

CONTACT MEMO

Date: January 27, 1997
Contact: Dee E. Swearingen, Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District (ACID)
Setting: Lunch Meeting in Anderson

Dee and I discussed CALFED's role in conjunctive use. The following is a summary of Dee's comments.

- 1) Most opposition to conjunctive use is political or the result of financial jealousies.
- 2) Willing conjunctive use participants will be at agencies that can physically implement conjunctive use operations
- 3) ACID encompasses two counties (Shasta and Tehama), and provides water from Redding to Cottonwood Creek. ACID is currently looking at water conservation projects
- 4) ACID has no wells and only one grower in the district has a well. ACID would like credit for recharge that occurs along its unlined canals
- 5) ACID would participate in a conjunctive use program, but potential problems with the County may make it difficult
- 6) Most of the districts are interested in conjunctive use programs, but opposition comes from the Counties. Shasta County is likely to follow Tehama County's lead on groundwater ordinances. Enough money may overcome County opposition
- 7) Fears come from concern over the ability to provide long-term assurances. A large factor is education -- much is needed in Shasta and Tehama counties. DWR northern district has been very helpful in providing information
- 8) Most people still have an open mind about CALFED, but they believe CALFED is too focussed on the Delta fix as opposed to watershed management and area of origin protection
- 9) Storage should be a large part of CALFED's discussions
- 10) Shasta County water managers meet once a month; Bob Dietz of Belle Vista is the Secretary; Mike Ryan with the Bureau also attends
- 11) One obstacle to conjunctive use that CALFED should consider will be identifying third party impacts and developing mitigation measures for those impacts
- 12) Workshops would be very helpful; ACID and other water managers would be open to conjunctive use discussions