



# *Redwood Valley County Water District*

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

## AGENDA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

### Regular Meeting

Time: 6:00 p.m.

Date: Thursday, January 19, 2016<sup>17</sup>

Location: District Office, 2370 Webb Ranch Road, Redwood Valley, California.

Expected Guests:

- *All items listed below are considered action items unless otherwise noted.*
- *The items listed below are numbered for convenience only and may not necessarily be heard in this order.*

1. Roll Call.

2. Hearing of comments or questions from the attending public.

*See end of Agenda for information regarding public comments.*

3. Consider hearing of urgent items received since the Agenda was posted.

*See end of Agenda for information regarding the hearing of urgent items.*

4. Acceptance of Agenda.

5. Approval of Consent Calendar.

Consent Calendar postponed until February meeting

6. Approval of Minutes as presented.

7. Action Items.

1. Selection of Officers. (Discussion and appointment of Board officers for 2017)
2. SCADA. (Discussion and possible direction regarding selection of SCADA contractor)
3. Meeting Time. (Discussion and possible approval of Resolution 2017-01 changing meeting time to 5:00)

### **BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

*Granville Pool*

*Pamela Ricetti*

*Ken Todd*

*Jeff Basili*

*Marvin Talso*

8. General Manager's Report and Action Items.
  - A. Discussion regarding IWPC participation.
  
9. Financial Report.
  - a. Discussion and possible action. (no January report)
  
10. JPA - Upper Russian River Water Agency
  - a. Report of attendance at JPA Meetings.
  - b. Consider any correspondence concerning the JPA.
  - C. Discussion and possible action on JPA topics.
  
11. Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.
  
12. Local Agency Formation Commission of Mendocino County – LAFCO.
  - a. Discussion and possible action on LAFCO topics.
  
13. M. C. Inland Water & Power Commission.
  - a. Report of attendance at IW&PC Meetings.
  - b. Consider any correspondence concerning the IW&PC.
  - c. Discussion and possible action on IW&PC topics.
  
14. Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control & Water Conservation Improvement District.
  - a. Report of attendance at MCRRFC&WCID meetings.
  - b. Consider any correspondence concerning the MCRRFC&WCID.
  - c. Discussion and possible action on Flood Control District topics.
  
15. Sonoma County Water Agency.
  - a. Consider any correspondence or reports concerning the Sonoma County Water Agency.
  - b. Discussion and possible action.
  
16. Report of attendance at agency meetings, i.e. City of Ukiah, County Board of Supervisors, other Special District's, County of Mendocino departments, or other entity not listed separately herein.
  
17. State Water Resources Control Board.
  - a. Updates and possible action.
  
18. Status report of Place of Use issues.
  - a. Updates and possible action.
  
19. Status report of 2800 acre-feet Storage Right.
  - a. Updates and possible action.
  
20. Consider attendance at seminars, training events, conferences as received since last Meeting.

POSTED: ~~4/15/16~~

4/12/17

Public Comments

Comments will be limited to matters under this District's jurisdiction that are not on the posted agenda and items that have not been previously considered by the Board of Directors.

Comments on a matter not on the agenda are limited to three (3) minutes per person and not more than ten (10) minutes for a particular subject.

No action will be taken. Individuals wishing to address the Board are welcome to do so throughout the Meeting.

Urgent Items

In accordance with Section 54954.2 (b)(2) of the Government Code Brown Act, Two-thirds Vote Required for Action Items. (Upon determination by a two-thirds vote of the legislative body, or, if less than two-thirds of the members are present, unanimous vote of those members present, that the need to take action arose after the Agenda was posted.)

ADA Compliance

The Redwood Valley County Water District complies with ADA requirements and will attempt to reasonably accommodate individuals with disabilities upon request. To assist us in better understanding your request, please notify the District Office no less than 3 working days in advance of the meeting by calling (707) 485-0679.

REDWOOD VALLEY COUNTY WATER DISTRICT  
GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT  
JANUARY 19, 2017

This will be an abbreviated meeting due to Paula's absence and the recent holidays.

One item that I think the Board should begin to consider is Redwood's involvement and participation in IWPC in light of the formation of the Upper Russian River Water Agency. In the past, Redwood has been the only county water district directly represented at the IWPC. The RRFC has indicated in the past that they felt that they represented the other districts as contractors, although there was never any communication with the other districts.

Currently, the IWPC is the *de facto* lead agency in two activities: the raising of Coyote Valley Dam, and the re-licensing of the Potter Valley Project. Both of these projects are vital components of the Mendocino County Water Budget. The Board should consider if they wish to continue to participate in the IWPC as an individual member or if they feel it appropriate to consult the URRWA to see if that agency would assume that role. An additional issue is the role of the RRFC as they are now a member of the URRWA and a member of the IWPC.

