



County of Mendocino
Grand Jury

Post Office Box 629
Ukiah, CA 95482
(707) 463-4320

WATER, WATER EVERYWHERE, but...
MENDOCINO COUNTY WATER DISTRICTS REPORT

May 4, 2006

Summary

As part of its obligation to conduct periodic reviews of County Special Districts, the Grand Jury performed an oversight of Water Districts as they impact water resources within the County, focusing primarily on those water agencies and special districts in Ukiah Valley and Potter Valley, their available water supply, their plans, and their ability to respond to emergencies and major water shortfalls.

Background

The area of Ukiah Valley and Potter Valley contains a high proportion of the Mendocino County population. Water agencies and special districts in the Ukiah and Potter Valleys originated in distinctly separate communities responding to various water events such as floods or droughts, local and neighborhood interests, needs and demands. Over decades, as the population increased, boundaries and interests have grown together and have overlapped. Continued urbanization has placed increased demand on a relatively fixed water supply; the issue has been further complicated by the advent of environmental interests, concerns, and habitat requirements.

Almost no rainfall occurs in Mendocino County from May through October. In addition, at 10 to 15 year intervals, the County, including the Ukiah and Potter Valley area, experiences extreme droughts lasting two to four years.

The source of water within the Ukiah and Potter Valley area is the Eel River Diversion, created by the Van Arsdale Dam and the Scott Dam (Lake Pillsbury), Coyote Dam (Lake Mendocino), the Russian River and its tributaries, as well as numerous ground water wells. Hydrologists have determined that geologically, the Ukiah Valley ground water aquifer is considered undeveloped and a potential water source, while Potter Valley is a fractured aquifer which is most likely not a water source.

The Eel River Diversion has supplied the Ukiah and Potter Valley area with summer water for nearly 100 years. However, a decrease in water imports from the Eel River Diversion is a distinct possibility. There are three reasons for this: the age and physical condition of the Eel River Tunnel; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) has issued a decision regarding water supply, though this is currently under appeal; and other possible environmental determinations.

Primary water storage for the Ukiah and Potter Valley area is Coyote Dam; other sources include agricultural ponds, various smaller dams and reservoirs, and storage tanks. The availability of stored water is not only essential but critical in drought conditions.

No one entity in Mendocino County has overall responsibility and authority for the development of water resource management plans and policy. The Board of Supervisors is required by law to develop these plans and policies but does not have the authority to implement or enforce them. The entities involved in Mendocino County water policy are: the Board of Supervisors, Mendocino County Water Agency, Mendocino County Inland Water and Power Commission, Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the City of Ukiah, and all the other individual County Water Districts.

Methods

The Grand Jury conducted interviews with officials of Mendocino County and the City of Ukiah, as well as representatives of some of the water agencies/special districts. The Jury reviewed numerous documents, hydrological studies, and reports concerning water, focusing primarily within Ukiah Valley and Potter Valley.

Findings

1. There are some 20 agencies, including Special Districts, involved with water resources within the entire County.

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

Response (Interim CEO): The Interim Chief Executive Officer agrees with this finding.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding.

2. The Ukiah Valley and Potter Valley (UV/PV) area alone has nine Mendocino County water agencies and/or special districts. They are:

City of Ukiah	Calpella County Water District
Mendocino County Water Agency (MCWA)	(CWD)
Mendocino County Inland Water and Power Commission (IWPC)	Millview CWD
Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RRFCWCD)	Potter Valley Irrigation District (PVID)
	Redwood Valley CWD
	Willow CWD

In addition there are a number of private water companies; the largest is the Rogina Water Company.

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

Response (Interim CEO): The Interim Chief Executive Officer agrees with this finding.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding.

3. In accordance with the Mendocino County Water Agency Act, the Board of Supervisors (BOS) acts as the Board of Directors for MCWA, and to the extent that the BOS may deem expedient or economical, MCWA is charged "to control flood and storm waters and other waters within the District [County] and the flood waters of streams outside the District, which flow into the District; to conserve such waters by storage in surface reservoirs, to divert and transport such waters for beneficial

uses within the District; to release such waters from surface reservoirs to replenish and augment the supply of waters in natural underground reservoirs and otherwise to reduce the waste of water and to protect life and property from floods within the District; and to do any and every lawful act necessary to be done that sufficient water may be available for any present or future beneficial use or uses of the lands or inhabitants within the district..." (California Water Code, §54-3.q)

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

Response (Interim CEO): The Interim Chief Executive Officer agrees with this finding.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding.

