

Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District

Brenda Haynes, President
Shawn Kreps, Vice President
Robert Blankenship, Director

2810 Silver Street, Anderson, Ca. 96007
(530) 365-7329 – Fax: (530) 365-7623
www.andersoncottonwoodirrigationdistrict.org

J.D. Leitaker, Director
Jason Munson, Director
Stan Wangberg, GM/Sec

April 15, 2010

Mr. Joe Yun
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-001

Re: IRWM Program Guidelines and PSP

Dear Mr. Yun:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Guidelines for the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program and the Proposal Solicitation Packages (PSP) which were recently released by the Department of Water Resources. As a participant in the newly emerging Northern Sacramento Valley Integrated Regional Water Management planning process, we are specifically targeting our comments to that section of the program and the planning PSP associated with Proposition 84 funding.

The Northern Sacramento Valley IRWM is a collaboration of six counties within the Sacramento Valley (Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama, Sutter and Shasta) that are coordinating this effort. They are joined by many divergent entities including agricultural and municipal water purveyors; cities; watershed groups; resource conservation districts; and members of the environmental community. Our region was approved to apply for Proposition 84 planning funding under the 2009 Region Acceptance Process (RAP).

The primary concern within our region is the 50% match for planning grants. As an emerging group, we feel that this cost-share is too high to accommodate our needs and may stifle our ability to attract the diversity that exemplifies our region. Proposition 50 funding only required a 25% match for planning grants. We urge DWR to exercise their discretion in this matter and lower the cost-share to 25% for the planning PSP.

Thank you for your consideration of this comment regarding the IRWM Draft Guidelines for the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program and the Proposal Solicitation Packages (PSP). We look forward to your response on this issue.

Sincerely,



Stan Wangberg
General Manager



**GLENN COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Willows Memorial Hall, 2nd Floor
525 West Sycamore Street
P. O. Box 391, Willows, CA 95988

*John K. Viegas, District 1
Tracey Quarne, District 2
Steve Soeth, District 3
Michael Murray, District 4
Leigh W. McDaniel, District 5*

Sandy Soeth, Clerk of the Board

April 20, 2010

California Department of Water Resources
Division of Integrated Regional Water Management
Attn: Mr. Joe Yun
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

Re: Proposition 84 (Prop 84) IRWM Program Guidelines and PSP

Dear Mr. Yun:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Guidelines for the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program and the Proposal Solicitation Packages (PSP) which were recently released by the Department of Water Resources. As a participant in the newly emerging Northern Sacramento Valley Integrated Regional Water Management planning process, we are specifically targeting our comments to that section of the program and the planning PSP associated with Prop 84 funding.

The Northern Sacramento Valley IRWM is a collaboration of six counties in the northern Sacramento Valley (Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama, Sutter and Shasta) that are coordinating this effort. They are joined by many divergent entities including agricultural and municipal water purveyors; cities; watershed groups; resource conservation districts; and members of the environmental community. Our region received conditional approval to apply for Prop 84 planning funding under the 2009 Region Acceptance Process (RAP).

The primary concern within our region is the 50% match for planning grants. As an emerging group, we feel that this cost-share is too high to accommodate our needs and may stifle our ability to attract the diversity that exemplifies our region. Prop 50 only required a 25% match for planning grants. We urge DWR to exercise their discretion in this matter and lower the cost-share to 25% for the planning PSP.

Thank you for your consideration of this comment regarding the IRWM Draft Guidelines for the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program and the Proposal Solicitation Packages (PSP). We look forward to your response on this issue.

Sincerely,

GLENN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

STEVE SOETH, CHAIRMAN

cc: Butte County Board of Supervisors
Colusa County Board of Supervisors
Shasta County Board of Supervisors
Sutter County Board of Supervisors
Tehama County Board of Supervisors



Butte County

LAND OF NATURAL WEALTH AND BEAUTY

WATER AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION

308 NELSON AVENUE • OROVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95965-3302
(530) 538-4343 • FAX: (530) 538-3807 • bcwater@buttecounty.net

PAUL GOSSELIN
Director

April 16, 2010

Mr. Joe Yun
Department of Water Resources
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-991

In Re: 2010 Prop 84 IRWM Program Guidelines and PSP

Dear Mr. Yun:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Guidelines for the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program and the Proposal Solicitation Packages (PSP) which were recently released by the Department of Water Resources. As a participant in the newly emerging Northern Sacramento Valley Integrated Regional Water Management planning process, we are specifically targeting our comments to that section of the program and the planning PSP associated with prop 84 funding.

