

**CALIFORNIA WATER HISTORY:
A SANTA CLARA COUNTY PERSPECTIVE**

Kevin R. Fish
628 S. 10th St. Apt. 9
San Jose, CA 95112

(408) 292-7814

CALIFORNIA WATER HISTORY: A SANTA CLARA COUNTY PERSPECTIVE

Unique in California water history is the fact that Santa Clara County is the only county whose water conservation and flood control districts merged into one district. Three water conservation districts were formed by popular votes in different parts of the county, then a flood control district was formed by the California legislature. The mergers subsequently occurred at different times over a period of several years and were uneventful, with the exception of the story of the water conservation district in the southern part of the county. That district survived many challenges to its sovereignty over a period of about thirty years, largely due to luck. The southern district's luck ran out long after the other mergers had occurred.

ARTESIAN WELLS

Until well into the twentieth century, artesian wells were a major source of water all over the Santa Clara Valley, an example of their use being that orchards were irrigated mostly from such wells. The geological features of the valley resulted in ground water under artesian pressure, so an artesian well was bored by tapping an underground stream, and water rushed to the surface as a result of that pressure. Such wells could even be bored in the higher grounds near the foothills. They were usually from sixty to one hundred feet deep, though some found a larger and more permanent supply at a much greater depth.

Many only flowed during the rainy season and following spring, while others were sometimes choked up by disturbances of the lower strata, due to earthquakes; or by sand and sediment that were produced by the flow of the water itself. By the 1930's, however, nearly all of them had ceased to flow because of the lowering ground water table, which resulted from an increasing population and farm irrigation.

Artesian wells in the valley date back almost to the California gold rush and the beginning of California statehood. The first well there was bored in San Jose in January, 1854. Later, in 1870, artesian water was thought to have been found in the San Felipe tract southeast of Gilroy. However, one night a well, windmill, tank, house, and frame on Mr. Buck's property sank and disappeared from sight. The longest sounding-line failed to discover the location of these improvements. This indicated that the water supply was a lake rather than an ordinary stream. Subsequently, however, in 1887, flowing artesian water was found at Gilroy, and the neighborhood was successfully developed afterwards.¹

RAINFALL AND WATER TABLE CONDITIONS

The rainfall and water table situation in the Santa Clara Valley was poor during much of the first half of the twentieth century. 1912 and 1913 were dry years and were no worse than similar years in the past, but had a very

marked effect upon ground water levels and were severely felt. There followed a long dry cycle in 1916-1934, the accumulated deficiency in rainfall being equivalent to three times as much as occurred in a single year. An examination of just 1889-1931, or 1903-1926, or 1909-1919 reveals normal cumulative totals of precipitation. However, many, though not all, of the rainfall years in the valley between 1916 and 1932 were subnormal. Precipitation was about 93% of normal in 1916-1917, about 57% of normal in 1917-1918, about 112% of normal in 1918-1919, about 67% of normal in 1919-1920, about 82% of normal in 1929-1930, about 50% of normal in 1930-1931, and about 105% of normal in 1931-1932. There were also dry years during the 1940's. Of course, there was considerable variation among the several rainfall stations.

The water table situation also demonstrated the alarming water picture in the valley, with insufficient rainfall being a major factor. There was a gradual but very marked recession in the ground water level there in 1915-1933, except when rainfall was at or above normal. Ground water levels in the northern part of the valley moderately rose in 1935-1938, and those in the southern portion of the valley rose to a high point in 1938. The levels declined in both portions in 1939. The levels rose to a maximum in the north in 1942 and in the south in 1943. In 1942 in the north and in 1943 in the south, the estimated average depth to the ground water table was the least during the period from 1932 through 1953. After 1942

in the north and after 1943 in the south, water levels continually fell. Examples of the average depth to the ground water table in the north (measurements taken in the fall) include 91 feet in 1939 and 139.6 feet in 1950. Examples of that in the south (measurements taken in the fall) include 42 feet in 1938 and 92.5 feet in 1950.²

THE MOVE FOR AN IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Not unlike the fact that the droughts of the 1970's-1990's motivated water conservation in the Santa Clara Valley, the water situation of the early twentieth century clearly motivated those in the valley who favored a water conservation program. Lack of enough rain motivated farmers to meet in the city of Campbell in 1913. This was the first definite step toward water conservation in the Santa Clara Valley. They appointed a committee and discussed the idea of forming an irrigation district, but nothing came of the movement due to World War I. As noted above, there began a few years after the meeting a period that witnessed continued poor rainfall as well as a sharply declining water table in the valley. Concern about these conditions and the consequent increased pumping costs led to the creation of the Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation Committee in 1920. Its president was Charles E. Warren of Cupertino and its consulting engineers were Fred H. Tibbetts and Stephen E. Kieffer of San Francisco. The cities in which the members lived ranged from Morgan Hill to Sunnyvale. Tibbetts and Kieffer were commissioned to

make an investigation and report on the situation and bring in some plan for relief. Such a report was submitted under date of March 23, 1921. It proposed a plan to develop the waters and the watersheds tributary of the valley, and proposed reservoir sites and dam sites as well as related works throughout the valley.³

Tibbetts' and Kieffer's report became the focal point of political activity in the Santa Clara Valley after it was issued. S. B. 192 of 1921 and S. B. 83 of 1923 were introduced by State Senator Herbert C. Jones of Santa Clara County (term: 1913-1935), who also was the president of the Progressive Voters League during most of its existence in the 1920's and who played important roles in the history of Big Basin Redwoods State Park during his time as a senator. The Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation Committee sponsored both acts, and their actual author was the committee's attorney, former Santa Clara County Assemblyman L. D. Bohnett (term: 1909-1915). These acts each proposed a district to be called the Santa Clara County Irrigation District and described it as a water conservation and irrigation district. Its purposes were conservation of water, and the furnishing of water for irrigation and domestic purposes. Neither act included the entire county, but each proposed different borders. The district was intended to carry out the recommendations of the engineers of the committee, though this was not stipulated by either act.

The two acts also differed on the consequences of

possible rejection in the required elections. S. B. 192 of 1921 stipulated that the act could no longer be in effect if the voters rejected the formation of such a district. On the other hand, S. B. 83 of 1923 specified that, if the voters rejected the proposed district, a new effort using the same formation proceedings could begin, but not until at least nine months after the election.⁴

In the required elections under these acts, the proposals were rejected. On September 27, 1921, the 1921 act's plan was rejected by a vote of 3,351-3,050. On March 10, 1925, the vote was even more lopsided, with the 1923 law's proposal being defeated by 6,085-960. The Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation Committee ended its existence with the 1925 election, according to a decision that was reached at a meeting shortly before the election.⁵

CONSERVATION VS. IRRIGATION

Later, in 1929-1949, those involved in trying to solve the Santa Clara Valley's water problems worked to form water conservation districts. They thus decided to forsake the option of proceeding, again, under S. B. 83 of 1923, meaning that they switched from the primary goal of irrigation. As were those who formed the Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation Committee, the advocates of the formation of water conservation districts in the valley were largely motivated by insufficient rainfall and the declining water table.⁶ (see above for these conditions)

Water conservation had been authorized for several years by the California legislature, and such authority has never disappeared. Some of the relevant laws were S. B. 998 of 1909 and S. B. 1028 of 1911, which were the first to authorize such conservation. Senator Richard J. Welch of San Francisco County authored the 1909 law. Senator Leslie R. Hewitt of Los Angeles County authored the 1911 law, which was named the Municipal Water District Act of 1911 by a law that was enacted in 1941. Both laws always authorized the organization of municipal water districts, one of the provisions allowing such districts to "store" water. Storage, of course, is a form of conservation. The Municipal Water District Act of 1911 was repealed and replaced in 1963 by what the legislature called the Municipal Water District Law of 1911. This new law has always contained the word "store" and has also contained the words "water conservation" since the 1970's. The County Water District Act of 1913 (unnamed until 1933) also authorized water conservation, but used both the words "store" and "conserve," provisions that were never repealed until the act was repealed and replaced by the County Water District Law in 1949. The words "store" and "conserve" were retained in the new law, and have never been repealed.⁷

In addition to authorizing water conservation, the legislature confused matters in its references to water conservation and irrigation. A 1913 law by Senator J. B. Curtin of Tuolumne County dealt with irrigation district

bonds, but a 1921 law by Senator L. G. Burnett of San Francisco County amended the 1913 law by stating that "irrigation districts" included water conservation districts. This confusing provision has never been revived since the repeal and replacement of the irrigation district bonds law in 1931. Also, partly echoing the Jones acts of 1921 and 1923 that are discussed above, the Conservancy Act of California of 1919 (authored by Senator S. C. Evans of Riverside County) authorized water conservation for purposes of irrigation for conservancy districts.⁸

An amendment to the California Irrigation District Act also contributed to the confusion over the meanings of water conservation and irrigation, but a discussion of California's Wright Act of 1887 provides necessary background. The Wright Act (A. B. 12 of 1887), which was authored by Assemblyman C. C. Wright of Stanislaus County, allowed citizens to form irrigation districts, and provided for the organization and government of such districts. This act had been inspired by the township governments of New England; and established self-governing mini-states, called irrigation districts, whose sole function was to deliver water onto barren land. Soon buckling under their responsibilities, the districts issued bonds that would not sell, built reservoirs that would not fill, allocated water unfairly, distributed water unevenly, then threw up their hands when anarchy prevailed.

