

REDWOOD VALLEY COUNTY WATER DISTRICT  
2370 Webb Ranch Road  
Redwood Valley CA 95470  
(707) 485-0679

MINUTES  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Regular Meeting  
January 19, 2012

Directors Present: Donald E. Butow, Jeanette Hallman, Granville Pool, Pamela Ricetti, Jack Spilman

Directors Absent: None

Staff Present: General Manager Bill Koehler

Recording Secretary: Linda Groth

Others Present: County Supervisor Carre Brown, GM Sean White/RR Flood Control District, Director Will Carson/Millview CWD, Judge (Ret.) Conrad Cox, Keith Tiemann, Shelly Janek/RCD

CALL TO ORDER: 7:04 P.M.

1. ROLL CALL.

Pamela Ricetti, Director  
Granville Pool, Board Vice-President  
Jack Spilman, Director  
Jeanette Hallman, Director  
Donald Butow, Board President

2. APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

Board President Butow introduced the Appointment of Officers and Committee Members; and Entertained a Motion for President Board of Directors:

Hallman: I Nominate Pam Ricetti.

Pool: I Nominate Don Butow.

Spilman: I Nominate Granville Pool.

Ricetti: I Nominate Granville Pool.

Supervisor Carre Brown recommended temporarily handing over the Gavel to Executive Officer/GM Koehler; and all agreed. The Gavel was then handed to Executive Officer/GM Koehler.

GM Koehler Called for Seconds to the above Nominations.

Pamela Ricetti Seconded the nomination for Granville Pool.

Jack Spilman Seconded the nomination for Don Butow.

Don Butow Seconded the nomination for Pamela Ricetti.

Seconds are now Closed.

Discussion: President Butow offered his assistance to whomever is nominated.

Pamela Ricetti respectfully declined the nomination, due to a lack of experience at this point in time, for her to take on the roll of Board President.

Executive Officer/GM Koehler: Director Ricetti has declined. We now have Pool and Butow, in that order. I Call for a roll call vote:

**MOTION: Those in favor of Granville Pool as Board President:**

Spilman/Ricetti Discussion CARRIED

AYES: Jack Spilman  
Pamela Ricetti  
Jeanette Hallman  
Don Butow

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: Granville Pool

The Gavel was then turned over to newly elected Board President Granville Pool. Board President Pool asked for nominations of Vice-President of the Board of Directors. Pam Ricetti nominated Jeanette Hallman. There was no Second to the nomination.

**MOTION: Nominate Donald Butow as Vice-President, Board of Directors.**

Spilman/Hallman Discussion CARRIED

Executive Officer/GM Koehler stated that since there was No Second to the first nomination (Jeanette Hallman), there is no need to take a vote. The Directors agreed.

President Pool led the review and appointment of various committees. Appointments are as follows:

**M. C. Inland Water & Power Commission** (monthly meeting)

Commissioner Rep: Donald E. Butow  
Alternate Commissioner Rep: Pamela Ricetti

**R.R. Flood Control District** (monthly meeting)

Donald E. Butow, Designated Attendee  
Jack Spilman, Designated Attendee

**Ad Hoc Committee re: Water Rights**

Donald E. Butow  
Granville Pool

**Sonoma County Water Agency Ad Hoc Committee re: Water Rights**

**(County Counsel Advised: if the same 2 ad hoc committee members remained on the Board of Directors, this Ad Hoc Committee should stay the same as before; no change)**

Donald E. Butow  
Granville Pool

**Emergency Water Conservation Committee**

Jeanette Hallman  
Granville Pool  
Wm. L. Koehler

**Assoc. of California Water Agencies/Joint Powers Insurance Authority (ACWA/JPIA)**

Delegate: Granville Pool

Alt. Delegate: Wm. L. Koehler

**Hardship Water Service Application Review Committee**

Jeanette Hallman

**Personnel Committee**

- Handbook
- Begin discussion regarding salary & benefits (almost 4 years since anyone has received a raise)

Granville Pool

Jack Spilman

**Committee to clear up records documenting properties owned or leased by District**

Granville Pool

Wm. L. Koehler

Eliminate inactives from list: Recovery Operations Specialty Services.