4. MCWA operates with a full-time equivalent staff of 2.8 persons.

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding. Please see the response provided by the Water Agency.

Response (Interim CEO): The Interim Chief Executive Officer agrees with this finding. Please see the response provided by the Water Agency.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding and notes that shortly after the Grand Jury report was released on May 4, 2006 the Water Agency's full-time equivalent staff was increased to 3.0 persons.

5. The City of Ukiah, RRFCWCD, PVID and Redwood Valley CWD comprise the Joint Powers Agency (JPA) that makes up IWPC.

6. RRFCWCD does not physically provide water directly to any individual user.

7. RRFCWCD wholesales water to water providers and agriculturists for beneficial use within the Ukiah Valley, but not Potter Valley.

8. Current water agencies/special districts in the UV/PV area originated as a result of an unplanned and uncoordinated history of water events, local and distinctly separate community and neighborhood interests, needs and demands.

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors can neither agree nor disagree with this finding as it does not have sufficient information.

Response (Interim CEO): The Interim Chief Executive Officer can neither agree nor disagree with this finding as it does not have sufficient information.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency has no information or belief sufficient to agree with or contradict this finding.

9. Continual growth and development, together with increased population demands, have resulted in some overlap of interests, influence and competition between various UV/PV area water districts.

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors can neither agree nor disagree with this finding as it does not have sufficient information.

Response (Interim CEO): The Interim Chief Executive Officer can neither agree nor disagree with this finding as it does not have sufficient information.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency has no information or belief sufficient to

agree with or contradict this finding.

10. State law and codes that mandate the organization and structure of water agencies/special districts are involved and complex.

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

Response (Interim CEO): The Interim Chief Executive Officer agrees with this finding.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding, the formation of a water agency or special district typically requires professional expertise in law and occasionally other disciplines.

11. Water districts are largely autonomous and governed by elected boards of directors serving a specific defined geographical area and population.

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

Response (Interim CEO): The Interim Chief Executive Officer agrees with this finding.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding.

12. Unification or consolidation of water districts, a complex process, requires that all parties or districts concerned must approve such action.

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

Response (Interim CEO): The Interim Chief Executive Officer agrees with this finding.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding.

13. Except for the City of Ukiah, accurate measurement and/or metering of water usage (industrial, agricultural, and residential) within most water districts varies widely. Currently, it is not possible to know exactly how much water is actually being used in the UV/PV area because of the multiple systems of accountability in use, as well as a degree of undocumented use.

14. The amount of water used by many water purveyors is known and available from those required to file Statement of Use with State Water Resource Control Board (WRCB). Reporting has been haphazard, with no current consequence for non-compliance.

15. RRFCWCD is currently operating under a Cease and Desist Order from WRCB over questions about water usage measurement.

16. Users with riparian rights, those whose property is immediately contiguous to a water source, are required to file a Statement of Use with WRCB. The requirement to report is currently not enforced, and many do not file. Currently, there is no requirement to report usage locally.

17. Projections of population growth and development within the County and specifically the UV/PV area, indicate that continued availability of adequate water resources will be problematic.

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

Response (Interim CEO): The Interim Chief Executive Officer agrees with this finding.

18. Increased demand for potable water within UV/PV area would require developing

new water sources, conservation of existing sources, and the construction of new treatment, storage or supply facilities. Construction of these facilities could have significant environmental effects.

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

Response (Interim CEO): The Interim Chief Executive Officer agrees with this finding.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding.

19. The majority of UV/PV area water districts have adequate emergency and water management plans for responding to local emergencies, such as power outages, local and system-wide contamination, and/or distribution interruptions.

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors can neither agree nor disagree with this finding as it does not have sufficient information.

Response (Interim CEO): The Interim Chief Executive Officer can neither agree nor disagree with this finding as it does not have sufficient information.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency has no information or belief sufficient to agree with or contradict this finding.

20. Except for the City of Ukiah, the plans of most UV/PV area water districts for responding to earthquakes and multi-year droughts are marginal to non-existent.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency has no information or belief sufficient to agree with or contradict this finding.

21. New contracts for water from RRFCWCD require agencies and individuals using its water to develop water conservation programs. To date, this requirement has not been enforced by RRFCWCD.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency has no information or belief sufficient to agree with or contradict this finding.

