

**BROOKTRAILS TOWNSHIP COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Tuesday, September 12, 2006**

The Board of Directors of Brooktrails Township Community Services District met in regular session on September 12, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. at the Brooktrails Community Center.

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

B. ROLL CALL

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

REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION

General Manager Chapman reported that the closed session originally scheduled for the meeting of August 22, 2006 had been continued to October 10, 2006.

C. ADDITIONS/ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None.

D. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

1. August 22, 2006. Director Williams moved to approve the minutes as submitted; Director Ziady seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

E. SPECIAL PRESENTATION

None.

F. PUBLIC HEARING

2. Consideration of resolution adding a new Tier 7 for monthly water usage. General Manager Chapman expressed appreciation for the full audience. He explained that excessive water use by individual water customers had been discussed since the summer and that a new Tier 7 had been proposed for those using six or more times the average. Typical summertime water use was around 7,000-8,000 gallons. But some individuals were abusing the water system. Tier 7 was designed to send a signal to these individuals. If passed, it would affect the October billing and thereafter.

President Skezas called the public hearing to order at 7:08 p.m. An audience member took the podium and said she did not think many Brooktrails residents really understand how serious the water situation is. She said she herself uses only 211 cubic feet per month, living alone and with no garden. She said instead of adding Tier 7 which would only affect a small percentage of people, we should raise the rates on Tiers 4 – 6 to encourage conservation.

Madeline Cole said she had a large vegetable garden from which they obtain 90% of their produce. She was very concerned about how to minimize her water usage. She asked for clarification of her usage which was 2,200 CF on her last bill and Mr. Chapman explained it is 7.5 gallons per cubic foot. Ms. Cole said she could not imagine how to cut the usage even in half and grow her own food, which she felt was important for this community.

Sandra King of Otter Drive said she and her husband had just moved here in March and were quite concerned about the water issue. She said anyone over Tier 5 is abusing water grossly, and using 1,000 gallons a day was absurd. She urged a tight restraint on the high users. If you're using it for agriculture and you have no problem paying the bill, the Tier 7 proposal is not going to discourage you, she concluded.

Richard Hinchy of 27950 Poppy Drive said his water and sewer are hooked up to his motor home, and although the District has chewed him out for this, this was the reason he bought his house, and he felt it set a precedent and he should be allowed to have his motor home hooked up. He said whatever you're using it for, nobody should have to worry about their water bill.

Tara Shannon of Poppy Terrace said maybe excessive users should be required to participate in catchment and given a certain amount of resources to accomplish the task, such as where to buy affordable tanks, where to put them on your property. She said she was not opposed to excessive charges for excessive use, but felt that people should be held accountable to reduce their water demand.

Madeline Cole asked about the cattails and wetlands around Lake Emily and why these couldn't be cleared out to expand capacity, and Mr. Chapman explained that you could not just bulldoze the cattails down and dredge or put in a catchment dam due to regulations, although we will do these when we expand the reservoir. Ms. Cole asked about the pink survey flags at the lake; Mr. Chapman said those were identified wetlands.

Wayne Osborne of Poppy Drive asked if the District could release the names and addresses of these high-end users. Mr. Chapman said absolutely not, but he has been sending courtesy letters to them all summer long asking them to review their usage habits and to check for leaks.

Maria Bates said she agreed that people abusing the water should be reckoned with, but said that more people are hooking up every year. Mr. Chapman clarified that no houses have been hooked up this

year. Ms. Bates asked how long the moratorium will be in effect; Mr. Chapman and several directors explained that it will be in effect until we have sufficient capacity.

Dan Green asked what the Board considered a reasonable amount of water usage per household. Mr. Chapman said the statistics were an annual average of 5,000 – 5,500 gallons per month, but this average included the high end users that actually skew the average figure.

Director Williams said he thought the question was whether Brooktrails had taken a position on what reasonable water use was. Mr. Chapman said no; the only thing we are addressing is what was unreasonable, and basically the Board decided this summer that 31,000 gallons or more was unreasonable.

An audience member said she had come from a community of 14 homes with its own well, and they couldn't get the 14 homes to agree on anything.

Tara Shannon said she didn't want anyone deciding what is reasonable for her, and she felt it was really important that we consider our own personal responsibility to everyone and everything around us. She said we should encourage that, but to legislate it is a grave error. Sandra King said she agreed wholeheartedly that no one should be saying what is reasonable for a household because none of them are the same.

