

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S SUMMARY REPORT
9:00 a.m., Thursday, March 6, 2008
Fortuna River Lodge, Coho Room
1800 Riverwalk Drive
Fortuna, California

ITEM: 8

SUBJECT: Workshop on the Draft Staff Work Plan to Control Excess Sediment in Sediment-Impaired Watersheds.

DISCUSSION

Background

The Draft Staff Work Plan to Control Excess Sediment in Sediment-Impaired Watersheds (Work Plan) is a staff-level planning document that was developed to fulfill the Regional Water Board's direction under the *Total Maximum Daily Load Implementation Policy Statement for Sediment Impaired Receiving Waters in the North Coast Region (Resolution No. R1-2004-0087)*.

Attachment 1 to this Report is the Executive Officer's Summary Report that was prepared for the January 2008 Board Meeting in Santa Rosa. It contains background information on the content of the Draft Work Plan, watershed applicability, and the definition of excess sediment.

Purpose of the Workshop

To provide another opportunity for interested parties to hear more about and provide oral comments on the Draft Work Plan. To that end, much of the information presented in Santa Rosa during the January 17, 2008 Board Meeting will be duplicated for this workshop.

The secondary purpose of this workshop is for Regional Water Board staff to present recent changes that staff have made to the Draft Work Plan, a summary of written comments and staff's responses, and information on current funding resources and workloads.

Public Comments

The Public Review Draft Work Plan was released on November 14, 2007. Since that time, Regional Water Board staff have engaged in outreach activities, and have received written and oral comments from the public, interested parties, and the Regional

Water Board. The written comments that staff received as of January 18, 2008, are summarized in Table 1.

The written comment period was extended to March 17, 2008 (just over one week after the Workshop). All written comments that are received by that date will be responded to in writing by Regional Water Board staff. The response to comments document will be available the beginning of April 2008.

Recent Changes

In response to written and oral comments, staff have been making changes to the Draft Work Plan. Most of these changes are listed in Table 2.

For example, many interested parties commented that they wish to be considered a key stakeholder and want to work with the Regional Water Board on excess sediment control in their watershed. Staff are revising the Work Plan to state that staff will work with all interested stakeholders. Additionally, language in the regional outreach and education task is being changed and a new task is being added to each watershed for staff to first identify key stakeholders and work with all interested stakeholders to control excess sediment.

More changes need to be made in response to written comments already received, and, as additional comments are submitted, staff expect even more changes will be necessary. A new Draft Work Plan should be released the beginning of April 2008. It will include the changes listed in Table 2 plus changes made in response to comments received by March 17, 2008.

Funding & Current Workload

The Draft Work Plan identifies the need for about nineteen additional permanent technical staff to execute all the tasks listed in the Work Plan in the next ten years and to maintain the program in subsequent years.

However, available staff will work on the sediment control tasks that are funded and for which staff resources are available. The tasks that are currently funded, and thus the tasks that staff intend to undertake for this fiscal year (2007-2008) and next (2008-2009) are listed in Table 3. Currently funded tasks include both regional tasks and watershed-specific tasks.

Staff will seek additional resources through all possible avenues. If more funding becomes available, staff intend to work on the next highest priority regional task (starting with outreach and education efforts, improving the Caltrans storm water program, developing waste discharge requirements or conditional waivers for the U.S. Forest Service, and coordinating with the California Department of Fish and Game and federal agencies on Habitat Conservation Plans and Incidental Take Permits). Once most of the regional tasks are underway, staff then intend to focus on watershed specific tasks, starting with the highest priority watersheds.

Next Steps

Following the release of the new Draft Work Plan, another written public comment period will begin on April 1, 2008, and end on April 28, 2008, to allow interested parties the opportunity to comment on the changes. On May 19, 2008, staff will respond in writing to written comments received between April 1 to 28, 2008, and will release the final Work Plan. The Regional Water Board is scheduled to consider a resolution directing staff to execute the tasks in the priority listed in the Work Plan on June 11 or 12, 2008.

PRELIMINARY STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

No action is recommended at this time. This is an informational item.

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

Comments Made By	Summary of Comments
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 31, 2008**

Comments Made By	Summary of Comments
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 31, 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. Ryneanson; 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.

