

**VALLEY OF THE MOON WATER DISTRICT**  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
November 1, 2005

A regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Valley of the Moon Water District was held on Tuesday, November 1, 2005, in the Board Chambers of the District Office at 19039 Bay Street, El Verano, California.

**1. CALL TO ORDER - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - ROLL CALL**

**Vice President Sanford Smith** called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call by **Deputy Secretary Walk** noted the following present:

Directors Present:	Mark Bramfitt Ron Prushko Sanford Smith
Directors Excused:	Ed Kenny Michael Woods
District Personnel:	Shari Walk, Office Supervisor Paul Gradolph, Operations and Maintenance Supervisor
General Manager:	Krishna Kumar
Public Present:	Ellen Adamson, William Adamson, Donald Borden, Beverly Calkovsky, Rudi Calkovsky, Gerry Felder, J.W. Holden, Sherri Lewis, Michael Murphy, Shannon Murphy, Mario Pasquini, Glenn Peterson, Diane Ramirez, Philip Sales, Cordel Stillman, and Sandi Hansen, Sonoma Index-Tribune

**2. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

**3. CONSENT CALENDAR**

- A.** Receive and Approve Minutes of Regular Meeting of October 4, 2005
- B.** Resolution No. 051101, Approving Water Main Extension Agreement with John Wilkinson

Motion by **Director Bramfitt**, seconded by **Director Prushko** and carried unanimously by a voice vote to adopt the Consent Calendar, as shown.

#### 4. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

THE VALLEY OF THE MOON WATER DISTRICT CONDUCTED A WORKSHOP, FACILITATED BY MARTIN STEINPRESS, BROWN AND CALDWELL, AND IRIS PRIESTAF, TODD ENGINEERS, TO SEEK PUBLIC AND BOARD INPUT REGARDING:

##### A. The District's Overall Need and Plan for a Proposed New Water Well

**Iris Priestaf**, Todd Engineers, explained that 88 percent of the VOMWD's water came from the Sonoma County Water Agency (Water Agency) and the remaining 12 percent from VOMWD wells. She noted that each source of water had constraints and limitations. With respect to the Water Agency, she explained that the Agency's Aqueduct had been breached in 2000 and there were uncertain water rights. The Sonoma Aqueduct was limited hydraulically and the second aqueduct being planned was years away. She also described groundwater supply constraints where the VOMWD was using five wells and owning four of those wells, which were all clustered in springs communities on the east side of the Sonoma Valley. Existing VOMWD wells were located on small lots, were old, limited in yield and could be subject to interruption.

As to what the VOMWD was doing to make the water supply more reliable, **Ms. Priestaf** stated that the VOMWD was actively promoting water conservation, supported the use of recycled water for irrigation purposes, cooperated in the basin wide United States Geological Services (USGS) groundwater study and analysis to understand how the groundwater system worked and which would be the basis for a cooperative effort to manage the basin, and the VOMWD was working with the Water Agency in a variety of ways to improve water supply reliability.

**Ms. Priestaf** stated that all those efforts were not enough and some problems remained; to supply sufficient water to meet the peak summer water demand and to maintain sufficient storage for public safety purposes. A new well, identified as #5, would ameliorate those problems and provide a supplemental supply of water intended to help meet water needs during the summer, ensure water supply in drought, and overall to enhance the reliability of the water supply.

##### B. The Proposed Criteria to Evaluate the Potential Well Sites

**Martin Steinpress** of Brown and Caldwell stated that a broad identification of potential sites for the new well and individual assessments would be conducted with a report prepared that would present the results to the Board during a public meeting followed by an exploration drill test well and test results for water quality and yields. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) environmental permitting process would be pursued and the water quality would be assured to be suitable for regulatory purposes pursuant to State Department of Health Services standards. A production/supply well would be drilled, equipped with a pump, plumbed into the VOMWD's existing system, and a building would be constructed to house the pump and equipment.

As to location, **Mr. Steinpress** stated that the site selection process would be systematic and thorough after a review of all available data, with a review of sites through a set of established criteria and sub criteria. The criteria would identify whether or not there would be a sufficient volume of water from each site with a required 100 to 200 gallons a minute production to make the well economically viable.

It would also require good quality water in terms of meeting health standards avoiding the need for costly water treatment. The site would have to be feasible in terms of engineering, proximity to the transmission pipeline, power and the like, and suitable in terms of access for a drilling rig, sufficient space and not too

close to other land uses that would be incompatible with the well. There would also have to be minimal environmental impacts in terms of neighboring wells, streams, nearby wetlands or critical habitats. The cost would also be a factor to consider in the selection process.