An audience member asked how do we have any confidence in the District saying we need to ration it now, when in the last few months you were asking for more building permits, and what about next year when you try to get more building permits. Mr. Chapman said there were three hearings tonight and we needed to stay on target.

Wallace Stahle said he'd like the bills to say gallons rather than cubic feet. Several audience members agreed with this suggestion. Mr. Chapman said that might be doable, but our meters are calibrated to cubic feet.

President Skezas closed the public hearing at 7:52 p.m. and thanked the public for their input.

District Counsel Neary said what we have right now is an incremental pricing structure spread over 6 tiers. Every time the Board makes a value judgment of what is needed for a family or what somebody should be using, you run into constitutional issues. Until recently there was a strong question whether to even have tiered water rates, which was resolved within the last four years as permissible. The structure the District has is key to the permissible way of enforcing conservation and drawing a distinction between one water user and another. The second limitation is that your water rates may be based only upon the reasonable cost of providing service, because once it goes beyond that, it becomes more akin to a tax than a user charge. A user charge reflects the fact that you have a choice of using the service. A tax is something you have no choice about. Mr. Neary added that this concept that water rates being tied to the reasonable cost of providing service is of recent origin, and since this Tier 7 proposal was first advanced in July there has been substantial clarification of the legal issues. He said the one thing that does concern him in light of the Bighorn decision is that the District doesn't have any data upon which to make a finding that the \$.25 cost for a Tier 7 is a reasonable cost of providing service. He said he thought it could be done, if a determination including the cost of the capital projects that are required by users over a certain tier is included, and calculate that into the cost of developing a reserve to provide service. But, he said, the proposal right now lacks any data as to the actual cost of providing the service to the Tier 7 users. He said he thought if you had that data and it were reasonable, the Tier 7 would be beyond question. He said this is the long way of saying that if you pass the rate as it stands now, you probably run a risk if you do it without having actual data.

General Manager Chapman said he was asked by Director Orth, who had called at 5:00 p.m. to voice his concerns about this. Director Orth had expressed he would want District Counsel Neary to get more information from the Attorney General's office before proceeding with Tier 7. Counsel Neary said that would probably take four months; we would have to get our state assemblyperson or senator to request it. The other way is to approach the Howard Jarvis organization in Redding as we have done before.

Mr. Chapman clarified for Director Ziady that our usage rates were based on the operational maintenance of our water plant with a little bit of reserves. When we get ready to finance the two major dam projects, we will be going to the lot owners asking them to put a blanket assessment to their property over 30 – 40 years. He assured the audience that we would hire a "district engineer" to come in and assess the situation; that there would be a difference between a vacant lot and an improved lot. The vacant lot would carry the lion's share of the assessment to raise the reservoir because that water benefit would be primarily to them. But there was going to be some assessment applied to the improved lots, as well.

District Counsel Neary said every year in the budget Mr. Chapman lays out the costs and comes up with a rate to cover the costs. Sometimes we can use a consultant to establish the rate justification as City of Willits did with their increased sewer rates. Sometimes consultants can be very creative, he said, but he didn't think you could put the cost of construction onto Tier 7, unless you said financing costs would be triggered earlier if users continued at that consumption rate.

Director Williams said we have not come up with a rationale other than conservation for raising the rate and creating Tier 7. He said from what he was hearing from District Counsel Neary, the Bighorn case, and Director Orth, he said it seemed we certainly do not want to adopt a Tier 7, get challenged and back down. Director Williams said he would vote to postpone the decision on Tier 7. Director Horrick said he had no comment. President Skezas said he felt we should postpone the next public hearing until we come up with a rationale to support the rate, whatever it would be. Director Williams addressed the audience and said he hoped they understood that as a community service district, the Board had severe legal restraints on what they can and cannot do in terms of water usage rates. District Counsel Neary said when the proposal was first put forward, there was a longstanding Supreme Court case upholding the notion that water rates

were outside of Prop. 218, but the Supreme Court essentially reversed itself. He said it was unusual for the Supreme Court to deny re-hearing on a number of cases and then reverse a longstanding case. Mr. Neary said he had mentioned that the Bighorn case was pending at the time Tier 7 was considered, but had given the wrong name for it. Director Williams said no criticism had been implied.

