

NEVADA IRRIGATION DISTRICT

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

MINUTES

July 28, 2010

The Board of Directors of the Nevada Irrigation District convened in regular session at the District's main office located at 1036 W. Main Street, Grass Valley, on the 28th day of July, 2010 at 9:00 a.m.

Present were W. Scott Miller, President; Nancy Weber, Vice-President; John H. Drew, Jim Bachman and Nick Wilcox, Directors.

Staff members present included Ron Nelson, General Manager; Tim Crough, Assistant General Manager; Marie G. Owens, Finance Manager/Treasurer; John Kirk, Operations and Maintenance Manager; Gary King, Chief Engineer; Yvonne DuBose, Human Resources Manager; Jeff Meith, District Counsel; Anthony Soares, District Counsel; and Lisa Francis Tassone, Board Secretary.

TREASURER'S QUARTERLY REPORT OF INVESTMENTS

Accepted the Treasurer's Quarterly Report of Investments for filing as of March 31, 2010 and June 30, 2010. M/S/C Weber/Drew

SOUTH SUTTER WATER DISTRICT - Reconnaissance Study for Water and Power Development on the Bear River (Garden Bar)

Ron Nelson, General Manager, stated that a briefing will be provided to the Board by representatives of South Sutter Water District (SSWD) regarding a proposed project. This will be an opportunity for the Board members to hear what SSWD is proposing.

Lyndel Melton, RMC Water and Environment (South Sutter Water District's Consultant), stated that SSWD's proposed project is commonly known as the Garden Bar project. He clarified that the SSWD is not proposing a project just yet, and he will be addressing this later in the presentation.

History of Bear River / Garden Bar Studies:

- First identified in 1950's, California Department of Public Works
- Numerous studies through 1990's
 - Flood Protection

July 28, 2010

- Water Supply
- Hydro Power
- South Sutter Water District reviewing and updating previous work to determine feasibility

Mr. Melton explained that during the 1980's, feasibility studies were completed and a license for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) was prepared in addition to an application to the State Board for water rights. The project did not move forward for a variety of reasons, and was "dropped" in the early 1990's. SSWD selected RMC as their consultant to review the work that had been done previously and update the information in light of what is occurring in today's environmental, economic water supply "world" and to analyze the available options.

Potential Location of Garden Bar Reservoir:

- Bear River in Placer and Nevada Counties (approximate location: high water level of the existing Camp Far West Reservoir)
- Potential for 100,000+ acre feet of new yield (water spilling through Camp Far West Reservoir)

SSWD has been looking at different reservoir sizes – 250,000 to 260,000 acre feet capacity is as large a reservoir that is being reviewed. Much smaller reservoirs are also being evaluated.

President Miller asked if the proposed project is in the boundaries of Nevada Irrigation District.

Staff confirmed that the project is within Nevada Irrigation District's boundaries.

Why Undertake the Garden Bar Reconnaissance Study?

- South Sutter Water District not "full service"
 - Supplies 30 to 35 percent of landowners' water needs
 - Remainder comes from landowner wells
- South Sutter Water District Supply
 - Camp Far West Reservoir
 - Nevada Irrigation District Transfers – potential for loss of contract supply
- Future Issues Could Impact Supply
 - Camp Far West hydroelectric relicensing

The original reason for the project was that the groundwater was being over pumped and SSWD needed additional supply.

SSWD is currently capturing water at Camp Far West and diverting water to agricultural lands within SSWD. Other water remains in the river for in-stream flows.

Director Wilcox asked if there are any indications that the groundwater basin is currently in overdraft, or if water levels have recovered.

July 28, 2010

Mr. Melton stated that every indication that he has is that SSWD is not in an overdraft circumstance at this time in the SSWD portion of the basin, and that the water levels have recovered.

Director Wilcox asked that if that is the case, how will SSWD's proposed project address this issue.

Mr. Melton explained that SSWD is meeting the balance of surface and groundwater and maintaining a balanced basin through use of water coming from Camp Far West in addition to water received in transfer from Nevada Irrigation District. In the future, SSWD might not receive the transfer from Nevada Irrigation District (10,000 acre feet), and may lose about 10,000 acre feet through FERC relicensing. Currently, SSWD delivers about 100,000 to 120,000 acre feet of surface water each year. There is the potential of losing 20 percent of this supply. To make up the loss in supply, SSWD is looking at additional water off the Bear River as one option.

Director Wilcox stated that the availability of the water from Nevada Irrigation District is somewhat dependent on Pacific Gas & Electric's (PG&E) hydrologic and operational conditions, because the water is actually PG&E's water. The water transfer contract with South Sutter Water expires in 2013 because that is when the contract between the Nevada Irrigation District and PG&E expires.

Director Weber stated that in the Appeal Democrat newspaper on July 6, 2010, there was an article stating that SSWD had received approval from the Department of Water Resources for a transfer of 10,000 acre feet of water. There was no mention of what that water was sold for. She is curious why SSWD has the extra water to sell and the difference between the price that Nevada Irrigation District sells water to SSWD and what SSWD might sell the water for in the future. She has heard that SSWD is selling the water for \$250 per acre foot (she believes the Nevada Irrigation District sells the water to SSWD for \$25 per acre foot).

Mr. Melton stated that he is not a party to the agreements and does not know what the price is. He stated that SSWD is reviewing the capital investments they will need to make (i.e. spillway modifications required by FERC, FERC relicensing issues, etc.). SSWD is trying to balance water supply (availability and reliability and groundwater basin issues, etc.) with the cash flow requirements.

Scope of Reconnaissance Study:

- Identification of potential facilities
- Hydrologic analyses
- Preliminary operations analyses
- Economic analysis
- Identification of potential environmental issues
- Identification of potential permitting issues

July 28, 2010

Reconnaissance Study Schedule:

- Draft Feasibility Study – Late 2010
- Discussion regarding next steps – First Quarter of 2011
 - Pursue further or drop?
 - Scale and scope?
 - Participants?

In response to President Miller's question regarding SSWD having criteria in which they base the feasibility of their proposed project, Mr. Melton stated that the project would have to break even because the bonds would need to be paid. He could not see the project going forward if water was to be sold for \$1,000 per acre foot. The agriculture interests could not pay this amount. He referenced a regional water project – the Freeport Project, which is a joint project between Sacramento area interests and East Bay Municipal Utility District's interests. The cost of water for the Sacramento area interests is approximately \$300 to \$350 per acre foot.