The Wright Act was amended by the California Irrigation District Act. This new law was enacted as

A. B. 730 of 1897, and was authored by the California Assembly's Irrigation Committee. This was the first general revision of the Wright Act, and was for some time known as the "Bridgeford Act" or the "Wright-Bridgeford Act." Later, it was definitely named the California Irrigation District Act by a 1917 law whose author was Senator L. J. Maddux of Stanislaus County. A 1921 law that was authored by Senator L. G. Burnett of San Francisco County further amended the law, partly by permitting districts that were organized under this law to be called either irrigation districts or water conservation districts. Later, however, a 1935 law by Senator Sanborn Young of Santa Clara County eliminated this option by amending the act to stipulate that all districts hereafter organized under this law would only be called irrigation districts. A provision that was similar to this last provision was included when the Irrigation District Law was enacted in 1943. The California Irrigation District Act was repealed and replaced by the Irrigation District Law.⁹

WATER CONSERVATION ALTERNATIVES

Those who worked to form water conservation districts in the Santa Clara Valley during the 1920's, 1930's, and 1940's were also faced with more than one California law that had "water conservation" in their titles. These people thus needed to make choices about which laws under which they would organize districts. One was the California Water Conservation District Act of 1923. This

was authored by Senator M. B. Harris of Fresno County and was amended by a 1925 law by Senator John Creighton of Kern County. As in the case of other laws that are discussed above, this added to the confusion over the meanings of water conservation and irrigation by requiring the water conservation districts that were formed under it to be irrigation districts within the meaning of the California constitution. This provision existed during all of the efforts to form water conservation districts in the Santa Clara Valley.¹⁰

The other California laws that had "water conservation" in their titles were the Water Conservation Act of 1927, the Water Conservation Act of 1929, and the Water Conservation Act of 1931. Unlike the California Water Conservation District Act of 1923, these laws authorized the formation of water conservation districts that were not to be regarded as irrigation districts. The 1927 law was authored by Assemblyman Walter H. Duval of Ventura County while the other laws were authored by Senator Herbert C. Jones of Santa Clara County, with the Water Conservation Act of 1931 being unnamed until 1949. The Water Conservation Act of 1929 was reenacted, continued, and amended by the Jones Act of 1931, which meant that the 1931 act was a new law. The legality of any districts that had been formed under the Jones Act of 1929 was not altered by the Jones Act of 1931 or any of its amendments. The Duval Act still exists, but the Jones acts of 1929 and 1931 were repealed and replaced in 1965 by what the California

legislature named the Water Conservation District Law of 1931. The Water Conservation District Law of 1931 did not affect the substantial rights of any individual or entity.¹¹

DAMS AND RESERVOIRS

One of the most important matters that concerned water conservation advocates involved dams and reservoirs, which were authorized by the legislature many times over the years. The Conservancy Act of California of 1919 had legalized them, though for purposes of irrigation and flood prevention. The Jones acts of 1921 and 1923 (see above) authorized them for water conservation, and the furnishing of water for irrigation and domestic purposes, but never became operative. The County Water District Act of 1913 always allowed the acquisition, operation, and maintenance of reservoirs, and only began to authorize construction of them in 1941, but never mentioned dams. The act was repealed and replaced in 1949 by the County Water District Law, which has always authorized the operation of works, thus not restricting the kind of works. Also, the County Water District Law has never mentioned construction or maintenance of works. The Jones Act of 1931 always allowed districts to take such actions as building, constructing, or acquiring dams, dam sites, reservoirs, and reservoir sites, these being for water conservation purposes. The Duval Act began to authorize the construction of dams and reservoirs and related actions in 1951.¹²

FORMATIONS AND MERGERS

The efforts to form water conservation districts in the Santa Clara Valley were usually successful. The first one was the Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District, which was formed in 1929 under the Water Conservation Act of 1929 after a successful election and which comprised most of the northern half of the county, thus being nicknamed the North District.¹³ (hereafter referred to as the North District) The effort to create the Llagas-Uvas Water Conservation District to comprise most of the southern half of the county began in October, 1933, and the desire to form it under the Water Conservation Act of 1931 was stated in the petition to the Santa Clara County board of supervisors in October, 1934, but the proposal met defeat at the hands of the voters in January, 1935.¹⁴ The second effort to create a water conservation district in the southern portion of the county under the Water Conservation Act of 1931 was approved by the voters in 1938, but this district was named the South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District and comprised a smaller area than that which would have been included in the proposed district that was rejected in 1935.¹⁵ The South District was renamed the Gavilan Water Conservation District in 1980.¹⁶ (hereafter referred to as the Gavilan District) In 1949, the Central Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District became the last water conservation district that was formed in the valley after winning voter approval, and was sandwiched

between the other water conservation districts in the valley. The Central District was also created under the Water Conservation Act of 1931.¹⁷

The mergers of these districts and Santa Clara County's flood control district (now called the Santa Clara Valley Water District) into one district occurred over several years without incident, with the exception of the story of the Gavilan District. The North District added some 4,000 acres that were not part of any of the water conservation districts in 1953, then annexed the Central District in 1954.¹⁸ The North District subsequently merged into the valley water district in 1968, a matter that is part of a story that is discussed, later. By 1960, on several occasions, the Gavilan District had also added territory that was not in any of the water conservation districts.¹⁹ The Gavilan District did not merge into the valley water district until late 1987 largely due to luck and once because Gavilan voters rejected the idea in 1968.

SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT

Before going on to the story of the mergers of the water conservation districts into the Santa Clara Valley Water District, it is crucial to understand the latter district. In 1951, soon after the Central Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District was formed, the California legislature enacted the Santa Clara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Act. This law had

been authored by Senator John F. Thompson of Santa Clara County and created a flood control district of the same name. The new district's boundaries included the portions of the county that were outside the water conservation districts. Then, a 1952 law that Thompson also authored made the district countywide, meaning that it overlapped the other districts. This was one of many flood control districts that the legislature created all over the state during the twentieth century, beginning in 1915 with the Los Angeles County Flood Control District. The word "conservation" was deleted from the names of the Santa Clara County flood control district and its act by a 1963 law, though the law stipulated that the district's name change would not become operative until July 1, 1964.

Subsequently, the names of the flood control district and its act were changed to Santa Clara Valley Water District on January 1, 1974, when a 1973 law took effect.²⁰ (hereafter referred to as the valley water district)

Although some flood control districts have both the words "flood control" and "water conservation" in their names while the other flood control districts only have "flood control" in their names, some clarification is necessary. The districts in Santa Clara and San Benito counties have had their names changed so that they now include neither the words "flood control" nor "water conservation," the Santa Clara County district's details being noted in the immediately preceding paragraph. Also,

two of the districts have been replaced by water agencies. The names of the districts do not necessarily indicate what powers that they have possessed, an example being that the Del Norte County Flood Control District has always been empowered to perform both flood control and water conservation. All of the flood control districts have always had flood control powers. Of these, the Santa Clara County district and some of the others have also always possessed water conservation powers, some have never had such powers, and some gained such powers after they were created.²¹ Although the Santa Clara County district has always held both kinds of powers, it did not exercise water conservation in the Gavilan District area until after the Gavilan District merged into the countywide district in 1987.

THREATS TO THE GAVILAN DISTRICT

The Gavilan District was struck by challenges to its sovereignty throughout more than half of the period of its existence (1938-1987). Common sense dictated that, because the district had been formed by the voters, the residents of the district always had the right to vote upon any question that involved a change that would result in the expiration of its sovereignty. Of course, the state legislature could have dissolved the district at any time because the California Supreme Court had ruled before 1938 that the legislature had such authority over special districts.²²

THE FIRST(?) THREAT

The first potential threat to the Gavilan District's sovereignty occurred during the 1950's, but a questionable suggestion of an earlier threat was made by Joel Aguilar, a Gilroy resident. If one adheres to Aguilar's claim, one would believe that the first potential challenge began in 1938, when the district was formed. In early 1987, Aguilar declared that the district had been aware since the 1930's of a decision to be made to merge itself into the valley water district. (see below for the merger discussions) However, this claim is dubious for two reasons. In the first place, he did not clarify his statement. Secondly, the valley water district did not exist until 1951, as already noted.²³

JOINT UVAS DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT

The first potential threat to the Gavilan District's sovereignty actually came during the discussions of the proposed joint Uvas Dam and Reservoir project during the 1950's. During the summer of 1952, the North District and the Gavilan District agreed to the project on Uvas-Carnadero Creek. While the two districts were considering the joint project, the idea of a possible annexation of the Gavilan District by the North District arose. One issue was that the Gavilan District was concerned about being harmed if it was annexed with a minimum of representation on the North District board of directors and without some understanding

about the minimum amount of water to be allotted to itself. In the end, however, no such annexation ever occurred. Furthermore, the joint project never occurred, and the Gavilan District completed its own Uvas project in 1957.²⁴

THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY GRAND JURY

Not long after the joint Uvas dam and reservoir project idea was dropped and the Gavilan District's own Uvas project was completed, the next potential threats to the Gavilan District's sovereignty came from certain committees of the Santa Clara County Grand Jury. Several of their reports contained recommendations for governmental changes, the first such report being vague and general, but ominous. The Grand Jury's Special Districts Committee, in reporting on the year 1959, recommended, in part, that the county supervisors establish a broadly representative committee to make a careful, long range, objective study of the county's governmental-administrative structure and problems.²⁵