3. Consideration of ordinance prohibiting resale of District water. General Manager Chapman said this had been suggested by Director Orth back in June, that we consider that water developed in Brooktrails should be for Brooktrails and Spring Creek residents only and not to be sold by individuals to somebody else outside our own territory. President Skezas opened the public hearing at 8:10 p.m.

Bruce Singer of Poppy Drive said he had been shocked to see the lake level in recent weeks and to see the alluvial fans created over the past 40 years. He said, to think of someone considering selling our water in this circumstance is shocking, tells him that our rates are too low, and asked why when water is so low anyone would be allowed to suck it up and sell it outside. General Manager Chapman clarified that this is generally done under the table. Mr. Singer asked if this is where the extra 40,000 or 50,000 gallons was coming from, people having an inexpensive home business selling treated water. Mr. Chapman said anyone hauling water has to be licensed by the CA Department of Health Services; there was a huge issue if someone was hauling water illegally if someone got sick and said it was Brooktrails water. Mr. Singer said our water supply should be preserved for the people who bought and paid for it.

Tara Shannon asked if it were not a criminal act to steal water when the water rights were owned by the District. Mr. Chapman said he couldn't answer as to the criminality, but the subject matter is if we catch you. He said this has not been done yet; if someone reports that someone has a 2,500-gallon water tank on the back of a pickup at the far end of Brooktrails, we would like to know about it, as the reality is we're trying to protect our water supply. Maria Bates asked who was doing this and if people are taking water out of the faucet and selling it or digging wells. She said somebody in Spring Creek had once said they were going to drill a well and sell their water from their property. Mr. Chapman said Spring Creek residents can drill a well, but individuals in Brooktrails Township cannot. Obviously anybody drilling a well and selling the water should check with the Department of Health Services and find out if they are within bounds. Director Williams said it was a concern when we found out about extremely high use from some properties; we do not know that someone has actually been selling our water, but the ordinance is intended to be a shot over the bow to anyone doing it or who would think of doing it in the future. He clarified that well water is not District water. District Counsel Neary confirmed that the draft ordinance is limited to water obtained from the District water system.

Chuck Harden of Willow Place asked why we were talking about an ordinance we cannot enforce. District Counsel Neary said you have an obligation as a water purveyor to delineate the place of use for the water, and in this case that is Brooktrails Township. Mr. Neary said the ordinance has two penalties, one being a misdemeanor; he said as a practical matter, the District Attorney was not going to enforce on a misdemeanor in a District ordinance. He said the real enforcement would be termination of service, and while that does not appear in this ordinance, it does appear in the ordinance it amends.

An audience member asked how often meters are read and was informed once a month. He asked what the relationship was between what water was produced and what the meters say. Mr. Chapman said there is a natural loss of water in a water system due to an estimated 27,000 connecting joints. The audience member believed water sales were more like 50 gallons in the backs of pickups. He said they are using fire hydrants and asked if these could be locked off. Mr. Chapman said fire regulations prohibited this. The audience member insisted that water theft was going on. Director Ziady said people do call the District about what they see, and you see situations where a water bill will go way up with no past history and no leak, and you can kind of figure out what's going on. She said it is not an ideal situation, but a "neighborhood watch" mentality can help.

Tara Shannon asked if she had understood correctly that the repercussion for violating this law was termination of service. President Skezas said the ordinance says that, and pointed out the provision in Section 2-212 for immediatedisconnection.

An audience member asked whether when they signed an application for service, they were not signing a contractual agreement with the District that they would accord with the bylaws of the District, and asked if there were a clause in there that says you're not allowed to sell the water. Mr. Chapman said we are trying to shore that up so that if you are selling it we can come back at you. It was discussed that this was part of Ordinance 76. President Skezas asked if the reference to misdemeanor should be deleted; District Counsel Neary said you didn't need to delete but he just wanted to point out that as a practical matter your enforcement was going to be disconnection from the water system; he wasn't suggesting that anything be changed in the ordinance.

President Skezas closed the public hearing at 8:23 p.m. Director Ziady moved to waive further reading of Ordinance No. 132; Director Williams seconded.

