data reported from aggregated farm-gate deliveries to a suite of new components that Agricultural Water Suppliers (Suppliers) would be required to collect, analyze, produce and report; and change the completion date for reporting this information from July 31 to April 1. The proposed components to be reported are shown below:

1. Surface inflow
2. Supplier's groundwater pumping in the service area
3. Effective Precipitation
4. Surface outflow
5. Deep percolation

When tools and resources are made available by the State, the annual report would also include the following components:

1. Private groundwater pumping in the service area
2. Evapotranspiration

I am concerned for the following reasons:

1. The initial requirements of AB 1404 were directly tied to the Critical Efficient Water Management Practices of SB7x-7, namely (1) measure the volume of water delivered to customers and (2) adopt a pricing structure for water customers based at least in part on quantity delivered. Suppliers expended considerable resources to be compliant with this requirement. The new requirements in essence disregard farm-gate deliveries.
2. The modifications require much more reporting than is required now. The initial reporting was farm-gate deliveries, nothing more. This new requirement in fact requires an engineering report. Each of these components would require additional measurements that a Supplier may not have the ability/or means to measure or determine. Suppliers can provide surface inflow, and Supplier's groundwater pumping, but the others may not readily available. Effective precipitation would require a detailed Theissen (or equivalent) analysis to determine this information. Surface outflow may require new facilities for measurement. Deep percolation would have to be determined through a mass balance calculation utilizing the previous information plus an total evapotranspiration (Et) analysis of the Suppliers surface area.

In regard to the the additional components, many landowners do not have meters on their wells, so that information would have to be calculated through the same process. The fact that Et would be determined "[w]hen tools and resource are made available by the State" (Draft Framework) is absurd because Et information is absolutely necessary to determine

deep percolation as required in the initial components.

I cannot stress this point enough. I understand that these components are tied to Section 1 of the Draft Framework - "Develop annual water balances for the agricultural water supplier's service area". If it is the opinion of Department of Water Resources (DWR) that the information for the prior five years are included in the 2020 AWMP Update, that is consistent with the 2015 Update requirements. However, to report this to DWR on an annual basis, would essentially change the AWMP process from something that is done every five years, as is required by statute, to something that the Supplier must do every year. This is above and beyond the original intent of AWMPs.

3. Changing the due date from July 31 to April 1 is an administrative burden. For many Suppliers, April is an extremely busy time of year as this is close to the time of year when many Suppliers' begin making irrigation deliveries. Changing this date, along with requiring so much more information will make it extremely difficult to complete.

4. There is NOTHING in Governor Brown's Executive Order B-37-16 authorizing Department of Water Resources (DWR) to modify Annual Reporting, in fact isn't mentioned. Each of the requirements of the Executive Order pertaining to Agricultural Water Use (Items 11, 12, and 13) are specifically tied to AWMP updates and requirements. One could assume that DWR is using the Executive Order's directives to update requirements of AWMP's as a way to authorize the proposed change. However, DWR's own "June 2015 Guidebook to Assist Agricultural Water Suppliers to Prepare a 2015 Agricultural Water Management Plan" state the following:

"The Aggregated Farm-Gate Delivery Report is not a part of the AWMP process. Information on the Aggregated Farm-Gate Delivery Report has been included in this Guidebook for informational purposes." (p. 15) and;

"The annual Agricultural Aggregated Farm-Gate Delivery Report to DWR is required under the AB 1404 (Water Code §531.10); however, it does not need to be included in the AWMP or USBR plans for compliance with Water Code agriculture management planning." (p. 135)

5. I assume based on the Draft Framework the Suppliers supplying less than 10,000 acres of irrigated land would still only be required to report farm-gate deliveries as per the previous reporting schedule. This would cause a dual reporting schedule of dual set of components.

Based on the information presented above, I propose that Section 7. Annual Reporting of the October 17, 2016 "Proposed Framework and Draft Recommendations for Updating AWMP Requirements" be eliminated.

Sincerely,

Sheridan Nicholas, P.E.
Assistant Engineer Manager