Mr. Melton reiterated that SSWD is not proposing to build a facility yet. If SSWD reaches a point where they would like to build a facility, they will be communicating with the Nevada Irrigation District.

Director Weber asked what the approximate cost would be to build a dam.

Mr. Melton stated that the approximate cost would be \$300 million.

Director Weber asked if SSWD considered having Nevada Irrigation District as a participant in SSWD's proposed project.

Mr. Melton answered in the affirmative. SSWD spoke with Nevada Irrigation District's General Manager at a concept level, and met with a number of greater area agencies. The option of partnership needs "to be on the table."

Director Weber stated that she understands that in the State Water Bond (now shelved for the 2012 election), that there was potential money to fund SSWD's proposed project.

Mr. Melton stated that is not aware of any specifics in the Water Bond that identifies the proposed project. His understanding is that there is money for storage projects. He suspects that the first priority of the Department of Water Resources is the Sites Reservoir Project in addition to reservoir projects on the San Joaquin River.

Discussion ensued regarding funding from an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP). SSWD has approached the Cosumnes, American, Bear and Yuba (CABY) IRWMP and the Sacramento Valley IRWMP to explore funding options. SSWD is "a long way" from having a project defined enough to be considered for funding.

Mr. Melton continued his presentation:

July 28, 2010

Garden Bar Project Partners for Reconnaissance Level Study:

- South Sutter Water District – Lead Agency
- City of Napa
- Palmdale Water District
- Castaic Lake Water Agency
- San Bernardino Municipal Water District
- Numerous local agencies contacted to determine interest prior to initiation of study

Disclaimer:

Consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Reconnaissance Study participants, including South Sutter Water District, have made no determinations or commitments to move forward with any water development project. No such determinations or commitments can or will be made until environmental review has been completed in accordance with CEQA and other applicable law.

Director Wilcox stated that he is aware that the former Garden Bar project pulled water rights applications from the State Water Board. He asked if these applications have been abandoned.

Mr. Melton stated that this is correct.

Director Wilcox stated that in terms of the proposed project, he has heard that SSWD might be trying to pursue pre-1914 water rights.

Mr. Melton stated that he has never heard a comment about pre-1914 water rights relative to SSWD's proposed project. He added that it would be hard to imagine how this would work.

Director Wilcox agreed. In terms of pursuing additional water rights for the proposed project, he asked at what point SSWD would file applications for water rights.

Mr. Melton stated that applications for water rights would be submitted after a feasibility study. He explained that SSWD abandoned previous applications due to the cost. Just to file an application is an expensive proposition. He does not believe that SSWD is interested in spending money until they determine the feasibility of the project. The SSWD Board of Directors has made it very clear that SSWD would hold the water rights to the project; otherwise they would not allow the project to proceed. This would be ameliorated if SSWD would be working with Nevada Irrigation District.

Director Wilcox stated that he would assume that SSWD's partner agencies would in effect seek long term contracts for the transfer of water.

Mr. Melton concurred.

July 28, 2010

Director Wilcox stated that all of the partnering agencies are downstream from the Delta, even the City of Napa, in a hydrologic sense. There are a number of uncertainties with respect to diversion of water from the Delta.

Mr. Melton stated that there is no assurance that the partnering agencies will receive the water they contracted for from the Delta. The agencies have asked Mr. Melton to indicate how much water might be available and what the water might cost north of the Delta.

Mr. Melton stated that after the feasibility study is completed, it would be necessary to contact local agencies so they are aware of the opportunities to more effectively use the water supplies when they are made available.

President Miller stated that Director Wilcox has been an advocate for Nevada Irrigation District marketing water. President Miller is not advocating the marketing of water, but the partnership would be a mechanism for the District to do so. He asked how the water that spills at Camp Far West is diverted before it reaches the Delta.

Mr. Melton explained that the water that spills at Camp Far West flows down the Bear River to the Feather River to the Sacramento River to the Delta.

Director Wilcox stated that in terms of water availability, he is aware that SSWD has a minimum 25 cubic feet per second by-pass flow at Camp Far West Reservoir. He asked if the by-pass flow is included in the calculation of 100,000 acre feet of spill.

Mr. Melton stated that the by-pass flow is not included in the 100,000 acre feet calculation.

Director Wilcox asked if the 100,000 acre feet of spill is an estimate based on a detailed hydrologic study. He would be surprised that there is that much additional yield in the Bear River.

Mr. Melton stated that the calculation is based on a detailed hydrologic study. On an average annual basis, this water is available.

President Miller asked if Mr. Melton can provide the results of his study to the Nevada Irrigation District.

Mr. Melton answered in the affirmative and offered to return to address the Board to answer any questions the Board may have.

Virginia Moran, Biologist, stated that Mr. Melton did not mention climate change in his presentation. She recently attended a conference that indicated the snowpack is predicted to be gone in 30 to 50 years. She asked how SSWD would fill the reservoir for their proposed project if the snowpack will be gone. She hopes that climate change will be included in the feasibility study.

July 28, 2010

Ms. Moran stated that she considers this “a classic water grab.” She would like to know where the County’s Board of Supervisors fit into this process. The water is going to Napa and Southern California. She stated that there is significant opposition to the proposed project. There was a quote in the Appeal Democrat that the opposition was being “overblown.” She stated that the opposition is not being overblown and that the public will be questioning all future issues.

Mr. Melton explained that issues associated with climate change and the implications associated with climate change will be evaluated. The run-off that has been evaluated so far is non-snow related, but rain related. Recently, his firm completed a similar analysis of climate change implications on the Mokelumne River.

Allan Eberhart stated that he would like to emphasize that SSWD has been proceeding with plans for the proposed project on a “pretty low profile” basis. They have put a cloud on the title of a number of individual properties, and have put a cloud on the actions of the Land Trusts in both Placer and Nevada counties. It is important for SSWD to understand the impact of their proposal.

Mr. Eberhart stated that for the last two years, SSWD has transferred 10,000 acre feet of water to Southern California. They have an application before the Water Board this year to transfer another 10,000 acre feet. Back in March 2007, RMC presented a prospectus that estimated the dam would cost \$500 million and that firm yield was estimated at \$370 per acre feet. This is inconceivable to him that this is water for agriculture purposes. The proposed project is a wheeling project of area of origin water to Southern California. He did not hear in the presentation any information that would change his impression.

