1325 SEP 23 1999

September 22, 1999

Mr. Lester Snow
CALFED Bay-Delta Program
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1155
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM
Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report

Dear Mr. Snow:

The following letter was put together for talking points at CALFED in Chico and Redding - but didn't get a chance to address at Chico and only half-way in Redding.

M.M. "Bud" Hagen
El Camino Irrigation District.
22979 Tehama Ave
Gerber, Ca. 96035
Ph. 530-385-1366
Call me if you have any questions
thank you
Bud

My name is "Bud" Hagen. I am a director on an Irrigation District and water association boards. But tonight I speak for myself. I have over 50 years experience in irrigational farming in Southern Idaho, Southern California, and Northern California, where I have been for the last 45 years. The Irrigation District that services my operation is a groundwater district who owns the water right and has seen a decline recently, in land being farmed, because of the high cost of pumping water.

In the late 50's and early 60's we had a study done to see the reliability of the groundwater aquafir to continue to meet the needs at that ime and looking to the future needs with resonable growth. This was done along with the C.V.P. and the building of Tehama Colusa and the Corning Canals. The District met need requirements to receive C. V. P. water in that 3,000 acres, at the time of the study were unable to be farmed due to lack of water. However, the district could not meet the financial requirement, with result no water from the C.V. P. The District was able to add some additional wells to the system in the late 60's and the last well was added in 1971. At this time, the District was pumping 14,000 A. F. of water yearly. Since that time, power cost and new well cost have continued to rise. The result cost of water to irrigator has risen to the point to where at present additional land are fallowed with the result that the average water pumped last 3 or 4 years has been 6,500 A. F.

We are in the northwest end of the Sacramento Valley aquafer and there is NO surface water developed to service this area.

At the present, I have great concern. our observation is that even

with past 4 years of good water years (EX. Good re-charge years) The District has some wells that seem to tell us we are in trouble, because they are in a continued net loss of 1-2 foot spring free standing water. Could this mean that 6,500 A. F. withdrawl of the aquafer is beyond the natural re-charge of the area?

If some land had not been fallowed between late 70's to late 80's, and the 14,000 A. F. of need had continued, our District might be like some in the Central Valley that are in serious overdraft and subsidence.

I want to thank you for coming and I hope you LISTENED to our input.
Cal-Fed is to make ALL Better and not move a problem from one area to any other area without getting a solution to the problem.

It's to bad that, as it appears, Cal-Fed is not interested in getting the latest information. By legislation enacted in 1999, D. W. R. is directed to update Bulletin 118 which was originally published in 1975. A limited update 118 was published 1980, but did not cover our area. Groundwater information available in Bulletin 118 is 24 years old and during that time, Northern California has gone through TWO major droughts. Damage this may have done, may go unaddressed at present fast-track.
Any water moved out of the valley south will be in all truth, GROUNDWATER.
Please be conservative in your moving any water out of the valley without new water of equal amount, being developed. There must be true new water by surface storage in the north. The items that caused the major Delta problems were not caused by the Sacramento Valley and the state need not put the load to solve all those problems on our back.

Thank you