

**SYNOPSIS OF REQUESTED RESPONSE TO FINDINGS
2009-2010 SONOMA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT
“Slippery Costs and Rising Fees in Graton Community Services District”
FROM: General Manager, Graton Community Services District**

The General Manager’s response to the findings consists of 117 pages detailing reasons and documentation for specific responses to each of the report’s findings. The 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury has reviewed the responses and is posting them without comment or concurrence. The following is a condensed version of the requested, not required response. To view the response in it’s entirety contact Industrial Wastewater Solutions.

Response to Finding F-1: The Redwood Grove did not fail.

Response to Finding F-2: Graton is continuing to investigate sustainable means of treating sewerage with a long view to projected costs of energy, changing regulatory environment, transportation costs, chemical costs, sludge tipping fees, other variable costs, and the increasing value of reclaimed water.

Response to Finding F-3: F-3 completely misrepresents testimony that was presented to the Grand Jury and indicates a failure to observe the infrastructure that was in plain sight when the Grand Jury toured the Graton Wastewater Treatment facilities. This assertion also misrepresents the historic facts.

Response to Finding F-4: The presentation of this finding casts doubt on the impartiality of the Grand Jury evaluators and lends understanding to the motives of the Complainants. When referring to Northern California River Watch, the Grand Jury used terms like; “claim to protect,” as opposed to neutral wording.

Response to Finding F-5: The Rate Payers of GCSD have been or anticipate being reimbursed for all of the administrative and engineering costs by FEMA and Proposition 50 for related work. The Grand Jury’s “finding of facts”, are erroneous, and their flawed conclusions contain evidence of bias.

Response to Finding F-6: It is true that the Cease and Desist Order issued by the NCRWQCB represents a great benefit of the Rate Payers of GCSD. The CDO shields GCSD from some fines and law suits and improves Graton’s priority for receiving state grants.

Response to Finding F-7: See Response to F-6.

Response to Finding F-8: The facts presented in finding F-8 are correct, however the issues surrounding this finding are more sinister.

Although not required or requested, the General Manager did respond to the recommendations of the report. These responses are also included in the 117 page response from the General Manager.