Mr. Eberhart noticed that the American Canyon agency was not included as a partner agency. He asked if they were dropped from the partnership. He reminded the Board that the partnering agencies have already paid approximately \$200,000 each towards the project study.

Mr. Melton explained that the American Canyon agency is a participant but are “tucked under” the City of Napa. They are not a signatory to the agreement, but are paying a portion of the share via the City of Napa. He greatly appreciates the implications on landowners and the SSWD Board is sensitive to these implications.

With regard to water transfers, Mr. Melton is not involved with water transfers made by SSWD. The limited information that he has is that SSWD has made three transfers in their history. Last year, they attempted to transfer 10,000 acre feet, but the water transfer was less (he does not know the exact details). Approximately 10,000 acre feet are being proposed as a water transfer this year to who he believes is the State Water Contractors.

July 28, 2010

President Miller asked if the information on SSWD's transfers will be included in RMC's study.

Mr. Melton had not anticipated including this information in the study.

Director Wilcox stated that in order to transfer water, it must be shown that the water is coming from storage or the water is being generated from fallowing crops. Alternatively, the water transfers can be conjunctive use transfers. In any case, the transfers have to be real water transfers. He asked how SSWD is making these transfers.

Mr. Melton stated that he understands the question, but does not know the specifics of the transfers.

Tyrone Gorre, property owner along the Bear River, stated that on his deed it states that South Yuba Water District purchased the water rights that Nevada Irrigation District accesses its dam. His issue with public access is very valid, and this project makes his issue more of an "example." He is asking for fencing, and this is a small pittance. It relates to the proposed project "very significantly."

Bill Trabucco, rancher in Nevada County, stated that it seems inconsistent that SSWD is transferring water at the same time they are complaining about overdraft in their own venue.

Mr. Trabucco asked if SSWD is aware that significant parts of the area that will be inundated and damaged by the dam are under a conservation easement or will potentially be under a conservation easement. The area is an incredibly historical area, not only for the community, but the Native American community.

Mr. Melton clarified that SSWD is currently not in an overdraft circumstance. They have a balanced basin. He is aware that there are lands upstream that are in trusts and that there are historic artifacts. At the present time, these implications will be included in the study.

David Palley, Nevada County resident, asked if there will be any recreation associated with the proposed project.

Mr. Melton stated that actual decisions are still in the preliminary stage. The thought is that the reservoir might enhance the recreational benefits of Camp Far West.

Director Wilcox stated that the previous Garden Bar project was conceived as a pump storage facility to produce peak power. He asked if that would be the concept for the new project.

Mr. Melton stated that pump storage is not in the equation. Hydropower would be a small scale facility (20 to 25 megawatt range).

July 28, 2010

Linda Chaplin, Nevada County resident, asked if there is anything in the study area that would trigger National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Mr. Melton answered in the affirmative because a FERC license would be required. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) will also be triggered by the water rights application.

MINUTES – June 23, 2010 Meeting

Approved the Minutes of the Board of Directors' meeting of June 23, 2010, as amended. M/S/C Wilcox/Drew

WARRANTS

Approved the following warrants: Yuba-Bear Revolving Fund Nos. 22870 through 22937, inclusive; General Fund Revolving Account Nos. 50752 through 51143; Recreation Fund Nos. 2382 through 2457, inclusive; and Payroll Direct Deposit and Warrant Nos. 54664 through 55188, inclusive. M/S/C Weber/Drew

President Miller stated that the District continues to spend money for Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) physicals. The employees receive health benefits, and these benefits should be used for the DMV physicals.

Director Weber suggested that this matter be placed on the Administrative Practices Committee agenda. President Miller directed Staff to place this matter on the September meeting agenda.

Tim Crough, Assistant General Manager, pointed out that this matter would be a meet and confer issue with the employee bargaining groups.

2010-2011 ASSESSMENT RATE – (Res. 2010-49)

Marie G. Owens, Finance Manager/Treasurer, asked the Board to consider adopting Resolution No. 2010-49. The assessment rate for 2010/2011 will be increased to \$.0023 per \$100 of assessed value from \$.0021 per \$100 of assessed value. The change represents a 10 percent increase due to the fact that the land assessed values decreased 10 percent.

Director Wilcox expressed concern about the 10 percent drop in property values and the loss of revenue to the District.

Ms. Owens stated that the assessment being discussed at this time is for the land assessed value. Approximately \$3.5 million in property taxes is generated from the land assessed value.

Adopted Resolution No. 2010-49 (Fixing the Rate of Money to be Raised by Assessments, 2010-2011, and Determining the Assessment Rate for Voter

July 28, 2010

Approved Debt Service) setting the assessment rate at \$0.0023 per \$100 of assessable property (land only) within the District. M/S/C Wilcox/Weber

Director Weber pointed out that 70.8 percent of the tax is paid for by Nevada County residents and 29.2 percent of the tax is paid for by Placer County residents. Approximately 2/3 of the District's water goes to Placer County.

Director Drew stated that conversely, 87.3 percent of treated water is served to Nevada County residents.

PERSONNEL – Water Efficiency Technician I/II Job Description

John Kirk, Operations and Maintenance Manager, presented a recommendation from the Administrative Practices Committee to approve the job description for the Water Efficiency Technician I/II position (a new position). The description was developed by Don Wight, former Operations Manager, Mr. Kirk and Bryce Consulting. The position will report directly to the Operations and Maintenance Manager.

Mr. Kirk stated that the Water Rates Committee has agreed to advance a recommendation to the Administrative Practices Committee to consider a budget amendment in order to add this position to current staffing in 2010.

Director Weber stated that it is evident that under Proposition 84, there is grant money available. The District cannot apply for these grants because the District does not meet the State requirement for having the Water Efficiency Technician on staff.

Ron Nelson, General Manager, added that having the Water Efficiency Technician on Staff is a step towards complying with Proposition 84 funding.