The current IWPC agenda indicates that there may be a request made soon for contribution to the dam raising feasibility study. There have been no requests for matching funds since 2009 due to inactivity. As of 2007 each of the five members (City, County, RRFC, Redwood, and PVID) had contributed \$80,000. At that time Redwood ceased contributing. In 2008 and 2009 the other members contributed for an additional \$54,000 each.

The re-licensing process for the Potter Valley Project has begun. There will undoubtedly be protests and expenses involved in keeping the project, including the two dams, in operation.

Currently Redwood pays annual dues to the IWPC.

In addition, there will likely be a request for participation in the proposed Upper Eel River Water Balance study to be performed by UC Davis (estimated total cost \$53,000).

**No action requested at this time.**



# *Redwood Valley County Water District*

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

RESOLUTION NO. 2017-01

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE REDWOOD VALLEY COUNTY WATER DISTRICT  
APPROVING CHANGE OF REGULAR MEETING TIME

JANUARY 19, 2017

WHEREAS, The Redwood Valley County Water District (Redwood) meets on the third Thursday of each month starting at 6:00 pm at 2370 Webb Ranch Road, Redwood Valley CA, and

WHEREAS, Redwood desires to change the meeting time to start at 5:00 pm, and

WHEREAS, The time of a regular meeting of a legislative body shall be set by ordinance, resolution, or by-law (Govt. Code § 54954(a)), and

NOW, THEREFORE, Be it resolved that the regular meeting time of the Redwood Valley County Water District shall be 5:00 pm on the third Thursday of each month at 2370 Webb Ranch Road, Redwood Valley, CA, 95470, effective February 16, 2017.

ADOPTED and APPROVED, at a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Redwood Valley County Water District on the 19<sup>th</sup> of January, 2017 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Granville Pool  
President, Board of Directors

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_

William Koehler, acting secretary

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

*Granville Pool*  
*Pamela Ricetti*  
*Ken Todd*  
*Jeff Basili*  
*Marvin Talso*

1  
2  
3 **MINUTES**

4 **Redwood Valley County Water District**

5 2370 Webb Ranch Road

6 Redwood Valley, CA 95470

7 (707) 485-0679

8 Board of Directors - Regular Meeting Minutes

9 Thursday, December 15, 2016

10  
11 Directors: Granville Pool, Pamela Ricetti, Ken Todd, Jeff Basili, Marv Talso

12 Staff: General Manager Bill Koehler

13  
14 Call To Order: 6:00 P.M.

15  
16 1. Roll Call

17  
18 Present:

19 Granville Pool, President

20 Ken Todd, Director

21 Pamela Ricetti, Director

22 Jeff Basili, Director

23 Marv Talso, Director

24  
25 2. Hearing of Comments or Questions from the Attending Public for Items Not on the  
26 Agenda

27 No attending public.

28  
29 3. Consider Hearing of Urgent Items Received Since the Agenda Was Posted

30 None from staff. GM Koehler says that Dir Ricetti has asked again about moving the  
31 meeting time to 5pm. If so, it needs to be on the agenda. The consensus is that it'd be  
32 better to have the meeting at 5pm. GM Koehler will begin the proper posting but the next  
33 meeting will be at 6pm.

34  
35 4. Acceptance of Agenda

36  
37 **Motion: Accept the agenda**

38 Motion by Dir Ricetti, second by Dir Basili

39 In favor: Unanimous

40  
41  
42 5. Approval of Consent Calendar

43 Dir Todd asks about a \$7,000 engineering fee and GM Koehler says that has to do with  
44 the SCADA system. They need to archive the current system so they can program it  
45 correctly in the new system. Dir Pool asks about a meter fee and GM Koehler says it is  
46 dealing with the large radio meters.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

**Motion: Approve the November consent calendar**

Motion by Dir Ricetti, second by Dir Basili

In favor: Unanimous

6. Approval of Minutes as Presented

Dir Pool has a few minor typos to correct.

**Motion: Accept the November Regular Meeting minutes**

Motion by Dir Basili, second by Dir Todd

In favor: Unanimous

7. Action Items

1. Piffero Services.

GM Koehler has not had time to deal with this and Piffero hasn't contacted him about it, so there's nothing to report on this item.

**Not action is taken.**

2. Renter/Owner Deposit.

Currently there is a \$25 owner deposit that just sits there. The renter deposit is currently \$100 and that isn't enough because we regularly get stiffed on it. We will not be demanding another \$100 from current renters, but all new renters will be charged \$200. Current owners will likely be seeing a \$25 credit on their bill to make up for the deposit. Dir Pool asks if this is subject to Prop 218 and GM Koehler says that it is not.