**Mr. Steinpress** asked for public input on whether there were any other criteria that should be included in that process.

With respect to location, **Mr. Steinpress** stated that had not yet been determined. The VOMWD owned or had access to seven sites; the corporation yard, the nearby Ernie Smith Park, the fire district office, three tank sites owned by the VOMWD (Chestnut, Bolli and Temelec) and the Felder Road site that had exploratory test borings, and any other site identified as part of the process that would meet the criteria and which were found to be as favorable or more favorable than the already identified sites.

**Mr. Steinpress** stated that a matrix would be developed to judge each site by the established criteria with a rating scale, which would be the basis for the selection of the top site. He commented that the process would take some time as would the CEQA process to be prepared by the VOMWD for public comment prior to drilling a production well. Due to the lengthy process and the time required for each task, a completed well would not be possible until the end of 2007.

**Mr. Steinpress** emphasized that water was a critical issue in the Valley, the project was important, and every voice mattered.

**Director Prushko** explained that at this point in time a loss of the trunk line would leave the VOMWD with only one day of storage. The intent was not only to ensure a reliable supply of water during peak periods but also during an emergency situation. With respect to the criteria for evaluating a well, he stated that impacts to the neighborhoods were a critical factor that should be considered and included in the process.

**Mr. Steinpress** advised that the issue of neighborhoods was the number one factor to consider as shown in the presentation.

**Director Bramfitt** noted that there were different pressure zones and all the well sites seemed to be in the springs and south area. He questioned whether or not there was an operational need to expand the search for sites up the Valley. He urged the VOMWD to consider that from an operational standpoint.

**Vice President Smith** echoed that concern and noted that of all the sites proposed, none were in the upper parts of the VOMWD. As a Glen Ellen resident, he would be seriously impacted by an earthquake, for instance, since his property sat between two bridges and a reliable supply of water was a concern to him and his neighbors.

**Glen Peterson**, 1400 Felder Road, Sonoma, asked about the yield for the older wells, to which **Mr. Steinpress** noted that if the level of water in the region declined there would be a smaller section of saturated screen and yield levels would decline. With age, the screen could become encrusted, or could be degraded, and there would be less flow into the well.

**Ms. Priestaf** added that the well could corrode, could crust, or wells could collapse and be affected by earthquakes and fill in with debris. She added that the life expectancy of a well is in the ballpark of 25 years, depending on a number of factors. She stated, when asked, that wells could also be rehabilitated.

**Paul Gradolph**, Operations and Maintenance Supervisor stated that some of the VOMWD's wells were able

to be rehabilitated while others had been determined to have a potential risk for damage if there was rehabilitation.

Out of all the sites, **Mike Murphy**, 1475 Felder Road, Sonoma, questioned which site would have the least amount of private wells surrounding it.

**Vice President Smith** advised that there was no concern for a specific site at this point. The concern was for the criteria needed for the placement of a possible well. While the criteria of proximity to existing wells were important, this was the first of at least three public hearings to allow the public input into the process.

**Mr. Steinpress** clarified that one of the criteria was the number of other wells in the area that would be impacted by the proposed well.

**An unidentified resident of Sperring Road** stated that the first test impacted two wells and there were 55 wells in the Temelec area. He noted that one well pumped once had drained Felder Creek. He stated that the impacts of the vineyard wells would also have to be considered.

**Ms. Priestaff** explained that while criteria had been established, a weighting would have to be placed on the criteria to be able to identify the key issues, distributing wells out without impacting neighboring wells and the creeks. In that process, she stated that it would have to be known who else was pumping in the area given that there could be a cumulative effect.

**Mr. Steinpress** stated that the VOMWD was collecting data in that regard.

**Vice President Smith** questioned whether or not there were good records as to whether or not wells were located in the VOMWD's service area and the hydrologies involved. He questioned whether or not there were good resources to identify that information and determine how a well would affect neighboring wells. He noted that public records of the wells in the area had only recorded 10 percent of the wells in existence.

**Ms. Priestaf** stated that the first task was to pull in all of the data through the Water Well Driller's Report, which was a State requirement when drilling wells. She stated that they would check that information and identify the location of wells. When returning to the next public meeting, she noted that the wells would be identified.

