Summer 8-18-2016

2009 Monterey County Water Resources Agency Groundwater Extraction Summary Report


2009
Ground Water
Summary Report
MONTEREY COUNTY WATER RESOURCES AGENCY
1947
Monterey County Water Resources Agency
August 2010

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Overview of the Ground Water Reporting Program

History of the Ground Water Reporting Program

In February 1993, the Monterey County Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance No. 3663 that required water suppliers within Zones 2, 2A, and 2B to report water-use information for ground water extraction facilities (wells) and service connections to the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (Agency). Monterey County Ordinance No. 3717, which replaced Ordinance No. 3663 and was adopted in October 1993, modified certain other requirements in the previous ordinance while keeping the ground water extraction reporting requirements in place for wells with a discharge pipe having an inside diameter of at least three inches.

The Agency has collected ground water extraction data from well operators, for the period beginning November 1 and ending October 31, starting with the 1992-1993 reporting year. Information received from the 300-plus well operators in the above-referenced zones of the Salinas Valley is compiled by the Ground Water Extraction Management System (GEMS) portion of the Water Resources Agency Information Management System (WRAIMS), a relational database maintained by the Agency. The intent of the ground water reporting program is to provide documentation of the reported amount of ground water that is extracted from Zones 2, 2A, and 2B of the Salinas Valley Ground Water Basin each year.

Since 1991, the Agency has required the annual submittal of Agricultural Water Conservation Plans (Ordinance 3851), which outline the best management practices that are adopted each year by growers in the Salinas Valley. In 1996, an ordinance was passed that requires the filing of Urban Water Conservation Plans (Ordinance 3886). Developed as the urban counterpart of the agricultural water conservation plans, this program provides an overview of the best management practices being implemented by urban water purveyors as conservation measures.

2009 Ground Water Summary Report

The purpose of this report is to summarize the data submitted to the Agency by well operators in February 2010 from the following annual reports:

- Ground Water Extraction Reports (agricultural and urban)
- Water Conservation Plans (agricultural and urban)
- Water and Land Use Forms (agricultural)

The agricultural data from the ground water extraction program covers the reporting year of November 1, 2008, through October 31, 2009; the urban data covers calendar year 2009. The agricultural and urban water conservation plans adopted for 2010 are also summarized. This report is intended to present a synopsis of current water extraction within the Salinas Valley, including agricultural and urban water conservation improvements reported to be adopted, to reduce the total amount of water pumped. It is not the purpose of this report to thoroughly analyze the factors that contribute to increases or decreases in pumping.

Reporting Methods

The Ground Water Conservation and Extraction Program provides well operators with a choice of three different reporting methods for each of their wells: Water Flowmeter, Electrical Meter, or Hour Meter (timer). The summary of ground water extractions presented in this report is compiled from data generated by all three reporting methods. Ordinance 3717 requires annual pump efficiency tests and/or meter calibration of each well to ensure the accuracy of the data reported.

Disclaimer

While the Agency has made every effort to ensure the accuracy of the data presented in this report, it should be noted that the data is submitted by individual reporting parties and is not verified by Agency staff. In addition, since so many factors can affect the extraction calculations, it is understood that no reporting method is 100 percent accurate. The Agency maintains strict quality assurance in the compilation, standardization, and entry of the data received. The Agency received Ground Water Extraction Reports from ninety-seven percent (97%) of the 1836 wells in the Salinas Valley for the 2009 reporting year. Agricultural and Urban Water Conservation Plan submittals for 2010 were both ninety-five percent (95%).

Reporting Format

Ground water extraction data is presented in this report by measurement in acre-feet. One acre-foot is equal to 325,851 gallons.

Ground Water Extraction Data Summary

The Salinas Valley Ground Water Basin is divided into four major hydrologic subareas whose boundaries are derived from discernible changes in the hydrogeologic conditions of the underground aquifers. Figure 1 (below) illustrates the Agency-designated Zones of the Salinas Valley in relation to the hydrologic subareas.



