

# Ramp Down (v11.23.2020)

---

## DISCUSSION TOPIC SEQUENCE: Interests > Decision Criteria > Options

---

<b>Problem to be Solved</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ How do the basins ramp down or reduce extraction to the sustainable yield by 2040? SGMA requires basins to achieve sustainability by 2040.</li><li>▪ What makes a smarter ramp down?</li><li>▪ What concerns do you personally or do others have associated with a ramp down?</li></ul>
<b>Existing Policy</b>	<a href="#">Allocation Ordinance</a> (does not stipulate a minimum allocation or ramp down method)
<b>Resources</b>	Oxnard GSP and Pleasant Valley GSP OPV White Paper <a href="#">[Link]</a> Example: California Emergency Drought Regulation 25% Reduction Regulation ( <a href="#">Fact Sheet Link</a> and <a href="#">Resource Page</a> ) and Governor <a href="#">Executive Order</a> Example: Borrego Water District Example <a href="#">Stipulated Judgment</a> Example: LPUG White Paper <a href="#">[Link]</a> Core Stakeholder Group Meeting Summaries #6 (9/15/20); #7 (9/29/20) <a href="#">[Link]</a>
<b>Key Term Definitions</b>	<b>Ramp Down:</b> <i>end point = sustainable yield</i> <b>Allocation Reduction Method:</b> <i>how you get there</i> <b>Minimum Allocation:</b> “Sustainable Yield means the maximum quantity of water, calculated over a base period representative of long-term conditions in the basin and including any temporary surplus, that can be withdrawn annually from a groundwater supply without causing an undesirable result.” [Water Code § 10721(w)]
<b>Stakeholder Interests + Issues</b>	<i>Issues identified to date.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ GMA Board has requested a minimum threshold per acre to avoid stranding land with no water.</li><li>▪ Responsive to different needs and constraints of high-water users and low-water users</li><li>▪ Move away from CombCodes towards land-based management of allocation as part of reduction strategy</li><li>▪ Treat surface water and groundwater together</li><li>▪ Manage water rights questions to create a legally defensible, durable approach.</li><li>▪ Limit cut-back requirements in short term (5 years) to allow time for project plans to materialize &amp; inform long-term cut-back needs</li><li>▪ Develop multiple ramp-down pathways based on different degrees of success with water projects and basin optimization. I.e. Best-case scenario ramp down with significant new water; middle option and worst-case</li></ul>

---

	option.
<b>Decision Criteria</b>	<p><i>What variables does the Core Stakeholder Group use to evaluate or weigh ramp down options?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Feasibility of administering the system</li> <li>▪ Legally defensible / durable</li> <li>▪ Burden sharing</li> <li>▪ Adaptive management, tied to certainty (vs. optimism) of projects or ability to create new supply and climatic variability (scale and refinement)</li> <li>▪ Predictability to plan investments and business decisions</li> <li>▪ Support diversity of crop types recognizing water use efficiency</li> <li>▪ Economic analysis of impacts</li> </ul>
<b>Options and Ideas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establish linear progression (simple, easy to administer, equitable burden share).</li> <li>▪ Establish linear progression to a minimum and then “safe harbor” (i.e. don’t fall below that minimum).</li> <li>▪ Reduce in “steps,” i.e. 5-year increments.</li> <li>▪ Delay ramp down to generate more fees from pumping, then do a cliff / dramatic reduction at 5 years or 10 years.</li> <li>▪ Create variable ramp down, set in 5-year increments, with smaller percentage reduction in initial increments, to allow projects time to come online. (Example scenario: 50% total reduction required over 20 years. First 5 years, reduce 5%; at end of 10 years, hit 25% reduction. And, then accelerate percentage in last 10 years.</li> <li>▪ Allow business owner to customize ramp down as long as owner hits benchmarks.</li> <li>▪ Provide for climatic variability in the end point based on physical location (i.e. coastal zones vs. inland); consider 3 potential zones. End point would reflect that zone (and thus affect the slope of the ramp down for individual users).</li> <li>▪ Consider establishing a floor and a ceiling (cap water use).</li> <li>▪ Consider general categories of crops and customize ramp down to those pools of crop-type (vs. individual ramp down).</li> <li>▪ OPV White Paper Hybrid Method: % reduction and AF/acre.</li> <li>▪ Establish minimum allocation or acre-foot per acre of land.</li> <li>▪ Others?</li> </ul>
<b>Concepts for Proposals</b>	<p>3. <i>Topics to be addressed in ramp down / allocation</i></p> <p>3.1. Assume that ramp down and associated reductions might <b>link Oxnard and Pleasant Valley</b> via joint management and sharing responsibility for reducing pumping (i.e. PV may commit to additional reductions beyond what might be needed if PV were managed as a single basin).</p> <p>3.2. <b>End Point(s): The Core Stakeholder Group has defined the end-point as 50,600AFY, the mid-point range in the GSP modeling.</b> This assumes a sustainable yield of 39,000AFY in the Oxnard Basin and 11,600AFR in</p>