Eliminate inactives from list: Real Property Negotiations/Representative Negotiations.

3. HEARING OF COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE ATTENDING PUBLIC.

Nothing.

4. CONSIDER HEARING OF URGENT ITEMS RECEIVED SINCE THE AGENDA WAS POSTED.

Nothing.

5. APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR.

- a. Financial Statement.
- b.-1. Bills Paid since those approved at last Meeting.
- b.-2. Bills Paid as approved at previous Meeting.
- c. Bills Payable.
- d. District Activity.

The Consent Calendar was reviewed.

**MOTION: Approve the Consent Calendar as presented.**

Ricetti/Butow Discussion CARRIED

AYES: Ricetti, Butow, Hallman, Spilman, Pool

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AS PRESENTED.

The Draft Minutes of December 15, 2011 were reviewed. Director Pool stated that although he did make a comment about the IW&PC during the Board Meeting, he did not actually attend that particular IW&PC meeting. Also, in Item No. 12, the instrument mentioned is a planimeter; and on Page 6, the unfinished sentence should be removed.

**MOTION: Accept the draft Minutes as corrected.**

Butow/Spilman Discussion CARRIED

AYES: Butow, Spilman, Hallman, Ricetti, Pool

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

7. DIRECTOR AND STAFF REPORTS AND DISCUSSION OF NON-ACTION TOPICS.

Nothing

8. DIRECTORS AND STAFF REPORTS OTHER THAN THOSE LISTED IN GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT.

a) Broad Band Alliance.

As a follow up to a presentation he made to the Board of Directors several months ago, Keith Tiemann is attending tonight to provide additional information to the Board of Directors about the Broad Band Alliance and its efforts to raise county-wide awareness and also to raise money for a Challenge Grant. He stated that there are only 4 cities in Mendocino County however there are more than 50 Special Districts within the County. He is proposing that the Special Districts act as 'anchor agencies' to help get the word out to the residents of their Districts. He then introduced Retired Superior Court Judge Conrad Cox.

Retired Judge Cox is a former Counsel to the Redwood Valley CWD back in its formative years and currently on the Board of Directors of the Community Foundation. The Community Foundation is the source of the Challenge Grant for the Broad Band Alliance.

Judge Cox stated that broad band is essential in modern life; Mendocino County is underserved. Telecommunications is the way of the future. It's amazing to learn that broad band coverage in African countries is much better than in Mendocino County; Korea is ahead of Mendocino County, and much of the

State. The Broad Band Alliance is the local guiding light; it started out on the Coast and now it has branched out throughout the entire county. It is important not only to have the availability, but that it also be affordable to all the residents of the county. The Community Foundation feels that economic growth is dependant upon broad band communications and it has put up \$40,000 for a matching grant to help this organization get started.

Judge Cox urges the RVCWD to do what it can to bring the awareness to the citizens of Redwood Valley and also to urge its constituents to complete and return (on-line) the Internet Availability Survey as soon as possible so that the Federal Government will know that its data needs to be corrected; (the Federal records show, inaccurately, that something over 90% of Mendocino County has high speed internet availability). We have no chance of receiving Federal Grant Funding unless there are responses to the Survey showing how little coverage actually exists in Mendocino County.

President Pool commented that as a Water District, we can't see where there is something in our Charter that would allow us to put funds in that direction. He would urge that other Special Districts be solicited.

Judge Cox said there isn't a loophole; your concerns are real; you cannot make a gift of public funds. Judge Cox asked the District to "support of the concept".

President Pool suggested perhaps we could offer that the Foundation or the Alliance could use some space on the RVCWD web page, but there is a cost whenever a change to the web page occurs.