Table 2
List of Significant Changes to the Work Plan
since the 11/17/07 Public Review Draft as of February 13, 2008

Please note that more changes will be made to the Work Plan as staff respond to public comments. The next public version of the Work Plan should be released April 1, along with staff's written response to public comments.

General Changes

- Added "staff" to the title.

Changes to the Introduction

- New section was added on temperature, nutrients, and other impairments with language describing how they relate to the Work Plan.

Changes to the Regional Sediment Control Tasks

- Revised the introductory language to clarify the definition of the regional tasks and added language describing the priority rankings.
- Rearranged the grouping of the tasks related to the Measures to Control Excess Sediment Amendment, the Stream and Wetlands Policy, outreach, and enforcement.
- Revised the language of the Basin Plan amendment tasks and several other tasks from "adopt" to language that reflects staff development and Board consideration.
- Separated out the outreach and education subtasks from the two Basin Plan amendment tasks into a separate regional task.
- Added a subtask to the outreach and education task to review and consider updating the *Handbook for Forest and Ranch Roads*.
- Clarified that the list of stakeholders includes some, but not necessarily all, of the stakeholders. Added several entities to the list of key stakeholders, including trade groups, other agencies not specifically listed, and landowner groups.
- Separated out the progressive enforcement subtasks from the two Basin Plan amendment tasks into a separate regional task.
- Added a "highest" priority ranking to the following regional tasks:
 - Measures to Control Excess Sediment
 - Stream and Wetlands Policy
 - Conducting outreach and education
 - Improving the Caltrans Storm Water Program
 - WDRs/waivers for the USFS
 - Coordinating with DFG on HCPs and ITPs.
- Added the Sonoma County Vineyard Ordinance to the Vineyard WDRs/Waiver Task.
- Added a new task to coordinate with CDFG, NOAA Fisheries, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on HCPs and ITPs.
- Added a new task to work with State Water Board staff on PG&E right-of-ways.
- Added a new subtask to employ a staff person for GIS work.
- Added a new task for staff to develop a tracking database of sediment control efforts, complaints, responses, etc. and tie into monitoring data.

**Table 2 (cont.)
List of Significant Changes to the Work Plan
since the 11/17/07 Public Review Draft as of February 13, 2008**

Changes to Watershed-Specific Sediment Control Tasks

- All watersheds: Revised the introductory language to clarify the definition of the watershed-specific tasks.
- All watersheds: Updated maps to better show the watershed, main roads, and major tributaries.
- All watersheds but Elk, Freshwater, Garcia, and Scott: Added a new task to identify and work with key stakeholders. Where the Work Plan already discussed information on individual watershed groups and stakeholders, staff kept the list and added language saying that the listed groups are not necessarily the only stakeholders in the watershed.
- All watersheds but Elk, Freshwater, Garcia, and Scott: Revised the outreach and education task to apply to all stakeholders.
- South Fork Eel, Upper Mainstem Eel, Noyo, and Ten Mile Rivers: Added a new task in each watershed to develop ownership-wide WDRs for Campbell Timberland Management / Hawthorne Timber Company.
- Lower Mainstem Eel River: Added the Humboldt Creamery Association to the list of key stakeholders.
- Lower Mainstem Eel, Gualala, Mad, and Russian Rivers: Added and revised language pertaining to instream gravel mining activities to clarify goals of 401 Certs. and stormwater permits, and to link mitigation to 401 Cert. requirements. Revised language so that all watershed tasks are consistent.
- Gualala River: Added a new task to encourage the Gualala River Watershed Council and/or Sotoyome RCD to develop a 3rd party NPS Control Program. Previously, this task was embedded in the outreach and education task for the Gualala.
- Mattole River: Added a new task to work with the Mattole Restoration Council and consider developing WDRs and waivers. Previously, this task was embedded in the outreach and education task for the Gualala.
- Redwood Creek: Revised language pertaining to the estuary and levees near Orick to state that staff intend to work with stakeholders on channel and riparian improvement projects to reduce excess sediment and offer flood control protection.
- Redwood Creek: Added subtask to consider teaming with Caltrans on efforts to coordinate research with Humboldt State University.
- Russian River: Added Alexander Valley landowners, gravel mining companies, and Sonoma County Salmonid Coalition to the list of key stakeholders.
- Russian River: Revised the area that Syar Industries is actively gravel mining.
- Scott River: Added coordination on HCPs and ITPs to the task to work with CDFG.
- Stemple Creek: Revised language to clarify the 82% number is not excess sediment, but the anthropogenic sediment load.