Approved job description for the Water Efficiency Technician I/II as a new regular full-time position. M/S/C Wilcox/Weber

CEMENT HILL WATER SUPPLY PROJECT – Public Hearing (Res. No. 2010-47)

Matthew Crowe, Senior Right-of-Way Agent, stated that the easement acquisition is for Assessor's Parcel Number 32-650-11 owned by Brian C. Houck and Crystal L. Clune. Mr. Crowe explained to the Board the findings:

Resolution of Necessity (RON) Findings:

- 1) Public interest and necessity require construction of the project
- 2) The project is planned or located in the manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury
- 3) The property interests sought to be acquired are necessary for the project
- 4) A written offer was made to compensate owner for easement(s) acquisition

Doug Roderick, Senior Associate Engineer, provided the following presentation:

July 28, 2010

Cement Hill Water Supply Project:

- Developed over the past decade
- District Board approved – CEQA (June 27, 2007)
- Community Facilities District Formation Election (December 11, 2007)
- Public Meetings:
 - February 2 and September 18, 2008
 - January 8 and October 28, 2009

Project Scope and Purpose:

- Water mains on North Bloomfield Road, Airport Road, Cement Hill Road, Augustine Road and several smaller roads
- 58,000 lineal feet of pipe
- Booster pump station
- 1,000,000 gallon storage tank at an elevation of 3,250 feet
- 2 pressure reducing stations
- Treated water service for over 200 CFD properties
- 55 new fire hydrants
- Convert 24 parcels currently served with irrigation water

Easement Area:

- Assessor's Parcel Number 32-650-11
- Parcel Size: 10 acres
- Easement Area: 4,472 square feet
- No trees to be removed

Director Weber stated that she attended a meeting with Staff and the residents of Daisy Blue Mine Road. Extensive efforts were made on Mr. Roderick's part and the contractor's part to work with the residents.

Mr. Crowe continued the presentation by providing the following information:

Acquisition Activities:

- Meetings:
 - January 8, 2010 – Appraisal and Site Inspection
 - April 19, 2010
 - May 14, 2010
- Contacts:
 - March 31, 2010 – First Written Offer
 - April 7, 2010 – Contact Attempt
 - April 12, 2010 – Contact Attempt
 - April 16, 2010 – Contact Attempt
 - April 20, 2010 – Contact Attempt
 - April 28, 2010 – Contact Attempt
 - May 11, 2010 – Discussion
 - July 1, 2010 – Notice of Intent mailed
 - July 13, 2010 – Notice of Resolution of Necessity hearing scheduled

July 28, 2010

Current Status:

- One owner is cooperative and has agreed to grant easement
- The other owner has been mostly non-responsive and has declined to grant easement
- Without the participation of the second owner, Staff is at an impasse
- No objections were raised regarding the project or the easement

Director Weber stated that the list of contacts is usually provided to the Board in the agenda packet. This time they were not, and she requested that in the future, Staff include this information in the packet.

President Miller opened the public hearing.

Hearing no testimony, President Miller closed the public hearing.

Adopted Resolution No. 2010-47 (Declaring Necessity and Authorizing Eminent Domain Proceedings for the Acquisition of Real Property for a Public Project known as Cement Hill Water Supply Project on Nevada County Assessor's Parcel No. 32-650-11, owned by Brian C. Houck and Crystal L. Clune). M/S/C Wilcox/Weber

LOWER CASCADE CANAL / BANNER CASCADE PIPELINE PROJECT – Public Hearing (Res. No. 2010-48)

Matthew Crowe, Senior Right-of-Way Agent, stated that the easement acquisition is for Assessor's Parcel Number 39-080-17 owned by Jim and Ann Chambers who are in attendance today. On July 26, 2010, Staff has received from Mr. and Mrs. Chambers a counter proposal to the District's revised offer. Staff is reviewing the proposal, but would like to request that the hearing take place at this time, and after the hearing, continue this matter to the Board of Directors' meeting of August 11, 2010.

Mr. Crowe provided the following information:

Resolution of Necessity (RON) Findings:

- 1) Public interest and necessity require construction of the project
- 2) The project is planned or located in the manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury
- 3) The property interests sought to be acquired are necessary for the project
- 4) A written offer was made to compensate owner for easement(s) acquisition

Brian Powell, Senior Associate Engineer, provided the following information:

Proposed Project Overview:

- Goal – To relieve Lower Cascade Canal pressure and provide reliable supply to Loma Rica and E. George Water Treatment Plants
- Means – Connect raw water pipeline to end of Cascade lower bench; replace Clipper Creek Siphon; install pipeline on Wings of Morning Drive, Banner Lava

July 28, 2010

Cap Road, Idaho Maryland Road and Lee Lane to Loma Rica Water Treatment Plant; then continuing across Nevada County Airport, Madrone Forest Drive, Red Gate Road, Banner Lava Cap Road to E. George Water Treatment Plant

- Design – Proposed pipeline alignment mostly within existing roadways minimizes costs, minimizes environmental impact, provides treated water access for parcel owners, allows for the installation of fire hydrants along the entire 5.5 mile path and requires 65 right-of-way easement acquisitions

Public Meetings:

- July 24, 2008 – Public Workshop for 10 percent design
- September 16, 2008 – Invitation Letter to meet for one-on-one meeting
- January 15, 2009 – Public Workshop for 50 percent design
- May 19, 2009 – Public Workshop for 80 percent design
- September 10, 2009 – Invitation letter to meet and discuss Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) specification
- April 21, 2010 – Introduce Teichert Construction – questions/answers

Mr. Powell reported that construction on the Project has started. Approximately 4,000 linear feet of 36-inch ductile iron pipe has been installed across the Nevada County Airport property and along Madrone Forest Drive.

Easement Area:

- Assessor's Parcel Number 39-080-17
- Parcel Size: 13.24 +/- acres
- Easement Area: 4,792 +/- square feet
- Temporary Construction Easement: 3,897 +/- square feet

Due to the proximity to the Chambers' home, the District will be protecting about 11 trees. There are an additional four trees in the temporary construction easement that were determined to be removed for construction. Staff is going to reevaluate to see if there is any way the trees can remain.

Mr. Powell stated that traffic detours will be put into place so that residents can enter or leave the area. In addition, during construction, base rock will be placed on the roadway and watering will occur for dust control throughout the Project.

