

EXHIBIT A



Mendocino LAFCo

200 South School Street
 Ukiah, CA 95482
 (707) 463-4470
 Website: www.mendolafco.org
 Email: eo@mendolafco.org

LAFCo Office Use Only

Date Filed: _____

Received By: _____

APPLICATION FORM

This application form is required for all proposed changes of organization/reorganizations or requests filed with the Commission. If a question is not applicable to your proposed project, please note accordingly. Additional forms may be required as indicated in the following sections. Refer to the attached Application Submittal Checklist for more requirements. Thank you for your cooperation in completing this application form and providing all the application submittal materials in a single submittal package.

Proposal Description

1. Type of proposal (*check all that apply and specify in the table below*):

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annexation | <input type="checkbox"/> Sphere of Influence Amendment | <input type="checkbox"/> City Incorporation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Detachment | <input type="checkbox"/> Sphere of Influence Update | <input type="checkbox"/> District Formation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reorganization
(involving both annexation and detachment) | <input type="checkbox"/> Outside Agency Services | <input type="checkbox"/> District Dissolution |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Activation of Latent Power(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Consolidation or Merger |

	<i>Subject Agencies (Cities and/or Special Districts)</i>	<i>Related Jurisdictional Changes (Annexation, Detachment, Sphere Amendment, etc.)</i>
1.	Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation Improvement District (RRFC)	Annexation. The complete service area of Redwood Valley County Water District (RVCWD) will be included in RRFC boundary but RVCWD will not be dissolved.

2. Title of proposal: RRFC Annexation of RVCWD's Complete Service Area

3. Who initiated the proposal? *LAFCo proposals may be initiated by resolution of application adopted by an affected city, county or special district, or by petition of landowners or registered voters of the affected area. (Note: a notice of intent must be submitted to LAFCo in advance for all proposals.)*

The annexation is a collaboration of the RRFC and RVCWD.

The following is attached to this application form:

- Agency Resolution of Application
- Landowner Petition
- Registered Voter Petition

4. Does the proposal have 100 percent consent of all affected property owners? *(If so, please submit a letter of consent from each property owner for potential processing of the application without public notice, hearing, or protest.)*

- Yes
 No

N/A- Resolution of support from RVCWD

5. Applicant:

<i>City/District/Chief Petitioner</i>	Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control & Water Conservation Improvement District (RRFC)
<i>Street Address</i>	PO Box 2104
<i>City/State/Zip</i>	Ukiah, CA 95482
<i>Telephone</i>	707-462-5278
<i>Signature</i>	<i>Elizabeth Salomone, General Manager</i>

6. Designated Contact Person:

Notices and other communications regarding this application will be directed to the proponent as follows:

<i>Name/Title</i>	As above
<i>Telephone</i>	
<i>Email</i>	
<i>Signature</i>	

General Information

1. Explain in detail the reasons for the proposal and why it is necessary at this time. *(For example, a proposed development or existing residences require services not currently provided or available.)*

With this application, RRFC seeks annexation of the remaining service area of the current LAFCo approved boundary of RVCWD, to which RRFC currently provides surplus water when available pursuant to the terms of the 1980 Superior Court of the State of California No 42059 Stipulated Judgement. This annexation would allow RVCWD to put water available under its pre-existing Uniform Water Supply & Purchase Agreement with RRFC to beneficial use anywhere within the RVCWD service area.

2. Describe the size (acres, etc.), general location, and physical features of the subject territory.

RVCWD’s service area is roughly 15 square miles in a valley 5 miles long by 3 miles wide and is located north of the Ukiah Valley area, with only a small area in the southern portion within the current RRFC boundary. The Redwood Valley community is rural residential and agricultural.

3. What is the current population of the subject territory?

The Redwood Valley population is approximately 2,000.

4. Are there twelve or more registered voters within the subject territory? Yes

5. How many total parcels are within the subject territory? (Provide a property matrix).

Large area – available upon request.