In response to the question as to when the second aqueduct would be developed or when the VOMWD would be independent of the aqueduct, **Director Bramfitt** did not believe that the VOMWD would ever be independent.

**Vice President Smith**, in response to a question from the audience, added that the situation of energy production as well as water for irrigation and domestic use had been evaluated, and it had been learned that a dam was a greater concern than any well site. He stated that the idea of dams anywhere in the State was highly unlikely and unfeasible. He also noted that while the second aqueduct was being considered, it would be very costly and time consuming. The matter of who would be affected by the construction of the second aqueduct was also a concern.

**Philip Sales**, 1355 Felder Road, Sonoma, commented that he was impressed with the presentation. He suggested that this was a quantum leap from what had occurred two years ago. He commented that when the well history issue had been discussed last time there had been only a record of two wells in the Felder Road area at that time.

**Mr. Sales** referred to a map presented to the VOMWD at the last meeting and that he now presented as part of the current process. He asked whether or not the second aqueduct was in the Water Agency's five year plan.

In response, **Cordel Stillman**, Capital Projects Coordinator, Sonoma County Water Agency, stated it was not. While the Water Agency had the responsibility for the design and construction of the second aqueduct, the VOMWD and the City of Sonoma would have the responsibility to pay for the second aqueduct.

As to whether or not existing wells were sanitary sealed and up to current standards, in response to Mr. Sales, **Mr. Gradolph** stated that some wells did not have sanitary seals and the State had permitted sampling and monitoring in those cases.

**Mr. Sales** questioned what would happen if some of those existing wells started to fail in terms of quality, as to whether they would be turned off when a new well had been established.

**Mr. Kumar** noted that currently there were no plans to reduce the draw from the VOMWD's existing wells. The proposed well under discussion would be an additional well for all the reasons previously identified.

**Mr. Sales** questioned whether or not it was the intention to test all seven sites or the one site considered to be the most viable, to which **Mr. Kumar** stated that the plan was to evaluate all sites and then drill on the number one selected site.

**Rudi Calkovsky**, 1310 Sperring Road, Sonoma, explained that he had good water, although his property was surrounded by vineyards including a fairly new large vineyard. He did not know how many gallons that vineyard pumped per minute. He stated that there were other vineyards close by and he questioned how the process would affect Felder and Sperring Roads.

**Vice President Smith** stated that the VOMWD was not able to control the vineyards, although it was germane to the discussion to be knowledgeable of the large agricultural users who had large production wells to irrigate their own agricultural areas, and to be apprised of the data associated with the wells used by those vineyards.

**Mr. Calkovsky** noted that a friend on Carriger Road had indicated that the golf course was putting in two new wells, which affected his friend's well and which was a concern to his friend and to him.

**Vice President Smith** suggested that the question related to the rights of all existing well owners whether municipal, industrial or agricultural users, who installed new wells that impacted pre-existing wells, which was a criteria to include to avoid worsening an existing problem.

**Mario Pasquini**, 1435 Felder Road, Sonoma, reported that a neighbor's well had just gone dry, which was a concern that he did not want to see repeated, particularly due to the financial impacts to the property owners.

**Vice President Smith** again advised that there would be at least two more opportunities for the public to raise any concerns.

**Director Bramfitt** stated with respect to the aqueduct, that the Water Agency might not be able to secure additional supplies to deliver to the VOMWD. Not just cost, the issue was reliability of the water supply.

**Director Bramfitt** also commented that there was a challenge in the Valley with respect to the Recycled Water Project, which would include bringing water up Arnold Drive and feeding all of the vineyards with recycled water from the water treatment plant. That project would remove the pressure from the groundwater system, although he noted that there were real challenges to make that project a reality. While most challenges were financial, the public would have to call for the project, to determine how to fund it and make it happen. He asked those present to get involved in the future process of recycled water.

**Michael Murphy** asked whether or not the need for the backup wells related to the growth in population. **Mr. Steinpress** replied that the VOMWD's growth was minimal at half a percent a year. The reasons for the well related to reliability and emergency supply. A new well would be needed if there was zero growth in the VOMWD given the age of the existing wells and the potential interruption of the existing supply.

**Vice President Smith** clarified the fact that the VOMWD was separate from the City of Sonoma. The proposed well would have zero impact on the City of Sonoma.