GM Koehler stated he feels he can get that done as a volunteer effort.

Judge Cox thanked the Board of Directors and said the Alliance will provide whatever wording might be needed.

Everyone understood there will be no cost involved for the Water District.

County Supervisor Carre Brown reiterated that the Federal Government thinks Mendocino County is covered with broad band access. If, for example, the Water District applied for a grant to establish broad band access, the Federal Government would look at its maps and they would see that Mendocino County is covered, and they would not issue any such Grant. Completing the Internet Availability Survey to the Federal Government is our effort to get their records corrected.

Judge Cox thanked the Board of Directors and left the Meeting at 8:03 P.M.

Keith Tiemann left the Meeting at 8:04 P.M.

b) Conservation, other than in GM Report: Resource Conservation District (RCD).

Shelly Janek, Watershed Coordinator for Mendocino County Resource Conservation District explained that the RCD is not a regulatory agency. It does a lot of conservation restoration assistance for voluntary landowners; also a lot of education and outreach. Her particular position just started last June, she is Grant Funded from the Department of Conservation and she is tasked with Water Quality, and Water Quantity issues in the Russian River Watershed. She is developing several different projects the RV District might be interested in. Also they are partnering with UC Cooperative Extension and NRCS to provide a series of five (5) workshops based on irrigation management, for all growers and small farmers. This is covering all the basics – irrigation maintenance, the different types of irrigation scheduling that can be used - from plant based to soil based. The first workshop will be held on March 9, 2012. The RCD is looking for partnering from all the Districts, whether it be contacting customers, or else financial support, or else "putting on the workshops". Anything would be very welcomed. The RCD is looking to do some irrigation evaluations and equipment upgrades; and looking for grant funding to help with that. The RCD recently missed out on a 50% grant because they couldn't get the matching 50%.

As an RCD, they can provide the Water District with some education and outreach assistance in its conservation programs and they are always looking for partners. If they can assist the Water District in any way, please let them know.

President Pool stated that, unlike the broad band topic just discussed, this is something that directly relates to our customers and their use of our product.

Vice President Butow mentioned that we will be placing some funds with the RCD resulting from some stream damage remediation. GM Koehler added that Ms. Janek will be setting up a meeting with Fish and Game and the Regional Board to confirm that RCD will be the appropriate recipient of the final funds. We are working with RCD on that.

GM Koehler also wanted to point out that Ms. Janek met with him and Dave Redding from Willow CWD and Tim Bradley from Millview CWD. It is important to note that when the Surplus Water Agreement that Redwood has with Sonoma, finally shakes out and gets reauthorized, that there is most certainly going to be a component in there of the California Urban Water Conservation Council and the Ag Water Management Council. It's easily possible that the opportunities for partnering that Ms. Janek was describing, could well satisfy a number of Best Management Practices that are required to comply with both the CUWCC and the AWMC. We are not doing it at this very moment, but we need to be aware of the possibility of a real cinergy of partnering with the RCD to get some of these required educational components. He is enthusiastic of the concept of putting some of our conservation dollars toward the ag community because to date, pretty much all of the money we've put out has been toward the residential customers. We have kind of a unique ag situation here in that a lot of the Ag Water Management Council Best Management Practices are really geared toward the folks in the vineyards that are large enough that they have fairly differing microclimates within their properties; however most of the vineyards in Redwood Valley seem to be fairly small. GM Koehler appreciates the opportunity to continue remaining in contact with the RCD.

The Board of Directors expressed appreciation to Ms. Janek for attending the Meeting. Ms. Janek thanked the Board of Directors for being able to speak with them. Ms. Janek left the meeting at this time.

c) Drought Ordinance.

Director Hallman suggested that the Conservation Committee review the data and bring their commentary back. President Pool reminded the Committee to bring their commentary to the General Manager and he will bring it to the Board of Directors. As always, President Pool welcomes and encourages commentary from all the Directors during the Board Meetings.

d) CEQA/Annexation.