Figure 1. Agency Zones and Hydrologic Subareas of the Salinas Valley Ground Water Basin

Ground Water Extraction Data Summary (continued)

Summary of Methods Used for Extraction Reporting

The distribution of methods used for ground water extraction reporting (agricultural and urban) for the 2009 reporting year is shown in Table 1; a percentage distribution by volume is shown in Figure 2.

Table 1. Total extraction data by reporting method

Reporting Method	*Acre-Feet per Reporting Method*	*Wells per Reporting Method*
Water Flowmeter	354,104	1,338
Electrical Meter	145,169	416
Hour Meter	11,951	20
Total (2009)	511,224	1,774
Average ('00-'09)	**500,670**	**1,685**



Figure 2. Percentage distribution by volume of methods used for extraction reporting

Total Extraction Data by Hydrologic Subarea and Type of Use

The total ground water extractions for the 2009 reporting year are summarized by hydrologic subarea, type of use (agricultural and urban in Table 2), and percentage (Figure 3).

Table 2. Total extraction data by hydrologic subarea and type of use

Subarea	*Agricultural Pumping (acre-feet)*	*Urban Pumping (acre-feet)*	*Total Pumping (acre-feet)*
Pressure	100,966	20,199	121,165
East Side	85,202	13,786	98,988
Forebay	140,567	7,521	148,088
Upper Valley	138,972	4,011	142,983
Total	**465,707**	**45,517**	**511,224**
Percent of Total	**91.1%**	**8.9%**	**100%**



Figure 3. Percentage of total extractions by hydrologic subarea

Urban Extraction Data by City or Area

The total ground water extractions attributed to urban (residential, commercial/institutional, industrial, and governmental) pumping for the 2009 reporting year are summarized by city or area in Table 3. Figure 4 shows how the total urban pumping for 2009 is apportioned among each city or area.

Table 3. Urban extraction data by city or area

City or Area	*Urban Pumping (AF)*	*Percentage of Total*
Castroville	760	1.7%
Chualar	132	0.3%
Former Fort Ord	2,609	5.7%
Gonzales	1,442	3.2%
Greenfield	2,348	5.1%
King City	2,881	6.3%
Marina Coast WD	1,951	4.3%
Other Areas	9,268	20.3%
Salinas	19,693	43.3%
San Ardo	116	0.3%
San Lucas	40	0.1%
Soledad	2,410	5.3%
Soledad Prisons	1,867	4.1%
Total	**45,517**	**100.0%**



Figure 4. Distribution of urban extraction by city or area

Agricultural Water Conservation

The Agricultural Water Conservation Plans include net irrigated acreage, irrigation method, and crop category. This information is forecasted and indicates what the grower plans to do in the upcoming year. It reflects the changing trends in irrigation methods in the Salinas Valley. Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7 show the distribution of irrigation methods by crop type for 1993, 2008, 2009, and 2010, respectively. Figure 5 (on the following page) illustrates the irrigation method trends from 1993 to 2010.

Table 4. 1993 - net acre distribution of irrigation methods by crop type (based on 94% companies reported)

1993	*Furrow*	*Sprinkler & Furrow*	*Hand Move Sprinklers*	*Solid Set Sprinklers*	*Linear Move*	*Drip*	*Other[1]*	*Total*
Vegetables	2,349	84,060	30,764	6,607	3,827	3,682	0	131,289
Field Crops	575	2,173	2,236	90	50	48	0	5,172
Berries	1	0	0	0	0	4,158	0	4,159
Grapes	261	0	0	13,347	0	15,976	0	29,584
Tree Crops	0	0	122	251	0	1,216	10	1,599
Forage	41	202	1,327	0	48	0	189	1,807
Unirrigated								N/A
Total	**3,227**	**86,435**	**34,449**	**20,295**	**3,925**	**25,080**	**199**	**173,610**

Table 5. 2008 - net acre distribution of irrigation methods by crop type (based on 94% companies reported)