**Vice President Smith** declared a recess from 7:27 P.M. to 7:35 P.M. to allow the room to be cleared.

The meeting resumed at 7:35 P.M. with all Directors present or excused as shown.

## **5. OPERATIONAL & COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **A. Approve Current Financial Reports for September 2005**

Motion by **Director Prushko**, seconded by **Director Bramfitt** and carried unanimously by a roll call vote to approve the monthly Financial Reports & Disbursements for the month of September 2005 in the amount of \$344,916.13.

### **B. Review/Comment on Current District Projects and Significant O & M Issues**

**Operations and Maintenance Supervisor Paul Gradolph** presented the summary review of current District projects and significant operations and maintenance issues for October, as follows:

- **Project #2855 - Glen Ellen Storage Tank:** The tank foundation had been poured, as had the retaining wall, the tank material was scheduled to be delivered on November 2, the tank crew would then start to erect the tank, and it would take 30 days for the tank to be installed at which point the interior coating would be applied. Good progress was being made.
- **Project #2892 – Agua Caliente Booster Station:** There had been a non-mandatory pre-bid meeting this date when two contractors had been present. Seven bid packages had been mailed out to contractors.
- **Project #2899 – Boyes Springs Water Mains:** The project was in the design phase with 50 percent of the drawings scheduled for staff review in mid-December.
- **Project #2900 – El Verano Area Water Mains:** The project was currently in the design phase with 50 percent of the drawings scheduled for staff review in mid-December.
- **Project #2901 – Glen Ellen Area Water Mains:** The project was currently in the design phase with 50 percent of the drawings scheduled for staff review in mid-November.

**Mr. Gradolph** added that the Meter Replacement Program was proceeding well. As to the delivery of the steel for the tank on Hill Road, in response to Vice President Smith, he noted that it would likely involve two to three total delivery days. There would be no continuous deliveries.

C. Water Source Report

There were no comments on the Water Source Report.

6. RECEIVE & FILE PRESIDENT'S AND DIRECTOR'S REPORTS OR COMMENTS

**Director Bramfitt** highlighted his and **Vice President Smith's** trip to the Geysers which had been hosted by the City of Santa Rosa with an incredible presentation on their pipeline project for the waste water treatment project.

**Vice President Smith** added that the trip to the Geysers had been very informative.

7. GENERAL MANAGER'S AND DISTRICT COUNSEL'S REPORTS

A. General Manager Report

**Mr. Kumar** stated at the request of Vice President Smith, that consultants under contract with the VOMWD had performed 225 water audits of primarily single family homes, spanning a period of one year. Currently the Water Agency was performing the audits with the help of interns. Staff planned to provide a more complete conservation report potentially at the next meeting.

8. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

- A. **Receive/Authorize:** Receive Status Report on the District's Emergency Preparedness And Authorize Staff to Provide Copies of the American Red Cross Information Brochures on Family Disaster Planning to Each of the District's Customers

**Mr. Kumar** noted that staff had been asked to provide an update on the state of the VOMWD's emergency preparedness. He reported that the VOMWD had recently completed its Emergency Response Plan as part of the federally mandated vulnerability assessment. The Emergency Response Plan had provided a standardized response and recovery protocol to prevent, minimize and mitigate injury and damage resulting from emergencies or disasters. For a better understanding of the VOMWD's emergency preparedness, he referred to the staff report where three separate water shortage situations – water supply interruption, earthquake and drought, had been described.

**Mr. Kumar** explained that one of the most telling lessons from Hurricane Katrina had been the need for individual preparedness on the part of families for at least the first 72 hours, a situation that would also apply to the VOMWD. He referred to the brochure attached to the staff report from the American Red Cross, "Your Family Disaster Supplies Kit." He requested authorization to provide a copy of the brochure to each VOMWD customer as a public service benefit at an approximate cost of \$840. He added that staff had worked out an arrangement with an outside agency to include the copy in its customer bills.

**Mr. Kumar** recommended that the VOMWD Board receive the report on the VOMWD emergency preparedness and authorize staff to provide a copy of the American Red Cross information brochure on family disaster planning to each VOMWD customer.

**Director Prushko** questioned if the Sonoma Aqueduct was lost whether or not the VOMWD ratepayers would be able to be provided water with just the District wells operating. He was advised by **Mr. Gradolph** that could not be done with the current wells.

**Vice President Smith** asked to see the location of bridges in the VOMWD service area and which bridges were carrying water lines to be able to identify areas that might be isolated due to an interruption in the aqueduct. He was concerned that Glen Ellen residents could be left on an island with a break in bridges by an earthquake or other emergency.

