

**Grand Jury Report
RESPONSE FORM**

RE: Report Titled: *Lobbies, Lawsuits and Legislation*

Report Dated: June 3, 2010

Response Form Submitted By:

Sean White, Manager
Russian River Flood Control District
151 Lans Avenue
Ukiah, CA 95482

Response MUST be submitted, per Penal Code §933.05, no later than: September 4, 2010

I have reviewed the report and submit my responses to the FINDINGS portion of the report as follows:

- I (we) agree with the Findings numbered:
1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, & 17
- I (we) disagree wholly or partially with the Findings numbered below, and have **attached, as required**, a statement specifying any portion of the Finding that are disputed with an explanation of the reasons therefore.
3, 7, & 18

I have reviewed the report and submit my responses to the RECOMMENDATIONS portion of the report as follows:

The following Recommendation(s) have _____ have been implemented and **attached, as required**, is a summary describing the implemented actions:

The following Recommendation(s) have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, **attached, as required** is a time frame for implementation:
3

The following Recommendation(s) require further analysis, and attached as required, is an explanation and the scope and parameters of the planned analysis, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared, discussed and approved by the officer and/or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed: (This time frame shall not exceed six (6) months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury Report)

1, 2, 3, 4

The following Recommendations will NOT be implemented because they are not warranted and/or are not deemed reasonable, attached, as required is an explanation therefore:

I have completed the above responses, and have attached, as required the following number of pages to this response form:

Number of Pages attached: 2

I understand that responses to Grand Jury Reports are public records. They will be posted on the Grand Jury website: www.co.mendocino.ca.us/grandjury. The clerk of the responding agency is required to maintain a copy of the response.

I understand that I must submit this signed response form and any attachments as follows:

First Step: E-mail (word documents or scanned pdf file format) to:

- The Grand Jury Foreperson at: grandjury@co.mendocino.ca.us
- The Presiding Judge: grandjury@mendocino.courts.ca.gov
- The County's Executive Office: ceo@co.mendocino.ca.us

Second Step: Mail all originals to:

Mendocino County Grand Jury
P.O. Box 939
Ukiah, CA 95482

Printed Name: Sean White

Title: General Manager

Signed: Sean White

Date: 8/19/10

2010 Grand Jury Report
Lobbies, Lawsuits, and Legislation
MCRRFC&WCID Response Attachment

FINDINGS

Finding 3: The MCRRFC&WCID (District) partially disagrees with this finding as we believe it would be better for the Grand Jury to defer verification of this finding to a more appropriate agency. The District recommends that the Grand Jury consult with the IWPC and/or the PVID for verification of this finding.

Finding 7: The District partially disagrees with this finding as we believe it would be better for the Grand Jury to defer verification of this finding to a more appropriate agency. The District recommends that the Grand Jury consult with URSA for verification of this finding.

Finding 18: The District partially disagrees with this finding as we believe it would be better for the Grand Jury to defer verification of this finding to a more appropriate agency. The District recommends that the Grand Jury consult with the City of Ukiah for verification of this finding.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 3 (future implementation): The City of Ukiah has prepared and circulated a draft RFP for the preparation of a *Recycled Water Master Plan*. The District has reviewed the draft and submitted comments to the City of Ukiah. In turn, the City of Ukiah has adopted the District's comments and is prepared to finalize and issue the RFP. The District is hopeful that the *Recycled Water Master Plan* will provide the necessary framework for implementing Recommendation 3.

Recommendation 1 (requires further analysis): The District continues to be supportive of the overall findings of the Valley-Wide Task Force, however the District does not see the utility of the formation of a JPA to accomplish these goals. Normally, LAFCO creates a Formation Committee comprised of stakeholders to assess the best way to reorganize local government agencies. In addition, the District believes that completion of LAFCO's forthcoming Water Supply MSR for the greater Ukiah Valley may provide the necessary guidance for accomplishing the goals outlined by the Valley-Wide Task Force.

Recommendation 2 (requires further analysis): The long-term mission of the Mendocino County Water Agency remains uncertain. The MCWA's lack of water resources makes sustainable sources for revenue for this agency difficult to identify in our fiscally constrained community. The District believes that assigning key leadership roles to an agency with an uncertain future warrants further consideration.

Recommendation 4 (requires further analysis): As one of the founding members of URSA, the District is uncertain that a loose coalition of partners similar to URSA would be a suitable model for accomplishing the goals outlined in Recommendation 1. As previously stated, the District believes that LAFCO's

forthcoming Water Supply MSR for the greater Ukiah Valley may provide the best “road map” for accomplishing Recommendation 1.