Later, in reporting on the 1960's, some of the Grand Jury committees made numerous suggestions of consolidating and deleting districts. One such suggestion was the creation of one water authority to include the entire county by merging the North District and the Gavilan District into the valley water district. One argument in favor of this idea was that the valley water district had been determined to be the county's authority for the importation, distribution, and conservation of water because it had concluded the South Bay Aqueduct contract with the California Department of Water Resources. Another contention was that the co-ordination of the importation of San Felipe Project water could

be more efficiently and economically handled by a single agency.²⁶

It is necessary to clarify these matters of the South Bay Aqueduct and the San Felipe Project. The South Bay Aqueduct is a part of the California State Water Project. The first stage of this aqueduct extends into Alameda County and was completed in 1962 while the aqueduct's other stage extends into Santa Clara County and was completed in 1965.²⁷ The San Felipe Division of the Central Valley Project was recommended by a feasibility report that was completed in 1964, but which was subsequently modified before being transmitted to Congress in 1966. The project was then authorized by a 1967 federal law, and was completed in the summer of 1987 when the water began to arrive in Santa Clara County. The San Felipe Division's boundaries include all of Santa Clara and San Benito counties and portions of Santa Cruz and Monterey counties, though agencies in only Santa Clara and San Benito counties have concluded water service contracts with the Bureau of Reclamation of the United States Department of the Interior, which runs the Central Valley Project. The project's water is stored in San Luis Reservoir, which is near Los Banos, California. San Luis Dam was renamed B. F. Sisk San Luis Dam in 1988, but the reservoir has never been renamed.²⁸

CONSOLIDATION ELECTION CAMPAIGN OF 1967-1968

In 1966, valley water district director Sig Sanchez proposed the same kind of merger that the Grand Jury had suggested. Sanchez also called for a seven-member board of directors for such a new district, with the first board to be appointed by the county supervisors, with one director for each of the water conservation

districts and one director for each county supervisorial district. Sanchez's proposal also stipulated that, after the initial directors had served their terms, directors from the supervisorial districts would be chosen by voters and the other directors would be appointed by the supervisors. The proposal further called for fiscal control of the new board to be held by the supervisors, who would annually approve the budget. (The valley water district directors had concurrently sat as the county supervisors since the district's formation in 1951.) Sanchez used the San Felipe Project in order to justify his proposal, one of his arguments being that a single, countywide water agency could more economically and efficiently handle the public importation and distribution of water.²⁹

The idea of a merger of water districts was soon given much hope by the adoption of a new California law. Early in 1967, the Gavilan District and the valley water district endorsed such a merger and called for a law that would make this possible.³⁰ Then, on March 8, shortly after these endorsements were made, such a merger bill (S. B. 540 of 1967) was introduced. It was authored by Senator Alfred E. Alquist of Santa Clara County and Senator Clark L. Bradley of Santa Clara and Alameda counties; and was co-authored by Assemblymen John Vasconcellos, Earle P. Crandall, and George W. Milias of Santa Clara County. It took effect on November 8 of that year. The new law authorized the voters to decide to accept or reject Sanchez's suggestion of a consolidation by permitting water conservation districts that were wholly within Santa Clara County and had been formed under the Water Conserva-

tion Act of 1931 to vote on the question of consolidating with the valley water district or to accept it automatically. The merger law stipulated that an election could be requested if a resolution was adopted by the board of directors of such a water conservation district or if a petition was filed with the county supervisors. (The only such water conservation districts were the North District and the Gavilan District, and the 1931 law had been replaced. See above for the "WATER CONSERVATION ALTERNATIVES" and "FORMATIONS AND MERGERS" sections of this article for details about the 1931 law and the water conservation districts.)

The 1967 law also amended the flood control district's act, but this was not automatic nor did it completely disregard the residents of the water conservation districts if the amendments became operative. Some of the amendments included what Sanchez had proposed in terms of the district's budget and board of directors. The new law also stipulated that the amendments could only become operative if and when at least one of the water conservation districts merged into the valley water district.

Such a merger occurred when the North District merged into the valley water district in March, 1968. As a result, the valley water district gained its own board of directors, and the county supervisors ceased their dual roles as the valley water district directors. Subsequently, the rules relating to the board of directors and the budget have not been changed.³¹

The question of consolidation was not an issue for the North District, but it was for the Gavilan District. Neither the residents nor the board of directors of the North District requested

an election, so that district automatically merged into the valley water district. However, the Gavilan District called for such an election within its borders two days after the 1967 merger bill took effect late that year, but did not name a date. The Santa Clara County board of supervisors later set April 30, 1968, as the date for such an election, and multiple endorsements of a favorable vote were made.³²

The major issue in the consolidation election campaign was the creation of a single water district to handle the imported water program from the Pacheco Pass Tunnel when it was completed. (this tunnel is part of the San Felipe Project) One argument of the proponents of the merger was that it would insure the sound management of both local and imported water. One of the proponents' other arguments was that, by itself, the Gavilan District would not be able to handle water demands with the coming of industrial growth.³³ One of the arguments of the opposition, however, was that the Gavilan District could not be denied imported water even if it was independent, and that it had applied for and received verification on up to 43,000 acre-feet of imported water.³⁴ In the end, the consolidation proposal was rejected by a vote of 563-342.³⁵

LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM TASK FORCE

Several years after the 1968 consolidation election, special districts in California in general received criticism from Governor Ronald W. Reagan. In April, 1973, Reagan formed the Local Government Reform Task Force, and rejected proposals to establish

regional government on the grounds that that would create another layer of government. However, Reagan also criticized the system of local government by using arguments that echoed the claims of the proponents of regionalism. These proponents argued that the present system of local government had excessive overlapping and duplication, that the public had no real voice in local government, and that wholesome changes were necessary in order to make the system economical and efficient.

However, in a report that was issued in early 1974, the task force advanced several arguments on behalf of special districts. It found that only a small fraction of such districts in the state maintained a low political profile. It also discovered that the type of public information that such districts distributed seemed to be somewhat superior to public information that was disseminated by other local governments. Another argument was that such districts on the whole did not seem to be any less efficient or less competent than multipurpose governments that provided similar services. One of the other arguments was that, contrary to the contention that the public had no real voice in local government, slightly more than half of the self-governed districts had no uncontested seats in the most recent election.³⁶

WATER DISTRICT AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT MERCER PROPOSALS

Later, in 1976-1979, proposals were made for the consolidations of Santa Clara County's water, resource conservation, sanitary, and sanitation districts. There was a flurry of activity at the local level. First, the Santa Clara County Local

Agency Formation Commission recommended that the county supervisors develop an ad hoc committee that would draft a plan for the consolidation of the county's resource conservation districts. (The California legislature has authorized soil conservation districts since 1938, though they have been called resource conservation districts since 1972, when a 1971 state law took effect.) Then, Santa Clara County Supervisor Rod Diridon called for the consolidation of the county's sanitary, sanitation, water, and resource conservation districts, such as the Gavilan District and the valley water district, along with related ideas. Soon, the county established the Task Team on Special District Consolidation. The task force recommended two consolidation plans, one designed to combine some of the county sanitation districts and one of the county's sanitary districts; and the other to merge the remaining resource conservation districts and the Gavilan District into the valley water district. The county board of supervisors approved both of the consolidation proposals of the task force, but subsequently decided not to reaffirm that recommendation.³⁷

Neither proposal materialized, though one did partially materialize. After the task team was formed but before it issued its report, one of the resource conservation districts, which also occupied part of Santa Cruz County, was dissolved; and its Santa Clara County portion was merged into one of the other resource conservation districts.³⁸ Then, in 1979, after the Santa Clara County board of supervisors had approved the proposals, State Senator Alfred E. Alquist of Santa Clara County and other counties

introduced a bill that called for the water district-resource conservation district consolidation proposal. However, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Water Resources rejected it. (The Gavilan District board minutes indicate that similar consolidation bills had been introduced in 1975 and 1978 by Senator Alquist, but there is no record of any such bill having been introduced in either year.) County Supervisor Diridon then requested the Santa Clara County Farm Bureau to support the water district-resource conservation district merger, but nothing came of it.³⁹

These proposals generated a wide variety of arguments. For example, the water district-resource conservation district merger proposal was called a cover-up for increased taxes. Another argument against that plan was that southern Santa Clara County would lose local control of water matters. One of the task force's many arguments in favor of both proposals was that accountability would be improved through the combination of resource management responsibility that was then shared by several agencies.⁴⁰

SANTA CLARA COUNTY'S LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION (LAFCO) AND SPHERES OF INFLUENCE

Threats to the Gavilan District's sovereignty in the 1980's began in May of that year with district officials suggesting that the district become a water utility or a county water district, but these were ignored.⁴¹ Even more serious was a Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) staff report that the LAFCO adopted in April, 1983. The staff noted that the

Gavilan District split the Llagas watershed; and also stated that it could not be determined at that time whether the Gavilan District should be expanded to include the entire Llagas Basin or be consolidated entirely within the valley water district. However, the staff also claimed that it appeared that the Gavilan District should merge into the valley water district sometime in the future because the latter district had a broader statutory authority.

The LAFCO staff also proposed the establishment of spheres of influence for these two districts and most of the other special districts for which Santa Clara County was the principal LAFCO. The staff recommended that the LAFCO establish the existing boundaries of the Gavilan District as that district's sphere of influence, but also suggested that the commission acknowledge that this created an inefficient "sphere within a sphere" situation, since part of the valley water district overlapped the Gavilan District. The staff also proposed that the commission establish the boundaries of Santa Clara County as the valley water district's sphere of influence. The report suggested that, for the purpose of establishing the Gavilan District's and the valley water district's initial spheres of influence, the LAFCO recognize the duplication of effort on the part of the two districts, but resolve the problem later when proper negotiations and consolidation studies had been completed.⁴²

UTILITY DISTRICT PROPOSAL

In 1985, the Gavilan District was faced with another potential threat to its sovereignty when a proposal for a utility district was made. The district's Citizens Advisory Committee, which had been formed in September, 1983, recommended that the district (1) continue its legal responsibility in managing the water resources within its territory, and (2) provide the leadership in the development of a utility district by forming a study committee. The advisory committee suggested that the study committee comprise representatives of such agencies as the Gavilan District, the San Benito County Water Conservation and Flood Control District (now called the San Benito County Water District), and Gilroy. The advisory committee also suggested that the board of directors of such a utility district should assume the responsibility of regulating all of the water resources and sewage treatment in the Llagas Basin. This basin extends from northern Morgan Hill into northern San Benito County. The Gavilan District approved its advisory committee's report in March, 1985. However, the cities of Gilroy and Morgan Hill rejected any involvement in the proposed study committee, and the Gavilan District's interest in the concept of a utility district had disappeared by early 1986.