GM Koehler stated this refers to the four annexations which actually includes five separate, non-contiguous areas. Two of those were merged into a single application for annexation (Weibel/Fetzer). The others are the Garzini property, the Gabrielli property, and the RV Rancheria property. The State Water Board is now demanding proof of CEQA for the annexations. GM Koehler has been working with Frank McMichael at LAFCO, whose records all the annexations were done. He has also been pouring through all our old records (through the late 1980's) for these. He has found hints that all the CEQAs were done, but he hasn't found all the records. GM Koehler is asking the State, if we can provide proof that the CEQA's (Negative Declarations) have been done, will that satisfy their latest requirement as far as proceeding ahead with the annexation. There will be some money involved because he is also working with legal counsel to make sure that 'whatever document' is properly prepared. Ultimately, when all the documentation is Filed, GM Koehler will have everything scanned and readily available at any point in the future.

e) Part 1: District Expansion Analysis/ re-organization with RRFCD.

GM Koehler is particularly concerned with the fact last month it was stated that we have treatment plant capacity for 1800 services; this is not accurate. We barely have treatment capacity for the 1350. That is demonstrated by the fact that in 2006 and 2007 the treatment

plant was running flat out, 24/7, and we were losing storage. When you do mathematical equations for statistics, you get a theoretical number. The State Health Department does mathematical equations for water consumption and fire protection. They tell us 400,000 is more than we need; this is 'legally'; but in order to serve those 400 additional customers we would need to be producing water faster. Because we do have adequate storage capacity for 400 additional services, if we are able to add another filter we will be able to make up for the consumption faster (by making at least 400 gpm).

President Pool commented, If we had the ability and willingness to supply small ag services to residential customers that are currently using large volumes of treated water for landscape watering or some small ag uses, that would free-up some of our treated water service capacity. GM Koehler said in some way, that might be an impact but we must keep in mind that there are many areas of the valley that have no ag lines existing at all.

The District Expansion Analysis was discussed item by item, and will be reviewed further by the Directors.

President Pool suggested the possible need to appoint an ad hoc committee to work on the capacity study with GM Koehler. But it was agreed at this time, the first thing to do is to solicit engineered RFPs for getting a rate study done, including cap fees, for a small water system.

Director Spilman asked for a discussion of the cap fees. Particularly where someone is buying into a group, and the group is already owned by the federal government. We all own it already. What is a new applicant getting for their cap fee?

GM Koehler answered, They are buying into the system. They are making up for the fact that somebody who has been here since 1978 has paid-in thousands of dollars already, into the infrastructure and in addition, for the marginal cost of increased water service. For instance, if we were to just go out and hook up 50 or 100 domestic customers with no fee being paid into it, who is buying the new filter that those customers will demand and that will need to be built to supply their needs? The cap fee pays that. That's what it's all about.

Director Spilman responded that he understands the costs to pay for the new filter and related incidentals should be paid by the applicants, but the rest of it seems like, this is a federal debt and they are just buying into a portion of the debt.

GM Koehler added, As I said, they are paying for the marginal increase in the production capacity of the District. We are maxed out now. If we don't charge a cap fee, where is the \$250,000 for the new filter going to come from? But ideally in my opinion, this is why we want to hire professionals, so that it isn't my opinion; it's an engineering firms opinion of what the capacity expansion fee should be.

Director Ricetti asked how they go about determining that if they don't know how many people want service?

GM Koehler suggested that ideally, they would figure it under several different scenarios. He feels the next plateau is 400 additional domestic customers. That's what we can handle with an 8'x30' filter. If we had to put in an additional 400,000 gallon storage tank, that's easily a half-million-dollars. Alternatively, and prohibitively, the cost of finished water storage reservoirs is roughly \$1 per gallon.