Mr. Crowe continued his portion of the presentation:

Easement Acquisition Review:

- Appraisal inspection – May 21, 2009
- First Written Offer – October 7, 2009
- Received copy of owners' second appraisal – December 22, 2009
- Notice of Intent mailed to owner – February 2, 2010
- Revised Offer – July 9, 2010

July 28, 2010

Acquisition Activity:

- September 11, 2009 – Discussion
- September 15, 2009 – Correspondence
- September 18, 2009 – Discussion
- October 6, 2009 – Discussion
- October 7, 2009 – First Written Offer
- October 7, 2009 – Discussion
- October 15, 2009 – Correspondence
- October 27, 2009 – Discussion
- November 10, 2009 – Discussion
- November 11, 2009 – Correspondence
- November 17, 2009 – Correspondence
- January 26, 2010 – Correspondence
- February 3, 2010 – Correspondence
- February 9, 2010 – Correspondence
- March 3, 2010 – Meeting at property with Director Weber, Gary King, Brian Powell and Matthew Crowe and discussion with Wings of Morning Group
- July 9, 2010 – Revised offer
- July 13, 2010 – Conference call with Gary King, Brian Powell and Matthew Crowe
- July 14, 2010 – Correspondence
- July 15, 2010 – Discussion
- July 19, 2010 – Correspondence

Current Acquisition Status:

- Owners' counter offer received July 26, 2010
- Staff to review counter proposal
- Apparent impasse regarding compensation
- Staff recommends that Board continue consideration on Resolution of Necessity on proposed easements affecting Assessor's Parcel No. 39-080-17 until August 11, 2010 Board of Directors' meeting

Director Weber stated that this pipeline is a transmission line to take water elsewhere. It has only been through potential litigation and settlement that the treated water line is available. She has been opposed to the route through the Wings of Morning neighborhood because of the devastation. She is very uncomfortable with this situation.

President Miller opened the public hearing.

Ann Chambers, property owner, stated that when she and her husband purchased their property, Mr. Chambers came into the District to ask if the District was ever planning on having treated water on Wings of Morning Drive. Staff stated that the District has no intention of bringing water down that road. They purchased property in a forest because that is what they wanted. They used to live on La Barr Meadows Road and she knows what it is like to have a house reach 100 degrees in the summer. The home they live in now does not have air conditioning because they do not need it. She loves

July 28, 2010

the trees for this purpose. They purchased the property and sold their home on La Barr Meadows Road. While their purchase was in escrow, they received an invitation to a District meeting regarding the Lower Cascade Canal / Banner Cascade Pipeline Project. They were told at this meeting that this Project was in the works for a number of years. So, automatically, her defenses have gone up. They live in a house on a hill that had to be built close to the road. If there is a problem with the pipe, it will be a disaster for the Chambers. They know these pipes have problems, because on La Barr Meadows Road, she woke up many mornings without water because the pipe broke.

Ms. Chambers stated that their home is the second closest home to the Project. She believes they are more impacted than anyone else in the Project. They have asked to keep the construction "narrow." They have never said "Don't do the Project." They understand the need for the Project.

Ms. Chambers stated that the trees being removed on their property and the trees being removed on the neighbor's property impact the Chambers' property. For every tree that will be removed, a tree will be replaced, and she is too old – she will never see the trees when they grow.

When the Chambers received their initial offer, it was \$700. This is like two cords of wood. This is unreasonable.

Jim Chambers, property owner, stated that in February 2002, they attended the District's meeting at the Miner's Foundry. They were told that this Project was going to be a 40 foot swath through the forest, and that the District would use eminent domain if they needed to. They have put in hundreds of hours attending meetings, workshops and public hearings. They submitted comments on both versions of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). In 2007, they asked the Board to use the EIR consultant's recommendation to run the Project down Banner Lava Cap Road which had the least environmental impact. The Board at that time chose to use Wings of Morning instead primarily to save \$17 million. Through this whole process, they have felt like there has been a gun to their heads of eminent domain, because the District has the power to use their road whether the residents want the Project or not. Now, Staff is asking the Board to cock the trigger on that gun and release the safety.

Mr. Chambers stated that in March 2008, they voluntarily granted the District a right of entry for testing and surveying. In May 2009, they were visited by Bender Rosenthal for an appraisal. The representative was a real estate analyst and she was accompanied by an assistant. This was their first time visiting Nevada County and they were not familiar with the area at all. They had to be shown what poison oak was because they had been warned about it. The Chambers did not hear anything about their appraisal until October 2009 when they received the first offer. The document was a waiver valuation and was unsigned, and they had no idea whose opinion the waiver valuation reflected or what the qualifications or licensing is, or the reasoning/validity behind it. The offer of \$700 was insulting for all of the disruption and long term damage that would occur to their property. The most insulting part is that the District offered them \$1 for

July 28, 2010

the portion that was under the road. The neighbors got together and retained Allan Haley, a local property attorney. Mr. Haley recommended that the neighbors obtain independent appraisals. Mr. Chambers learned that Bender Rosenthal was known for working with public agencies and mass producing low-ball estimates of property values.

In November 2009, they engaged Kenneth McVay (sp?) to conduct an independent appraisal. He is licensed by the State as a General Real Estate Appraiser and Real Estate Broker, and is a Member of the Appraisal Institute. He is a Senior Right-of-Way agent, accredited by the International Right-of-Way Association and he has an Easement Valuation Certification from the Appraisal Institute. He has worked with El Dorado Irrigation District and Placer County Water Agency. In December 2009, the Chambers received his appraisal. Interestingly, the appraisal for the value of the property was \$105,000 less for the parcel as a whole than Bender Rosenthal's waiver valuation. This calculates to \$.45 cents per square foot versus \$.63 (Bender Rosenthal's waiver valuation). However, Mr. Chambers stated that his appraiser stated that the District should pay the same amount for the property under the road as the rest of the easement, and that the District should pay for the trees that will be removed. The District is only willing to pay for the four trees in the temporary construction easement. He also said that there are severance damages. In other words, after the Project is completed, the rest of the Chambers' property will suffer from the results of this Project (loss of tree cover, the graded ground, etc.). The District paid \$3,700 for the second appraisal. The second appraisal was rounded up to \$15,000, and this is what the Chambers submitted to the District as their first counter offer in December 2009. In January 2010, they worked with other neighbors to revise the language in the agreement. The Chambers were in New Zealand for three months and they were working with a 21 hour time difference and faulty e-mail, so it took longer than they had hoped. In March 2010, they met with District Staff and the District finally responded to the Chambers' offer in July 2010. The District increased their offer to \$1,274. The Chambers responded with a second counter offer and reduced their price to \$14,531 to correct a misunderstanding about an arborist report, and made some minor changes to the documents. The Chambers have signed the counter offer, and the District can accept this offer today and they will have their easement.