22. While there may be some arrangements between various water districts for water sharing, there is no official comprehensive plan or legal agreement among water districts for sharing water resources.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency has no information or belief sufficient to agree with or contradict this finding.

23. The Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) and the Inland Water and Power Commission (IWPC), the local sponsoring agency, are studying methods to improve flood control and increase water storage for the UV/PV area.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding.

24. The Coyote Valley Dam Feasibility Study will consider various options for increasing water supplies and storage. Raising the water level behind Coyote Dam or raising the dam itself are two of those options.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding.

25. ACE has completed its initial Reconnaissance Study and is prepared to proceed with the next phase of the Coyote Valley Dam Feasibility Study, which will include

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analyses.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding.

26. The current cost for the complete Coyote Valley Dam Feasibility Study is estimated to be approximately \$6,000,000 and will take five or more years to complete; \$3,000,000 of that cost will consist of local matching funds.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding.

27. In the past, nearly \$300,000 in ACE's annual appropriations for the Study have been lost due to local entities' inability to furnish the required matching funds.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding. Because no contractual agreement between a local sponsor and the ACE existed, the local entities could not furnish the required matching funds.

28. In fiscal year 2006-2006, the Federal government has appropriated \$100,000 to ACE for the next phase of the Coyote Valley Dam Feasibility Study, anticipating \$100,000 of local matching funds. This appropriation will expire September 30, 2006 if local monies are not forthcoming.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding.

29. While Redwood Valley CWD has not committed to the project, three of the four members of IWPC (City of Ukiah, RRFCWCD and PVID) are currently negotiating financial participation relationships and funding availability for the Coyote Valley Dam Feasibility Study, under critical time constraints. Qualification for Federal funds will depend upon successful completion of these negotiations.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency has no information or belief sufficient to agree with or contradict this finding.

30. Funding for development and construction costs for the potential project coming out of the Coyote Valley Dam Feasibility Study, would consist of 75% from the Federal government and 25% local monies. Total costs are estimated to be in excess of \$150 million.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency has no information or belief sufficient to agree with or contradict this finding.

31. State, Federal, and local laws deal with environmental issues, water supply, water quality, and water rights, utilization and distribution.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding.

32. RRFCWCD, ACE, and the Sonoma County Water agency (SCWA) are currently undertaking a Section 7 Consultation with NOAA-Fisheries to evaluate the effects of existing and proposed operation and maintenance activities (SCWA's "Water Supply and Transmission System Project") on the Russian River on listed salmonid species.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding.

33. Agencies outside Mendocino County influencing decisions regarding UV/PV area water resources include:

Sonoma County Water Agency
(SCWA)
California Water Resources Control
Board (WRCB)
California Regional Water Quality
Control Board (RWQCB)
California Department of Health
Services (DHS)

Army Corps of Engineers (ACE)
National Marine Fisheries Services,
(NOAA-Fisheries)
State and Federal courts

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

Response (Interim CEO): The Interim Chief Executive Officer agrees with this finding.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency agrees with this finding.

34. There is universal agreement that the most efficient, inexpensive and environmentally sensitive method to increase water availability is to reduce demand through conservation.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency partially agrees with this finding. While it may generally be true that the most efficient, inexpensive and environmentally sensitive method to increase water availability is to reduce demand through conservation, there may be instances, albeit rare, when conservation is not the most inexpensive method to increase water availability. Accordingly, the Water Agency proposes the following finding: "It is generally acknowledged that the most efficient, inexpensive and environmentally sensitive method to increase water availability is to reduce demand through conservation".

35. The authority and ability of the Board of Supervisors (BOS) to directly affect water resource policy is limited by statute and the nature of the autonomous organizational character of County Water Districts.

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors agrees in part with this finding. While the ability of the BOS to influence water resources management decisions by individual water districts – decisions pertaining to district operations – is limited, the BOS believes that existing State statute, such as the Mendocino County Water Agency Formation Act, does in fact provide the BOS with sufficient authority to formulate and implement county-wide water resources management policy.

Response (Interim CEO): The Interim Chief Executive Officer agrees in part with this finding. Please see the response provided by the Board of Supervisors.

36. There is in existence a Mendocino County Service Area #3 which has jurisdiction over the entire county. The BOS acts as its Board of Directors. Created in the 1950's and last activated in 1991, it has been inactive and non-operational in recent years.

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

Response (Interim CEO): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

Response (Water Agency): The Water Agency has no information or belief sufficient to agree with or contradict this finding.