---

the Pleasant Valley Basin. (agreed to CSG#7 9/29/20). [includes surface water as part of modeling assumptions]

- 3.3. Integrate **5-year intervals for adaptive management** in concert with the GSP update; adjust sustainable yield and ramp down based on particular pre-defined conditions
- 3.4. Consider a **minimum allocation**, recognizing that it must be supportive of the sustainable yield over the 20-year period.
- 3.5. Characterize how **surface water** is factored in.
- 3.6. Do ramp-down elements treat **high water and low water users differently?**
- 3.7. Consider inter-play of **GSP management areas**.
- 3.8. Establish a **strategy for reducing pumping (timing and location)** that might have a greater impact to realize management objectives and achieve sustainability goals

---

**Preliminary Recommendation**    *To be developed*

---

**Agreements / Recommendations**    *To be developed*

---

# Allocation

---

*Facilitators' Note: The facilitators would like to acknowledge the history, work, and extensive conversations that have gone into developing the allocation plan, culminating with the adoption of the allocation ordinance. The facilitators acknowledge that the GMA and some stakeholders do not want to reopen the allocation ordinance. The facilitators acknowledge that the allocation plan is a primary driver for other stakeholders' participation in the facilitated process. However, given the articulated goal of avoiding adjudication and given that the ordinance left open some issues to be addressed, the Core Stakeholder Group will consider and decide which issues merit group discussion.*

<b>Problem(s) to be Solved</b>	What are the elements of the Allocation Plan that need to be developed or merit attention or refinement? What are the key issues that the group needs to tackle to fully implement the allocation ordinance, specifically, or an allocation plan, more generally?
<b>Existing Policy</b>	<a href="#">Allocation Ordinance</a> Groundwater Market Pilot Project in Oxnard Subbasin
<b>Resources</b>	<a href="#">Trading Sustainably: Critical Considerations for Local Groundwater Markets under SGMA, Nysten et al, Wheeler Water Institute (June 2017)</a>  Orange County Water District Replenishment Program / Allocation Annual Application Process
<b>Key Term Definitions</b>	<b>Conjunctive use</b> refers to the coordinated and planned <b>use</b> and management of both surface water and groundwater resources to maximize the availability and reliability of water supplies in a region to meet various management objectives. (Source: DWR)  <b>In-lieu replenishment</b> can be defined as providing water to meet a demand that would otherwise be met from groundwater extraction. <b>In-lieu</b> replenishment changes a basin's groundwater budget by reducing the volume of groundwater pumping. (Source: DWR)
<b>Stakeholder Interests + Issues</b>	<i>Ideas expressed during stakeholder assessment process</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Incentivize conjunctive use</li> <li>▪ Clarifications on carryover</li> <li>▪ Avoid penalizing farmers who were early adopters of conservation measures</li> <li>▪ Avoid big winners and losers—everyone “feel some pain”</li> <li>▪ Avoid zero allocations</li> <li>▪ Address issues of poor historical data on water use</li> <li>▪ Base period and initial allocation</li> <li>▪ Equitable partitioning of water between M &amp; I and Ag</li> <li>▪ Move to land-based (vs. wellhead-based) system)</li> </ul>
<b>Decision Criteria</b>	