**Motion: Eliminate the \$25 owner deposit and increase the renter deposit to \$200**

Motion by Dir Ricetti, second by Dir Talso

In favor: unanimous

3. Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA).

Each of the Boards voted to support that the GSA be formed of the four core agencies (County of Mendocino, City of Ukiah, Upper Russian River Water Agency (URRWA), and Russian River Flood Control(RRFC)), that Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA) have an advisory role, that we advocate for an ag presence, and take no position on the Resource Conservation District and the tribes. GM Koehler and Tamara Alaniz [GM for RRFC] have held this position but Sean White [GM for City of Ukiah water] is really pushing for SCWA to have a full seat because of their experience and resources. SCWA has said all along that they are willing to take an advisory position because they have an interest in what happens in the upper basin since it affects the lower basin. The latest idea is to ask SCWA what they expect their advisory role to look like.

1 The discussion between the small water agencies and the City of Ukiah got  
2 intense and Doug Crane said that if SCWA isn't a full member, the City may walk  
3 away from the GSA. The City then attacked the fact that RRFC has dual  
4 representation since they have their own GSA seat and a voice in the URRWA  
5 Board. RRFC said that they would abstain from voting as part of the URRWA.  
6 GM Koehler and Tamara also ran into Dan Rogina [who runs a private water  
7 district in Talmage] and he would be a good candidate for an advisory role. There  
8 was some more discussion at the GSA meeting, but nothing came of it.

9  
10 **4. USGS Study.**

11 This study is co-sponsored by USGS, the State Water Board, and SCWA. SCWA  
12 is paying about \$450,000 and is asking for \$200,000 from Mendocino County.  
13 Mendocino County will pay \$100,000 if the City, RRFC, and URRWA will pay  
14 the balance. RRFC will pay \$34,000 over four years, the City of Ukiah will pay  
15 \$33,000 over four years, which leaves \$33,000 for the URRWA. That means each  
16 member of the URRWA will owe \$2,062.50 a year for four years. It's a mixed  
17 blessing.

18  
19 USGS developed some very sophisticated software that shows the correlation  
20 between groundwater and surface water. SCWA wanted to pay for this study and  
21 worked on setting everything up without ever notifying anyone in Mendocino  
22 County.

23  
24 **Motion: Pay \$2,062.50 each year for four years toward the USGS study**

25 Motion by Dir Ricetti, second by Dir Basili

26 In favor: unanimous

27  
28 **8. General Manager's Report and Action Items**

29 **a. Cannabis Conversion**

30 The former Fetzer winery property with the exception of the front area is planned  
31 to be converted. Dir Todd says that he heard the guy who is proposing the project  
32 hasn't thought it out very well; GM Koehler agrees. GM Koehler talked with the  
33 proposer and was able to tell him flat out that domestic water cannot be used for  
34 cannabis cultivation. The proposer then said that it would be a processing center,  
35 in which case a bunch of guys sitting around wouldn't use that much water. Then  
36 he went to the planning meeting and they want a tasting room, greenhouses, guest  
37 houses, cloning areas, and all of it. Dir Todd said the neighbors are all against it  
38 and Dir Ricetti says that it will be a permitting nightmare and that we should just  
39 wait on this to see what happens.

40  
41 Dir Talso asks if GM Koehler has heard anything from an owner on West Road  
42 with a similar request. He has not and Dir Talso says that he will be following up.

43  
44 **b. Second Units**

45 GM Koehler has contacted Planning & Building three times now and has not  
46 received any more information.



1  
2 c. SCWA Streamflow Change Protest

3 Paul finally got the protest letter together and this whole process is probably  
4 going to run about \$10,000. Most of these hours have been spent figuring out  
5 what we're protesting and how it affects us. The main thing is that it affects  
6 Millview and they sell water to us. It also impacts Willow which causes them to  
7 purchase more water from RRFC, again reducing the available surplus.  
8

9 The flows in the Russian River are set by a Biological Opinion that sets required  
10 flows for the fish. Our diversions are only viable at certain flow rates, so if the  
11 maximum flow is set at 125 cfs and our diversion right only is effective at 150  
12 cfs, we will NEVER be able to divert water. That's what we're protesting. It will  
13 leave more water in Lake Mendocino but nobody will be able to touch it for water  
14 consumption. There is a possibility that the URRWA will be able to combine the  
15 rights of the individual agencies and put together a viable water company.  
16