Director Horrick said he would like to see the misdemeanor penalty removed as the teeth of the ordinance really is the disconnecting of water. Director Williams suggested that we leave it in; he said he felt District Counsel Neary was right and times change and we may find in the future that the District Attorney's office is a little more excited about water theft and issues, and a misdemeanor is criminal, so he thought it better to keep it in there. Director Horrick said we're talking about resale and that was not theft. Director Ziady said it was theft. An audience member said why don't we put in a provision saying other than use for the specific resident where the meter is. Someone said the ordinance does have that provision, and President Skezas read the paragraph reflecting that. Roll call vote was as follows:

AYES: Directors: Williams, Ziady, Skezas
NOES: Directors: Horrick
ABSENT: Directors: Orth

4. Consideration of water emergency declaration. General Manager Chapman said he had consulted with Richard Estabrook and there were many aspects of the situation to be covered. Mr. Estabrook had concurred that we should not declare a water emergency at this time, which is not to say that we do not have a serious water situation. Mr. Chapman said that instead, he would rather send out a letter to the water customers explaining the severity of the situation, and further alerting them to the definite water emergency that must be declared next August 2007 because of having to lower the reservoir another 8 feet to allow construction of the rubber spillway. We would have rationing from August through November 2007. Typically, he said, we would take the usage figure from March, which is basically in-house water use, and would probably be around 5,000 gallons, which would satisfy the vast majority of our customers. He clarified that in-home use was kitchen, dishwashers, washing machines, toilets, etc. He said another reason not to call the emergency is that we have a 95% probability of having rain by December 1, and his own worst-case calculations were that there would be approximately 90 acre-feet of water between the two lakes. In 2001, the last extremely dry year, we had about 110 acre-feet at that time of year.

Mr. Chapman continued that the other issue was Ordinance 122, which needs to be entirely revamped over the next six months. It was based on the assumption that if you were not in compliance we would double your bill and eventually raise it fivefold; however, Bruce Burton of DHS and himself discussed having an ad hoc committee of three to five individuals who would serve as the appeal board, appoint a water referee (typically the manager), and that referee had to have the authority to shut someone off immediately for grossly misusing water during a water emergency. If they were barely over, they would come to the appeals board and perhaps they could be adjusted. The letter to the public would go out within the next month and explain where we are and ask for a voluntary 10% conservation between now and December. He said the educational process would be to tell you now that lawns would be in serious jeopardy next year, and we would have to cut the golf course off.

Mr. Chapman said we had to do reverse engineering thinking, working backwards from how much we needed in December next year. We have to have the ability to very quickly cut someone off who is abusing the process, instead of having something like the Ord. 122 penalty block system. He said Bruce Burton had felt that we were making our ordinance much too complicated.

President Skezas opened the public hearing and stressed it was about whether or not to declare a water emergency (and none of the things that General Manager Chapman had just been discussing, which do not yet exist). District Counsel Neary said it might help to describe the current ordinance. Mr. Chapman said if the Board were to declare an emergency now, we would have to have a draft resolution (which was attached to the report), the Board would have to make findings of necessity, and within five days we would have to send a letter to all customers and identify the amount of gallons each would have for use until the end of the year. He said you would have 5,640 gallons per month in September and October, and then in November and December this would be cut back to 4,047. Meter readings and staff time would be doubled.

Mr. Chapman presented a graph showing that we were tracking in water supply exactly in accordance with the Estabrook projection. Mr. Estabrook feels that we probably lost 10 to 15 acre-feet due to the winter storms. Mr. Chapman said we will physically survey the reservoir to find out how much sediment there is now. Mr. Estabrook has been making observations weekly and his report says at the end of December we will have 30 acre-feet of water. At the bottom is 15 acre-feet of mud. However, there is a 95% probability that we will have rain by the end of November. Typically we start with a 2-4" rain and then another. The first two rains do nothing but saturate the soil; the next two fill our reservoirs fairly quickly. Mr. Chapman stressed we are using the worst-case scenario and conservative numbers. He said he felt we would have a little bit more than projected, but he would not argue that this will be the lowest amount we've ever had and we are very concerned. He will be reporting back to Bruce Burton of DHS in October; Mr. Burton thought we were calling an emergency possibly too quickly and pointed out that if we don't have significant rain we were not going to be the only community in trouble.

Tara Shannon said if you declare this emergency now, for someone who is in the middle of canning from their garden and had no warning, this would destroy her harvest. Ms. Shannon asked if the Board would go on the fast track to support residents getting water tanks and filling those tanks and whether there would be a special exception to fill those tanks now that haven't been filled by winter rains or where people didn't have time to construct. She said she was okay with not having a garden next year but she was not going to kill her fruit trees. She said she wanted to know she wasn't going to be punished now without having had time to prepare.