2008	*Furrow*	*Sprinkler & Furrow*	*Hand Move Sprinklers*	*Solid Set Sprinklers*	*Linear Move*	*Drip*	*Other[1]*	*Total*
Vegetables	547	31,818	23,616	10,622	1,644	54,577	4	122,828
Field Crops	107	215	341	1,528	0	226	80	2,497
Berries	0	192	276	0	0	4,595	0	5,063
Grapes	0	0	0	659	0	35,805	0	36,464
Tree Crops	0	0	2,807	412	0	2287	0	5,506
Forage	0	0	320	0	0	0	18	338
Other Type[2]	0	0	0	28	0	940	0	968
Unirrigated								1,402
Total	**654**	**32,225**	**27,360**	**13,249**	**1,644**	**98,430**	**102**	**175,066**

Table 6. 2009 - net acre distribution of irrigation methods by crop type (based on 96% companies reported)

2009	*Furrow*	*Sprinkler & Furrow*	*Hand Move Sprinklers*	*Solid Set Sprinklers*	*Linear Move*	*Drip*	*Other[1]*	*Total*
Vegetables	50	33,970	21,921	11,754	927	51,311	0	119,933
Field Crops	75	736	422	100	1,416	502	143	3,394
Berries	0	185	0	0	0	6,209	0	6,394
Grapes	0	0	0	2,045	0	34,056	0	36,101
Tree Crops	0	0	0	366	0	2,018	0	2,384
Forage	18	0	243	10	0	0	92	363
Other Type[2]	0	4	0	213	0	936	0	1,152
Unirrigated								6,742
Total	**143**	**34,895**	**22,586**	**14,488**	**2,343**	**95,032**	**235**	**176,463**

Table 7. 2010 - net acre distribution of irrigation methods by crop type (based on 95% companies reported)

2010	*Furrow*	*Sprinkler & Furrow*	*Hand Move Sprinklers*	*Solid Set Sprinklers*	*Linear Move*	*Drip*	*Other[1]*	*Total*
Vegetables	1,190	27,828	22,191	8,474	808	58,352	1,857	120,700
Field Crops	40	750	540	28	1,416	367	0	3,141
Berries	0	38	0	400	0	6,761	0	7,199
Grapes	0	0	0	678	0	36,270	0	36,948
Tree Crops	0	0	0	366	0	1,354	0	1,720
Forage	18	0	185	10	0	32	0	245
Other Type[2]	0	149	2,429	190	15	1,566	202	4,551
Unirrigated								6,511
Total	**1,248**	**28,765**	**25,345**	**10,146**	**2,239**	**104,702**	**2,059**	**181,015**

[1] "Other" may include an irrigation system not listed here or a different combination of systems
[2] "Other Type" are for other crop types not included, i.e. cactus, flower bulbs, etc.
NOTE: Percentage of companies reported varies from year to year

Agricultural Water Conservation (continued)



Figure 5. Types of irrigation methods used in the Salinas Valley based on companies reported

NOTE: Reported net acres vary from year to year

Agricultural Water Conservation (continued)

Since 1991, Salinas Valley growers have submitted Agricultural Water Conservation Plans to the Agency. Table 8 shows the number of net acres, by year, for selected Best Management Practices (BMPs) or water conservation measures which were reported to be implemented over the past eight years.

Table 8. Agricultural Best Management Practices reported to be adopted from 2003 through 2010