In addition, the physical cost of construction varies depending upon which side of the road the water main exists. So, you are paying for buying into the District, making up for the fact that other people have been buying into the District for many years. Of course originally, as part of the first loan, people signed up with a \$25 fee, and they received a free meter installation. The domestic cap fee's that GM Koehler knows of, currently range around \$5,000-\$10,000. If the

logic is that you're buying into the system and you're buying into the production capacity, then presumably an ag cap fee would be lower because you are not buying into the water treatment portion of water system delivery. You are buying into a piece of the pumping costs and the distribution system. Further discussion of various related topics continued. It was noted that, as a County Water District, we are not obligated to go to bid. We are also not obligated to take the low bid. County Water Districts have exemptions on bid issues because so many of them are so small that they tend to develop relationships with vendors rather than bidding. But this is an opportunity to request bids because we are not under a deadline crunch at this time. In addition to the California Rural Water Association, we do know which engineering firms actually offer an Engineered Rate Study for a small water system. It was agreed that the next step in this process is to solicit Engineered RFP's for getting a small water system Rate Study done.

**MOTION: Solicit Engineered RFP's for getting a Rate Study done for a small water system.**

Butow/Spilman Discussion CARRIED  
AYES: Butow, Spilman, Hallman, Ricetti, Pool  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: None  
ABSTAIN: None

e) Part II. Merger versus Contract.

GM Koehler stated his recollection of his last conversation with GM Sean White indicated that the Flood Control District (MCRRFC&WCID) Board of Trustees prefers a merger of our two Districts rather than a contract to provide a firm water supply.

Sean White said his reason for coming to this meeting is to say that from a factual standpoint, he agrees with most of what GM Koehler has stated in his information sheet to the RV Board. But he felt that a lot of the language and the tone of it didn't really resonate with how he felt that the discussion went. Sean thinks that his Board of Trustees wants to get involved in a merger because they want to see all of the Districts consolidate. The reason the FCD sees that as kind of the only viable option is because that's what Sonoma has required us to do. It's not really elective for either of us; they want to deal with less people up here.

He thinks that people of the valley want to deal with less water agencies. If we are going to do this, the FCD is definitely in favor of developing a big fix versus an intermediate fix. Really, when it comes down to the nuts and bolts of it, from Sean's conversations anyway with Sonoma, it's really one of their requirements. And in passing conversations with the State Board, if we're ever going to get our application approved, they're going to make that a condition of it as well; and he thinks it's sort of what the public in general and the County wants as well; so why not just figure out how to do it.

It isn't that the FCD insists, it seems like the only avenue for actual resolution. So, on that, he just sort of felt that this was not necessarily reflected in the paper provided for the Board of Directors here. And then the other item in the GM's paper about the application being a nuisance but not really having legs, Sean doesn't think that is really how the FCD felt about it either. They definitely thought it was a huge burr in the saddle of SCWA, which is why it made a great bargaining chip, and if we were looking to walk away from it so we could renegotiate this sale now that we know they can't negotiate a water right sale, it's really our only avenue for getting additional water. It's the only thing we have, so the FCD thinks that now it's more than a nuisance, it's our only hope. As expected, it was protested by SCWA and seven (7) other parties, which is not uncommon for these parts. But we've managed to get three of these dismissed already and he thinks the Friends of the Eel is going to get dismissed. The only

sustaining one left is the City of Ukiah and Sonoma and the City has already said they would waive theirs when it gets down to the skinny. So it really does leave us negotiating with Sonoma and unfortunately, SCWA is in the driver's seat. All we can do is negotiate a way to buy a block of water from them; and anything they don't want to move on, we are kind of out of that loop. So as far as FCD is concerned, it seems apparent this is one of the few terms they are not going to budge on.

Sean concluded, he just wants to clarify that the way this application is written, he is fairly certain that the seniority of that Right would be the same as the one we have right now.

GM Koehler stated that this last comment is something that he did not know.

President Pool asked why the 6,000 is locked? (2800 & 3200 = 6000).