The utility district proposal needed a new law in order to be implemented because there was no existing law under which such a district in the proposed area could have been formed. Such a new law could have been patterned after the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District Law of 1977, which gave its district authority

over water supply, control, and distribution; ground water management; recreational facilities; and sewage and industrial waste. The Gavilan District had some of the same powers, so if a new law had been enacted and patterned after the Monterey Peninsula law, and the proposed utility district was created under such a new law, the Gavilan District might have been dissolved. The Gavilan District would not have suffered such a fate if the new law had provided for protection of the Gavilan District, as the Santa Clara Valley Water District Act protected the Gavilan District. The Santa Clara Valley Water District Act stipulated that the valley water district comprised all of Santa Clara County, but that it was not authorized to condemn the present or future properties of the county's water conservation districts. These provisions are still in the act, though there are no longer any such water conservation districts.⁴³

CONSOLIDATION ELECTION CAMPAIGN OF 1987

The final potential threat to the Gavilan District's sovereignty, which was the only one that materialized, was a special election in 1987. The Gavilan District voted to merge into the Santa Clara Valley Water District late that year, but there were statements to the effect that such an event had been expected for many years. In early 1987, former Gavilan District director Courtland M. Rush stated that there had been a gentlemen's agreement twenty-five years earlier that such a merger was inevitable. Rush's statement meant that such an agreement was made about 1962. Also, in early 1987, Joel Aguilar of Gilroy claimed that the Gavi-

lan District had been aware since the 1930's of the then-present merger decision to be made, but the Gavilan District had been formed in 1938 and the valley water district was not formed until 1951. Furthermore, Aguilar did not clarify his statement.⁴⁴

The Gavilan District voters narrowly approved Measure G, the consolidation or merger question, in November, 1987, and the merger occurred on December 4 after a recount and certification of the results by the county supervisors. However, such a consolidation was not always the district's only option for change. The district had recently also had two other such options. One of these was to be reorganized by the Santa Clara County supervisors as provided for under its enabling act. The other option was to reorganize under the Cortese-Knox Local Government Reorganization Act of 1985. However, these other options were closed because the Mello Act of 1987 (S. B. 740 of 1987), which authorized the election, stipulated that the provisions of general law that governed the reorganization of districts could not be applied to the Gavilan District-valley water district consolidation proposal. The 1987 law was authored by State Senator Henry J. Mello of Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Santa Clara counties, and was supported by the Association of California Water Agencies.⁴⁵

There were multiple issues in the consolidation election campaign, but cost produced one of the biggest arguments. The opposition argued that the valley water district was forcing the Gavilan District to share the cost of many expensive diverse and unnecessary countywide functions, such as the Gilroy waste water reclamation facility.⁴⁶ On the other hand, proponents claimed

that consolidation would result in lower costs for the two districts and the public, along with water management by a countywide agency that was capable of maintaining an adequate supply of good quality water. The proponents' arguments partially meant that Gavilan residents would pay a greater amount by paying ground water charges or pump taxes to both districts without a merger, but that a merger would result in them paying less by paying one pump tax. This has been the case. The valley water district's pump taxes in the district's southern county ground water charge zone, part of which overlapped the Gavilan District, were first levied in that zone when the San Felipe Project's water began to arrive that summer, and were designed to help pay for the project.⁴⁷

CONCLUSIONS

After about half a century of multiple water districts, following the 1987 consolidation, Santa Clara County at long last had a single agency to handle floods, water conservation, and water importation, which is a more efficient means of doing business. However, one must be cautioned not to take the merger for granted. It was as though fate was taunting the Gavilan District until, at the very end, it proclaimed that this time it was for real. Though the Gavilan District's sovereignty was threatened on numerous occasions and though it was destroyed by only the last one (the 1987 consolidation election), one cannot and must not assume that the consolidation was inevitable because the 1987 vote was barely favorable. One might argue that the merger would still

have occurred at a later date even if the 1987 vote was negative because of the high costs to the Gavilan District's residents of living in two independent but overlapping districts, these costs including the payment of pump taxes to both the Gavilan District and the valley water district. However, this is mere speculation because we will never know that since the election was successful.

Endnotes

NOTE: All board minutes of districts are stored in the offices of the Santa Clara Valley Water District in San Jose, California.

1. Jan O. M. Broek, The Santa Clara Valley, California; A Study In Landscape Changes (Utrecht, the Netherlands: Oestlocks, 1932), p. 26. H. S. Foote, ed., Pen Pictures From the Garden of the World; or Santa Clara County, California (Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Company, 1888), pp. 189-190. Hare's Guide To San Jose and Vicinity, For Tourists and New Settlers (San Jose, California: George H. Hare, Bookseller and Stationer, 1872), pp. 65-66. Frederick Hill, The History of San Jose and Surroundings With Biographical Sketches of Early Settlers (San Francisco: Printing House of A. L. Bancroft and Company, 1871), p. 265. William F. James and George H. McMurry, History of San Jose, California (San Jose: Smith Printing Company, 1933), pp. 95-96; 144. J. P. Munro-Fraser, History of Santa Clara County, California (San Francisco: Alley, Bowen & Co., Publishers, 1881), pp. 24-25. Eugene T. Sawyer, History of Santa Clara County, California (Los Angeles: Historic Record Company, 1922), p. 143. Judge Belden, "The Santa Clara Valley," Santa Clara County, California, September, 1887, p. 11 (originally published by the Board of Trade of San Jose, San Francisco: W. B. Bancroft & Company, printers and publishers, 1887; reprinted by the San Jose Historical Museum Association, 1980).
2. Fred H. Tibbetts and Stephen E. Kieffer, San Francisco civil engineers, "Report to Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation Committee On Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation Project" (March, 1921), pp. 71; 141. "Report To The Honorable Board Of Directors Of The South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District On Water Supply And Well Replenishment Project," Project Report No. 1, Blackie and Wood, Civil Engineers, San Francisco (January, 1939), pp. 55; 56; 62. "Report To The Honorable Board Of Directors Of The South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District On Llagas Creek Well Replenishment Project," Project Report No. 8, Blackie and Wood, Consulting Engineers, San Francisco, submitted by E. E. Blackie (June, 1947), p. 7. "Report To The Honorable Board Of Directors Of The South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District On Llagas Creek And Uvas Creek Well Replenishment Project," Project Report No. 14, Blackie and Wood, Civil Engineers, San Francisco (January, 1952), p. 17. Santa Clara Investigation, California Division of Water Resources of Department of Public Works, Bulletin No. 42 (1933), pp. 12; 15; 16-17; 32-33. California State Water Resources Board, Santa Clara Valley Investigation, Bulletin No. 7 (1955), pp. 34-36.

NOTE: The Tibbetts and Kieffer report and the Blackie and Wood reports are at the Santa Clara Valley Water District offices in San Jose, California.

3. "Uvas-Llagas Watersheds," Gilroy (Calif.) Advocate, 16 October 1920, p. 3. "Water Problem Kiwanis Subject," Gilroy Advocate, 28 February 1930, p. 1. "Irrigation Drive Is Started," San Jose Mercury-Herald, 1 February 1920, p. 1. "Orchardists To Investigate Big Irrigation Project," San Jose Daily Mercury, 13 June 1913, pp. 9; 11. Herbert C. Jones, "Water For the Valley; A Quarter-Century Record of the Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District, 1929-1954," pp. 4-5 (unpublished 1954 pamphlet at the Santa Clara Valley Water District offices in San Jose, California). "Water Meeting Today," San Jose Mercury-Herald, 28 February 1920, p. 1. "Committee On Irrigation Elects Permanent Officers," San Jose Mercury-Herald, 29 February 1920, p. 25. Fred H. Tibbetts and Stephen E. Kieffer, San Francisco civil engineers, "Report to Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation Committee On Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation Project" (March, 1921), pp. 150; 162; 172; 182; 200; 201; 204-208; 211-212; 214; 216; 218; 226-233; 238.

NOTE: The Tibbetts and Kieffer report is at the offices of the Santa Clara Valley Water District in San Jose, California.

4. Russell M. Posner, "The Progressive Voters League, 1923-26," California Historical Society Quarterly, September, 1957, pp. 252; 253; 258; 259. Carolyn de Vries, Grand and Ancient Forest; The Story of Andrew P. Hill and Big Basin Redwoods State Park (Fresno, California: Valley Publishers, 1978), pp. 58; 68. California, S. B. 192 of 1921, sec. 2; 7; 14, Statutes (1921) 1,523-1,572. California, S. B. 83 of 1923, sec. 2; 7; 14, Statutes (1923) 1,215-1,257. Secretary of State Frank C. Jordan, comp., California Blue Book or State Roster, 1911 (Sacramento: Friend W. Richardson, Superintendent of State Printing, 1913), p. 484. California Blue Book or State Roster, 1932 (Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1932), p. 43. Alden Campen, "Herbert C. Jones," in Bertha M. Rice, Builders Of Our Valley; A City of Small Farms (self-published, 1957), 1:93. Sawyer, History of Santa Clara County, California, pp. 1,670; 1,673. "Water Conservation Measure Discussed," San Jose Mercury-Herald, 30 March 1921, p. 4. "Water Conservation Bill Is Subject Of Discussion," San Jose Mercury-Herald, 7 April 1921, p. 9. "Proposed Water District Loses By 960 To 6084," San Jose Mercury-Herald, 11 March 1925, p. 1.
5. "Proposed Water District Loses By 960 To 6084," San Jose Mercury-Herald, 11 March 1925, p. 1. Santa Clara County supervisors' minutes of October 3, 1921. Santa Clara County supervisors' minutes of March 16, 1925, Book 8, p. 181.