Best Management Practices	Net Acres[1]							
	2003	*2004*	*2005*	*2006*	*2007*	*2008*	*2009*	*2010*
12 Months Set Aside	2,742	6,012	3,337	2,557	2,282	768	9,043	7,447
Summer Fallow	2,278	2,025	2,535	5,797	464	703	509	692
Water Flowmeters	124,342	133,349	131,711	133,148	137,701	105,374	124,561	138,957
Time Clock/Pressure Switch	133,405	140,167	138,707	142,184	148,993	117,554	126,694	144,853
Soil Moisture Sensors	50,460	49,328	48,824	50,130	53,269	37,631	32,427	44,644
Pre-Irrigation Reduction	90,878	93,094	88,576	96,082	102,103	73,186	84,693	96,908
Reduced Sprinkler Spacing	76,691	82,292	81,068	87,159	85,105	72,287	83,046	90,065
Sprinkler Improvements	110,194	102,041	105,544	102,642	105,491	89,973	105,495	111,889
Off-Wind Irrigation	111,278	111,862	117,254	113,867	112,952	92,160	107,552	114,843
Leakage Reduction	121,890	118,125	115,117	116,662	117,655	94,694	105,702	113,820
Micro Irrigation System	58,742	62,796	68,861	74,829	77,107	55,749	71,710	67,383
Surge Flow Irrigation	8,538	6,708	7,180	7,117	4,551	4,549	7,182	8,785
Tailwater Return System	23,914	27,653	23,097	23,968	14,410	15,906	10,046	16,581
Land Leveling/Grading	69,420	71,682	69,673	71,873	73,993	60,710	56,482	73,361

[1] Due to unique crop rotations, it is difficult to account for each BMP used on total Crop Acres; therefore Net Acres were used.

Note: For Urban Water Conservation Plan information, see page 10.



Figure 6. Top ten Best Management Practices reported to be adopted for 2010

Water and Land Use

Agricultural Water Pumped

The following three figures present, by crop type and hydrologic subarea reported, the agricultural water pumped (Fig. 7), irrigated net acres (Fig. 8), and amount of water pumped per acre (Fig. 9) by hydrologic subarea and crop type. The data was compiled using the reported acreage and water pumped from the 2009 Water and Land Use Forms. The data accounts for all crop types reported and all reporting methods: water flowmeter, electrical meter, and hour meter.

Changing weather patterns, variable soils, and crop types affect the amount of water needed for efficient irrigation. Even during a normal rain year, pumping rates will vary from one area to another and crop types will vary depending on economic demand.



Figure 7. 2009 reported acre-feet by crop type & hydrologic subarea



Figure 8. 2009 reported net acres by crop type & hydrologic subarea



Figure 9. 2009 reported acre-feet/acre by crop type & hydrologic subarea

Urban Water Conservation

Since 1996, the Agency has been collecting data for the Urban Water Conservation Plan program. Table 9 shows the forecasted adoption of "Best Management Practices" (water conservation measures) for the past five years, as a percentage of total acreage reported. It is important to note that, while all of the listed practices apply to "large" water systems (200 or more customer connections), not all apply to "small" water systems (between 15 and 199 customer connections). The practices that apply *only* to large systems are printed in **bold** below.

Table 9. Urban Best Management Practices reported to be adopted from 2006 through 2010