GM White said he would have to go through historical records, but basically as he understands it, most of those blocks of water were, for lack of a better word, pieces of appropriative rights that were sort of left on the table through various decisions – D1030 and prior. Some of it was reserved at some point for either Mendocino County and some of it was also in a reserved initially for northern Sonoma County, but the State never got to it.

President Pool stated, Our understanding is that the specified point of diversion for the entire 6,000 is the RV District pumping plant.

GM White said, It was actually, our point of diversion for all of our water is the East Fork of the Russian River and it is, for Sonoma County as well. I think at that point you have to remember that the entire intent of applying for this block of water was to try to get Redwood Valley a block of water, so it would have probably made sense to use the most likely point of diversion.

Director Butow asked if that would be the point of diversion for the entire 6,000 or just for the portion of RV's diversion.

GM White doesn't think we are going to get the entire 6,000; when we leave the negotiation mill, we're going to get, really whatever the EIR supports RV needed. That's what we're going to get. That's why the study you are looking to do is probably a wise thing to have. We're going to need a defensible number, not just for negotiations, but for the CEQA. If we're going to avoid huge antigrowth sentiment and all that, we are going to have enough, with a little bit of cushion for reasonable growth. And we definitely are going to need to have a real supportable standard. GM White continued, What Bill's (GM Koehler) comment brought to the Board is what we've come to you with from the beginning. For this initial part of things it will be fine, but sooner than later we're going to have a pretty good estimate.

Director Butow brought up the fact that when GM Koehler spoke with SCWA, he returned to the Board of Directors reporting that the emphasis from them was, How much are you really going to need?

Director Butow added that the ad hoc committee was left in a 'scorcher' with structure buy-out. It's extremely complicated; it's extremely difficult to come up with, unless we look at it from different angles.

GM White responded, All of that's true, but at the same time, lots and lots and lots of Special District's have merged over the years. It's not exactly 'new stuff'. Bill (GM Koehler) has made an accurate point: we have ridiculously different Districts. But as far as an initial step into consolidation is the footprint of the two District's making a really great first step. I think we've all agreed that if we can get our act together, there will probably be some small, adjacent entities that will follow. At some point, ideologically, we could get bogged down in the details for years, and never actually go anywhere; but sometimes you need to make some sort of ideological commitments and then when it comes time to put pencil to paper, we can do that. But if we don't sort of agree to agree in concept early on, we're just going to sit here and find a thousand reasons to not do it.

Director Pool referred to the first action item on GM Koehler's list, which is to propose the date for the next joint ad hoc committee meeting.

County Supervisor Brown handed President Pool a note with two meeting dates that are already filled. The Public Policy Facilitating Committee (PPFC) will meet in Santa Rosa on February 9<sup>th</sup>; and the Eel-Russian River Commission will meet in Ukiah on February 14<sup>th</sup>. After discussing vacation schedules and other meeting schedules, it was agreed that the ad hoc meeting will plan to meet February 7<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup>.

County Supervisor Carre Brown left the meeting at 9:10 P.M.

GM Sean White (FCD) left the meeting at 9:15 P.M.

The Directors discussed different CAP fee scenarios to possibly consider in the future.

The Directors verbally reviewed GM Koehler's recent (December 2, 2011) meeting with SCWA, as was reported at the December 15, 2011 Board Meeting.

For the benefit of newly elected Directors Ricetti and Spilman, a review of previous ad hoc meetings and R.V. Board discussions and decisions as reported in each of the monthly Minutes were provided and discussed.

Break: 9:25 P.M.

Reconvene: 9:43 P.M.

#### 9. GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT AND ACTION ITEMS, JANUARY, 2012.

##### A. Plant Operations.

The District is operating normally with no problems to report.

##### B. Holidays.

The upcoming Martin Luther King Day is a recognized District holiday on January 16<sup>th</sup> this year.

##### C. Surge Tank Mitigation Update.

Still waiting for the Mendocino County Resource Conservation District to notify us regarding the final mitigation payment.