Mr. Chambers stated that in their cover letter, they proposed another alternative. The Chambers stated that they would grant the District an easement under the existing road for \$2,800 provided the District did not remove any trees from the Chambers' property or their neighbor's property within their boundary lines. This would be their preferred solution to this issue. The Chambers are not looking to "make a bunch of money" but if the destruction is to occur, they want to be fairly compensated.

Mr. Chambers stated that the District does not want to pay the Chambers any extra for the trees removed in the permanent easement. His appraiser stated that it is standard appraisal practice to treat these as improvements and pay for them separately. In this market, both appraisers had to go to Placer County to obtain comparables. These comparables have varying degrees of tree cover compared to Banner Mountain. In terms of the severance damages, the EIR approved by the Board of Directors identified

July 28, 2010

numerous significant and unavoidable impacts both temporary and permanent that will affect his property value. There will be 30 trees removed within 60 feet of their home and another seven trees within 100 feet. These trees provide shade for their home and a view scape from their living room and office. There will be an additional loss of privacy due to brush removal. It was determined by three local realtors that the market value for their home would be reduced by an estimated five percent. The Chambers are willing to accept their appraiser's valuation as adjusted. Both appraisals were on the "short end of the stick" because of the current real estate market. The District is being benefitted by this. The price for the trees is also "way down."

Mr. Chambers stated that most of the neighbors' properties were valued at \$1.10 to \$1.40 per square foot, and the Chambers' property was valued at \$.63 per square foot because their parcel is larger.

Mr. Chambers stated that he is not making the next statement as a threat but he was advised to state if an action is brought against the Chambers, they will defend it vigorously and will challenge the location based on the fact that the District has two other parallel public rights-of-way available and one was found to have the least damage. They will also challenge the width of the proposed easement as being too large and challenge the public interest and necessity on the grounds that the State Water Resources Control Board disputes the District's consumptive rights. Whatever rights the District currently has will expire less than a year after completion of the Project.

The Chambers recommend that the Board direct Staff to find a way to construct the Project by staying within the road and not taking out any trees. If this cannot be done, they recommend that the Board direct Staff to sign the counter proposal submitted to the District on July 26, 2010.

Mr. Chambers stated that three other issues came up when researching the easements: 1) He was told one time that Sesame Street would not be used for construction; another time, he was told that it will be used. He asked if the District is obtaining temporary or permanent rights-of-way on Sesame Street. 2) When he spoke with his appraiser, his appraiser stated that when he works with Placer County Water Agency, and when they dump water on a parcel, the agency obtains an easement to be able to do this. The District will be dumping water on a neighbor's parcel and it will flow across the Chambers' parcel before entering Clipper Creek. 3) Part of Bender Rosenthal's waiver valuation stated that 576 square feet of the temporary easement is under the roadway. He asked if the District is going to use Wings of Morning for maintenance purposes after the Project is completed, how they will do this without a permanent easement.

Director Bachman asked if Staff was going to minimize the loss of trees.

Mr. Powell explained that within the temporary construction easement on the Chambers' side of the road, there are four trees listed in the design phase that need to be removed. He will be meeting with the contractor to reevaluate whether or not those trees need to

July 28, 2010

be removed. On the other side of the road, trees will need to be removed in order for the contractor to maneuver the equipment and install the 48-inch pipe. The separation between the 48-inch pipe and the treated waterline would typically be 10 feet apart. Since the 48-inch pipe is a welded steel pipe, there are no joints. Because of this, the separation between the two pipes is now four feet.

Director Drew asked if there is currently no treated water at the Chambers' residence.

Mr. Chambers answered in the affirmative.

Director Drew asked if the appraisers took into consideration the increased value of having treated water (which amounts to approximately \$30,000).

Mr. Chambers stated that Bender Rosenthal did not take that into consideration because they did not consider whether there was any severance damages. His appraiser considered the treated water and the fire hydrants. Basically, in terms of the fire hydrants, the Chambers were informed by their insurance company that they do not qualify for any discounts. With regard to treated water, Director Drew's point is valid if the Chambers had a vacant parcel with no well. The Chambers have a functional well that cost \$15,000. Someone would not be willing to buy the Chambers' property for the value of the well and the value of a treated water pipeline.

Director Wilcox asked if the property owners for Assessor's Parcel Number 39-080-03 have signed an easement.

Mr. Powell stated that they have not yet signed an easement, but Staff has been in discussions with the property owners. They have a well on the east side of the alignment and there is no avoiding the well for the Project. The District will need to remove the well. At this time, discussions regarding compensation for the well are taking place. Otherwise, the property owner is willing to sign a right of entry to keep the Project moving forward.

Director Wilcox stated that in reviewing the diagram presented in the packet, it appears that most of the impacts are on the neighboring parcel and not the Chambers' parcel.

Mr. Powell stated that the waterlines will be installed in the roadway and that there are impacts to each side of the roadway.

Director Weber stated that it is important to point out that trees on the neighboring property in close proximity have an influence on the Chambers' property.

Gary King, Chief Engineer, stated that Mr. Geary (property owner across from the Chambers) has drilled nine dry wells. He has one well that provides sufficient water at 25 gallons per minute. Mr. Geary would like to receive another service so that he can subdivide his property. Mr. King does not know at this time whether or not Mr. Geary

July 28, 2010

can do this. Staff is expecting that negotiations will be wrapped up in the next couple of weeks on the Geary property.

With regard to Mr. Chambers' question about Sesame Street, Mr. Powell explained that the District does not plan on using Sesame Street as a construction road. Sesame Street will be used for residential traffic only. All of the construction traffic will occur on Wings of Morning Drive.

Director Weber stated that access from Sesame Street on to Banner Lava Cap Road is "very hairy." She asked if there will be traffic control at that location.

Mr. Powell responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Powell stated that Mr. Chambers' request to have the Project installed in the roadway without removing trees is not feasible.