17 SCWA is claiming they're doing this to be in compliance with the BO. The State,  
18 however, takes decades to get anything done in which time we won't be able to  
19 divert river water.  
20

21 d. Monitoring Well

22 Luhdorff & Scalmanini did a job for PG&E and had a lot of transducers left over.  
23 So we bought one surplus and installed on in the monitoring well on H&W  
24 Vineyards. The transducer will store 6 months of information instead of just  
25 reading the well levels a few times a year.  
26

27 e. Watershed Sanitary Survey

28 Luhdorff & Scalmanini got this done a while ago. Last time we paid \$34,000 but  
29 this time we got it for \$20,000 and it's more of an update. Five years from now,  
30 the costs will be different and hopefully lower yet.  
31

32 f. SCADA

33 We have hired L&S to consult on this. The new technology is pretty neat, but he's  
34 not sure about it yet. What happens if they fall apart in 10 years? MCC can do a  
35 standard install for \$140,000 and that's nice because anyone can work on it if  
36 MCC is gone in 10 years.  
37

38 9. Financial Report

39 Dir Basili asks about how the backflow testing is going. GM Koehler says that it's not  
40 moving along as fast as he'd like because it's becoming even more apparent how much  
41 the last guy screwed people over. He'll have an item on the next agenda about this  
42 because we should have a fund for replacing/repairing the backflow devices that the  
43 previous guy said he worked on but didn't.  
44

45  
46 **Motion: Approve the November 2016 Financial Report**

1 Motion by Dir Ricetti, second by Dir Todd  
2 In favor: unanimous  
3  
4 10. JPA – Upper Russian River Water Agency  
5 Already discussed.  
6  
7 11. Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SCMA)  
8 Already discussed.  
9  
10 12. Local Agency Formation Commission of Mendocino County (LAFCo)  
11 Already discussed.  
12  
13 13. Mendocino County Inland Water & Power Commission (IWPC)  
14 Already discussed.  
15  
16 14. Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control & Water Conservation Improvement  
17 District (RRFC)  
18 Already discussed.  
19  
20 15. Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA)  
21 Nothing to report.  
22  
23 16. Report of Attendance at Agency Meetings  
24 Already discussed.  
25  
26 17. State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)  
27 Nothing to report.  
28  
29 18. Status Report of Place of Use Issues  
30 Nothing to report.  
31  
32 19. Status Report of 2800 acre-feet Storage Right.  
33 Nothing to report.  
34  
35  
36 20. Consider Attendance at Other  
37 Dir Talso went to a meeting involving the Association of California Water Agencies  
38 (ACWA). They went through the flow chart from Lake Mendocino that the Army Corps  
39 uses to regulate Lake Mendocino and how they're trying to change the storage amounts  
40 to reflect the actual weather. They are also beginning to ask how they are doing with  
41 addressing agriculture.  
42  
43 GM Koehler changes the subject to Masonite. He instigated an offer 6 months ago and  
44 hasn't heard anything since. So he went to Dick Selzer who gave him a contact at  
45 Masonite. Unfortunately, it wasn't helpful.  
46

1 Millview is annexing some areas and has been getting a very positive response.

2

3 There is a property at the end of Kunzler Ranch Road near Masonite that GM Koehler  
4 asked Selzer to look into. The idea would be to drill a well on that property. Dir Todd  
5 thinks it would probably be underflow buy GM Koehler disagrees. Getting another well  
6 down in that area will benefit all of us. A good plan would be to pull water out of the lake  
7 when it's full and ship it south. If we're in need of groundwater, get it out of these wells  
8 and ship it north.

9

10 Dir Todd says that he won't be able to make the next URRWA meeting, so Dir Pool will  
11 be there as the alternate.

12

13 **Motion to adjourn.**

14 Motion by Ricetti, second by Dir Todd

15 In favor: unanimous

16

17 Meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm.

18

19

20 Minutes submitted by Jeanette Wise

21

22 Approved: Board of Directors

23 Date Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

24 Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

**Bill Koehler**

---

**From:** Bill Koehler [millviewwater@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 11, 2017 3:10 PM  
**To:** Bill Koehler  
**Subject:** Fw: Some Comments of the Proposed SCADA system for Redwood

**From:** Bill Gustavson  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 04, 2017 6:14 AM  
**To:** Bill K ; Bill Koehler  
**Cc:** Joe Prevendar <joe@epsfresno.com> (joe@epsfresno.com) ; William Gustavson  
**Subject:** Some Comments of the Proposed SCADA system for Redwood

