

## CONTACT MEMO

Contact: John Fielden and Susan Tatayon, DWR  
Date: June 9, 1997  
Setting: Meeting at The Resources Building

I met with John Fielden and Susan Tatayon at Bob Potter's suggestion to get more information on current DWR conjunctive use projects. The following is a summary of our conversation.

- 1) General Issues
  - a. The State Water Project would be operated to deliver water (either directly or through exchange with the Bureau) in normal and wet years to the program areas in the Sacramento Valley, allowing for in-lieu recharge of the basins; groundwater would not be pumped, allowing the basin to recharge
  - b. Most of the conjunctive use programs would operate by groundwater substitution in dry and critical years whereby participants pump groundwater to reduce the amount of surface water delivered to them by the SWP. The surface water would be transferred to (purchased by) the State Water Contractors.
  - c. The State Water Contractors are funding all programs; the amount paid is proportional to their respective Table A entitlement
- 2) American Basin Project
  - a. DWR is wrapping-up the feasibility study and negotiating with sellers, local participants and state water contractors
  - b. The five participants are: South Sutter, Natomas Mutual, Pleasant Grove, Placer County, Reclamation District 1001
  - c. Up to 55,000 acre-feet proposed for transfer in dry and critical years
  - d. Long-term contract through year 2030
  - e. New facilities will be required and are to be paid by DWR/SWC; the facilities may be built and operated by local agencies
  - f. Opt-in/opt-out test case: nine contractors out of 29 have opted in, meaning they will be the only contractors to fund the project and receive the benefits
- 3) Lower Colusa Basin
  - a. Colusa and Yolo Counties
  - b. up to 35,000 acre-feet. Source of water will be Sacramento River and exchange with Bureau
  - c. Three participants: Reclamation District 108, Yolo Zamora Water District, and Colusa County Water District
  - d. The pre-feasibility study is finished and DWR is currently writing a report
  - e. This project may also become an opt-in/opt-out program
  - f. In-lieu recharge will work because not all areas within lower Colusa basin are full
  - g. At least two more years of study will likely be required before implementation

- 4) Los Rios Farms
  - a. Yolo County near Putah Creek and west of Yolo Bypass
  - b. The Eastern Yolo County Conjunctive Use project was the preliminary study; Los Rios was intended to be the test project
  - c. Up to 14,000 acre-feet dry-year supply
  - d. Some new facilities would be required
  - e. The project is waiting on DWR management and SWC approval to proceed
  
- 5) Provident Irrigation District
  - a. Provident ID would be the only participating district
  - b. The ability for in-lieu recharge has yet to be determined; some potential exists for recharge if the basin is drawn down
  - c. Up to 30,000 acre-feet dry year supply
  - d. DWR northern district completed a preliminary study and concluded that there were no fatal flaws for the project
  - e. DWR proposed to Provident a small-scale test program
  - f. Provident is now waiting for specifics from DWR prior to working out an agreement
  
- 6) Chico M&T Ranch
  - a. Area is between Chico and the Sacramento River
  - b. DWR northern district has completed three phases of study
  - c. There is no planned recharge component; the project is referred to as a "facilitated water transfer proposal"
  - d. The SWCs would pay M&T for facilities to substitute groundwater
  - e. This is the only conjunctive use project that would operate in the deeper aquifer
  - f. Up to 15,000 acre-feet dry-year supply
  - g. The project is on hold; the Phase 3 report has not been released at the request of M&T management
  - h. The project may not be viable under Butte County's groundwater ordinance
  - i. This could also be a test program to see how groundwater basin responds; the expectation is that there will be natural recharge; concerns about depleting the river
  
- 7) Western Canal and Richvale
  - a. DWR had preliminary discussions regarding a conjunctive use test program
  - b. The project was put on hold as a result of the Cherokee Strip controversy
  
- 8) Turlock Irrigation District and East Side Water District, San Joaquin Valley
  - a. DWR is in the very preliminary stages of exploring the potential for a conjunctive use operation
  - b. The project may involve re-operation of New Don Pedro
  - c. Recharge would occur in East Side Water District
  - d. Currently evaluating costs and facilities required

e. The project would not involve SWP directly, but would involve an exchange with USBR

9) Other Issues

a. John asked what my role is for CALFED. I explained that I was coordinating the conjunctive use outreach program, which includes discussions with various people about their concerns with respect to conjunctive use, coordination of workshops, the formulation of guiding principles for conjunctive use operations, and identification of potential conjunctive use projects for local operation.

b. John expressed some concern that the principles would be developed independently, without input from those who have been working on developing conjunctive use operations. I told John that I shared that concern, and as a result I suggested to CALFED and Bob Potter that a conjunctive use committee be formed to formulate the principles. John said that he would be interested in sitting on the committee.