37. The BOS has the authority to allocate monies for water projects within the County.

Response (Board of Supervisors): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

Response (Interim CEO): The Interim Chief Executive Officer agrees with this finding.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that:

1. the BOS take a leadership role in developing long-range comprehensive management plans and strategic policy for dealing with all aspects of water resources (supply, rights, availability, usage, conservation, storage, distribution and infrastructure) countywide and specifically for the UV/PV area. (Findings 3, 10, 35-37)

Response (Board of Supervisors): The recommendation has not yet been implemented. Please see the response provided by the Water Agency.

Response (Interim CEO): The recommendation has not yet been implemented. Please see the response provided by the Water Agency.

Response (Water Agency): The recommendation has not yet been implemented. BOS is currently seeking federal funding for the development of a countywide water management plan, is an active participant in the North Coast Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, was recently awarded state funding for the development of the Noyo/Big River Coastal Integrated Watershed Management Plan, and is conducting technical investigations in support of a “water supply/demand analysis” for the Russian River drainage.

The County’s 2006 Legislative Program includes a funding request for development of a countywide water management plan that among other things, will include an inventory of existing water resources and uses, and project water demands for agricultural, environmental and municipal purposes over the next 25 to 30 years. The proposed water management plan will also investigate alternative institutional mechanisms for providing water supply and wastewater services in the rural portions of the County. In 2005 the County adopted, along with the neighboring counties of Sonoma, Humboldt, Del Norte, Siskiyou, Modoc and Trinity the “North Coast Integrated Regional Water Management Plan”, which is designed to address water management issues, most notably the restoration of endangered Steelhead and Coho Salmon fish populations, in the North Coast region.

In 2006 the County was awarded funding (\$196,000) for the development of the Noyo/Big River Coastal Integrated Watershed Management Plan, a collaborative effort involving the City of Fort Bragg, Mendocino County Resource Conservation District, Mendocino Coast Weed Management Area, Mendocino Land Trust, State Parks, Trout Unlimited, Mendocino Redwood Company and others. The Noyo/Big River Plan will address a variety of water supply, aquatic habitat protection and storm water management issues in the Noyo River and Big River drainages and will be used as a vehicle for obtaining state and federal funds for a variety of water management projects in the plan area.

In addition to the above planning efforts, the County has contracted with the University of California Cooperative Extension for an "Agricultural Water Use Inventory" of the Mendocino County portion of the Russian River drainage, and is assisting the Mendocino County LAFCO with the preparation of "Municipal Service Reviews" of the Ukiah Valley water districts. Together, the Agricultural Water Use Inventory and the information that will be produced as a part of the Municipal Service Reviews will provide the data needed to up date the water supply projections for the greater Ukiah Valley and provide the technical foundation for subsequent water resources management investigations, such as the Coyote Dam Feasibility Study. Later this year the BOS will consider initiating a groundwater study of the greater Ukiah Valley – a study that will provide baseline data needed as a part of the environmental impact studies for the Ukiah Valley Area Plan, the Coyote Valley Dam Feasibility Study, potential litigation involving Eel River diversions to the Russian River, and in support of technical arguments centered on the question of "percolating groundwater" as opposed to "underflow".

2. the BOS establish a Water Resource Policy Council, composed of all water agencies/special districts and official water-related entities within the County and the UV/PV area. The Council should explore interests and concerns in order to develop common long-range plans and strategies to address the issues of adequate guaranteed water availability, usage, conservation and storage within the County. (Findings 3, 10, 35-37)

Response (Board of Supervisors): The recommendation has not yet been implemented and requires further analysis by the County's Executive Office.

Response (CEO): The recommendation has not yet been implemented and requires further analysis by the County's Executive Office, upon direction to do so by the Board of Supervisors.

Response (Water Agency): The recommendation has not yet been implemented. The Water Agency currently hosts semi-monthly meetings of the "Russian River Public Water Agencies", which are attended by water district representatives and other interested parties and provide an informal forum for the discussion and exchange of information pertaining to a variety of water management issues in the Russian River drainage. Similar forums – a "Coastal Mendocino Public Water Agencies", "Eel River Public Water Agencies" and a Countywide group, – are proposed but have not been established due to staff and funding limitations.

3. the BOS increase staff and funding for the MCWA and immediately initiate procedures with the State necessary to expand its mission, powers and authority to include co-ordination and administration of all water resource management and feasibility studies within the County. (Findings 3, 4)

Response (Board of Supervisors): The recommendation has not yet been implemented and will require further analysis. Please see the response provided by the

Water Agency.