6. "Water Storage Vitally Needed, Jones Declares," San Jose Mercury-Herald, 30 October 1929, p. 22. "Water Saving To Benefit High and Lowland Regions," San Jose Mercury-Herald, 31 October 1929, p. 17. "Gilroy District Begins Move To Conserve Water," San Jose Mercury-Herald, 3 June 1930, pp. 1; 11. "Conservation Of Water Topic At C. Of C. Meet," Gilroy (Calif.) Advocate, 6 June 1930, p. 1. "Water Meeting At S. Martin Tonite," Gilroy Advocate, 6 October 1933, p. 1. "District Water Survey To Be Made By State," Gilroy Advocate, 13 October 1933, pp. 1; 8. "Strong Committee Endorses Conservation Plan," Gilroy Evening Dispatch, 3 January 1935, p. 1. "Gilroy Voting Tomorrow On Water District," San Jose Mercury-Herald, 25 July 1938, p. 7. "Water District Vote Due Dec. 6," San Jose Mercury-Herald, 5 November 1949, p. 14. "South County Votes Today On Water Plan," San Jose Mercury-Herald, 6 December 1949, p. 14.
7. California, S. B. 998 of 1909, sec. 12, Statutes (1909) 1,097-1,105. California, S. B. 1028 of 1911, sec. 12, Statutes (1911) 1,290-1,302. California, S. B. 252 of 1941, sec. 15, Statutes (1941) 453-465. California, S. B. 265 of 1913, sec. 1; 6; 12, Statutes (1913) 1,049-1,063. California, A. B. 1036 of 1933, sec. 34, Statutes (1933) 2,252-2,275. California, S. B. 98 of 1941, sec. 11, Statutes (1941) 1,562-1,573. County Water District Law, California Water Code, annotated (West), sec. 31021; 33900. Municipal Water District Law of 1911, California Water Code, annotated (West), sec. 71610; 71610.5; 73000.
8. California, S. B. 1257 of 1913, Statutes (1913) 778-781. California, S. B. 542 of 1921, sec. 3, Statutes (1921) 1,198-1,199. Conservancy Act of California of 1919, sec. 1; 2, Statutes (1919) 559-604. California, S. B. 191 of 1931, sec. 2; 18, Statutes (1931) 2,263-2,270. California Water Code, sec. 20000; 20002; 150010, Statutes (1943) 1,604-1,896. California, S. B. 948 of 1943, Statutes (1943) 1,897. California, A. B. 947 of 1971, sec. 21, Statutes (1971) 1:279-326. California, S. B. 925 of 1979, sec. 429, Statutes (1979) 1:1,250-1,429. California, S. B. 767 of 1991, sec. 26, Statutes (1991) 3:5,172-5,188 (West's California Legislative Service). California Water Code, annotated (West), sec. 20200.

9. Marc Reisner, Cadillac Desert; The American West and Its Disappearing Water, revised and updated (New York: Penguin Books, 1993), p. 109. Frank Adams, Irrigation Districts in California, Bulletin No. 21, Reports of the Division of Engineering and Irrigation (Sacramento: Department of Public Works, {1929}), p. 17. California, Wright Act of 1887 (A. B. 12 of 1887), Statutes (1887) 29-45. A. B. 12 of 1887, in Journal of the Assembly During the Twenty-Seventh Session of the Legislature of the State of California, 1887, p. 44. California, A. B. 730 of 1897, Statutes (1897) 254-287. A. B. 730 of 1897, in Journal of the Assembly During the Thirty-Second Session of the Legislature of the State of California, 1897, p. 390. California, S. B. 541 of 1921, sec. 5, Statutes (1921) 1,108-1,111. California, S. B. 658 of 1917, sec. 39, Statutes (1917) 751-769. California, S. B. 872 of 1935, sec. 1, Statutes (1935) 1,555. Irrigation District Law, California Water Code, sec. 20847; 29975, Statutes (1943) 1,604-1,896; and S. B. 949 of 1943, Statutes (1943) 1,897. Irrigation District Law, California Water Code, annotated (West), sec. 20847; 29975.
10. California Water Conservation District Act of 1923, sec. 1; 3; 4; 5; 6; 35, Statutes (1923) 978-999. California, S. B. 52 of 1925, sec. 3; 4, Statutes (1925) 555-571.

NOTE: Similar in part to the California Water Conservation District Act of 1923 was the California Irrigation Act of 1919. Senator M. B. Harris of Fresno County authored both laws, both of which were in effect at the time of the efforts to form water conservation districts. The 1923 law created what it called the state irrigation board while the 1919 law created what it called the irrigation board. Both boards were authorized to create districts by uniting various types of districts and other political subdivisions of the state, but the 1923 law called them water conservation districts while the 1919 law named them conservation districts. Both laws required petitions to the boards from these units. Also, unlike the 1923 law, the 1919 law did not require any elections on such proposals. Furthermore, the 1919 law repealed and replaced the California Irrigation Act of 1915, which had also created what it called an irrigation board. The 1915 law had been authored by Assemblyman Elmer L. Sisson of Tehama County and amended by a 1917 law by Assemblyman Henry Hawson of Fresno County.

California Irrigation Act of 1919, sec. 1; 6b; 20, Statutes (1919) 671-711. California Irrigation Act of 1915, sec. 1, Statutes (1915) 1,173-1,185. California, A. B. 792 of 1917, sec. 2, Statutes (1917) 1,068-1,107.

11. California, Water Conservation Act of 1927, sec. 1; 2; 45, Statutes (1927) 160-180. California, A. B. 1871 of 1931, Statutes (1931) 425-426. California, S. B. 1492 of 1949, Statutes (1949) 1,601-1,603. California, Water Conservation Act of 1929, sec. 1; 2; 3; 38, Statutes (1929) 307-321. California, Water Conservation Act of 1931, sec. 1; 2; 3; 54, Statutes (1931) 2,045-2,068. California, S. B. 567 of 1933, Statutes (1933) 2,348-2,361. California, S. B. 231 of 1937, Statutes (1937) 1,420-1,423. California, A. B. 1593 of 1937, Statutes (1937) 2,414-2,416. California, S. B. 588 of 1943, Statutes (1943) 2,976. California, S. B. 432 of 1945, Statutes (1945) 1,938-1,940. California, S. B. 433 of 1945, Statutes (1945) 1,940-1,941. California, S. B. 84 of 1949, Statutes (1949) 1,981-1,982. California, S. B. 469 of 1949, Statutes (1949) 2,409-2,410. California, S. B. 1632 of 1949, Statutes (1949) 2,283-2,288. Water Conservation District Law of 1931, (enacted in 1965) California Water Code, annotated (West), sec. 76500; 76501.
12. Conservancy Act of California of 1919, sec. 1; 2, Statutes (1919) 559-604. California, S. B. 192 of 1921, sec. 13; 14, Statutes (1921) 1,523-1,572. California, S. B. 83 of 1923, sec. 13; 14, Statutes (1923) 1,215-1,257. California, Water Conservation Act of 1931, sec. 2, Statutes (1931) 2,045-2,068. California, Water Conservation Act of 1927, as amended by S. B. 267 of 1951, sec. 1, Statutes (1951) 2:2,774-2,776. Water Conservation Act of 1927, California Water Code Appendix, annotated (West), sec. 34-2.
13. Santa Clara County supervisors' minutes of October 7 and November 12, 1929, Book 10, pp. 14; 21; 43. Annual Report; Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1960 (San Jose, California: Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District, {1960}), p. 4. (This annual report is in the offices of the Santa Clara Valley Water District in San Jose.)
14. "Water Meeting At S. Martin Tonite," Gilroy (Calif.) Advocate, 6 October 1933, p. 1. "District Water Survey To Be Made By State," Gilroy Advocate, 13 October 1933, pp. 1; 8. "Water Survey Plan Defeated In 5 Out Of 7 Vote Districts," Gilroy Advocate, 18 January 1935, p. 1. Santa Clara County supervisors' minutes of October 22, November 5, November 23, December 10, and December 17, 1934; and January 21, 1935, in Book 12, pp. 234; 240; 248; 256; 264; 272; 296. Statement Of All Votes Polled At the Special Election Held January 15, 1935, On Formation Of The Llagas-Uvas Water Conservation District, County of Santa Clara, State of California; accompanies county supervisors' minutes of January 21, 1935.