6. How many acres (or square miles) of territory are included in the proposal? 15 square miles.

7. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the subject territory? N/A

Proposal Boundaries

1. A map and geographic description of the proposal area meeting State Board of Equalization requirements is required.

The following is attached to this application form:

Vicinity Map

Boundary Map

Boundary Description

2. Describe how the boundaries of the proposal were determined.

Civil Engineering Land Surveyors conducted research of deeds, maps, and original legal boundary descriptions of both Districts to generate a legal written boundary description of the annexation area and accompanying maps.

3. Please indicate yes/no to the following questions:

Yes	No	
	X	<i>Do the proposed boundaries create an island of non-agency territory?</i>
	X	<i>Do the proposed boundaries split lines of assessment or ownership?</i>
	X	<i>Do the proposed boundaries overlap with another agency providing similar services?</i>
N/A		<i>Does the proposal involve public rights-of-way or easements?</i>
N/A		<i>Does the proposal involve public land or land assessed by the State?</i>
N/A		<i>Does any part of the proposal involve land under a Williamson Act Contract or Farmland Security Zone?</i>
N/A		<i>Does any part of the proposal involve land with a Wildlife/Habitat Easement or Agricultural Land Conservation Easement?</i>

4. Is this proposal consistent with the adopted Sphere of Influence of all affected agencies?

Yes

No

If no, this application must be preceded or accompanied by a Sphere of Influence Amendment Application.

Land Use Information

1. Describe the existing uses within and surrounding the subject territory. Be specific regarding existing commercial corridors, residential communities, relevant structures, etc.

See Plan for Services and Negative Declaration Regarding Environmental Impact.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation(s) within the subject territory?

Mixed.

3. Describe any proposed change in land use or zoning as a result of the proposal. (For city annexations, attach a copy of the adopted pre-zoning ordinance and associated CEQA determination.)

None.

4. Is the proposal consistent with city or county general plans, specific/area plans, and or other adopted land use policies? (Please include policy consistency analysis.)

See Plan for Services and Negative Declaration Regarding Environmental Impact.

5. Will the proposal result in development of property now or in the near future? Describe the type of development proposed (type of business or industry, single-family or multi-family residential, etc., and the number of units or facilities).

No; see Plan for Services and Negative Declaration Regarding Environmental Impact.

6. If development is proposed, what discretionary approvals are needed? Indicate below all discretionary approvals or permits from a city, the County, or another agency that will be needed to complete the project. If already approved, please indicate the date of approval. N/A

	<i>Project File No.</i>	<i>Date of Approval</i>	<i>Future Requirements</i>
<i>City/County General Plan Amendment</i>			
<i>Pre-zoning (City)</i>			
<i>Rezoning (City)</i>			
<i>Tentative Subdivision Map</i>			
<i>Minor Land Division</i>			
<i>Conditional Use Permit</i>			
<i>Boundary Line Adjustment</i>			
<i>City/County Building Permit</i>			
<i>Other</i>			

7. If no development is planned at this time, would approval of this proposal increase the development potential of the property?

- Yes If yes, please indicate in terms of potential use, number of units, etc.
 No If no, indicate when development of the area is anticipated.

See Plan for Services and Negative Declaration Regarding Environmental Impact.

8. What is the effect of this proposal on agricultural or open-space lands within and adjacent to the subject territory? If the subject territory is subject to a Williamson Act contract, please provide a copy of the contract(s) along with any amendments.

See Plan for Services and Negative Declaration Regarding Environmental Impact.

Public Services

1. List which agencies presently provide public services to the subject territory, and which are proposed to provide service with the proposal. If not applicable or no change, please indicate accordingly.

No changes: see Plan for Services and Negative Declaration Regarding Environmental Impact.

