

Response to Grand Jury Reports

WATER, WATER. Everywhere, But...

Report Title: M C W Districts Report
(please fill in all information relating to this report)

Report Date: MAY 4, 2006

Response by: STEVEN ELLIOTT Title: SUPERINTENDENT
& PUID BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

FINDINGS

1 I (we) agree with findings numbered:

1, 2, 8, 16-19, 22, 34

2 I (we) disagree wholly or partially with the findings numbered:

9, 13, 14, 20, 27, 33

(Attach a statement specifying any portions of the findings that are disputed; include an explanation of the reasons therefore.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1 ~~3~~ Recommendations numbered 2, 6, 7, 8
have been implemented. (Attach a summary describing the implemented actions)

2 ~~A~~ Recommendations numbered _____
have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.
(attach a time frame for the implementation)

3 ~~1~~ Recommendations numbered 4, 5, 9
require further analysis.
(Attach an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.)

4 ~~2~~ Recommendations numbered 3
will not be implemented because they are not warranted or are not reasonable. (Attach an explanation)

Date: 6-23-06 Signed: Steven Elliott

Number of pages attached: 2

JUNE 23, 2006

Response to the 2005-2006 Grand Jury report dated May 4, 2006.

BACKGROUND

- 1 Par. #5
First line, Delete the words, and Potter Valley
- 2 Last paragraph #6.
Add to end of paragraph, Potter Valley Irrigation District.

FINDINGS

- 0 Items #1, 2, 8, 16-19, 22, 34 = 1
- 1 Item #9 = 2
We don't believe PV should be included here. Potter Valley Irrigation District's water rights or boundaries are not in conflict with any other district.
- 2 Item #13 = 2
PVID tracks all of their water use and delivery.
- 3 Item #14 = 2
PVID has always filed the required SWRCB use reports. Failure to do so is regulated and administered through the SWRCB.
- 4 Item #20 = 2
PVID does have a draft water shortage plan and a earthquake section covered within our Emergency Management Plan.
- 5 Item #27 = 2
Not true. The funds that were to be available were decreased through Congress for the ACOE to \$100,000. And we are successfully meeting our share of the matching funds as required.
- 6 Item #33 = 2
Additional agencies should be added here.

California Department of Fish and Game
US Department of Interior
The Round valley Indian Tribes
Cal Trout & Trout Unlimited
Friends of the Eel River
Humboldt County Board of Supervisors
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Sport Fishing Alliance
US Forest Service

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1 Item #1 = 4**
PVID, on behalf of Potter Valley farmers and ranchers, have been managing our water rights and distribution in an equitable manner since the 1920's. Our Capital Improvement Plan has provided on going infrastructure rehabilitation. We are currently intrenched in the US 9th Circute Court Case battle against FERC in an effort to insure the continued diversion of a minuscule amount of Eel River water to the East Branch of the Russian River.
- 2 Item #2 = 1**
MCIWPC Is presently filling this role and has been doing so for the last ten years. The BOS was involved in the formation of this commission and was a member at one time but later chose to withdraw. As of June 22, 2006 The BOS is not currently a member.
- 3 Item #3 = 4**
PVID is not prepared to relinquish control of our water rights to anyone.
- 4 Item #4 = 3**
PVID agrees and is currently part of this plan as a member of IWPC.
- 5 Item #5 = 3**
The BOS can accomplish this by becoming a member of the MCIWPC.
- 6 Item #6 =1**
PVID already fully complies with this recommendation.
- 7 Item #7 = 1**
Is presently being implemented through the MC LAFCO Municipal Services Review.
- 8 Item #8 = 1**
PVID complies through our BY-LAWS and Water Shortage plan.
- 9 Item #9 = 3**
PVID concurs with this recommendation. It would be acceptable if the BOS became a member of the MCIWPC.

COMMENTS

- 1 PVID as a member of the MCIWPC is attempting to be part of that single entity to address common water issues. The support and commitment of the MCWA would go a long way in promoting a united effort in the development of water resources within the inland Russian River Watershed .**