15. Santa Clara County supervisors' minutes of June 27 and August 1, 1938, in Book 14, pp. 147; 150; 184-186. 1938 map of the South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District; and "Order Canvassing Vote, Declaring Organization Of District And Election Of Directors," in Santa Clara County supervisors' library file entitled "DISTS. Water. Gavilan Water Conservation Formation."
16. South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District minutes of April 5, April 10, and May 9, 1979; and May 14, June 11, and July 9, 1980. South District Resolution FY 81-1, dated July 9, 1980, in the Santa Clara County supervisors' library file entitled "DISTS - Water - Gavilan Water Consv - General." Water Conservation District Law of 1931, (enacted in 1965) California Water Code, annotated (West), sec. 74509. California, S. B. 1045 of 1979, sec. 2, Statutes (1979) 1:1,135-1,136. S. B. 1045 of 1979, in Journal of the Senate; Legislature of the State of California; 1979-1980 Regular Session, Vol. 1, p. 1,358; and Vol. 3, pp. 4,669; 5,148; 5,548; 5,645. S. B. 1045 of 1979, in Journal of the Assembly; Legislature of the State of California; 1979-80 Regular Session, Vol. 3, pp. 5,447-5,448; 5,586; and Vol. 5, p. 7,881.
17. Petition for organization of a water conservation district to be known as the Central Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District, and notice of hearing, September 8, 1949; and map of the Central Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District, in Santa Clara County supervisors' file entitled "DISTS - Water - Sta Clara Valley Water Cons Central District Annexed 8-19-1954." Santa Clara County supervisors' minutes of October 10, October 24, October 31, and December 19, 1949, in Book 19, pp. 319; 331; 339; 398-399. Order declaring the organization of the Central Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District, adopted by the Santa Clara County board of supervisors on December 19, 1949, in Book 1895, pp. 111-113, in Santa Clara County Recorder's office.
18. Annual Report; Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1960 (San Jose, California: Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District, {1960}), p. 4. (This annual report is in the Santa Clara Valley Water District offices in San Jose.) California, Water Conservation Act of 1931, sec. 37-49, Statutes (1931) 2,045-2,068. California, S. B. 84 of 1949, sec. 1, Statutes (1949) 1,981-1,982. California, S. B. 1632 of 1949, sec. 4, Statutes (1949) 2,283-2,288. "Voters Approve All Three Water Annexation Issues," Morgan Hill (Calif.) Times and San Martin News, 9 April 1954, p. 1. "Voters Okay Water Dist. Annexation," San Jose Mercury, 7 April 1954, p. 1. Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District minutes of August 19, 1954; and that district's Resolution No. 381, which is undated, but which is referred to in these minutes.

19. "Issue Report On Water Problem," by Dr. Elmer J. Chesbro, first in a series, Gilroy (Calif.) Evening Dispatch, 20 April 1951, p. 1. Statement and Data Regarding South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District Required By Section 3720 Of The Political Code Upon Change Of Boundaries Of The District (a legal description), dated August 20, 1951, by the South District, in the Santa Clara County supervisors' library file entitled "DISTS - Water - Gavilan Water Conserv - General." Santa Clara County Boundary Commission minutes of November 13, 1950. South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District minutes of April 21 and December 15, 1950; February 2, March 7, and June 11, 1951; May 4, 1953; March 6 and June 5, 1956; October 25, 1957; and October 14, 1960. California, Water Conservation Act of 1931, sec. 37-49, Statutes (1931) 2,045-2,068. California, S. B. 84 of 1949, sec. 1, Statutes (1949) 1,981-1,982.
20. California, Santa Clara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Act, sec. 1; 2, Statutes (1951) 2:3,336-3,355. California, S. B. 27 of 1952, sec. 1, Statutes (1952 and 1953) 1:372-376. California, S. B. 1571 of 1963, sec. 2; 3; 9, Statutes (1962 and 1963) 2:3,993-4,002. California, S. B. 87 of 1973, sec. 1; 2, Statutes (1973) 1:92-99. For the flood control districts, see the California Water Code index under "Flood Control Districts," then check these districts' laws for references to the original and amending statutes.
21. For the flood control districts, see the California Water Code index under "Flood Control Districts," then check these districts' laws for references to the original and amending statutes.
22. In re Bonds of the Madera Irrigation District, 92 California Reports 296; 27 American State Reports 106; 28 Pacific Reporter 272, 675; and 14 Lawyers' Reports Annotated 755 (1891). Allyn H. Barber v. T. Galloway, et al., 195 California Reports 1, 6; and 231 Pacific Reporter 34 (1924). Palo Verde Irrigation District v. Tony Seeley, etc., 198 California Reports 477; and 245 Pacific Reporter 1,092 (1926). Thomas Mulcahy, et al., v. B. W. Baldwin, etc., 216 California Reports 517; and 15 Pacific Reporter, Second Series 738 (1932).
23. Gavilan Water Conservation District minutes of February 25, 1987.
24. "Report To The Honorable Board Of Directors Of The South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District On Llagas Creek And Uvas Creek Well Replenishment Project," Project Report No. 14, Blackie and Wood, Civil Engineers, San Francisco (January, 1952), p. 3. "Report To The Honorable Board Of Directors Of The South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District On Uvas Creek Dam,

Reservoir, Conduit And Well Replenishment Project Proposed To Be Constructed Jointly With Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District And On Proposed Llagas Creek Dam, Reservoir And Well Replenishment Project," Project Report No. 15, Blackie and Wood, Civil Engineers, San Francisco, submitted by Harold Wood (March, 1953), pp. 3; 6. "Progress Report On The Well Replenishment Project Of The South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District," Project Report No. 19, Blackie and Wood, Civil Engineers, San Francisco (March, 1954), pp. 1-2. California, Water Conservation Act of 1931, sec. 36, as amended by S. B. 567 of 1933, sec. 1, Statutes (1933) 2,348-2,361. California, Water Conservation Act of 1931, sec. 36, as amended by S. B. 27 of 1954, sec. 3, Statutes (1954 and 1955) 1:239-244. South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District minutes of July 11, 1952; May 4, 1953; October 8 and 22, 1954; December 23, 1954; and February 7, 1955. "Uvas Dam Plans To Be Discussed," Gilroy (Calif.) Evening Dispatch, 29 January 1953, p. 1. "Uvas, Llagas Dam Bond Election Set," Gilroy Evening Dispatch, 9 March 1953, p. 1. "Water Bonds Pass By 7-1 Vote," Gilroy Evening Dispatch, 29 April 1953, p. 1. "It's Official - Water Bonds Pass," Gilroy Evening Dispatch, 5 May 1953, p. 1. "Uvas Bond Issue Wins By Over 8-1," Gilroy Evening Dispatch, 2 February 1955, p. 1. As-built plans for Uvas Dam and Reservoir, in the files of the Division of Safety of Dams of the California Department of Water Resources. Notice of completion of Uvas Dam and Reservoir, in Book 3958, pp. 549-550, in Santa Clara County Recorder's Office. Certificate of Approval of Uvas Dam, dated April 25, 1960, in the files of the Division of Safety of Dams. Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District minutes of November 4, 1954; and this district's Resolution No. 389 of 1954, which is undated, but which accompanies the district's minutes of that date.

NOTE: The Blackie and Wood reports are in the offices of the Santa Clara Valley Water District in San Jose, California.

25. Santa Clara County Grand Jury, "Final Report: 1959," pp. 168-169, in Santa Clara County Superior Court Executive Office.

26. Santa Clara County Grand Jury, "Final Report: 1960," pp. 103-104; 107; "Final Report: 1961," p. 64; "Final Report: 1962," pp. 81; 83; "Final Report: 1963," pp. 56; 61; "Final Report: 1965," p. 77; and "Final Report: 1966," pp. 61; 63-64, in Santa Clara County Superior Court Executive Office. Santa Clara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District minutes of March 21, 1960. California Department of Water Resources-Santa Clara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District contract for a water supply (South Bay Aqueduct contract), dated November 20, 1961, at the Department of Water Resources and the Santa Clara Valley Water District offices in San Jose, California.
27. Santa Clara County Grand Jury, "Final Report: 1965," p. 82, in Santa Clara County Superior Court Executive Office. Bulletin No. 132-63, The California State Water Project In 1963 (California Department of Water Resources, {April, 1963}), Plate III. Bulletin No. 132-64, The California State Water Project In 1964 (California Department of Water Resources, {June, 1964}), p. 98. Bulletin No. 132-66, The California State Water Project In 1966 (California Department of Water Resources, {June, 1966}), p. 21.
28. U. S., Congress, House of Representatives, San Felipe Division, Central Valley Project, California, H. Doc. 500, 89th Cong., 2nd sess., 1966, pp. III; VII; IX; X; 53. Public Law Number 90-72 of 1967, 81 Stat. 173-174 (1967). "Gush Of Water Baptizes Start Of San Felipe Flow," The Dispatch (Gilroy, California), 10 June 1987, p. A1. "San Felipe Project Officially Turned On," The Dispatch, 10 August 1987, p. A1. Public Law Number 86-488 of 1960, 74 Stat. 156-160 (1960). Public Law Number 100-490 of 1988, sec. 201, 102 Stat. 2,435-2,436 (1988).

NOTE: The Reclamation Service of the United States Department of the Interior was created in 1902, then it was reorganized as the Bureau of Reclamation in 1923. It was renamed the Water and Power Resources Service on November 6, 1979. The Bureau of Reclamation name was restored on May 18, 1981.

The United States Government Manual 1988/89
(Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, {1988}), p. 832.
Marc Reisner, Cadillac Desert; The American West And Its Disappearing Water, revised and updated
(New York: Penguin Books, 1993), pp. 113; 117.