<i>Service</i>	<i>Present Provider</i>	<i>Proposed Provider</i>
<i>Sewer</i>		
<i>Water</i>		
<i>Fire</i>		
<i>Police</i>		
<i>Recreation</i>		
<i>Roads</i>		
<i>Drainage</i>		
<i>Street Lighting</i>		
<i>Other</i>		

2. Are there any current service or growth moratoriums in place for the affected agency(ies)?

- Yes If yes, please indicate imposing agency and terms.
 No

See RVCWD Municipal Service Review.

3. How would the proposal affect the type or level of services within the subject territory?

See Plan for Services and Negative Declaration Regarding Environmental Impact.

4. If, as a result of this proposal, increased service demand exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase capacity of services.

N/A; see Plan for Services and Negative Declaration Regarding Environmental Impact.

5. Will the future delivery of services by any other public agency or service provider be affected by this proposal? If yes, list the agencies and indicate any comments received from these agencies. (Note: affected agencies will be contacted by LAFCo during application processing.)

No; see Plan for Services and Negative Declaration Regarding Environmental Impact.

6. A plan for providing services within the affected territory must be prepared pursuant to Government Code Section 56653.

A Plan for Services is attached to this application form:

Yes

Not applicable

7. If the proposal affects a water service provider, does the agency have a Water Shortage Contingency Plan or Urban Water Management Plan?

Yes If yes, please provide a URL link or electronic copy of the Plan.

No

RRFC: See [Ordinance #25-01](#) on district website (rrfc.net). RVCWD: unknown.

8. Does the project require an extension of infrastructure or increase in capacity to serve the territory?
 Yes If yes, please complete the table below.

No

<i>Total anticipated demand</i>	<i>Extension of Infrastructure (feet/miles)</i>	<i>Number of Units (GDP/EDU/ESA)</i>
<i>Residential Use</i>		
<i>Industrial / Commercial Use</i>		
<i>Agricultural Use</i>		

Financial Information

1. How will public services be financed? List any assessments, taxes, fees or other charges to be levied as part of this proposal, or levied in the near future. (Note: a five- or ten-year pro forma financial statement may be required to project long-term level of service costs and revenue stability).

See Plan for Services and Negative Declaration Regarding Environmental Impact.

2. Are there anticipated costs associated with addressing deferred maintenance, major capital improvement needs, or capacity expansion projects related to the proposal? If so, please provide a financial analysis and estimated cost apportionment plan and schedule.

No; see Plan for Services and Negative Declaration Regarding Environmental Impact.

3. Does any affected agency have existing bonded indebtedness for which the subject territory will become/remains liable? If so, please indicate taxpayer cost per year and when the obligation will end.

RVCWD has debt that will not be impacted by the proposed annexation.

4. Does the proposal involve an annexation to a city and/or changes in district boundaries? If yes, negotiations for any exchange of property tax revenues (Revenue and Taxation Code [Section 99](#)) must be completed by the County and any affected city/district prior to LAFCo action. For those proposals, LAFCo will notify the affected agencies after receiving your application and will provide preliminary information to begin the negotiations process.

Yes
 No

Sphere of Influence

Note: If a sphere of influence amendment is proposed, please also submit the Sphere of Influence Change Request Supplemental Form.

1. Is the subject territory within the existing sphere of influence of the affected agency?

Yes
 No

2. Is the subject territory within the existing sphere of influence of an adjacent agency providing similar services?

Yes If yes, please specify the circumstances and whether a sphere amendment is needed.
 No

Environmental Determination

Note: If no environmental document has been prepared, please submit the Environmental Questionnaire.

1. Copies of environmental documentation, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), prepared by the lead agency (including an initial study, technical reports, and written comments or recorded public testimony relative to the environmental documents) is required to be submitted with the application. Please include a copy of the Notice of Determination/Notice of Exemption showing the date filed with the County Clerk, and the environmental filing fee receipt from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

The following environmental document has been prepared:

- Statutory and/or Categorical Exemption
 Negative Declaration
 Mitigated Negative Declaration
 Environmental Impact Report

- Statement of Overriding Considerations
- Supplemental or Tiered Environmental Document
- Other:

2. Was the environmental documentation (Notice of Preparation/Notice of Intent) circulated to LAFCo, a Responsible Agency, according to statutorily required timeframes prior to Lead Agency adoption?

