

CONTACT MEMO

Date: September 25, 1996
Contact: David Guy, California Farm Bureau Federation
Setting: Meeting at Farm Bureau

David Guy and I spoke about the Farm Bureau's perspective on conjunctive use issues throughout the state. The following is a summary of our conversation.

1. Within the last year the Farm Bureau has taken a look at conjunctive use projects throughout state. South San Joaquin Valley programs are the best models they have found, including Semitropic and Arvin Edison.
2. 500,000 acre-feet is a high goal; it would be best to work up to this goal. Setting large numbers can send a negative message.
3. Conjunctive use is local issue; a large, regional program is not sound, although the drought water bank is viable. Conjunctive use should involve local programs tied into a drought bank.
4. Conjunctive use arrangement needs to be done with local entity -- contractual arrangements will help provide assurances to landowners.
5. District has to have buy-in of landowners. Semitropic had has two levels of agreement:
 - a. MET & Semitropic
 - b. Semitropic and landowners
6. Districts have to find a way to reach outside the district boundaries (Yolo contract may be a good example)
7. Obstacles
 - a. Psychological obstacle -- fear of losing control of groundwater (the Owens Valley syndrome).
 - b. Getting districts and landowners to work together; there is still some tension between the two
 - c. Protecting overlying landowner's rights -- lip service not enough; what happens at end of drought cycle when everyone turns on their pumps? Priority should be allocated according to overlying rights
 - d. Prescriptive rights issue -- if it attaches, people will be reluctant to participate in conjunctive use (the importing entity will need to relinquish prescriptive rights).
 - e. There needs to be a clear net addition to system.
 - f. In lieu recharge issue -- how to account for the volume of water -- does prescriptive right attach?
 - g. Storage component of CALFED is very important (Sites Reservoir, Los Banos Grande). Conjunctive use should not be substitute for surface storage.
 - h. Conservation of water allows for transfer. Incentive should be provided for water efficiency & conservation.
 - i. Distrust of DWR; conflict between SWP portion of DWR & local assistance.

A:\GUY.NTS

8. Recommendations:

- a. Public outreach
- b. Provide assurances that are real, not veiled attempts.
- c. MET should be held back or tempered so controversy is minimized
- d. Model Water Transfer Act - repeals water transfer laws
 - 1) User initiated transfers (District has ultimate authority over independent landowners.
 - 2) Groundwater.
 - 3) Riparian rights.
 - 4) No increase in jurisdiction over pre-1914 water rights.
- e. Separate DWR into two components.
- f. Define Counties' Role
 - 1) County's role should not interfere with District's ability to operate.
 - 2) County can help address concerns of larger community
 - 3) District should realize that there is larger perspective beyond their own local interests.
- g. Environmental issues should be addressed. Corners should not be cut; a good and thorough environmental review is important (CEQA).

9. Additional Contacts.

- a. Bert Bundy, Tehama Board of Supervisors, Board of Farm Bureau
- b. Michael Jackson, regional counsel for rural counties (Quincy) - attorney.