

**From:** [Rian, Kathryn\(Katie\)@Wildlife](mailto:Rian,Kathryn(Katie)@Wildlife)  
**To:** [Kein, Michael](mailto:Kein,Michael)  
**Cc:** [Hollis, Jonathan@Wildlife](mailto:Hollis,Jonathan@Wildlife)  
**Subject:** Hagan Quarry 19182 CDFW recs  
**Date:** Friday, April 25, 2025 9:14:28 AM

---

**Caution:** This email was sent from an EXTERNAL source. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Hi Michael,

Jon and I had a constructive site visit with the applicant and NorthPoint staff. The quarry was clean and organized, with appropriate measures to contain stormwater runoff and protect water quality. We made a few recommendations relating primarily to road shaping and maintenance, since the access road needs minor improvement to minimize sediment delivery to streams. There was one spot where runoff had started to undermine the fill slope of the road near one of the stream crossings; we recommended reshaping to minimize hydrologic connectivity and preserve the life of the culvert. There was also some side cast material near the other culvert inlet, which we recommended pulling back. We also touched on the benefits of outsloping the road where feasible and recommended installing a greater number of rolling dips to reduce the need for maintaining inboard ditches. We also advised him to routinely check culverts to ensure proper function. Mr. Beebe is already cleaning up the vehicle maintenance area near the unnamed tributary but was open to our suggestions about improved secondary containment. The only other thing that came up was avoidance of the nesting bird season for minor brushing within the active quarry, a recommendation with which he seemed happy to comply.

As I mentioned over the phone, the main issue that needs to be resolved is the water source and any proposed use. Mr. Beebe indicated that water is needed for dust abatement, but the site currently has no water supply. The prior landowner and operator was issued an LSAA for diversion in 2010, but that agreement was suspended in 2013 and would have expired by now anyway. To be clear, Mr. Beebe is not currently diverting from the creek but expressed an interest in exploring the possibility of getting a new LSAA for a diversion.

The 2010 IS/MND makes conflicting statements about water use, first indicating that water is drafted from Anderson Creek, but then stating that water is trucked in from offsite and no water impoundments or diversions are proposed. If the applicant wishes to pursue the option of diverting water from Anderson Creek, CDFW recommends a thorough evaluation of water use and any potentially significant impacts to biological resources. In addition to providing estimates of water use and storage needs, CDFW recommends a water availability analysis for Anderson Creek. Our understanding of diversion impacts has evolved since 2010, and standard permit conditions today include seasonal forbearance, stricter bypass flow requirements, and maximum diversion rates, among other measures to minimize impacts to fish and wildlife. Considering what will likely be a high demand for water (the operator estimated as much a 6,000 gallons per day), these measures would necessitate substantial

onsite water storage capacity. Even with tanks, a diversion may be inadequate to supply operational needs.

Depending on how the landowner wishes to proceed, CDFW recommends the County revise the Conditional Use Permit to specify that water will be sourced from off-site (thus explicitly prohibiting diversion from streams) or require LSA notification pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1602. Notification should be submitted through our online permitting portal EPIMS, available through the Lake and Streambed Alteration Program webpage. We also advise the landowner to consult with the State Water Resources Control Board's Division of Water Rights to satisfy any other reporting and permitting requirements for water diversion.

I have one quick follow-up question about future activities in the area identified as Phase II: would the County prepare a new Conditional Use Permit and Reclamation Plan for operations, and if so, would CDFW receive a referral?

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Thanks,  
Katie

**Kathryn M. Rian**

Environmental Scientist  
Coastal Conservation Humboldt/Del Norte  
California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
619 2<sup>nd</sup> St, Eureka, CA 95501  
[Kathryn.Rian@Wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:Kathryn.Rian@Wildlife.ca.gov)  
Cell: (707) 298-1346  
Office: (707) 441-2098