Best Management Practices	*2006*	*2007*	*2008*	*2009*	*2010*
Provide speakers to community groups and media	**70%**	**67%**	**67%**	**85%**	**86%**
Use paid and public service advertising	**70%**	**67%**	**67%**	**85%**	**89%**
Provide conservation information in bill inserts	76%	54%	79%	96%	90%
Provide individual historical water use information on water bills	81%	80%	85%	90%	85%
Coordinate with other entities in regional efforts to promote water conservation practices	92%	82%	91%	94%	85%
Work with school districts to provide educational materials and instructional assistance	**72%**	**68%**	**69%**	**87%**	**87%**
Implement requirements that all new connections be metered and billed by volume of use	93%	81%	94%	98%	99%
Establish a program to retrofit any existing unmetered connections and bill by volume of use	57%	54%	58%	97%	97%
Offer free interior and exterior water audits to identify water conservation opportunities	**92%**	**100%**	**54%**	**79%**	**78%**
Provide incentives to achieve water conservation by way of free conservation fixtures (showerheads, hose end timers) and/or conservation "adjustments" to water bills	**68%**	**61%**	**67%**	**85%**	**94%**
Enforcement and support of water conserving plumbing fixture standards, including requirement for ultra low flush toilets in all new construction	**94%**	**100%**	**55%**	**100%**	**99%**
Support of State/Federal legislation prohibiting sale of toilets using more than 1.6 gallons per flush	90%	88%	61%	78%	76%
Program to retrofit existing toilets to reduce flush volume (with displacement devices)	62%	41%	28%	83%	87%
Program to encourage replacement of existing toilets with ultra low flush (through rebates, incentives, etc.)	**71%**	**67%**	**67%**	**80%**	**95%**
Provide guidelines, information, and/or incentives for installation of more efficient landscapes and water-saving practices	83%	63%	87%	90%	95%
Encourage local nurseries to promote use of low water use plants	59%	35%	62%	58%	55%
Develop and implement landscape water conservation ordinances pursuant to the "Water Conservation in Landscaping Act"	**35%**	**11%**	**33%**	**63%**	**68%**
Identify and contact top industrial, commercial, and/or institutional customers directly; offer and encourage water audits to identify conservation opportunities	**68%**	**59%**	**65%**	**57%**	**67%**
Review proposed water uses for new commercial and industrial water service, and make recommendations for improving efficiency before completion of building permit process	**73%**	**62%**	**72%**	**64%**	**64%**
Complete an audit of water distribution system at least every three years as prescribed by American Water Works Association	64%	36%	24%	60%	69%
Perform distribution system leak detection and repair whenever the audit reveals that it would be cost effective	71%	47%	28%	85%	98%
Advise customers when it appears possible that leaks exist on customer's side of water meter	94%	84%	94%	100%	100%
Identify irrigators of large landscapes (3 acres or more) and offer landscape audits to determine conservation opportunities	**30%**	**8%**	**65%**	**57%**	**73%**
Provide conservation training, information, and incentives necessary to encourage use of conservation practices	**32%**	**61%**	**67%**	**81%**	**97%**
Encourage and promote the elimination of non-conserving pricing and adoption of conservation pricing policies	30%	30%	64%	84%	89%
Implementation of conservation pricing policies	29%	30%	64%	88%	93%
Enact and enforce measures prohibiting water waste as specified in Agency Ordinance No. 3932 or as subsequently amended, and encourage the efficient use of water	46%	33%	80%	78%	54%
Implement and/or support programs for the treatment and reuse of industrial waste water / storm water / waste water	**40%**	**26%**	**32%**	**61%**	**50%**

This page left blank intentionally.

Monterey County
Board of Supervisors

Fernando Armenta	District #1
Louis Calcagno, Chair	District #2
Simón Salinas	District #3
Jane Parker, Vice Chair	District #4
Dave Potter	District #5

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Board of Directors

Jose Mendez	District #1
Silvio Bernardi	District #2
Roger Moitoso	District #3
Doug Smith	District #4
Ken Ekelund	District #5
Stephen P. Collins	Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association
Richard Morgantini	Farm Bureau
David Hart, Chair	Agricultural Advisory Committee
Richard Ortiz, Vice Chair	Mayor Select Committee

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Executive Management

Curtis V. Weeks, General Manager
William L. Phillips, Deputy General Manager
Robert Johnson, Assistant General Manager, Chief – Water Resources Planning and Management
Brent Buche, Assistant General Manager, Chief – Operations and Maintenance
David Kimbrough, Finance Manager, Chief – Administrative Services

Summary Report Team

Kathleen Thomasberg, Senior Hydrologist
Tamara Voss, Hydrologist
Carla James, Water Resources Technician
Chris Jannusch, Water Resources Technician
Teresa Campa, Engineering Aide II

For more information, contact:

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
893 Blanco Circle, Salinas

Mailing address:
P.O. Box 930, Salinas, CA 93902-0930

831.755.4860
831.424.7935 (fax)

www.mcwra.co.monterey.ca.us


MONTEREY COUNTY WATER RESOURCES AGENCY
1947