

**Table 1  
Summary of Written Comments Received by January 18, 2008**

<b>Comments Made By</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>
171 Landowners from Alexander Valley	Stressed the importance of in-stream maintenance, including gravel bar skimming.
Brenda Adelman; Russian River Watershed Protection Committee	Supports Alan Levine's comments. Commented on nutrient issues in the Laguna de Santa Rosa.
Henry Alden; Gualala Redwoods, Inc.	Suggested changes to prioritized list of Gualala River sub-watersheds for road restoration work and reconnaissance.
Eli Asarian; Quartz Valley Indian Reservation	Supports the Work Plan. Supports the Stream and Wetlands Policy. Stressed the value of combining sediment control and wetland protection measures and outreach. Suggested conditions that should be incorporated into WDRs pertaining to cumulative watershed impacts, timber harvest activities, unstable soils, areas with rain-on-snow events, landslide risk, road density, abandoned roads, timber harvest rates, grazing activities, and vineyards. Suggests that grants not be given unless land use disturbance patterns are improved. Suggested the Work Plan include the Middle Klamath Basin and make it a priority.
Ron Barlow; Orick Community Services District	Stressed importance of flood protection along Redwood Creek near Orick. Working with stakeholders is the right approach. Requested removal or revision of language pertaining to levee removal.
Craig Benson; Redwood Community Action Agency	Recommended changes in language pertaining to their efforts in the Mad River watershed. Concerned about impact of the Work Plan on the scope of their watershed management plan.
Sharon E. Duggan; Environmental Protection Information Center	Supports the Work Plan. Concerned that the Work Plan is too financially ambitious and may be unrealistic. Suggested contingencies be adopted to accommodate inability to fund the Work Plan. Example contingencies include limit use of roads in impaired watersheds, restrict industrial activities so as to not introduce excess sediment, require NPDES permits for any discrete conveyance of pollution to a waterbody, adopt empirical standards, require larger buffer zones, and a development moratorium in significantly impaired watersheds until the Work Plan is fully funded and achievable.
Richard Gienger	Suggested the Environmental Protection Information Center is interested in consulting and helping with the Board on the Work Plan. Suggested several stakeholders to add for the South Fork Eel River watershed. Suggested the Board host a workshop for South Fork Eel River stakeholders, and another for the Mattole stakeholders. Suggested Stitz Creek be added as a specific focus. Suggested the Mattole River task related to evasion of county permit process may be misconceived and proposed instead working with Humboldt County and their Alternative Owner Builder Ordinance and using outreach/education and incentives. Suggested the Work Plan needs a funding plan.
Barry Hill; U.S. Forest Service, Region 5	Requested revision of language for USFS related tasks to include State Board waivers, WDRs, and Management Agency Agreements.
Lisa Hulette; Gold Ridge Resource Conservation District	Requested they be listed as a Russian River stakeholder.
Peter S. Johnson; Mendocino County Farm Bureau	Suggested that rural roads be the number one priority within the Work Plan. Suggested a new task for general WDRs/waivers for rural residential roads. Suggested roads be specifically address in each watershed. Suggested clarifications to the language pertaining to county grading ordinances. Supports the outreach and education tasks. Suggested outreach be directed to children with a focus on rural roads.