Maria Bates said she would like to see the cubic feet converted to gallons as soon as possible. President Skezas said we can put the conversion figure on the bill. Ms. Bates asked which March would be used to calculate allocations; President Skezas said next March. Ms. Bates said her March bill is very small. Mr. Chapman said the state requires planning for the worst case scenario, and the allocation is designed for in-home use, which basically means people do have sufficient water for kitchen and bathroom normal use.

An audience member asked if the allocation amount was drawn from the State or Water Board. Mr. Chapman said no, that was coming from Richard Estabrook's best estimate of water supply projection. The man said he thought that was a reasonable amount of water for household needs.

Madeline Cole said she was strongly against a water emergency right now but a year's advance notice would give her an opportunity to enter into a learning curve on how to conserve water not just for a

state of emergency but for the future. She suggested that some of the community residents doing bio-intensive farming offer classes to Brooktrails so we can have our gardens and conserve water too.

Mr. Bruce of Poppy Drive asked if we could have a trigger point for a water emergency, a certain number of acre-feet. Mr. Chapman said it does appear we will have somewhere between 75 and 90 acre-feet of water on December 1. He said he would report back to Mr. Burton in mid-October. The resident said he would leave this to the judgment of the two experts in the field. He asked, after the spillway is installed, how far up towards getting out of the moratorium will we go. Mr. Chapman said around 1,300 homes.

An audience member asked about the revenue stream if everyone reduced their consumption 10% voluntarily; he said in a community he had lived in where people voluntarily reduced their usage around 20%, the water provider then came back and doubled the price of the water, saying they could no longer afford to operate. He asked if the District was planning to double the water rates, eliciting laughter from the general audience.

President Skezas closed the public hearing at 9:04 p.m.

G. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Patricia Cornell made a small discussion about identifying meth labs in Brooktrails. Ms. Cornell said she had talked to Lt. Tom Allman and he had said getting rid of these in the whole area was one of his priorities. Director Ziady said the Board had recently had the sheriff to speak. Claudia Reed said she was going to write an article about this.

Ron Woolsey said he recognized the Board was in a hard place with people wanting to build. He said that less than a year ago someone was trying to allow more building permits to go in, and here we are talking about rationing water. President Skezas said that was requested and denied and will not be requested again. Mr. Woolsey said something doesn't feel legal; someone came in here and chopped these lots up into enough lots where there's no way we'll get enough water for all of them. He asked if that person doesn't have legal liability and whether this has been pursued. President Skezas said this was designed as a vacation village for 300-square-foot cabins to be inhabited about 25% of the time, and that's what they built the water system to support, and it was approved by the County. The subdivision would never be approved today. In evolution it has become a permanent place to live, and that's why we have a water problem. Mr. Woolsey said community gardens are a great idea and we would be willing to teach classes in that and drip irrigation if Brooktrails wants to sponsor them. Mr. Chapman asked him to call him the next day.

Maria Bates asked about leaks. President Skezas said the public hearing was closed. Ms. Bates asked how she would know if a leak was her fault or Brooktrails'. President Skezas said if it has gone through her meter, it's her leak.

Wally Stahle commented on developing more gardens and said appropriate land use here is actually a redwood forest and not conducive to long-term wide-scale gardening, whereas the valley is.

H. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

6. Retroactive approval of checks issued August 4 and 23, 2006. Director Horrick moved to retroactively approve the checks; Director Ziady seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

I. ACTION AGENDA

7. Consideration of ordinance prohibiting resale of District water. This matter was voted on during the Public Hearings portion of the agenda.

8. Consideration of receipt of latest Estabrook water supply update. President Skezas commented this had already been discussed and no action was necessary.

9. Consideration of whether to declare water emergency and adopt Water Conservation Program as outlined in Ordinance 122 and adopt monthly water usage limit per water connection. General Manager Chapman said Director Orth had asked that his concerns be expressed, that he did not want to call an emergency at this time, but to have a mailing sent out to the public advising what was happening now and what to expect next year. Director Williams said it seemed to him nothing could be effective until October 1. Mr. Chapman said that's basically correct, but certainly we were going to have some enforceability issues in terms of the computers. Director Williams asked what grows here after October 1; residents said squash, tomatoes and greens, carrots, beets. Mr. Chapman said it was a difficult call and he hoped the directors had read his report and Mr. Estabrook's report and his opinion that this is not the time to call. Director Williams asked how much longer we should wait. Mr. Chapman said he would be talking with Bruce Burton in October and monitoring whether we are in line with projections. Director Williams said there is an added "fudge factor" mentioned in the reports because we don't know how much sediment is on the bottom of Lake Emily, and so we don't really know how much water there is. Mr. Chapman said we probably are going to be pretty close on that. He said he didn't feel we could enforce and this would be solved by next year. He said he felt we do have the water and Mr. Estabrook has concurred in his own independent judgment in that same regard.

