Water Supply and Sustainability

Managing Our Resources
For Profit

Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District

- Historical Water Rights back to 1883
- Settlement Contracts
  - 720,000 acre feet of base supply
  - 105,000 CVP water
- Irrigate 141,000 acres of farmland
- Supplies water to 3 federal wildlife refuges
Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District

- Board’s primary focus
  - Protection of Water Rights
  - Preserve reliability of Supply
  - Enhancement of water supply for state
- Active engagement—Local, Regional, State and Federal levels
- Proactive—Anticipate problems

Recent History

- Injunction for killing of winter run salmon
- Stipulated agreement to build new screen
- Legislation on landowner voting in 1992
- Replacement of all directors
- Hiring of new legal counsel and manager
Fish Screen & Gradient Project

• Fish screen
  – Cost of $65,000,000
    • Federal, district and state cost share
• Gradient Restoration Project
  – Cost of $15,000,000
    • Federal, district and state cost share
Fish Screen & Gradient Project

• Need to Winterize System
  – Increased demand for winter water
    • Rice straw decomposition
    • Duck Hunting
    • CVPIA and refuge water supply
Fish Screen & Gradient Project

• Refuge Water Supply
  – CVPIA contract
  – Sacramento, Delevan and Colusa Federal Wildlife Refuges
    • Federal funding to winterize our system
      $15,000,000
    • Siphon on Stony Creek
    • Wheeling revenue
Water Transfers

• Districts Interest in Transferring Water
  – Meet economic needs of growers
  – Need to address statewide objectives
  – Potential to become part of cropping mix

Water Transfers

• District’s Policy
  – Priority for transfers
    • Ag areas within the Sacramento River watershed
    • Environmental purposes
    • Urban water agencies north of the delta
    • Ag or urban water users south of the Delta
Water Transfers

• 2005 MET Transfer
  – Terms:
    • One year transfer
    • Land fallowing transfer
    • $10.00/AF option on up to 80,000AF
    • Total Payment of $125.00/AF for water purchased
    • District retained 25% of revenue

Water Transfer

• Mechanics
  • April 1 deadline to option 40,000-80,000 AF
  • Tillage fee
    – Call between 4/1-414---$10.00/AF
    – Call between 4/15-5/1---$20.00/AF
Water Transfer

- MET Transfer
  - Revenue:
    - Rice
      - Gross $412.50/acre
      - Grower $309.37/acre
      - District $103.13/acre
      - Tillage cost in addition to above $33-$66/acre

Water Transfers

- Future
  - Short Term Transfers
    - Fallowing, groundwater or combination
    - General acceptance by region
  - Long Term Transfers
    - Valley not ready for any type of transfer
    - Fear of loss of water right
Water Supply

• Support increased supply in State
  – Transfers should not be a replacement for storage
  – Need to improve overall system reliability (state)
  – “Keep the wolf away from the hen house”

Water Supply

• Support for Sites Reservoir
  – District would not be direct beneficiary
  – Opportunity for wheeling revenue
  – Lobbied in Washington, DC for Sites Funding
  – Over $5,000,000 appropriated to GCID over last 5 years
Water Supply

- Groundwater Development
  - Development of a basin wide approach to water management
  - Working with landowners within district
  - Working with adjoining districts
  - Potential future revenue stream for well owners

Contract Renewal

- Settlement Contracts
  - Renewed for another 40 years
  - Similar terms and conditions (same supply)
  - Senior water right contract—first priority on the river
Contract Renewal

• Potential Litigation
  – Environmentalist will challenge renewal
  – Defense will cost millions of dollars
  – Outcome could have enormous impacts on the land values in the valley

Beneficiary Pays

• CALFED
  – Development of policy by agency
  – Early proposals had cost as high as $40-50/A
  – Still being negotiated
  – We support the concept but people should not pay unless they receive direct benefits
  – Indirect benefits paid by all citizens
Regionalization

- Desire to build an Integrated Regional Water Management Program
  - Not a top down process
  - Build on existing partnerships
  - Regional conjunctive use programs
  - Work with county and city government, irrigation districts and interested parties

Questions?