Lee Hudson, audience member, stated that she did not attend the Board meeting for this issue, but has been very moved by what she just heard. There is no way to mitigate or to compensate for loss of trees or water. Generally speaking, well water is far more valuable than treated water. The Board may disagree with her on this point. In terms of trees, she has 140 acres of property that someone came in and lumbered without her knowledge and consent. She had spent 30 years creating a beautiful forest area, and those trees were removed. She is 74 years old and will not live another 30 years to see her property come back to the way it was. The Chambers will not live long enough to see the trees grow back where they once were. Trees provide shade, energy conservation, clean air and erosion control. She suggested that the District find a way not to remove the trees.

Ann Chambers, property owner, reminded the Board that 10 years ago, the Chambers were told no water was coming down Wings of Morning Drive. However, the District has been planning this Project for many years.

President Miller closed the public hearing.

Continued the matter of declaring necessity and authorizing eminent domain proceedings for the acquisition of real property for a project known as the Lower Cascade Canal / Banner Cascade Pipeline Project on Nevada County Assessor's Parcel No. 39-080-17, owned by Jim Chambers and Elizabeth Ann Chambers, to August 25, 2010. M/S/C Wilcox/Weber

Meeting recessed at 11:25 a.m. and reconvened at 11:31 a.m.

July 28, 2010

LOWER CASCADE CANAL / BANNER CASCADE PIPELINE PROJECT – Easement Acquisition

Matthew Crowe, Senior Right-of-Way Agent, is asking that the General Manager be authorized to send a Notice of Intent to commence eminent domain proceedings to property owners within the Lower Cascade Canal / Banner Cascade Pipeline Project. An offer has been sent to the property owner, but the District has not received a signed possession and use agreement. Staff spent the last two months discussing the issue of his well. He stated that he is willing to sign a possession and use agreement, but has not yet done so. He has also not provided the District with a counter offer or any basis of opinion that the District's offer is inadequate. At this point, Staff would like the Board to authorize the General Manager issue a Notice of Intent.

Authorized the General Manager to issue a Notice of Intent (NOI) to consider commencement of eminent domain proceedings for Assessor's Parcel Number 39-080-03 within the Lower Cascade Canal / Banner Cascade Pipeline Project. M/S/C Miller/Drew

LOMA RICA HYDROELECTRIC FACILITY – Award of Contract

Adrian Schneider, Senior Associate Engineer, requested that this matter be pulled from the agenda and presented to the Board at a later date. President Miller pulled the item from the agenda.

STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE #1 – EXPAND WATER SERVICES – Horseshoe Lane Waterline Extension

Shannon Bradley, Business Coordinator, presented three funding agreements for a District constructed waterline extension on Horseshoe Lane. The finance program was placed on hold for some time, but the Board reinstated the program for this project. The property owners have been on hold for a couple of years, and they were close enough to bring a project to fruition. The property owners have executed funding agreements and provided deposits, and the District has obtained the necessary easements. The District's Maintenance Department will be constructing the waterline which will tie into the Echo Drive and Old Wood Road waterlines.

Approved the Funding Agreements with three property owners on Horseshoe Lane: Assessor Parcel Nos. 37-220-01; 37-220-33; and 37-440-13, for a District constructed waterline. M/S/C Drew/Wilcox

AGREEMENTS: CELL TOWER AT LAKE WILDWOOD TANK SITE (GROUND LEASE)

Tim Crough, Assistant General Manager, presented a recommendation from the Maintenance and Resource Management Committee and the Administrative Practices Committee to approve a lease for a cell tower with Verizon Wireless at the Lake Wildwood Tank Site. The agreement has been reviewed by District Counsel. The

July 28, 2010

question is what the value is of the lease. After reviewing the appraisal that valued the lease at \$1,200 per month, the Administrative Practices Committee recommended a value of \$1,500 per month with a 3 percent annual escalator. Staff would like to recommend that since the recommended appraisal value is not being used that the District absorb the entire cost of the appraisal (\$3,000) instead of splitting the cost as initially agreed to.

Crystal Wood, representative for Verizon Wireless, stated that Verizon needs this cell tower at this site to help serve the Lake Wildwood area. In 2008, she contacted Bill Gann, former Business Coordinator, to discuss a lease agreement for \$1,000 per month. The District requested an independent third party appraisal which came in at \$1,200 per month. Based on this appraisal rate, she is respectfully requesting that the lease agreement be approved at \$1,200 per month. She suggested that it would be appropriate for the District to approve higher lease rates for future agreements. She happens to know that Verizon is interested in a site near the Auburn Airport. If the District will not accept the independent third party appraisal, she will request that the lease agreement be approved at \$1,500 per month and she will communicate this action to Verizon Wireless.

Director Weber distributed to the Board a copy of a map and the comparables of other cell tower sites, and pointed specifically to the rate of \$1,700 for the Madelyn Helling Library site.

Director Wilcox asked if the Board were to agree to \$1,200 per month, would Verizon pay for half of the appraisal.

Ms. Wood responded in the affirmative.

Director Weber stated that \$1,200 per month is not enough. She would be willing to compromise at \$1,500 per month with the District paying for the appraisal.

Ms. Wood stated that one alternative is that if the \$1,200 amount is approved, Verizon has agreed to pay each year's rent up front.

Shannon Bradley, Business Coordinator, pointed out that discussion took place at the Administrative Practices Committee meeting regarding presenting the matter once again to the Maintenance and Resource Management Committee. Ms. Wood had stated during this discussion that Verizon did not want to incur further delay, so she requested that the matter be presented to the Board of Directors.

Approved ground lease with Verizon Wireless for a cell tower at the Lake Wildwood Site for the amount of \$1,500 per month with a 3 percent annual escalator and payment in full by the District of the appraisal (\$3,000), subject to minor revisions by Legal Counsel, and authorized the General Manager to execute the necessary documents. M/S/C Drew/Miller

July 28, 2010

DISTRICT CONSTRUCTED WATERLINE EXTENSION (Wagner)

Shannon Bradley, Business Coordinator, is asking the Board to authorize the General Manager to execute a District Constructed Waterline Extension Letter Agreement. This project is associated but separate from the Cement Hill Water Supply Project. She received a request for treated water from Mr. and Mrs. Wagner. They own one parcel adjacent to the boundaries of the Cement Hill Community Facilities District. She spoke with Doug Roderick, Project Manager, Tim Crough, Assistant General Manager, and Gary King, Chief Engineer, about the Wagner's request. They came up with a creative solution to serve treated water to the Wagner's. The District has a policy in place for District constructed waterline extensions that allows for a waterline extension of 300 feet. The Wagner's request is for 390 feet. Staff felt that this would be an opportune time to extend the waterline. Construction for the Cement Hill Water Supply Project will commence on Sunrock Road on August 2, 2010; the Wagner's property is located at the end of Sunrock Road. Mr. Roderick and Ms. Bradley developed the Letter Agreement, and the Wagner's have executed the Agreement and the Right of Entry agreement.