Changes to the Priorities and Prioritization Criteria

- Added new language to clarify how staff intend to use the regional task priority rankings.
- Revised the watershed rankings. Added 10 points to the Elk River, Freshwater Creek, Klamath River, and Russian River (the Scott River already had 10 points) to reflect previous direction from the Board to work on excess sediment control efforts in these watersheds.

**Table 3
Currently Funded Tasks that Staff will Undertake
During FYs 2007-08 and 2008-09**

Regional Task 1	Adopt the Measures to Control Excess Sediment Amendment.
Regional Task 2	Begin to conduct outreach and education on the Measures to Control Excess Sediment Amendment.
Regional Task 4	Adopt the Stream and Wetland System Protection Policy.
Regional Task 7	Develop general WDRs and a conditional waiver for vineyards.
Regional Task 8	Develop general WDRs and a conditional waiver for dairies.
Regional Task 14	Improve the Caltrans Storm Water Program.
Regional Task 15	Continue to implement the general WDRs and conditional waiver for non-federal timber harvest activities.
Regional Task 16	Continue to implement the general WDRs and conditional waiver for federal timber harvest activities.
Regional Task 19	Continue to implement the municipal, construction, and industrial storm water programs.
Regional Task 20	Continue to implement the 401 Certification Program.
Regional Task 21	Continue to fund excess sediment control projects through grants and loans.
Regional Task 22	Internal management and coordination.
Regional Task 27	Meet regulatory with county planning staff.
Multi-Watershed Task 1	Develop ownership-wide WDRs for Green Diamond.
Multi-Watershed Task 2	Develop ownership-wide WDRs for Mendocino Redwood Company.
Multi-Watershed Task 7	Work with North Coast Railroad Authority.
Eel - NF, MF, and Middle Mainstem Tasks	Work with Round Valley Indian Tribes.
Eel – Lower Mainstem Task 13	Develop watershed-wide WDRs for timber harvest activities in Bear Creek.
Eel – Lower Mainstem Task 14	Develop watershed-wide WDRs for timber harvest activities in Jordan Creek.
Elk River Task 2	Continue to implement CAOs for PALCO.
Elk River Task 3	Continue to implement watershed-wide WDRs for PALCO.
Elk River Task 4	Continue to implement watershed wide WDRs for Green Diamond.
Freshwater Creek Task 2	Continue to implement CAOs for PALCO.
Freshwater Creek Task 3	Continue to implement watershed-wide WDRs for PALCO.
Garcia River Task 1	Continue to implement the Garcia River TMDL Action Plan.
Gualala River Task 9	Develop ownership-wide WDRs for Gualala Redwoods Inc.
Redwood Creek Task 10	Develop ownership-wide conditional waivers for the National Park Service.
Russian River Task 1	Work with local stakeholder and watershed groups.
Scott River Task 2	Address private roads and sediment waste discharges.
Scott River Task 3	Address Caltrans' roads and improve the Caltrans Storm Water Program.

**Table 3 (cont.)
Currently Funded Tasks that Staff will Undertake
During FYs 2007-08 and 2008-09**

Scott River Task 4	Work with Siskiyou County on county roads.
Scott River Task 6	Address sediment waste from dredge mining activities.
Scott River Task 7	Address sediment waste from flood control and bank stabilization activities.
Scott River Task 10	Develop a MOU/MAA and WDRs with the USFS and BLM.
Scott River Task 11	Address sediment waste from grazing activities.
Scott River Task 12	Work with Siskiyou RCD and the Scott River Watershed Council.
Scott River Task 13	Work with NRCS and UCCE.
Scott River Task 14	Work with CDFG.