**Table 1 (cont.)  
Summary of Written Comments Received by January 18, 2008**

<b>Comments Made By</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>
Jennifer Lance	Supports the Work Plan. Requested decommissioning roads, enforcing standards, and controlling timber and agriculture-related sources be a high priority. Requested the upper mid-Klamath watershed be included and have a high priority.
Alan Levine; Coast Action Group	Supports the Work Plan. Supports the Measures to Control Excess Sediment Amendment. The Board should work with other agencies. Suggested a new task to update and distribute the <i>Handbook for Forest and Ranch Roads</i> . Timber general WDRs/waivers need repair. Suggested a new task to comment on Board of Forestry rule-making and CDFG policy. Suggested the Board focus more on vineyard impacts in the Russian, Navarro, and Gualala River watersheds. Suggested interagency training. Concerned about funding timber road restoration work.
Paul E. Martin; Western United Dairymen	Requested additional time to comment. Offered to take staff on a field tour of dairies.
Len Mayer; Humboldt Creamery Association	Stressed the importance of the Board Members making careful decisions and the unique nature of watersheds. Requested to be kept informed. Offered to meet with the Board Members.
Lex McCorvey; Sonoma County Farm Bureau	Requested a time extension on the comment period.
Daniel Myers; Redwood Chapter of the Sierra Club	Supports the Work Plan. Requested the resolution be revised to: make a stronger case for increased funding, state that the work is not optional, state that most of the water bodies have been listed since 1993, state that the Board has the primary responsibility as Lead Agency for nine of the rivers, refer to the Stream and Wetlands Policy, and mention monitoring. Stressed the need to develop actions plans for the temperature TMDLs. Stressed that more funding will be needed to address the Klamath TMDLs. Offered their resources to encourage others to support the additional funding.
Denver Nelson	Incentive programs are excellent ideas. The 19 new staff should be based in Eureka. Monitoring is not adequately addressed. The Work Plan should include timber harvest yarding methods. Diaries do not produce excess sediment, and should be address through mechanisms other than the Sediment Work Plan. "Progressive enforcement" sounds too harsh. Confused about the relation of the Work Plan to the Klamath River TMDL. Dredging should be used in the Salt River, lower mainstem Eel River, and lower Klamath River.
Dr. Jane Nielson; Sebastopol Water Information Group	Supports the Work Plan as it pertains to the Russian River watershed. Supports Alan Levine's comments. Suggested the development of the Russian River TMDL be a high priority task. Supports the Measures to Control Excess Sediment Amendment and the Stream and Wetland Systems Protection Policy.
Robert Pennington; Community Clean Water Institute	Supports the Work Plan. Requested they and the Redwood Chapter of the Sierra Club be added to the list of Russian River stakeholders. Suggested Russian River watershed tasks be prioritized. Stressed the importance of municipal storm water control. Suggested that rural residential storm water programs are ineffective. Recommended that information on peak runoff reduction systems be made available. In-stream gravel mining should be phased out completely in the Russian River. Timber general WDRs/waivers need repair. Suggested a new task to comment on Board of Forestry rule-making and CDFG policy. Suggested the Board focus more on vineyard impacts in the Russian, Navarro, and Gualala River watersheds.

**Table 1 (cont.)  
Summary of Written Comments Received by January 18, 2008**

Comments Made By	Summary of Comments
John Perry; Syar Industries, Inc.	Gravel mining is not a source of excess sediment. Suggested waiting until the Russian River TMDL is developed. Confused about the priorities. Concerned about mitigation requirements. Identified inconsistencies between watersheds regarding gravel mining.
Peter F. Ribar; Campbell Timberland Management / Hawthorne Timber Company	Suggested decoupling of the Measures to Control Excess Sediment Amendment from the Work Plan or simultaneously develop ownership-wide WDRs/waivers. Suggested watershed-specific tasks are higher priority than regional tasks. Favors less regulatory approaches and voluntary reporting. Suggested wording changes. Requested a new task to develop an ownership-wide WDR for Campbell/Hawthorne. Watershed prioritization is transparent and understandable. Cautioned Board against using TMDL load allocations for regulatory compliance.
David Ripple; Shamrock Materials, Inc.	Identified error in the location of their activities. Requested the Board work with them. Gravel bar skimming is not a source of excess sediment. Riparian buffers cause excess sediment discharges. Stressed need for the Russian River TMDL. Requested to be a stakeholder. Identified inconsistencies between watersheds regarding gravel mining. Concerned and confused about the concepts of prevent, minimize, inventory, prioritize, schedule, fix, monitor, and adapt. Concerned about mitigation requirements. Requested clarification of the use of permits and recommendations from the Scientific Review Committee.
David Rose	Supports the Work Plan. Requested a high priority for decommissioning roads, enforcing standards, and controlling timber and agriculture-related sources. Requested the upper mid-Klamath watershed be included and have a high priority.
Gary C. Ryneason; Green Diamond Resource Company	Concerned about the Measures to Control Excess Sediment Amendment and the Stream and Wetland Systems Protection Policy, with specific comments related to both of these amendments.
Hank Seemann; Humboldt County Public Works Department	Stressed their willingness to work with the Board to develop general WDRs for county roads. Supports multi-agency permit facilitation. The Redwood Creek task related to the estuary and levee removal is problematic, should be deleted because the TMDL study area is upstream of the estuary, does not mention the function of the levees to protect life and property in Orick, is heavy handed regulation, contradicts the outreach and education task, and is economically infeasible.
Sandi R. Tripp; Karuk Tribe	Supports the Work Plan. Supports the Stream and Wetlands Policy. Stressed the value of combining sediment control and wetland protection measures and outreach. Suggested conditions that should be incorporated into WDRs pertaining to cumulative watershed impacts, timber harvest activities, unstable soils, areas with rain-on-snow events, landslide risk, road density, abandoned roads, timber harvest rates, grazing activities, and vineyards. Suggests that grants not be given unless land use disturbance patterns are improved. Suggested the Work Plan include the Middle Klamath Basin and make it a priority. Suggested the regional tasks apply to Salmon River and Lower Klamath and Middle Klamath basins. Concerned about the failure of San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board's waivers to control the extent of vineyard development.