The Northern Sacramento Valley IRWM is a collaboration of six counties within the Sacramento Valley (Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama, Sutter and Shasta) that are coordinating this effort. They are joined by many divergent entities including agricultural and municipal water purveyors; cities; watershed groups; resource conservation districts; and members of the environmental community. Our region was approved to apply for Prop 84 planning funding under the 2009 Region Acceptance Process (RAP).

The primary concern within our region is the 50% match for planning grants. As an emerging group, we feel that this cost-share is too high to accommodate our needs and may stifle our ability to attract the diversity that exemplifies our region. Prop 50 only required a 25% match for planning grants. We urge DWR to exercise their discretion in this matter and lower the cost-share to 25% for the planning PSP.

Thank you for your consideration of this comment regarding the IRWM Draft Guidelines for the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program and the Proposal Solicitation Packages (PSP). We look forward to your response on this issue. If you need further clarification on this request, please contact Vickie Newlin, Assistant Director at (530) 538-2179.

Sincerely,

Paul Gosselin, Director
Butte County Water and Resource Conservation



COLUSA COUNTY RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

April 14, 2010

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

PRESIDENT
Jay Dee Garr

VICE PRESIDENT
Tom Hickok

DIRECTORS
Bob Alvernaz
Brandon Ash
Jay Dee Garr
Gil Ramos
Darrin Williams

ASSOCIATE DIRECTORS
Ben Felt

STAFF

DISTRICT MANAGER
Patti Turner

CBW COORDINATOR
Mary Fahey

CONTACT INFORMATION

100 Sunrise Boulevard
Suite B
Colusa, CA 95932

PHONE
(530) 458-2931

FAX
(530) 458-3683

EMAIL
info@colusarcd.org

WEB
www.colusarcd.org

Joe Yun
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-001

In Re: IRWM Program Guidelines and PSP

Dear Mr. Yun,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Guidelines for the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program and the Proposal Solicitation Packages (PSP) which were recently released by the Department of Water Resources. As a participant in the newly emerging Northern Sacramento Valley Integrated Regional Water Management planning process, we are specifically targeting our comments to that section of the program and the planning PSP associated with prop 84 funding.

The Northern Sacramento Valley IRWM is a collaboration of six counties within the Sacramento Valley (Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama, Sutter and Shasta) that are coordinating this effort. They are joined by many divergent entities including agricultural and municipal water purveyors; cities; watershed groups; resource conservation districts; and members of the environmental community. Our region was approved to apply for Prop 84 planning funding under the 2009 Region Acceptance Process (RAP).

The primary concern within our region is the 50% match for planning grants. As an emerging group, we feel that this cost-share is too high to accommodate our needs and may stifle our ability to attract the diversity that exemplifies our region. Prop 50 only required a 25% match for planning grants. We urge DWR to exercise their discretion in this matter and lower the cost-share to 25% or less for the planning PSP. We would also request that special considerations be taken to reduce cost-share even further in Regions that contain Disadvantage Communities.

Thank you for your consideration of this comment regarding the IRWM Draft Guidelines for the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program and the Proposal Solicitation Packages (PSP). We look forward to your response on this issue.

Sincerely,

Jay Dee Garr
CCRCDC President



COLUSA COUNTY RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

PRESIDENT

Jay Dee Garr

VICE PRESIDENT

Tom Hickok

DIRECTORS

Bob Alvernaz

Brandon Ash

Jay Dee Garr

Gil Ramos

Darrin Williams

ASSOCIATE DIRECTORS

Ben Felt

STAFF

DISTRICT MANAGER

Patti Turner

CBW COORDINATOR

Mary Fahey

CONTACT INFORMATION

100 Sunrise Boulevard
Suite B
Colusa, CA 95932

PHONE
(530) 458-2931

FAX
(530) 458-3683

EMAIL
info@colusarc.org

WEB
www.colusarc.org

April 19, 2010

Joe Yun
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-001

In Re: IRWM Program Guidelines and PSP

Dear Mr. Yun,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Guidelines for the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program and the Proposal Solicitation Packages (PSP) which were recently released by the Department of Water Resources. Colusa County is a participant in the newly emerging Westside Region Water Management planning process, we are specifically targeting our comments to that section of the program and the planning PSP associated with prop 84 funding.

Our primary concern within this region is the 50% match for planning grants. We feel that this cost-share amount is so high it may stifle our ability to further planning efforts that effect the portion of our County that falls within this region. We urge DWR to exercise their discretion in this matter and lower the cost-share to 25% or less for the planning PSP. Please note that Prop 50 only required a 25% match for planning grants. We would also request that special considerations be taken to reduce cost-share even further in Regions that contain Disadvantage Communities.

Thank you for your consideration of this comment regarding the IRWM Draft Guidelines for the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program and the Proposal Solicitation Packages (PSP). We look forward to your response on this issue.

Sincerely,

Jay Dee Garr
CCRCD President