RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY REPORTS
SUMMARY OF PC 933.05

Penal Code § 933.05 provides for only two (2) acceptable responses with which agencies and/or departments (respondents) may respond with respect to the **findings** of a Grand Jury report :

1. The respondent agrees with the finding.
2. The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the findings, ***in which case the respondent shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefore.***

Penal Code § 933.05 provides for only four (4) acceptable responses with which agencies and/or departments (respondents) may respond with in respect to the **recommendations** of the Grand Jury.

1. The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action.
2. The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be in the future, with a timeframe for implementation.
3. The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis, with a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency/department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. ***This timeframe shall not exceed six (6) months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury Report.***
4. The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with a detailed explanation therefore.

However, If a finding and/or recommendation of the Grand Jury addresses **budgetary** or **personnel** matters of a county agency/department head and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the Grand Jury, but the response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only those budgetary or personnel matters over which it has some decision making authority. The response of the elected agency or department head shall address **all** aspects of the findings or recommendations affecting his or her agency/department.

RESPONSE PROCEDURE TO GRAND JURY REPORTS

The governance of responses to Grand Jury Final Report is contained in Penal Code § 933 and § 933.05. Responses must be submitted within 60 or 90 days. Elected officials must respond within sixty (60) days. Governing bodies (for example: the Board of Supervisors) must respond within ninety (90) days. Please submit all responses in writing and digital format to the Presiding Judge, the Grand jury Foreperson and the CEO's office.

Report Title : Redwood Valley County Water District 48 Years of Water Insecurity
Report Date : 6/29/2022

Response by : Redwood Valley CWD Board of Directors Title : Elected Officials

Findings

I (we) agree with the findings numbered:

☐ F1, F2, F3, F4, F5 and F7

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

_____

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

Recommendations

☐ Recommendations numbered: R2_____ have been implemented. (attach a summary describing the implemented actions.)

☐ Recommendations numbered: R4_____ have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. (attach a time frame for implementation)

☐ Recommendations numbered: R1 & R3_____ 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 and/or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed; including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This time frame shall not exceed six (6) months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury Report)

☐ Recommendations numbered: _____ will not be implemented because they are not warranted and/or are not reasonable. (attach an explanation.)

Date: 11/23/22 Signed: _____

Total number of pages attached: 6

Redwood Valley County Water District
Post Office Box 399 • Redwood Valley, CA 95470 • (707) 485-0679

November 18, 2022

Response of the Board of Directors of the Redwood Valley County Water District to the Final Report of the Mendocino County Grand Jury Report Dated 6/29/2022

Report Title: Redwood Valley County Water District: 48 Years of Water Insecurity

The Board of Directs of the Redwood Valley County Water District ("Board") provides the following responses to the findings and recommendations of the Grand Jury Report noted above.

Narrative Summary

Findings:

The District Board agrees with findings numbered F1 – F5 and F7.

Recommendations:

R1 *The RVCWD will immediately pursue all avenues towards consolidation with local water districts to obtain secure access to sufficient water rights to meet the health and safety needs of the RVCWD domestic, commercial, and agricultural customers.* ***This recommendation will require further analysis.***

The Board is currently in discussions with other local water districts to obtain secure access to sufficient water rights to meet the health and safety needs of the District's domestic, commercial and agricultural customers. These efforts are focused on consolidation with the Millview, Willow, Calpella, and Ukiah water districts as well and the Ukiah Sanitation District. Although there are numerous challenges associated with consolidation, it is the Board's intent to pursue all reasonable avenues towards consolidation. We recognize that should our efforts fail to achieve voluntary consolidation, it is very likely that the State will step in and force their views on us. None of the water districts currently in discussions regarding consolidation want that outcome.

Additionally, the Board is once again reviewing the possibility of being annexed into the Russian River Flood Control District (RRFCD). Annexation is the best option for Redwood Valley to assure a reliable, secure source of water for agricultural uses. Of course, it is also reasonable to assume that RRFCD water could be used by municipal users in the short term to relieve the current limit of 55 gallon per day per person currently in place for all RVCWD municipal customers. It is likely that the timeline for annexation would also be significantly shorter than the timeline for consolidation.

It is unclear how much time will be required for the annexation process or consolidation of water districts. In all cases, numerous agencies will be involved in final decisions. Needless to say, the Board is fully committed to working with other districts to identify a reliable, secure water source for the Redwood Valley community.

R2 *The RVCWD shall agendize fiscal and water rights progress at their regular meetings.* ***This recommendation has been implemented.***

The Board immediately took steps to adopt the recommendation that agendas should have placeholders for discussions on fiscal and water rights progress at the regular meetings. Under Old Business, our agendas now provide an opportunity to discuss drought and water supply issues as well as monthly updates on the URRWA and consolidation efforts. The board also reviews financial P&Ls and balance sheets at each meeting and will continue to do so.

R3 *Within 90 days, the RVCWD engage in negotiations with the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation to pursue partial or full loan*

forgiveness and/or develop a repayment plan. ***This recommendation will require further analysis.***

The Board met with their attorney at the September Board meeting to discuss plans for engaging in negotiations with the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation to pursue partial or full loan forgiveness and/or develop a repayment plan. The RVCWD Board is still considering a best path forward towards achieving this goal and hope to have some clarity regarding our options by the end of 2022. The Board is aware that the debt is an impediment to consolidation and Board recognizes that the sooner this matter is resolved, the more likely it is that consolidation can be achieved.

R4 *The RVCWD shall find ways to engage their stakeholders in water security.* ***This recommendation has been partially implemented, and will be fully implemented by the end of the year.***

The Board recognizes it is critical that we find ways to engage our stakeholders/constituents in discussions regarding water security for Redwood Valley. Staff currently post meeting agendas at the Redwood Valley post office. Recent time-sensitive correspondence to municipal customers has been in English and Spanish. We have also made efforts in increase attendance to our meetings by making them available via Zoom. In addition to current efforts, the Board would like to bring monthly meetings back to Redwood Valley, as it is difficult for the community to travel down to the Willow Water District Office is South Ukiah for the meetings. The Board will begin discussing options for where future meetings can be held, with the intention of finalizing a move by the end of the 2022.

R5 and R6: These two recommendations apply to the BOS, but we agree that greater involvement by the supervisors would be beneficial to consolidation efforts.

Approval by the Board of Directors of the Redwood Valley County Water District by the following vote:

Ayes: Klotter, Gaska, Schoeneman
Noes: ——
Absent: Todd
Abstain: ——

Redwood Valley County Water District

By: _____
President