29. "Water District Merger Proposed," Gilroy (Calif.) Evening Dispatch, 11 October 1966, p. 1. Santa Clara County Flood Control and Water District minutes of October 11, 1966. South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District minutes of March 11 and July 8, 1966. California, Santa Clara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Act (now called the Santa Clara Valley Water District Act), sec. 1; 2; 7, Statutes (1951) 2:3,336-3,355. California, S. B. 1571 of 1963, sec. 5, Statutes (1962 and 1963) 2:3,993-4,002.
30. Santa Clara County Flood Control and Water District minutes of February 21, 1967. South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District minutes of February 24, 1967.
31. California, S. B. 540 of 1967, sec. 7; 9; 11; 15; 29; 33, Statutes (1967) 1:1,312-1,333. Santa Clara Valley Water District Act, California Water Code Appendix, annotated (West), sec. 60-7; 60-7.2; 60-7.4; 60-20. S. B. 540 of 1967, in Journal of the Senate; Legislature of the State of California; 1967 Regular Session, Vol. 1, p. 561.
32. "Annual Report of the Santa Clara County Flood Control and Water District, 1967-68," pp. 2-3, in the offices of the Santa Clara Valley Water District in San Jose, California. South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District minutes of November 10, 1967. Santa Clara County supervisors' ordinance no. NS-7.1, adopted on February 26, 1968. Santa Clara County Grand Jury, "Final Report: 1967," p. 115, in Santa Clara County Superior Court Executive Office. Gilroy city council resolution no. 1255, adopted on April 25, 1968. "Water District Merger Plan Turned Down By South County," Gilroy (Calif.) Evening Dispatch, 1 May 1968, p. 1.
33. "Advisory Committee Promised," Gilroy (Calif.) Evening Dispatch, 24 April 1968, p. 9. "Issues In Water District Merger Election Debated," Gilroy Evening Dispatch, 25 April 1968, pp. 1; 6. "Water District Merger Plan Turned Down By South County," Gilroy Evening Dispatch, 1 May 1968, p. 1. Gilroy city council resolution no. 1255, adopted on April 25, 1968. California, S. B. 540 of 1967, sec. 2; 14, Statutes (1967) 1:1,312-1,333.
34. "Issues In Water District Merger Election Debated," Gilroy (Calif.) Evening Dispatch, 25 April 1968, p. 1. "Water District Merger Plan Turned Down By South County," Gilroy Evening Dispatch, 1 May 1968, p. 1.

35. Notice and certification of election results in the April 30, 1968, special consolidation election in the South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District, George A. Mann, Santa Clara County Registrar of Voters, to Santa Clara County supervisors, May 2, 1968, in Santa Clara County supervisors' library file entitled "DISTS - Water - Gavilan Water Conserv - General."
36. "State of California; Task Force Report On Special Districts," February 15, 1974, pp. 4; 5; 14-15; 20, in Robert B. Hawkins, Jr., Chairman of the Local Government Reform Task Force, "Regional Organization Issue." Ed Salzman, "Reagan Task-Force Surprise: Special District Is the Most Efficient Form of Local Government," California Journal 5 (January, 1974): 28.
37. Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission staff, "Sphere of Influence - Resource Conservation Districts," original report (January, 1976), p. 10, in Santa Clara County supervisors' library file entitled "ADM - Boards and Commissions; Local Agency Formation Comm; Districts - Resource Conservation; Consolidation Study." Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission staff, "Sphere of Influence - Resource Conservation Districts," revised report (February, 1976), pp. 12-13, in Gilroy city clerk file no. 440; and Santa Clara County supervisors' library file entitled "ADM - Boards and Commissions; Local Agency Formation Comm; Districts - Resource Conservation; Consolidation Study." Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission minutes of January 7, February 4, March 3, and May 5, 1976; and February 2, 1977, in Book 5, pp. 365-366; 376; and 397-398; and Book 6, pp. 11-13; 155-156. Santa Clara County supervisors' minutes of May 17, June 7, 21, and 28, August 2 and 17, October 4, November 1, and December 6, 1976; January 3 and February 15, 1977; and January 9 and July 25, 1978, in Book 79, pp. 569-570; Book 80, pp. 86-88; 169; 234-236A; 525-529; Book 81, pp. 59-61; 297-299; 491; Book 82, pp. 184-185; 342; Book 83, pp. 195-196; Book 87, pp. 565-571; Book 90, p. 458. Santa Clara County supervisors' resolutions, adopted on August 17, 1976; November 1, 1976; and February 15, 1977, in Santa Clara County supervisors' library file entitled "ADM - Committees - Special District Consolidation Task Team - General." County of Santa Clara Special District Consolidation Task Team, "Report of Task Team On Special District Consolidation" (November 28, 1977), pp. 4-6, in the Santa Clara County supervisors' library and at the offices of the Santa Clara Valley Water District in San Jose, California.

38. Santa Clara County supervisors' minutes of March 14 and April 11, 1977, in Book 83, p. 362; and Book 84, p. 35. Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) minutes of February 2, 1977, Book 6, pp. 155-156. Certificate of completion of the dissolution of the Black Mountain Resource Conservation District, May 3, 1977, in Book C 804, pp. 556-557, in Santa Clara County Recorder's office. Certificate of filing in the California secretary of state's office of the certificate of completion of the dissolution of the Black Mountain Resource Conservation District, May 5, 1977, in Book C 804, p. 558, in Santa Clara County Recorder's office. Santa Clara County supervisors' resolution ordering the dissolution of the Black Mountain Resource Conservation District, adopted on April 11, 1977, in Book C 804, pp. 559-562, in Santa Clara County Recorder's office. Certificate of completion of the annexation of the Santa Clara County portion of the Black Mountain Resource Conservation District to the Evergreen Resource Conservation District, May 3, 1977, in Book C 804, pp. 563-564, in Santa Clara County Recorder's office. Certificate of filing in the California secretary of state's office of the certificate of completion of the annexation of the Santa Clara County portion of the Black Mountain Resource Conservation District to the Evergreen Resource Conservation District, May 5, 1977, in Book C 804, p. 564-A, in Santa Clara County Recorder's office. Resolution of the board of directors of the Evergreen Resource Conservation District approving annexation of the Santa Clara County portion of the Black Mountain Resource Conservation District after a public hearing, adopted on April 13, 1977, in Book C 804, pp. 564-B - 566, in Santa Clara County Recorder's office.
39. S. B. 209 of 1979, in Journal of the Senate; Legislature of the State of California; 1979-1980 Regular Session, Vol. 1, pp. 149; 168; 677; 678; 1,048; and Vol. 3, p. 5,125. S. B. 209 of 1979, a copy of which is in the government documents depository at Stanford University. Santa Clara County Farm Bureau minutes of July 3, 1979. South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District minutes of April 14, July 14, and August 23, 1978. Gavilan Water Conservation District minutes of February 8, 1984.
40. Mary Lou Weis of Morgan Hill, letter to the editor, Gilroy (Calif.) Dispatch, 4 August 1976, p. 2. "Pending Legislation Needed For Water District's Survival," Gilroy Dispatch, 14 February 1979, p. 3. Alfred R. (Fred) Angelino letter to the editor, Gilroy Dispatch, 12 February 1979, p. 2. "Water District Merger Aired Before Council," Gilroy Dispatch, 6 January 1978, p. 1. "Urge-To-Merge Something Of A Political Hot Potato," San Jose Mercury-News, 2 January 1978, p. 9A. "Eight Into Two," editorial, San Jose Mercury-News, 2 January 1978, p. 2B. "Tough Sledding For Consolidation Plan," San Jose

Mercury-News, 7 January 1978, p. 12A. "Water District Directors Rap Agency Merger," San Jose Mercury-News, 7 January 1978, p. 12A. Loma Prieta Resource Conservation District minutes of February 20, 1979. Morgan Hill city council minutes of January 4, 1978. Santa Clara County supervisors' minutes of June 21 and 28, 1976, Book 80, pp. 169; 234-236A. South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District minutes of December 9, 1977. South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District President John H. (Jack) Martin and South District secretary-manager R. Jack Sturla to California State Senator Alfred E. Alquist, March 8, 1979, in Santa Clara County supervisors' library file entitled "DISTS - Water - Gavilan Water Conserv - General." County of Santa Clara Special District Consolidation Task Team, "Report of Task Team On Special District Consolidation" (November 28, 1977), pp. 4-5, in the Santa Clara County supervisors' library and at the offices of the Santa Clara Valley Water District in San Jose, California.

41. South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District minutes of May 14, 1980. County Water District Law, California Water Code, annotated (West), Division 12.
42. "Master Sphere of Influence Plan For Special Districts In Santa Clara County," adopted by the Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) on April 13, 1983, pp. 23; 25; 26; 30; 32; 33; and accompanying memorandum from Cathy R. Lazarus, assistant executive officer of LAFCO, to LAFCO, April 1, 1983, in Santa Clara County supervisors' library file entitled "ADM - Boards and Commissions - Local Agency Formation Commission - SPHERE OF INFLUENCE: Spec. Dists." Santa Clara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Act (now called the Santa Clara Valley Water District Act), sec. 2, as amended by California, S. B. 27 of 1952, sec. 1, Statutes (1952 and 1953) 1:372-376. Santa Clara Valley Water District Act, California Water Code Appendix, annotated (West), sec. 60-2. California, A. B. 1642 of 1965, sec. 10, Statutes (1964-1965) 2:1,914-1,924. California, A. B. 2284 of 1965, sec. 9, Statutes (1964-1965) 3:4,768-4,781. California, A. B. 1191 of 1979, sec. 1, Statutes (1979) 2:3,085-3,087. California, A. B. 115 of 1985, sec. 2; 3; 5, Statutes (1985) 2:1,920-2,024. California, A. B. 558 of 1985, sec. 1; 1.3, Statutes (1985) 3:5,944-5,959. Cortese-Knox Local Government Reorganization Act of 1985, California Government Code, annotated (West), sec. 56027; 56076. Resource Defense Fund v. Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Cruz County, 138 California Appellate Reports, Third Series 987; 188 California Reporter 499 (California District Court of Appeal, 1983).