ATTACHMENT 1

State of California
Regional Water Quality Control Board
North Coast Region

Rebecca Fitzgerald
December 26, 2007

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S SUMMARY REPORT
10:00 a.m., January 17, 2008
North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
Hearing Room
5550 Skylane Blvd., Suite A
Santa Rosa, CA

ITEM: 4

SUBJECT: Workshop on the Draft Work Plan to Control Excess Sediment in Sediment-Impaired Watersheds.

DISCUSSION

Overview

The Draft Work Plan to Control Excess Sediment in Sediment-Impaired Watersheds (Work Plan) describes the actions and tasks Regional Water Board staff are currently taking and intend to take over the next ten years, as resources allow, to reduce and control human-caused excess sediment in the sediment-impaired water bodies of the North Coast Region. The Work Plan is a staff-level planning tool and is designed to be a living document that will be updated as conditions change.

The Draft Work Plan includes:

- Thirty-three regional tasks and many watershed-specific tasks.
- Priority rankings for each regional task and for each watershed.
- A ten year timeline for executing the tasks, assuming resources are available.
- An estimate of the resources and staff needed.

Applicability

The Work Plan focuses on the following twenty-seven water bodies that are listed as sediment impaired per the 2006 303(d) List. Approximately 61% of the North Coast Region drains to these sediment-impaired water bodies.

Albion River	Estero Americano	Noyo River
Big River	Freshwater Creek	Redwood Creek
Eel River, North Fork	Garcia River	Russian River
Eel River, Middle Fork	Gualala River	Scott River
Eel River, South Fork	Jacoby Creek	Stemple Creek & Estero de
Eel River, Upper Mainstem	Klamath River (downstream	San Antonio
Eel River, Middle Mainstem	of Weitchep)	Ten Mile River
Eel River, Lower Mainstem	Mad River	Trinity River, Mainstem
Eel River, Van Duzen River	Mattole River	Trinity River, South Fork
Elk River	Navarro River	

What is Excess Sediment?

Excess sediment is soil, rock, and/or sediments (e.g., sand, silt, or clay) from human related activities that is discharged to waters of the state in an amount that could be deleterious to beneficial uses or cause a nuisance. Some of the most sensitive beneficial uses to high sediment loads are associated with the migration, spawning, reproduction, and early development of cold water fish such as coho salmon, Chinook salmon, and steelhead trout. Besides harming aquatic life, excess sediment can limit the use of water for domestic consumption, agriculture, industry, wildlife, fishing, and recreation, and can cause or contribute to flooding. Excess sediment can also result in the exceedence of water quality objectives for suspended material, settleable material, sediment, and turbidity.

Task Priorities and Funding Needs

As described in the Draft Work Plan, staff intend to work first on sediment control tasks that are currently funded over the next few years. As more funding becomes available, staff intend to work on developing regional tasks and on outreach and education. In general, staff intend to execute regional tasks before watershed-specific tasks if staff resources are not fully funded, starting with the highest priorities. Staff also intend to take advantage of opportunities with willing partners, consortiums, and watershed groups as they become available.

The Draft Work Plan identifies the need for an estimated 19.2 additional permanent technical staff, plus more support staff (e.g., clerical), to execute all the tasks listed in the Work Plan in the next ten years, and thereby reduce excess sediment and improve water quality.

Public Comments

The written comment period for the Draft Work Plan ended on December 14, 2007. Staff received twenty-three comment letters. Almost all the letters include suggested changes and clarifications to the Draft Work Plan, most of which are minor in scope. Nine letters explicitly support the Work Plan. None of the letters oppose the Work Plan as a whole.

Next Steps

The Public Review Draft Work Plan was released November 14, 2007. The workshop at the January 17, 2008 Board Meeting will include examples of the implementation of the Work Plan, and for the opportunity for input to the plan. Staff are currently incorporating changes based on public and Board Member comments. Staff also are preparing a written response to the written public comments received. Staff intend to present the final Work Plan to the Regional Water Board at the March 6, 2008 Board Meeting in Fortuna, CA, along with a resolution for the Board's consideration directing staff to execute the sediment control tasks listed in the Work Plan.

PRELIMINARY STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

No Regional Water Board action is recommended at this time, as this is an informational item.