Director Bachman asked if there are any problems with easements.

Ms. Bradley explained that the right of entry authorizes Staff to begin construction. Once the pipe is installed, an easement will be recorded and the District will record the easement before accepting that portion of the waterline. She stated that the District obtained the other necessary easements in conjunction with the Cement Hill Water Supply Project.

Director Weber asked if the parcel can be subdivided.

Ms. Bradley stated that she does not know if the parcel can be subdivided. She added that only one connection will be installed.

Director Wilcox stated that every property owner in the Cement Hill Community Facilities District (CFD) is paying a pro rata cost for the Cement Hill Water Supply Project and are paying for the Project over a long period of time. He asked if the Wagner's are receiving an advantage from those in the CFD paying for the construction of the Cement Hill Water Supply Project and if the Wagner's are paying their fair share.

Doug Roderick, Senior Associate Engineer, explained that the cost of installing the pipeline for the Wagner's is close to the same cost of the assessment for each parcel in the CFD.

Approved Letter Agreement with Douglas Wagner and Debra Wagner (Assessor's Parcel No. 04-410-23) as it relates to the Cement Hill Water Supply Project, and authorized the General Manager to execute the necessary documents. M/S/C Drew/Wilcox

July 28, 2010

CLOSED SESSION was declared at 12:07 p.m. pursuant to Government Code Section to discuss pending litigation with District counsel; the name of the case is Nevada Irrigation District vs. Nevada City Sugar Loaf Properties LLC, et al., Nevada County Superior Court Case No. 76097.

CLOSED SESSION was declared at 12:07 p.m. pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9 to discuss pending litigation with District counsel; the name of the case is Jean A. Malbrough vs. Nevada Irrigation District, Nevada County Superior Court Case No. 75384.

CLOSED SESSION was declared at 12:07 p.m. pursuant to Government Code 54957.6 to provide direction to the District's designated bargaining representatives – Nelson, Crough, Morrow, DuBose and Meith – regarding 2010 salary/benefit/working conditions.

Director Drew left the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

MEETING RECONVENED in regular session at 1:40 p.m.

DISTRICT'S CASH AND INVESTMENTS

Marie G. Owens, Finance Manager/Treasurer, stated that the General Manager asked her to review the new format of the District's Statement of Cash and Investments which are included in the Board's agenda packet on a quarterly basis.

President Miller stated that since Director Drew has left the meeting, and due to the importance of this matter, he requested that this report be brought back to the Board of Directors at a future date.

GOLD COUNTRY FLY FISHERS MEETING – Scotts Flat

Lisa Francis Tassone, Board Secretary, reported that the meeting with the Gold Country Fly Fishers scheduled for August 25, 2010 (following the Board of Directors' meeting) needs to be rescheduled. Discussion ensued regarding the selection of another date, and the Board agreed that the meeting should be rescheduled for a date next year.

WATER RATES COMMITTEE – Update on Meeting with Citizens' Committee

Director Weber reported that a workshop was held with the Citizens' Committee (comprised of large agricultural water users) on July 13, 2010. Ten individuals were invited, and eight attended, including Director Bachman (who did not participate in the discussion). The meeting was cordial, and the members were happy to be invited. They provided good input which will be included in the Water Rates Committee meeting minutes.

July 28, 2010

The Water Rates Committee has concluded their meetings and unanimously agreed to advance the following recommendations to the Administrative Practices Committee:

- implement treated water rates pursuant to the 2009 Proposition 218 Notice for 2011 (increases revenue by \$466,220 above which was projected for 2011 revenue)
- implement raw water rates pursuant to the 2009 Proposition 218 Notice for 2011 (increases revenue by \$173,212 above which was projected for 2011)
- phase out the raw water five percent discount over a two year period (two and one-half percent each year) beginning in 2011 (will increase revenue by \$80,000)

Director Bachman asked how many customers actually take advantage of the five percent discount.

Marie G. Owens, Finance Manager/Treasurer, stated that approximately 1,200 to 1,300 (out of 6,000) customers use the discount program.

Director Weber stated that the District needs to come with creative methods in order to preserve agriculture.

Director Wilcox asked what the procedure would be to advance the Citizens' Committee input to the Board of Directors.

President Miller stated that the Operations and Maintenance Manager needs to fill the Water Efficiency Technician position. Items from the Citizens' Committee would then be presented by the Water Efficiency Technician to the Water and Hydroelectric Operations Committee, and ultimately the Board of Directors.

ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA WATER AGENCIES (ACWA) REGION 3 TOUR – Water Storage on the Foresthill Divide

Director Wilcox reported that he attended the ACWA Region 3 Tour on July 9, 2010 with Ron Nelson, General Manager. They toured the Sugar Pine Dam which is owned by the Foresthill Public Utilities District (PUD), and toured the Ralston Powerhouse and Afterbay. Sugar Pine Dam is a nice facility above Foresthill and was originally constructed under the Folsom South Canal Unit of the Central Valley Project to provide water supply exclusively to the town of Foresthill. Foresthill PUD negotiated with the Federal government to take sole, clear title of this project about five years ago for \$3 million, when it cost \$60 million to build in 1978. They also toured the Placer County Water Agency's sediment remediation project. Sediment is dredged from Ralston Afterbay and placed next to the channel downstream. A certain amount of grading and processing of the material occurs prior to placement and the material is subsequently washed downstream during large storm events to replenish natural stream gravels. Director Wilcox stated that the one turbine at the Ralston Powerhouse is about an 85

July 28, 2010

megawatt unit. It was very impressive to see. The system was predicated on the construction of the Auburn Dam, which was never built.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 2:17 p.m. to reconvene in regular session on August 11, 2010, at 8:00 a.m. at the District's main office located at 1036 W. Main Street, Grass Valley, California.

Board Secretary

Attest a true record of actions
had and taken at the above and
foregoing meeting our presence
thereat and our consent thereto.

Director
Division I

Division II

Division III

Division IV

Division V