##### D. Watershed Sanitary Survey.

Survey is complete. The final billing for our share of the cost is expected any day.

##### E. Special Action Items.

GM report was kept short to allow time for other important matters previously discussed.

#### 10. FINANCIAL REPORT.

After a review of the Financial Report, and a note to update the FY date shown, a Motion was made.

**MOTION: Accept the Financial Report as presented.**

Butow/Ricetti Discussion CARRIED

AYES: Butow, Ricetti, Hallman, Spilman, Pool

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

11. LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION OF MENDOCINO COUNTY – LAFCO.

GM Koehler provided an update on the progress of working with Frank McMichael on the Redwood Valley portion of the Sphere of Influence update. He suggests that if any of the Directors have any additional areas they wish to include, perhaps now is the time to add them. The only advantage of doing this now is because it is free and it won't be free again for another five years because they are doing the study anyway.

President Pool commented that in his opinion, even five years hence would be an ambitious schedule to include areas like Black Bart Trail and Bakers' Creek.

General consensus is that RVCWD will not make any changes to the SOI at this time.

12. INLAND WATER & POWER COMMISSION.

GM Koehler reported that the Corps of Engineers has been 'saying all along' that IWPC can contribute

in-kind hours to the Feasibility Study Matching Funds. But now the COE has come back and they've determined that in-kind hours can only be charged out at the rate that is paid for your service. Since virtually every Commissioner on the IW&PC has been volunteering their time and is therefore unpaid, the COE is not crediting their hours because those were unpaid hours!

On another topic, The P.R. group that Paige Poulos is working on with Hal Voege, has named themselves the Russian River Preservation Alliance. They are winding-down their Phase 1. They want 501C3 status but they've elected to do it under the umbrella of another organization, the Fish Friendly Farming, and it looks like a real good fit. Ms. Poulos is also working through a group called the North Coast Regional Food System; as the folks that grow food are completely aware of their 'link' with water.

And, the next meeting of the Eel-Russian River Commission will be at 9 a.m. on February 24, 2012 at the Board of Supervisors, Ukiah Chambers.

13. MENDOCINO COUNTY RUSSIAN RIVER FLOOD CONTROL & WATER CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT.

It was reported that the same Officers of the Board of Trustees were all reelected.

There is some action on the application for the 6000 acre-feet. It appears the Friends of the Eel Protest will be rejected.

The FCD was urged to talk to the Corps of Engineers and SCWA to get the Coyote Dam releases reduced.

The Department of Water Resources is pleased with the maps resubmitted by the FCD and an agent was ordered to proceed with processing the FCD application.

Richard Shoemaker will be the new President of LAFCO.

14. SONOMA COUNTY WATER AGENCY.

Discussed previously in the Meeting.

15. REPORT OF ATTENDANCE AT AGENCIE MEETINGS OF ANY OTHER ENTITY NOT LISTED SEPARATELY HEREIN.

Farm Bureau Water Committee Meeting:

The Millview CWD filing for reconsideration of the Hill-Gomes issue was denied. It's possible they will be headed to the State Supreme Court.

On February 3, 2012 at 9am, Dept E, Ukiah Court: Rudy Light will be attempting to get an injunction against the Frost Water Management Plan. On the same day, Sonoma County Farm Bureau will be doing the same thing, in Sacramento.

Director Butow and Director Ricetti attended a meeting with the SWRCB representatives in Ukiah last Friday. Sean White did a wonderful job as well as did the representative from Fish Friendly Farming. With all that, unfortunately, it is unknown what impact their presentations made with the State.

The Meeting ended at 10:27 P.M

The next Regular Meeting is scheduled for 7:00 P.M. on Thursday, February 16, 2012 at the Water District Office, 2370 Webb Ranch Road, Redwood Valley, California.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Linda Groth, Recording Secretary

APPROVED: Board of Directors

DATE APPROVED: February 16, 2012

SIGNED: Paula Berezay  
Secretary, Board of Directors