Response (Interim CEO): The recommendation has not yet been implemented and requires further analysis upon Board of Supervisor direction.

Response (Water Agency): The recommendation has not yet been implemented. In FY 2006-2007 Water Agency staff will be increased by 0.7 to 1.2 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) over the prior fiscal year. The BOS recognizes that further increases in staff and funding for the Water Agency would be highly desirable. Unfortunately, significant increases in either staff or funding are not practical given the County's current fiscal condition.

Pursuant to State statute - "Mendocino County Water Agency Formation Act"- the Water Agency currently has the authority to coordinate and administer water resources management and feasibility studies in and for the County. The BOS does not believe that it is necessary or practical, or even desirable, for the Water Agency to coordinate or administer every resource management or feasibility study occurring within the County.

4. the BOS and the IWPC, perhaps in conjunction with other appropriate entities, arrange necessary financing for the matching funds to add to the ACE's 2005-2006 appropriated monies for the continued development of the Coyote Valley Dam Feasibility Study. (Findings 26-29, 36, 37)

Response (Board of Supervisors): The recommendation has already been implemented. Please see the response provided by the Water Agency.

Response (Interim CEO): The recommendation has already been implemented. Please see the response provided by the Water Agency.

Response (Water Agency): The recommendation has already been implemented. It is the understanding of the BOS that the four entities currently involved in the Coyote Valley Dam Feasibility Study; Redwood Valley County Water District, Potter Valley Irrigation District, City of Ukiah and the Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation Improvement District are providing the necessary local match to the 2005-2006 ACE appropriation. Consequently, no additional funds are needed to match the 2005-2006 ACE appropriation. Future local sponsor contributions by the County – which could consist of cash, in-kind service or a combination of the two - will depend in part on the degree to which the County becomes involved with the Coyote Valley Dam Feasibility Study.

5. the BOS take all steps necessary to ensure the water rights of any added water capacity be negotiated in favor of the County and UV/PV. (Findings 23, 24, 31)

Response (Board of Supervisors): The recommendation has already been implemented. Please see the response provided by the Water Agency.

Response (Interim CEO): The recommendation has already been implemented. Please see the response provided by the Water Agency.

Response (Water Agency): The recommendation has already been implemented. The

County believes that the rights to any water supply created as a result of an enlarged or re-operated Coyote Valley Dam should belong to the entities that have paid for the creation of said water supply. The County has previously and will continue to assert that in-county interests, as opposed to out-of-county interests, should hold the rights to any water supply created as a result of an enlarged or re-operated Coyote Valley Dam.

6. the BOS by ordinance or other appropriate authority (activate Mendocino County Service Area #3) require all water purveyors, providers, agencies and special districts, as well as riparian rights users, to install meters and/or measuring devices to track water usage for local reporting. (Findings 13 -16)

Response (Board of Supervisors): The recommendation requires further analysis. Please see the response provided by the Water Agency.

Response (Interim CEO): The recommendation requires further analysis. Please see the response provided by the Water Agency

Response (Water Agency): The recommendation requires further analysis over a three to six month time frame is necessary to determine whether or not implementation of Recommendation # 6 is feasible and desirable. Key questions include the legal basis by which the County would require reporting of water usage data, and how water usage data would be compiled and made available to the public.

7. the Mendocino County Water Agency receive and compile water usage data for informational and planning purposes. (Findings 13-16)

Response (Board of Supervisors): The recommendation has been implemented. Please see the response provided by the Water Agency.

Response (Interim CEO): The recommendation has been implemented. Please see the response provided by the Water Agency.

Response (Water Agency): The recommendation has been implemented. As of August 1, 2006 the Water Agency routinely requests publicly available water usage data from public water purveyors. Any data received will be compiled for informational and planning purposes.

8. all water agencies/special districts immediately develop and implement conservation programs, with an education component for residential, agricultural and industrial use. Devices such as reduced-flow water fixtures and irrigation equipment and other passive and active approaches, including reclaimed water (treated wastewater) systems, should be investigated and considered. (Findings 3, 18, 31)

Response (Board of Supervisors): The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The Board will work directly with the CEO's office and the Water Agency to complete an analysis as to the recommendation within the next year.

Response (Interim CEO): The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will

be implemented in the future. The Board will work directly with the Board of Supervisors and the Water Agency to complete an analysis as to the recommendation within the next year.

