



# *Redwood Valley County Water District*

Post Office Box 399 • Redwood Valley, CA 95470 • (707) 485-0679

## RESPONSE TO GRAND JURY REPORT "LOBBIES, LAWSUITS AND LEGISLATION" JUNE 4, 2010

Please note: This respondent is variously referred to as "Redwood Valley Community Water District", "Redwood Valley Water District", "RWVD", and "RVWD." All of these terms are incorrect. The proper name for this respondent is the Redwood Valley County Water District, or RVCWD.

### **Response to Findings:**

1. Partially disagree. NOAA's biological opinion was issued in 2004, not 2009 as stated. Respondent disagrees with the comment [...without regard to the needs of local farmers and the economy of the region...]. This comment would be more accurate if the term [...insufficient regard...] were substituted.
2. Partially disagree. Although velocity and flow in the Russian River are interrelated, this sentence incorrectly states that the *velocity* is to be decreased from 185 cubic feet /second to 125 cubic feet /second (*flow*).
3. Partially disagree. RVCWD is not in a position to comment on decisions or actions made by FERC or Friends of the Eel River. RVCWD is unfamiliar with Decision 77.
4. Agree. Although the enabling legislation that created Lake Mendocino/Coyote Valley Dam provided for flood control, recreation, and water storage, the primary function of the project was initially flood control.
5. Partially disagree. The County of Mendocino does not have any rights to the water in Lake Mendocino. In the County of Mendocino these rights are held by the Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation Improvement District.
6. Agree. The manual was updated in 1986 but the changes were not substantive.
7. Partially disagree. RVCWD is not in a position to comment on agricultural related production for Mendocino County.
8. Partially disagree. The USGS stream gage installed near the Talmage Bridge was funded by RVCWD, RRFCD, and USGS. URSA did not participate in the funding of this gage.

### **BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

*Donald E. Butow  
Jeanette Hallman  
Hal Voege  
Granville Pool  
Merle D. Reuser*

9. Agree. It should be noted that the ponds being constructed should be more properly identified as "off-stream" ponds.
10. Agree. It should be noted that the reference to "this County" is inappropriate given the focus of this report on the greater Ukiah valley rather than the entire county.
11. Agree. It should be noted that the reference is again to "this County" rather than the greater Ukiah valley.
12. Partially disagree. RVCWD cannot speak for other districts. However, RVCWD has effective management and sufficient funds for capital improvements. Redwood does not have sufficient funds to construct adequate off stream storage required to fully license its water right.
13. Partially disagree. This finding refers to the County rather than the greater Ukiah valley. It is assumed that there is indeed no comprehensive plan for water sharing county wide. There are currently interconnections in place between RVCWD, Calpella, Millview, City of Ukiah, and Willow. However, these interconnections are limited by size of infrastructure as well as regulatory place of use issues. RVCWD has a court ordered moratorium on domestic water hook-ups and a self imposed moratorium on agricultural water hook-ups.
14. Agree. The reference should be to the greater Ukiah valley rather than the entire County.
15. Agree.
16. Agree. It should be noted that RVCWD is not in a position to comment on other districts, budgets, policies, and procedures.
17. Partially disagree. RVCWD is not in a position to comment on the City of Ukiah.
18. Partially disagree. RVCWD is not in a position to comment on the City of Ukiah.

#### **Response to Recommendations:**

1. Not implemented. Although LAFCo would have oversight over any consolidation of public districts, LAFCo does not develop JPAs. The definition of geographic territory covered by this section; "Russian River South to the Sonoma County line" is unclear.
2. Not implemented. RVCWD does not understand the meaning of the term "uniform controls." RVCWD is not in a position to comment on the operation of the MCWA.
3. Not implemented. Questions regarding the operation of the City of Ukiah should be addressed to the City of Ukiah.
4. Not implemented. The Upper Russian Stewardship Alliance is a single purpose organization supported by a Memorandum of Understanding. The single purpose of this organization is to reduce direct diversions for agricultural frost protection from the Russian River and its tributaries in Mendocino County. Although URSA has been successful in facilitating communication among direct diverters, URSA should not be used as a model for a proposed JPA.