**Mr. Gradolph** identified areas on the map located in the Board room where VOMWD lines crossed over a creek, stream or bridge. He noted that a typical installation included a valve on both sides of a bridge which would allow breaks to be isolated. In Glen Ellen, there were a few bridges which carried water lines. In some cases portable hoses could be used to make connections to either side of the bridge. He stated that it would be valuable to use other agencies' materials, personnel and equipment in an emergency.

**Director Bramfitt** commented that the Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Committee had wrestled with a perceived need in the community to have a disaster preparedness workshop to allow local agencies to identify what was being done in that regard. He supported the VOMWD's proactivity and supported what had been proposed.

**Mr. Kumar** stated that the Sonoma Valley Hospital was considering hosting a disaster preparedness workshop involving all the local agencies.

Motion by **Director Bramfitt**, seconded by **Director Prushko**, and carried unanimously by a roll call vote to receive the report on the VOMWD emergency preparedness and authorize staff to provide a copy of the American Red Cross information brochure on family disaster planning to each of the VOMWD's customers.

- B. Review/Authorize:** Review Articles on Sonoma Valley's Water Supply and Authorize Staff to Submit Them to the Sonoma Index-Tribune for Publication

**Mr. Kumar** stated that earlier this year the VOMWD had been offered the opportunity to draft a series of essays to run in the Sonoma Index-Tribune. The draft series of articles had been included in the Board packets. Mr. Kumar thanked **Director Bramfitt** for his generous help in the preparation of the draft article series. He recommended that the Board review the article series on Sonoma Valley's water supply and authorize staff to submit them to the Sonoma Index-Tribune for publication.

**Vice President Smith** requested that the definition of the following terms be spelled out in the articles, *acre foot*, *infiltration ponds*, *tertiary treatment*, and potentially others, to better inform the general public. He also suggested that those reading the articles understand that the population increase has been very nominal with respect to the VOMWD.

Motion by **Director Prushko**, seconded by **Director Bramfitt**, and carried unanimously by a voice vote, the VOMWD Board reviewed the article series on Sonoma Valley's water supply and authorized staff to



submit them to the Sonoma Index-Tribune for publication, with the articles to clearly define certain terms and abbreviations to better inform the general public.

- C. Discuss/Approve:** Task Order No. 05-2903-01 to Brelje & Race in the Amount of \$51,500 to Update the District's Master Water Plan and Hydraulic Model

**Mr. Kumar** stated that the VOMWD's existing Master Water Plan and Hydraulic Model had been prepared by Brelje & Race in 1998. It was desirable that the current plan and model be updated to incorporate all of the facilities that had been constructed since the adoption of the plan as well as to identify and prioritize the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) for the next eight to ten years.

**Mr. Kumar** explained that most of the infrastructure improvements identified in the current plan had been or would be completed before the end of the VOMWD's current five-year CIP. As to the VOMWD's efforts to locate a new water well, an updated hydraulic model would be beneficial since the location of the well could affect the VOMWD system hydraulics and in turn the system hydraulics might determine design criteria for the new well.

**Mr. Kumar** recommended that the Board adopt Resolution No. 051102 authorizing budgetary adjustments to the District's FY 2005-06 Final Budget in the amount of \$51,500 and approve Task Order No. 05-2903-01, to Brelje & Race in the amount of \$51,500 to update the District's Master Water Plan and Hydraulic Model.

Motion by **Director Bramfitt**, seconded by **Director Prushko** and carried unanimously by a roll call vote to adopt Resolution No. 051102 authorizing budgetary adjustments to the District's FY 2005-06 Final Budget in the amount of \$51,500, and approved Task Order No. 05-2903-01, to Brelje & Race in the amount of \$51,500 to update the District's Master Water Plan and Hydraulic Model.

- D. Discuss/Approve:** 1) Task Order No. 05-2855-01 to Winzler and Kelly for a Not-to-Exceed Amount of \$37,360 to Provide Construction Observation and Inspection Services for the Glen Ellen Storage Tank and 2) Change Order No. 3 in the Amount of \$11,639 to North Bay Construction, Inc. for Replacement of Gate Valves with Butterfly Valves

**Mr. Kumar** explained that the Board had awarded the engineering and design contract for the Hill Road storage tank to Winzler & Kelly for \$102,000. The design engineering proposal for services at that time had not included construction inspection services. Staff was satisfied with the firm's performance on past and current projects.