Response (Water Agency): The recommendation has not yet been implemented. The Water Agency agrees with and supports Recommendation # 8.

9. the BOS lobby State and Federal agencies to promote solutions to each and all water resource and distribution problems within the County and UV/PV area.
(Findings 10-12, 31, 35)

Response (Board of Supervisors): The recommendation has already been implemented. The BOS will continue to lobby State and Federal agencies to the extent staff and financial resources permit.

Response (Interim CEO): The recommendation has already been implemented. The Interim CEO will continue to lobby State and Federal agencies to the extent staff and financial resources permit.

Response (Water Agency): The recommendation has already been implemented. The BOS and Water Agency will continue to lobby State and Federal agencies to the extent staff and financial resources permit.

Comments

Historically, instead of using a unified consensual approach, various County Water Districts have been embroiled in continual squabbles and infighting, petty territorial and philosophical conflicts, and competition, typically without accomplishing any meaningful results except to generate extraordinarily high legal costs for all involved.

Strategic planning must be done now rather than waiting until a crisis develops. The process of developing new supplies in the face of ever increasing demand will be difficult and time-consuming, especially if there is a material decrease in imports from the Eel River Diversion. Additionally, the potential impact of a typical multi-year drought, as well as outside restrictions on Russian River water use, requires immediate and serious attention to both short and long range strategies.

The Municipal Service Review of the Ukiah Valley/Russian River Watershed currently being written for the Local Area Formation Commission (LAFCO) may shed more light on the issues of water resources in the UV/PV area.

A properly organized, single entity dealing with UV/PV area water issues can provide the appropriate direction and leadership for smaller independent agencies and special districts to follow in addressing and solving mutual water problems.

There must be a top-down political will to accomplish any multi-agency unification among the various agencies and special districts, with the assistance of LAFCO. The agencies and special districts must be committed to the benefits of unification and consensus. Agencies and special districts should retain their individual water rights even as they work together. The BOS needs to play a pivotal role in the development of this

political will and consensus among the diverse independent water entities within UV/PV. Beyond that, citizen involvement and engagement in development of this political will is equally essential.

Because water development, improvement and infrastructure require large financial resources, a unified entity can better provide the financial leadership needed to negotiate with financial institutions about bond issues, as well as to negotiate with political groups and elected officials concerning revenues.

Outside entities such as several State and Federal agencies, ACE and SCWA require an effective County negotiator. A single unified entity would provide a coherent and knowledgeable negotiating force.

Responses Required

Mendocino County Board of Supervisors:

(Findings 1-4, 8-12, 17-19, 33, 35-37, All Recommendations)

Mendocino County Water Agency:

(Findings 1-4, 8-12, 18-34, 36, All Recommendations)

Chief Executive Officer, Mendocino County:

(Findings 1-4, 8-12, 17-19, 33, 35-37, All Recommendations)

Ukiah City Council:

(Findings 5, 9, 13-18, 20, 22-31, 33, 34, Recommendations 1, 2, 4-8)

Board of Directors, Inland Water and Power Commission:

(Findings 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 13, 17, 18, 20, 22-31, 33, 34, Recommendations 5, 6)

Board of Directors, Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation District:

(Findings 1, 2, 5-18, 21-34, Recommendations 1, 2, 4-8)

Board of Directors, Calpella County Water District:

(Findings 1, 2, 8-14, 16-20, 22, 31, 33, 34, Recommendations 1, 2, 4-8)

Board of Directors, Millview County Water District:

(Findings 1, 2, 8-14, 16-20, 22, 31, 33, 34, Recommendations 1, 2, 4-8)

Board of Directors, Potter Valley Irrigation District:

(Findings 1, 2, 8-14, 16-20, 22, 31, 33, 34, Recommendations 1, 2, 4-8)

Board of Directors, Redwood Valley County Water District:

(Findings 1, 2, 8-14, 16-20, 22, 31, 33, 34, Recommendations 1, 2, 4-8)

Board of Directors, Willow County Water District:

(Findings 1, 2, 8-14, 16-20, 22, 31, 33, 34, Recommendations 1, 2, 4-8)

Resources

California Water Code, Chapter 45, Mendocino Water Agency - 1996

Ukiah Valley Drinking Water Adequacy Assessment - April 2002

City of Ukiah Water Management Plan - November 2002

Ukiah Valley Area Plan, Draft Environmental Impact Report - July 2005

The Ukiah Valley/Russian River Watershed Municipal Service Review (in progress)