Mr. Chapman said on December 31st his calculation for worst-case scenario was we're down to 20 acre-feet, taking out the sediment allowance, and Mr. Estabrook's worst-case scenario was 30 acre-feet. Mr. Chapman felt, however, that we would be between 30-40 acre-feet at that point, but would be getting down to the mud stage. Director Ziady asked how long that would need to last. Mr. Chapman said until January 1, and if we don't get rain by that time, a lot of districts are going to have a real problem. Director Ziady said she would rather have something in the cupboard January 1, but she yielded to Estabrook and what she was hearing here, with the understanding that the District was dependent on the weather, but it is a close call. She said at this point she would accept Estabrook's decision. Director Horrick agreed, so at this point he would not declare an emergency, but he agreed with the proposal to send a letter to all water users emphasizing the problem and giving suggestions to cut back, and warning about next year. Mr. Chapman said if he got the authorization tonight he would work with staff and Mr. Estabrook and try to put this out by October 1.

Director Ziady said she would like to see the water bill also in gallons. Mr. Chapman said we would call MOM's Software and try to figure that out. President Skezas said the sense of the Board was not to declare an emergency and asked if a motion was needed. Mr. Chapman said he would like a motion as to what he just summarized and to authorize the letter. Director Williams said he would like the sense of the Board that if at any time between now and mid-October we see some significant drop below the line, we could call an emergency meeting to declare an emergency effective the first day of the following month. Director Williams asked when the lake was last checked; Mr. Chapman said on Sunday. President Skezas said it should be read every week; Mr. Chapman agreed.

Director Williams moved the District Office immediately get out a letter advising all residents of the nature of the water supply and the need for all possible water conservation for the rest of the calendar year. Mr. Chapman said also preliminary education regarding what to expect next year. Director Williams endorsed the idea of holding educational meetings at the Community Center; he said there were a lot of houses without low flush toilets and we'd better start talking about that. Mr. Chapman said he would like the Board to read the issues he had raised about golf and a potential compensation package for Ron Runberg. Director Horrick said he seconded Director Williams' motion. Director Ziady having returned to the table, President Skezas informed her we had a motion to send a letter advising residents of the situation and urging conservation for the remainder of the year and giving them early notice of the situation for next year. The motion carried unanimously.

10. Authorization to begin bid process for Tank 9 access road repair. General Manager Chapman referred to the January 1 winter storm which caused damage to the road for water tank 9. Engineer Mark Vogel had come up with a blueprint for its repair. We've been reimbursed by FEMA for about \$18,600.00 and we think the project will be in the \$20,000 - \$25,000.00 range. He requested a motion to approve the bidding process for this repair so it could be done before the rains. He said he would return in a couple of weeks with a similar request for repairing the sewer line deflection on the golf course. Director Williams so moved; Director Ziady seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

J. ADDITIONS TO FUTURE AGENDAS

None.

K. SPECIAL REPORTS

From Directors: Director Ziady said there was a grant proposal by the Fire Safe Council with CDF as the lead agency for a potential \$200,000.00 with a \$200,000.00 match for a shaded fuel break on the ridge. The match is predominantly being offered to be met by the CDF crew who would work for about \$200.00 a day and provide 240 days work. This would come before the Board in October. Director Ziady said she was extremely excited about this idea due to the risk of fire and the fact that there have been no grants out there.

From District Counsel: None.

From General Manager: General Manager Chapman said he would like to publicly thank Dean Durbin for his work on the ADA door for the polling place. Also we are investigating the purchase of a backup 4" pump for the sewer lift stations and general purposes; we will need it for the golf course 12" line repair. Also we have a \$3,400 repair to the transmission of one of our fire trucks and have just spent \$6,000 on gravel for fish habitat.

L. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

M. ADJOURNMENT

Director Horrick moved to adjourn, and President Skezas declared the meeting of September 12, 2006 closed at 9:29 p.m.

GEORGE SKEZAS, President

ATTEST:

