

Minutes For January 02, 2001, Rural North Vacaville Water District

1

RURAL NORTH VACAVILLE WATER DISTRICT

January 2, 2001

Solano County Board of Supervisor's met in its ex-officio capacity as the Rural North Vacaville Water District on this day in regular session. All Directors were present.

(Item 21) RESOLUTION NO. 02-2001
PROPOSING CHANGES IN
BOUNDARIES, CHANGES IN
IMPROVEMENTS, AND
SUPPLEMENTAL ASSESSMENTS TO
BE LEVIED WITHIN ASSESSMENT
DISTRICT NO. 1 OF THE RURAL
NORTH VACAVILLE WATER
DISTRICT, ADOPTED

PUBLIC HEARING RE PROPOSED
SUPPLEMENTAL ASSESSMENT
SCHEDULED FOR FEBRUARY 27,
2001 AT 2:00 P.M.

Harry Englebright, Environmental Management, reviewed the information contained in the Agenda Submittal from his office dated January 2, 2001, incorporated herein by reference, highlighting a brief background, design changes to the Water System, the Supplemental Assessment, the Supplemental Assessment Ballot process, and that applications have been submitted for a full domestic water system. Mr. Englebright provided the Board with a Cost Comparison – 3% for 20 years dated January 2, 2001, incorporated herein by reference. Responding to questions posed by Director Kromm regarding changes to the allocation of costs between fire and domestic water service, and with increased piping sizes, Mr. Englebright noted originally the water treatment component was allocated evenly to all. Changes have been made to increase the charges to those receiving both domestic water and fire protection services. There were some changes to the modeling when going to the 100% design documents; the changes are mainly in the type of

pipng not the size.

Don Lyon, Not About Water, read a prepared statement noting that there maybe a math error in the Assessment Engineer's Report, and questioned the methodology in allocating the assessments resulting in overcharging for fire protection.

Mr. Lyon read a prepared statement on behalf of Eric J. Nelson dated January 2, 2001, incorporated herein by reference, outlining eleven questions resulting in several discrepancies and inconsistencies from the Engineer's Report for Supplemental Assessments.

Responding to questions presented in the statement of Mr. Nelson, Mr. Englebright noted question #1: The measurement of 1,000 feet is the reasonable distance from the proposed hydrants, the seven parcels that were removed were greater than 1,000 feet from the hydrant location.

Question #2: The additional five reserve water connections listed in the December 2000 Engineers Report were a result of modifications approved by the Board for some additions and deletions to the district. Question #3 the change of transmission pipes is to meet certain fire flows. Basically the changes were in the type of pipe, as a result of the final design work. Question #4 The domestic peak daily water demand was lowered due to the calculations done that determined the excess capacity in the system for the State loan calculations and based on each individual well rather than the combined well capacities.

Assessment Engineer John Wanger, Coastland Civil Engineering, responded to Question #5 noted clarification on Table B1 outlining the cost breakdown for domestic water and fire protection, and also on Table B7. Question #6 noted the breakdown on the percentages and allocation, and will have to go back and verify the numbers for accuracy. Question #7 the 29% of the water treatment facility benefits Zone 2 were determined by the percentage of the physical construction costs of a system to handle both domestic and fire protection. Question #8 the design engineer provided an overall summary and the attributable portion to fire protection. (Question #9 was basically answered with previous answers). Question #11 the allocation method of non-construction costs was proportional to the total amount of assessment as noted in the first engineer's report.

Mr. Englebright responded to Question #10 contingency costs were allocated by components based on potential problems.

Responding to questions posed by Director Kromm

regarding piping costs on page 16 which is listed differently on page 14, Mr. Wanger the difference of about \$200,000 is attributable to piping for the fire hydrants and is being charged to the fire protection system.

Responding to questions posed by President Thomson regarding the formula, Mr. Wanger noted the numbers and formula questioned by Mr. Lyon will have to be verified, and noted corrections will be made if necessary.

President Thomson noted the importance of issuing the ballots, and directed staff to make any necessary corrections and to proceed with issuing the ballots, if the item is approved.

Roberta Sullivan, Vacaville, feels this issue is really about development. Ms. Sullivan expressed concern that her wells may become contaminated with all the development around her property, with being caught between development and large farmers, and with the lack of representation of the general population that did not want water.

Director Kondylis noted development has been a concern with this project, and spoke about zoning and the General Plan.

Responding to questions posed by Director Kondylis relating to leach field guidelines and requirements, Director of Environmental Management Birgitta Corsello noted there are guidelines for leach fields, and that there are several tentative maps on file for subdivisions that are incomplete, but that each subdivision will have an environmental review process that includes leach field requirements that will have to be met.

Responding to questions posed by Director Kondylis relating to the piping to be used, Mr. Englebright noted the pipe is PVC pipe as well as other high density PVC pipe that must meet water quality standards.

Director Carroll noted some history leading to the formation of the water district, the English Hills Specific Plan, mandated fire protection, and the need to get the ballots out for a vote of the people.

Roy Silva, Vacaville, voiced concern with the lack of meetings to review the engineer's report, with no public meetings, and with the number of changes. Mr. Silva questioned why some parcels were being removed, and with the validity of the votes these parcels carry.

Responding to questions posed by Mr. Lyon regarding the allocation of water connections and the number of parcels that can be developed from the large

parcels, Deputy County Counsel Jim Laughlin noted there is no guarantee on the number of parcels that can be developed as noted in the supplemental water connection agreement. Mr. Lyon did request a consultation period to review the answers to the questions posed by Mr. Nelson. Clif Poole, Vacaville, discussed the Steiger Hill Water District, and noted he is no longer a member of the district.

Jerry Martin, English Hills Homeowners

Association, noted the number of years the development of a water system has been going on, the declining water table, the need for reliable water, support for the project, escalating costs, the lien will stay with the property if it is sold, and feels it is time to have the public vote.

Responding to questions posed by Director Kromm regarding the fire protection benefit numbers, and how to resolve the questions, Mr. Wanger noted the numbers would be verified, and any corrections that are needed would be made, and suggested the Board direct any necessary corrections be made and go forward.

There was a brief discussion regarding the time constraints pertaining to the ballot process, and the options available through the public hearing on February 27, 2001.

Responding to questions posed by Director Silva regarding review of the assessment numbers by the engineer, correction of those numbers, and with proceeding with the process, Mr. Laughlin noted the most important thing is for the Board to approve the total dollar amount that the assessment district is being asked to pay, and to give the General Manager some discretion to determine the best apportionment of them.

Mrs. Guest noted concern relative to contamination, with the public hearing on the day the ballots are due, the lack of public notice, with increased costs, with weighted voting, and with the inability to withdraw from the district.

Cathy Ann Hewitt, Benicia, noted the danger of draught, and hoped this would not encourage development in an arid area.

Mr. Laughlin proposed changes to the resolution on page 3 paragraph 3 to remove the first clause, and to add a new sentence that would read "Individual assessments shall be as described in the Engineer's Supplement Report or as revised by the District's General Manager due to any calculation error in the Engineer's Supplemental Report".

On motion of Director Kondylis and seconded by Director Carroll, the Board acted to adopt Resolution No. 02-2001 Proposing Changes in Boundaries, Changes in

Improvements, and Supplemental Assessments to be Levied Within Assessment District No. 1 of the Rural North Vacaville Water District, to schedule a public hearing on February 27, 2001 regarding the proposed supplemental assessment, and to include the amended language offered by County Counsel. So ordered by a vote of 4-1; Supervisor Kromm voted no.

SKIP THOMSON, President

MICHAEL D. JOHNSON, Secretary

By _____
Maggie Jimenez, Deputy Secretary