There was also a change order from North Bay Construction for \$11,639 to replace 8-inch motorized gate valves at the tank site to butterfly valves and add a one inch air release valve, which had not been in the original design. Since it had not been included in the design, the VOMWD would be credited \$5,000 from Winzler & Kelly to be applied to the earlier task order.

**Mr. Kumar** recommended that the Board approve Task Order 05-2855-01 to Winzler and Kelly in a not to exceed amount of \$37,360 to provide construction observation and inspection services for the Glen Ellen Storage Tank and 2) Change Order No. 3 in the amount of \$11,639 for North Bay Construction, Inc.

**Director Prushko** inquired of staff if the use of butterfly valves would be better than a motorized gate valve, to which **Mr. Gradolph** responded that the valves would be motorized regardless of gate or butterfly valves. The gate valves did not fit the installation.

**Director Bramfitt** questioned whether or not that could have been reasonably expected in the original engineering design.

**Mr. Kumar** advised that issue had been raised which was the reason the VOMWD would receive a \$5,000 credit from Winzler & Kelly.

On motion by **Director Prushko**, seconded by **Director Bramfitt**, and carried unanimously by a roll call vote to approve Task Order 05-2855-01 to Winzler and Kelly not to exceed amount of \$37,360 to provide construction observation and inspection services for the Glen Ellen Storage Tank and 2) Change Order No. 3 in the amount of \$11,639 for North Bay Construction, Inc.

**E. Discuss/Authorize:** Authorize Staff to Forward Input from a District Ratepayer to the Sonoma County Water Agency for Inclusion as a Formal Comment that Should be Addressed in the Sonoma Valley Recycled Water Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

**Mr. Kumar** explained that at the last Board meeting **Director Prushko** had passed along the comments from a VOMWD ratepayer regarding the Sonoma County Recycled Water Project to consider installing additional pipeline for sewer in the same trench planned for the Recycled Water Project. He had recommended that the input from the ratepayer be forwarded to the Water Agency for inclusion as a formal comment that should be addressed in the EIR for the project.

**Director Prushko** recommended that the pipeline from the sewer plant that was to be dug all the way up to the Hanna Center to be in the same encroachment, and installing a sewer line would be a long term benefit. Since the entire west side of the Valley needed sewer systems, he recommended that since there would be an encroachment associated with the Recycled Water Project, that encroachment could also be used for a sewer line. He questioned whether or not feedback would be provided on the ratepayer's comment.

**Cordel Stillman**, Capital Projects Coordinator, Sonoma County Water Agency, explained in response to **Director Prushko** that the current process was an early step in the preparation of the EIR. The comment would be passed on and considered as part of the EIR process. He reiterated that the process was at the scoping stage where suggestions were being taken on pipeline routes and the like. The suggestion would be submitted to the decision makers at the Water Agency to determine whether or not it was a feasible alternative given the goals of the project.

**Director Prushko** emphasized the situation where there was an inadequate sewer system and where VOMWD constituents who were provided with potable water had no say in the sewer system.

**Mr. Stillman** reiterated that the comment would be considered as part of the project.

In response to **Vice President Smith** as to any separation requirements between a sewer line and a recycled water line, **Mr. Stillman** reported that there were no separation requirements for those two pipelines, although it was possible that if one of the lines were to break, as a result of an earthquake as an example, it could impact the other pipeline.

**Director Prushko** did not see that as a problem due to the construction process and need for future repairs.

**Vice President Smith** clarified that the comment would be forwarded to the Water Agency at the request of a ratepayer but not as an input from the VOMWD Board.

On motion by **Director Prushko**, seconded by **Director Bramfitt**, and carried unanimously by a voice vote to authorize staff to forward input from a District ratepayer to the Sonoma County Water Agency for inclusion as a formal comment that should be addressed in the Sonoma Valley Recycled Water Project Environmental Impact Report.

**9. CLOSED SESSION**

There was no Closed Session.

**10. RECONVENE INTO OPEN SESSION**

There was no Closed Session.

**11. REQUEST FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

There were no requests for future agenda items.

**12. ADJOURNMENT**

**Vice President Smith** adjourned the meeting at 8:24 P.M. The next scheduled meeting is a regular meeting on December 6, 2005 at 6:30 P.M.

---

Shari Walk, Deputy Board Secretary