Bill

Joe and I have revisited the emails, the information and quotations provided for the proposed upgrades/modifications of the existing RVCWD SCADA system, and from phone conferences with each of the integrators. Some of the following is redundant but given the District desire to minimize costs and yet try to maximize SCADA operation/monitoring of the system, we offer the following summary and comments:

Telstar

1. The Telstar quotation addresses a small fraction of the work required to upgrade the current SCADA total SCADA system.
2. Telstar has a long track record in integration work, and L&S/EPS having worked with Telstar on several projects, are pleased with the work performed by them.
3. Telstar installed the current Millview SCADA system which uses an Ignition software system; and is the same system proposed by Primex.
4. The proposed cost of \$196,610 is unrealistically high for what the District is trying to accomplish, in that Telstar's proposal focuses only on the water treatment plant and is simply proposing to completely "start from scratch" by removal and replacement of all existing hardware. Their proposal does not address the other sites; accordingly we do not recommend acceptance.

Primex

1. Representatives from Primex have reviewed the various locations and investigated each for upgrade/replacement need. Thus, Primex is the most familiar with the overall current SCADA system and needs of the District.
2. Primex has a long track record in integration work and L&S/EPS are quite familiar with Primex (and formerly MCC).
3. Primex proposes to utilize common hardware (PLC's, HMI's, etc) which use commonly available software programs to modify/replace existing hardware/software for an estimated cost of \$150,000. There are some provisos that are time and material and others that reflect an assumed scope of work. These provisos may or could result in additional change order requests for unforeseen conditions.
4. The screen designs are generally unique/custom to the client and operation which make the screens more informative than having generic graphics. It is a usual procedure for the screens to follow a logical P&ID process flow with piping and flow details being descriptive of the treatment process for the operator.
5. Report format is also custom to suit the needs of the client and is usually provided in a common format (such as excel) which means more flexibility to the District.

## XiO

1. Representatives from XiO have not reviewed all of the locations though have indicated a peripheral knowledge of the system.
2. The estimate for providing a workable system is \$80,000 to \$100,000. This includes all programming and engineering. The owner will be responsible for the installation of the balance of the system which we estimate at between \$10,000 to \$20,000 in outside contract work to provide all conductors, conduits, masts, cables, etc. The cost is less than other SCADA system providers.
3. XiO is an relatively new SCADA company and does not possess a long track record.
4. XiO utilizes a controller "box" which is marketed to eliminate a common PLC however the unit is nothing more than a "pre-programmed" logic controller in that the software is embedded within the unit with sub-programs turned on or off depending on the need or operation. Unlike a common market PLC, this unit is very proprietary and can only be programmed by XiO. If XiO goes out of business, the District cannot hire anyone to attempt to "reverse engineer" the system. The system, when it fails (it is obsolete the moment XiO goes out of business) it has to be replaced with some other available technology.
5. It appears the screen graphics are generic with no custom design – the schematics will not follow the normal P&ID format common to most SCADA systems.
6. Report formatting looks nice but is not any different than the format provided under other software programs. There is also concern that retrieval is also using proprietary means.

## Recommendations

It is our opinion the District would be better served by using industry available hardware and software. Currently, if one integrator leaves the marketplace it is common to have another integrator, and depending on documentation left by the previous integrator, modify/correct/replace existing hardware/software and hence, maintain operation of the system. Though we are intrigued with the technology presented by XiO, we are concerned of the very proprietary nature of the hardware/embedded software in that failure of the components and the resulting repair cannot be performed by another integrator; hence the District could find itself in a situation of completely not having any alternative but to replace the equipment/software and attempt to integrate the replaced equipment into the XiO system, if that can occur. We are also concerned that XiO lacks the experience to operate a simple water treatment system. The argument presented is that the XiO system can "monitor" the treatment system while the treatment manufacturer's PLC operates the treatment system. Thus, PLC technology remains embedded in the system and can perform, as they are normally are programmed to do, all monitoring, operational and reporting functions. Accordingly, in that light, the District may as well opt to keep with standard industry PLC/hardware working in concert with industry available software. We have reviewed all of the proposals presented and find the Primex proposal to be well thought out, the most responsive, and the price very reasonable for the work involved. We also recommend the District stay with the use of standard and widely available industry hardware, such as Modicon or Allen-Bradley PLC's, and a common industry available software package, such as Ignition. Another benefit with the use of Ignition is that the operators have familiarity with the Ignition system (at Millview) minimizing any requisite cross-training.

### **William A. Gustavson**

Principal Project Manager



500 First Street • Woodland, Ca 95695

530.661.0109 • Fax 530.661.6806

Cell 916.417.4196 • [bgustavson@lsce.com](mailto:bgustavson@lsce.com)