

Subject: Fwd: FW: Letter to UDJ re Hal Voege Letter v4.doc
From: Jeanette <jbhent@sonic.net>
Date: 5/14/2014 2:45 PM
To: Rosalind Peterson <info@californiaskywatch.com>

----- Original Message -----

Subject:FW: Letter to UDJ re Hal Voege Letter v4.doc
Date:Mon, 28 Apr 2014 09:44:17 -0700
From:Bill Koehler <gmrvcwd@pacific.net>
To:'Jeanette' <jbhent@sonic.net>, <jbcb69@comcast.net>, 'kathe todd' <kathe@pacific.net>, <Pamela0111@comcast.net>

Final version with minor revisions suggested by various directors. I'll get this to the newspaper tomorrow. Bill

From: Granville [<mailto:teacupfarm@comcast.net>]
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 9:28 AM
To: 'Bill Koehler'
Subject: Letter to UDJ re Hal Voege Letter v4.doc
Importance: High

Bill, I fixed the "personal" bit at the beginning, and the confusion about "He" later on. I reviewed the part about "going to license" and decided to leave it alone. I added a short sentence at the very end; you may leave or delete it, at your sole discretion.

Thanks, Granville

Letter to UDJ as follow-up to Hal's letter

Hal Voege's letter to the UDJ of 17 April 2014 did a stellar job of laying out the situation so that everyone could understand it. Mr. Voege's letter should be required reading. However, I wish to clarify that Redwood Valley did not sue Flood Control to get water. Flood Control initially agreed to supply RV with water then sued to get out of the deal. That is how we got the Stipulated Judgment. The court-ordered moratorium on domestic water hookups was the result of a separate citizen lawsuit, in 1989.

In 2013, the Flood Control District (FCD) and Redwood Valley County Water District (RV) renewed stalled efforts to consolidate into one agency. All five RV board members voted to move forward with such efforts and the work of the general managers of both agencies continues those efforts at this time. However, recent actions by FCD have begun to dampen the RV board's enthusiasm.

FCD—particularly Lee Howard—tried to rush RV into embracing absorption into FCD, without discussion of details, on the faith that FCD could be trusted to take care of RV's customers, with reliable (not surplus) water. Yet, as Mr. Voege states, FCD has a long history of trying to get out of reliably supplying RV with water.

The water is there; the issues are political. FCD needs **RV** to go to license for its 8,000 acre-feet (A-F) right

to Lake Mendocino Water. The base year (2007) FCD used to claim that it is putting 8,000 A-F of water beneficial use was a year in which RV purchased over 1,800 A-F from FCD. FCD has applied for an additional 6,000 A-F right to Lake Mendocino water, to meet future needs of the area, and must go to license on the 8,000 before that application can get any traction. Again, FCD needs RV.

As Mr. Voege pointed out, Mr. Howard keeps trying to cause trouble with the State regulators for the local water purveyors. Mr. Howard recently stated that Masonite Well No. 6 (from which RV hopes to get water through the upgraded intertie) was proved to be underflow, as stated in Water Resources Control Board Decision 1030 (1949). Not true. D1030 makes no such statement.

Sonoma County Water Agency and no doubt all State and Federal regulatory agencies would like to see all the upper Russian River basin water purveyors come together, speak with one voice, and even—if possible—merge into one well-managed agency, one that would work with SCWA in common interests. One such interest is the upcoming relicensing of the Potter Valley diversion. This worthy goal was a major motivation for my getting involved in the water scene. FCD claims to have this in mind in all its efforts but forcing RV to cut off ag users is an attempt to starve us into submission, instead of building trust by being supportive. Which is it to be?