

RESPONSE PROCEDURE TO GRAND JURY REPORTS

The governance of responses to Grand Jury Final Report is contained in Penal Code § 933 and § 933.05. Responses must be submitted within 60 or 90 days. Elected officials must respond within sixty (60) days. Governing bodies (for example: the Board of Supervisors) must respond within ninety (90) days. Please submit all responses in writing and digital format to the Presiding Judge, the Grand Jury Foreperson and the CEO's office.

Report Title : Lobbies, Lawsuits & Legislation Report Date : June 3, 2010

Response by : DEVON JONES (URSA) Title : Participating Member

Findings

I (we) agree with the findings numbered: _____

I (we) disagree wholly or partially with the Findings numbered: _____

7 8 9

(attach a statement specifying any portions of the Findings that are disputed; include an explanation of the reasons therefore.)

Recommendations

Recommendations numbered: _____ have been implemented. (attach a summary describing the implemented actions.)

Recommendations numbered: _____ have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. (attach a time frame for implementation)

Recommendations numbered: 4 require further analysis. (attach an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer and/or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed; including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This time frame shall not exceed six (6) months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury Report)

Recommendations numbered: _____ will not be implemented because they are not warranted and/or are not reasonable. (attach an explanation.)

Date: 9/3/10 Signed: Devon Jones

Total number of pages attached: 1

2010 Grand Jury Report
Lobbies, Lawsuits and Legislation
URSA Response Attachment

Findings

Finding 7: URSA partially disagrees with this finding as the independent report presented to the SWRCB regarding the value of the agricultural industry was an estimate based on best available data for the agricultural related production value within the Russian River watershed, not Mendocino County as a whole.

Finding 8: URSA partially disagrees with this finding as URSA was not involved with the cost share or installation of the new USGS Talmage gauge that was placed in the Russian River in 2009. RVCWD and RRFCD along with the USGS jointly installed the USGS Talmage gauge.

Finding 9: URSA partially disagrees with this finding as farmers and property owners started new construction of off-stream ponds or re-plumbing existing off-stream ponds for frost control and irrigation starting in 2009 in order to mitigate the instantaneous demand of both water from the Main Stem of the Russian River as well as tributaries within the Russian River watershed.

Recommendations

Recommendation 4: (requires further analysis) URSA is an informal coalition of like-minded partners that developed in 2009 out of necessity to contend with the issues surrounding the ability to continue using water from the Russian River for frost protection of agricultural commodities. The model used for URSA, though affective, is not the model that should be replicated for larger proposals with vast implications.