43. Monterey Peninsula Water Management District Law of 1977, Wat. Uncod. Acts (Deering's California Codes, annotated), Act 5065, sec. 102; 311; 326-329; 341-366; 368; 371. Water Conservation District Law of 1931, (enacted in 1965) California Water Code, annotated (West), sec. 74500-74645. Santa Clara Valley Water District Act, California Water Code Appendix, annotated (West), sec. 60-2; 60-6. San Benito County Water District Act, California Water Code Appendix, annotated (West), sec. 70-1; 70-2. California, San Benito County Water Conservation and Flood Control District Act, sec. 1; 2, Statutes (1952 and 1953) 2:3,279-3,301. California, S. B. 1871 of 1988, sec. 1; 2, Statutes (1988) 2:2,240-2,242. Gavilan Water Conservation District minutes of March 13 and 20, April 27, May 8, and August 14, 1985; and February 12, 1986. Gilroy city council minutes of April 15, 1985. "Directors Endorse Super Water District For South County," The Dispatch (Gilroy, California), 14 March 1985, p. A3. "City Council Rejects Super Water Board," The Dispatch, 17 April 1985, p. A3. "Water, Sewer Regional Agency Proposal Shelved By Council," Morgan Hill (Calif.) Times and San Martin News, 8 May 1985, p. 3. "Umbrella Agency Shunned," San Jose Mercury-News, South County morning edition, 3 May 1985, p. 1B. Report to the Gavilan Water Conservation District board of directors from the Citizens Advisory Committee, 1985, in Gilroy city clerk file no. 770.
44. Gavilan Water Conservation District minutes of February 11 and 25, 1987.
45. California, S. B. 740 of 1987, sec. 1, Statutes (1987) 1:71-74. S. B. 740 of 1987, in Journal of the Senate; Legislature of the State of California; 1987-1988 Regular Session, Vol. 1, pp. 362; 716; 748; 1,084-1,085; 1,548; 1,570. S. B. 740 of 1987, in Journal of the Assembly; Legislature of the State of California; 1987-88 Regular Session, Vol. 1, p. 1,669; and Vol. 2, pp. 2,043; 2,066; 2,085; 2,153-2,154. Original and amended versions of S. B. 740 of 1987 in the government documents depository at Stanford University. Gavilan Water Conservation District minutes of May 20, 1987. Water Conservation District Law of 1931, (enacted in 1965) California Water Code, annotated (West), sec. 74030; 74031; 74050; 76030; 76031; 76040. Cortese-Knox Local Government Reorganization Act of 1985, California Government Code, annotated (West), beginning at section 56000. California, A. B. 115 of 1985, sec. 3; 4; 5, Statutes (1985) 2:1,920-2,024. California, A. B. 558 of 1985, sec. 1; 1.3, Statutes (1985) 3:5,944-5,959. California, S. B. 740 of 1987, sec. 1; 6, Statutes (1987) 1:71-74. "Declaration of Election Results," by George A. Mann, Santa Clara County Registrar of Voters, November 9, 1987, in Santa Clara County Registrar of Voters' file entitled "Gavilan

Water Conservation District, November 3, 1987." Gavilan Water Conservation District Measure G of November 3, 1987, in Statement Of All Votes Cast At the Consolidated Election Held On November 3, 1987, In the County of Santa Clara, State of California, p. 13, in Santa Clara County Registrar of Voters' office. Alfred Angelino to Santa Clara County Registrar of Voters, November 10, 1987; and "Certificate of Results of Recount," by Santa Clara County Registrar of Voters George A. Mann, November 16, 1987, in Santa Clara County Registrar of Voters' file entitled "Recount; Gavilan Water Conservation District Election, November 3, 1987." California Elections Code, annotated (West), sec. 17160; 17166. Santa Clara County supervisors' minutes of November 24, 1987, Book 124, Agenda Item Number 41.

46. Pro and con arguments over Gavilan Water Conservation District Measure G in the sample ballot, November, 1987, general election in Santa Clara County, in the Santa Clara Valley Water District file entitled "INTER-GOVT: District; Water; Gavilan WCD-SCVWD Merger; Aug. 87-." Mayor Roberta H. Hughan of Gilroy to Gavilan Water Conservation District President Robert Blaine, February 11, 1987, in Gilroy city clerk file no. 1113. "Water Wars," The Dispatch (Gilroy, California), 29 October 1987, p. A10. "Can You Put A Price On Clean Water?" letter to the editor by Mark Masoni of Gilroy, The Dispatch (Gilroy, California), 30 October 1987, p. A9. "Water Control Is the Real Issue," letter to the editor by Dory Leverton of Morgan Hill, The Dispatch, 30 October 1987, p. A9.
47. Gavilan Water Conservation District minutes of October 14, 1987. "Water Merger Talks Leaning To Ballot Box," The Dispatch (Gilroy, California), 5 February 1987, pp. A1; A10. "Debate On Water District Merger Spurs Impromptu Vote At Rotary," The Dispatch, 26 August 1987, p. A10. Mayor Roberta H. Hughan of Gilroy to Gavilan Water Conservation District President Robert Blaine, February 11, 1987, in Gilroy city clerk file no. 1113. Pro arguments over Gavilan Water Conservation District Measure G in the sample ballot, November, 1987, general election in Santa Clara County, in the Santa Clara Valley Water District file entitled "INTER-GOVT: District; Water; Gavilan WCD-SCVWD Merger; Aug. 87-." Gilroy Public Works Department director Richard L. Cox to Gilroy city administrator Jay Baksa, two Gilroy Public Works Department memoranda, January 9, 1987, one memorandum with attached proposed Santa Clara Valley Water District ground water charges or pump taxes for fiscal year 1987-1988, in Gilroy city clerk file no. 1113. Gilroy city administrator Jay Baksa to Gilroy city council, January 26, 1987, in Gilroy city clerk file no. 1113. Santa Clara Valley Water District, The Water Utility Enterprise; Preliminary - February, 1987, p. 17. Santa Clara Valley Water District, The Water Utility

NOTE 47 (CONT'D.)

Enterprise; Final - June, 1987, p. 17. Santa Clara Valley Water District, The Water Utility Enterprise; Preliminary - February, 1988, p. 17. Santa Clara Valley Water District, The Water Utility Enterprise; Final - June, 1988, p. 17. Water Conservation District Law of 1931, (enacted in 1965) California Water Code, annotated (West), sec. 75507. Santa Clara Valley Water District Act, California Water Code Appendix, annotated (West), sec. 60-26.1. California, Santa Clara Valley Water District Act, sec. 26.9, as amended by S. B. 839 of 1983, sec. 5, Statutes (1983) 2:2,497-2,503. Santa Clara Valley Water District Resolution No. 74-28, adopted on April 2, 1974, effective July 1, 1974. Santa Clara Valley Water District minutes of January 7, 1987. Santa Clara Valley Water District minutes of June 23, 1987, and the agenda memorandum for Item 11B of these minutes. South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District minutes of June 27, 1979; and June 11, 1980. Gavilan Water Conservation District minutes of June 10, 1981; September 20, 1982; June 8, 1983; April 10, 1984; June 16, 1985; and January 7 and June 10, 1987. San Felipe Public Hearing - Gilroy, California Department of Water Resources, May 2, 1975, p. 14, at the Santa Clara Valley Water District offices in San Jose, California. "San Felipe Promises To Meet Future Needs," The Dispatch (Gilroy, California), 15 August 1986, pp. A1; A8. "Water Wars," The Dispatch, 29 October 1987, p. A10. "New Water Pump Tax Coming; Water District Registering Wells," Morgan Hill (Calif.) Times, 1 September 1986, p. A1. "Water District Boards Seek Amended Bill," Morgan Hill Times, 3 April 1987, p. A6.

KEVIN R. FISH

BACKGROUND OF THE AUTHOR

M. A. in Social Science, with history being the major. May, 1984.
San Jose State University.

Thesis: California's Hetch Hetchy controversy of 1905-1913 in
historical, local, and national perspective

The Hetch Hetchy controversy centered on San Francisco's struggle to win federal approval of its plan to convert the Hetch Hetchy Valley to a municipal reservoir. This valley is located about 18 miles northwest of the Yosemite Valley, and both valleys are inside Yosemite National Park. Sierra Club President John Muir and Century magazine editor Robert Underwood Johnson led the opposition, the magazine headquarters being in New York City. San Francisco won its struggle when President Woodrow Wilson (term: 1913-1921) signed the Raker Act on December 19, 1913. The Hetch Hetchy Project's initial completion occurred in 1933.

B. A. in History. June, 1976. Southern Oregon State College. Ashland, Oregon.

A. A. in History. June, 1974. DeAnza Community College. Cupertino, California.

California Pioneers of Santa Clara County contest of 1977. I won second prize for the essay on California water rights.

California Pioneers of Santa Clara County contest of 1986. I won first prize for the essay on Alviso.

Soil and Water Conservation Society. 50th anniversary meeting. Des Moines, Iowa. August, 1995.

I presented in an exhibit information on (1) the subject of the paper that I am entering in this contest - water conservation and flood control districts of Santa Clara County; (2) the history of the San Felipe Division of the Central Valley Project, a federal water supply project that is run by the Bureau of Reclamation of the U. S. Interior Department; this Division comprises all of Santa Clara and San Benito counties and portions of Santa Cruz and Monterey counties; and (3) the history of waste water reclamation.

I also sent a longer version of my paper on Santa Clara County flood control and water conservation districts to the National Association of Conservation Districts, but this association does not publish papers, pamphlets, or books on this kind of subject.

29th annual Northern Great Plains History Conference. St. Paul, Minnesota.

Fall, 1994. I presented a paper on the Billie Sol Estes agricultural influence peddling scandal of the 1960's. Estes, a Texan, was arrested by the F. B. I. and the State of Texas in 1962. Texas A & M University Press has expressed interest in a book-length manuscript on the subject, which I am currently writing.

Texas State Historical Association conference. Austin, Texas. February, 1996.
I attended this conference, but I did not present a paper.

Water In the Santa Clara Valley: A History.

Cupertino, California: California History Center of DeAnza College, 1981.
I wrote Chapter 2 of this book.