

**BROOKTRAILS TOWNSHIP COMMUNITY SERVICESDISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Tuesday, October 10, 2006**

The Board of Directors of Brooktrails Township Community Services District met in regular session on October 10, 2006 at 7:02 p.m. at the Brooktrails Community Center.

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

B. ROLL CALL

Roll call showed the following directors present: Ziady, Orth, Horrick and Skezas. Director Williams was absent with notice. Also present were General Manager Chapman and District Counsel Neary.

REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION

District Counsel Neary reported that the Board had renewed the General Manager's contract for an additional year, but that no salary increase would be given because the General Manager, who is subject to the same "step" schedule as all employees, had reached the top step of his classification.

C. ADDITIONS/ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

President Skezas stated that because the second closed session scheduled for this meeting was now anticipated to run for several hours, it would be desirable to drop Action Agenda Items 4, 5 and 6 from this meeting. Director Horrick so moved; Director Ziady seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

D. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

1. September 12, 2006 Director Ziady moved to approve the minutes; Director Horrick seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

September 26, 2006 Director Orth requested that under "Reports from Directors," "Director Williams" be replaced with "General Manager Chapman." Director Orth moved to approve the minutes as so amended; Director Ziady seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

E. SPECIAL PRESENTATION

None.

F. PUBLIC HEARING

None.

G. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

H. CONSENT CALENDAR

2. Review of Accounts Payable report and authorization to issue checks. Director Orth moved to approve payment of the outstanding invoice report; Director Horrick seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

3. Retroactive approval of water alert mailing postage check issued 9/22/06. Director Orth moved to retroactively approve payment of the postage invoice; Director Horrick seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

I. ACTION AGENDA

Items 4, 5 and 6 dropped from this meeting as per preceding vote.

7. Consideration of cooperative agreement with DOT – Lake Ada Rose. General Manager Chapman described how this cooperative agreement would enable the District to do the road construction/relocation required for the Lake Ada Rose project. The roads would be constructed and maintained by the District during the project but then conveyed to the County after project completion for future maintenance. The agreement would be approved by means of resolution. Director Orth moved to adopt Resolution 2006-25 approving, authorizing and directing execution of a cooperative agreement with Mendocino County Department of Transportation for road work involved in the Lake Ada Rose project. Director Horrick seconded. Roll call vote was as follows:

AYES:	Directors:	Ziady, Orth, Horrick, Skezas
NOES:	Directors:	None
ABSENT:	Directors:	Williams

J. ADDITIONS TO FUTURE AGENDAS

Director Orth requested a future agenda item addressing raw water delivery to residents during the water emergency next year for irrigation purposes.

K. SPECIAL REPORTS

From Directors: None.

From District Counsel: None.

From General Manager: General Manager Chapman reported that he met with our lenders, USDA Rural Development, and we are looking at terms of 3.5% over 40 years for financing for the rubber spillway project. They also discussed financing for the two major dam projects and USDA expressed its interest in being the lender. He pointed out the new Estabrook water supply graph and said it shows we have gained another 5.7 acre feet which is a sign that conservation efforts are working.

L. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Bob Turner asked how the improvements to Lakes Ada Rose and Emily would be financed, whether by a bond or a tax. General Manager Chapman replied this would be through a "land-based assessment." He said an engineer from Coastland Engineering (Santa Rosa) would address the Board on this subject in December.

An audience member asked how many water wells had been done. Mr. Chapman replied of the four drilled, three are essentially dry holes, and one is producing about 5 gpm at the water plant. The gentleman said he did not want to spend any money on the dam projects or wells. Someone asked what the \$5 million cost per dam project would cost each landowner. Mr. Chapman said that improved properties would be assessed less than vacant lots, which would pay the lion's share of the assessment as it benefited them most. The December meeting would explain the process of a "cost benefit analysis." The audience member made multiple complaints about having to pay for any water projects after the original bond. Director Orth explained the original bond and how it had been used. More audience members asked just how much the assessment per lot would be. Director Orth and General Manager Chapman explained that the District did not have this detail yet and urged those interested to attend the December meeting. Director Ziady explained that the 218 election was not a Board decision but would be voted upon by everyone in the community; if they voted it down, it would never happen. Director Orth explained that ballots would be sent to every property owner and that the ballots would be weighted by an engineer. He said the first task was to determine what projects would be and what they would cost and that was what the District was engaged in. As a water district, he said, it is our job to impound water to provide for the 4,000 SFRs the Specific Plan requires over the next 60 years.

Bob Turner said he believed that the District should know by this point exactly what the costs should be and what the assessments per lot would be. Mr. Chapman reiterated that the current engineer estimate is approximately \$5 million for each dam. President Skezas said an exact number would not be available at the December meeting either, as an engineering process has to be completed lot by lot before that is established. Mr. Turner said we are always told by the District that they don't have the numbers yet on projects. He said, referring to a previous golf course situation, that he believed we did know the numbers in advance but chose not to release them until a more timely point, and he felt this was happening again. Director Orth commented on how the figures for the Willits Bypass have increased during the years of planning and said we are still in that process on our projects; we do not know the ultimate actual cost and we will also have to add an inflation factor. Mr. Turner said we should know the cost per lot and how the lots are going to be weighted; Director Orth and General Manager Chapman repeated that we do not know this yet.

Claudia Reed explained to the audience that the assessment would be based on how much benefit you would get from the project. She said there were two kinds of water problem: one was that there was no water for building new homes, and the people who want to build would be carrying the bulk of that cost; the other was that there was not enough water for the people already here in case of a drought, so this [rubber spillway] project must be done and the people already here must carry that cost. Then a Prop. 218 election will be conducted for projects beyond that. The directors thanked Ms. Reed for a clear explanation for the public.

An audience member took the podium and asked what it had cost to drill the wells; Mr. Chapman said we've probably spent about \$90,000.00. The audience member again complained about spending all this money. Director Orth said we had to prove to the 4,000 vacant lot owners who were demanding water and to the state that we had actually tried to drill wells and proved this would not work.

M. ADJOURNMENT

Director Ziady moved to adjourn, and President Skezas declared the meeting of October 10, 2006 closed at 7:31 p.m. The building was cleared and the directors then entered closed session.

GEORGE SKEZAS, President

ATTEST:

MICHAEL V. CHAPMAN