

State Water Resources Control Board Workshop
Wells Fargo Center, Santa Rosa, California
North Coast Instream Flow Policy
6 August 2008

hand delivered
by Rudy Light
on
August 6, 2008

Comments by Rudolph H. Light
P.O. Box 736
Redwood Valley, CA 95470
(707) 485-1335

My name is Rudolph Light and I live on the West Fork of the Russian River in Redwood Valley in Mendocino County.

The North Coast Instream Flow Draft Policy was released for public comment in late December, and public comments were due by May 1. Staff has had time to read the comments and take them into consideration.

Before the Policy is submitted to the Board, I would like to ask the Division staff eight very important questions. I realize that not all questions can be answered in detail today, but each is framed as a yes or no question, which can be answered now.

I'll read all eight questions first for the benefit of the audience, and ask that the Staff provide at least a yes or no brief response after.

1. Are you certain that implementation of the Draft Policy will significantly improve anadromous fish habitat and fish passage in streams, and are you certain it will increase population numbers of coho, chinook and steelhead?

2. Has what you are proposing in the Draft Policy ever been done before in any watershed of any size? And, has such a policy been operable before on a multibasin level of 4,900 square miles, the size of the Policy area?

3. Would you be willing to experiment and try out the provisions of the Policy for a few years on a medium-sized watershed, say 100 square miles, to see if you obtain the desired outcome, and then if the experiment proves successful, apply the Policy to a larger area at a later time?

4. Do you agree with the cost estimates provided by the engineering firm of Wagner and Bonsignore that the direct costs to landowners to implement the Policy will be somewhere between a quarter of a billion dollars and 1.8 billion dollars? (Wagner and Bonsignore Commentary Sec. 10.7.1) and that there will also be high costs incurred by the agencies to administer the Policy?

5. Section 11.1.1 states [quote], "The State Water Board also will consider adding terms and conditions to existing water rights or revising ambiguous or inappropriate terms and conditions when analyzing petitions. Additionally, the State Water Board may impose terms and conditions to implement this policy through a public trust proceeding, an enforcement proceeding or as a result of

Comments by Rudolph H. Light
6 August 2008

a complaint investigation." [end of quote] This sounds like it will allow an environmental organization to file a complaint on an already licensed diversion and as a result the Division can impose the new conditions of the Policy on that license. My question is, does the Division intend to modify conditions of already licensed onstream ponds or diversions to pit ponds to make them retroactively compliant with the Policy, such as forced demolition of a licensed dam, or newly required construction of a bypass facility on a licensed pond even when the licensee has not filed a change petition?

6. Do you still plan to use the formulas for Minimum Bypass Flow and Maximum Cumulative Diversion rates as written in the Draft Policy of December 2007? (Secs. 2.3.2 and 2.3.3)

7. Will you exempt small watersheds from the MBF and MCD requirements, and if so, below what Drainage Area size would the exemption apply? (Secs. 2.3.2 and 2.3.3)

8. Do you still intend to include small domestic uses and stock pond registrations in the Policy? (Sec. 5.0)

Thank you in advance for your answers.