

SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY SURVEY ON WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Dr. Lisa Bryant & Dr. Jeff Cummins
Institute for Leadership and Public Policy

Purpose of Survey

- Get an idea of how people view water supply in SJV
- Gauge support for infrastructure programs
- Gauge wiliness to pay for those improvements through taxes

Pressing Questions

- Do people view water as an issue important to the SJ Valley?
- Do people perceive current water levels as sufficient to sustain residential and ag communities?
- Would people support a regional organization to solve water infrastructure problems?
- Would people support a special tax to pay for water infrastructure and delivery?
- Who do people think should pay for updates to water infrastructure and delivery? Are they willing to pay a tax increase?

SJV Water Infrastructure Financing Survey

- 8 counties SJV Valley
- ~20 questions
- Likely voters (2 of 4 last statewide elections)
- Live, phone interviews (70% cell, 30% landline)
- July 2020
- N=355, +/-5% at 95c.i. (still in field...)

Opening Statement of Survey

- Informed the survey was about water:

“We are conducting a survey about *water issues* in the San Joaquin Valley. We would like to include your opinion...”

Most Important Issue Facing SJV

- “Aside from coronavirus, what do you think is the most important issue facing the SJV today?”

	TOTAL	Ag	Non-Ag
Water Supply	27.9	42.0	20.7
Jobs/Economy	21.7	28.8	23.8
Homelessness/ Housing/ Poverty	8.7	1.1	8.7

Economy

- “How would you rate the SJV’s current economy?”

	TOTAL	Men	Women
Excellent	1.8	3.2	0.1
Good	35.6	42.4	29.4
Not so good	46.7	34.5	57.7
Poor	15.9	19.9	12.2

Dependence on Ag/Jobs in Ag

- The SJV's economy depends on agricultural production more so than any other place in the state.

	TOTAL	Ag	Non-Ag
Strongly agree	67.1	57.2	64.5
Somewhat agree	28.9	35.2	30.9
Somewhat disagree	3.9	7.6	4.2
Strongly disagree	2.1	0.0	3.4

Future Water Supply

- Do you think the future supply of water will be adequate enough for RESIDENTIAL use?

	TOTAL	Ag	Non-Ag	Men	Women
Yes	40.1	44.0	34.5	46.5	34.2
No	44.8	45.0	50.1	38.9	50.3
DK	15.1	11.0	15.4	14.6	15.5

Future Water Supply

- Do you think the future supply of water will be adequate enough for AGRICULTURAL use?

	TOTAL	Ag	Non-Ag	Men	Women
Yes	25.7	30.4	24.9	25.7	25.8
No	63.7	52.2	65.2	65.0	62.4
DK	10.6	17.4	9.9	9.3	11.8

Water Supply Responsibility

- Studies of water supply indicate shortages will remain a concern in the future. Who do you think should lead the efforts to address this concern?

	TOTAL	Ag	Non-Ag
State govt	31.7	33.1	24.3
Federal	7.5	12.0	8.8
City and County	6.4	2.2	7.1
Private Sector	3.2	2.5	3.1
Combination of Public and Private	51.2	50.2	56.7

Support for Regional Organization

There is a proposal to create a regional organization in the SJV w/representative from local governments, low-income communities, agriculture, and environmental interests to develop solutions to address current and future water supply conditions. Would you support the development of the creation of this body?

	TOTAL	Dem	Rep	DTS
Yes	91.7	86.7	98.7	88.0
No	8.3	13.3	1.3	12.0

Possible Solutions

- Which of the following do you think would be most effective at addressing concerns about future water supplies?

	TOTAL	Ag	Non-Ag
Build more dams to store water	32.9	32.8	30.1
Install water use efficiency technology	23.1	34.5	30.2
Repair current water infrastructure	16.3	3.3	24.0
Recharge groundwater into underground storage	12.8	14.2	8.6
Build more canals and aqueducts to move	10.9	9.4	10.8
Fallow agricultural land to reduce water demands	4.0	5.8	4.7

Possible Solutions

- Which of the following do you think would be most effective at addressing concerns about future water supplies?

	TOTAL	Dem	Rep	DTS/NPP
Build more dams to store water	32.9	36.1	34.1	31.5
Install water use efficiency technology	23.1	16.3	30.0	20.5
Repair current water infrastructure	16.3	17.5	12.2	18.3
Recharge groundwater into underground storage	12.8	11.6	12.0	20.5
Build more canals and aqueducts to move	10.9	14.4	7.4	14.0
Fallow agricultural land to reduce water demands	4.0	4.1	4.3	2.2

Who Should Pay?

- Of the following, who do you think should pay for new water storage and delivery to address future water supply concerns in the SJV?

	TOTAL	Dem	Rep	DTS/NPP
State govt	37.7	42.1	37.9	37.9
Federal govt	23.3	17.3	29.6	26.8
City and County govt	13.7	18.9	7.1	9.6
Farmers only in SJV	6.0	3.5	3.2	3.6
All Residents in SJV	19.3	18.2	22.2	22.1

Who Should Pay Balance?

- IF Farmers only...

	TOTAL
Added Property Tax Assessment	14.0
Added water consumption tax surcharge (based on use)	76.3
DK	9.7

- IF All Residents...

	TOTAL
Added Property Tax Assessment	10.1
Added water consumption tax surcharge (based on use)	53.0
Added special sales tax	27.0
DK	9.9

Special Sales Tax

- One way to pay is through a special sales tax...if a 0.5 (zero point five) percent sales tax appeared on the ballot, how likely would you be to support the special sales tax?

	TOTAL	Economy Good	Economy Poor
Very likely	25.5	25.6	26.2
Somewhat likely	43.2	43.4	44.6
Somewhat unlikely	11.8	14.9	9.7
Not at all likely	19.6	16.1	19.5

Concerns over Special Tax

- If passed, what would be your greatest concern?

	TOTAL
The money would be diverted to purposes other than water projects	62.8
The money would not reduce the water shortage conditions	14.9
The money would not benefit the regional economy	9.0
The money would not reduce job losses in agriculture	5.7
I have no concerns	7.6

Concerns over shortages

- Which of the following are you most concerned about when considering alternatives to address water shortages?

	TOTAL	Ag	Non-Ag
Maintaining my current job and income	14.0	29.1	13.1
Sustaining the regional economy for the benefit of everyone	61.0	49.2	60.1
Keeping taxes low	25.0	21.7	26.8

Summary of Results

- Broad consensus that water supply and ag play key roles in the success of the SJV
- Strong support of a regional organization that includes key stakeholders
- Support for a special sales tax, but messaging is key. (\$1 for \$200 goods)
- Those who are most vulnerable to job/income loss willing to support increase, but partisan opposition.