- Yes
- No

Notification

Provide the names and contact information of the primary persons or agents who are to receive information requests, staff reports and notices related to the proposal:

<i>Name/Title</i>	<i>Telephone</i>	<i>E-mail Address</i>
Elizabeth Salomone, General Manager	707-462-5278	DistrictManager@rrfc.net

Fee Agreement and Indemnification

All applications must include a signed [Fee Agreement and Indemnification Agreement](https://www.mendolafco.org/application-materials), which is located at: <https://www.mendolafco.org/application-materials>.

RRFC already submitted to LAFCo.

Filing Fees

Applicants are required to pay fees in accordance with LAFCo’s adopted fee schedule to cover the administrative and staff costs required to evaluate proposals.

Per the Mendocino LAFCo Fee Schedule, deposits toward the cost of processing proposals must be paid at the time an application is submitted. All deposits are initial payments toward the actual costs of processing proposals, including staff time and materials (e.g., noticing, postage, copying). In signing the Fee Agreement and Indemnification, the applicant consents to reimburse LAFCo for all costs incurred in processing, including pre-application assistance.

Checks for application fees must be made payable to: "Mendocino LAFCo".

Board of Equalization (BOE) fees per the current BOE fee schedule are required to be submitted to LAFCo for the BOE Filing. Checks for BOE filing fees must be made payable to: "State Board of Equalization".

The following is included with this application form:

- Check for Application Filing Fees
- Check for BOE Filing Fees
- Other (please explain):

Certification

The undersigned hereby certifies that all LAFCo filing requirements will be met and that the statements made in this application are complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Signature	<i>Elizabeth Salomone</i>
Print Name/Title	Elizabeth Salomone, General Manager
Date	<i>10/7/25</i>
Telephone	707-462-5278
Email	DistrictManager@rrfc.net

Application Submittal Checklist

In order for an application to be processed, the following items need to be provided. Please mark the checklist items applicable to your proposal and submit the number of hard copies noted for each item.

- Electronic copy:** legible/searchable PDFs of the application packet (thumb drive, email, Dropbox, etc.).
- Cover letter (1):** listing the materials being submitted and noting the method of CEQA compliance.
- Application form (1):** fully completed and signed with original signature(s).
- Fee Agreement and Indemnification form (1):** fully completed and signed with original signature(s).
- Notice of Intent form (1):** original form must be sent to LAFCo in advance per instructions on the form.
- Supplemental Application form(s) (1):** fully completed (activation of powers, outside agency services, sphere amendment, etc.) and signed with original signature(s).
- Resolution of Application (1):** certified copy, including all exhibits, of the agency's legislative body.
- Landowner/Registered Voter Petition (1):** making application to LAFCo, with original signature(s).
- Full-scale Proposal Map (5):** 24" x 36" size map page(s) showing the affected territory and its relationship to the affected/adjacent jurisdiction(s) and prepared to State Board of Equalization specifications.
- Reduction of Proposal Map (3):** 8.5" x 11" or 11" x 17" size map page(s) of the above item.
- Vicinity Map (3):** 8.5" x 11" size map page, if not already included on the proposal map.
- Metes and Bounds Description (3):** a legal description of the affected territory (proposal area).
- Property Matrix (1):** list all affected properties by Assessor Parcel Number, specify source tax roll year data is from, and include an editable digital format (excel, etc.) with the electronic submittal.
- Property Owner Consent Letter(s) (1):** from each affected owner of record with original signature(s); for petition applications this may already be addressed with the petition form.
- Proof of CEQA Compliance (1):** complete project environmental document (electronic-only if more than 25 pages), Notice of Determination or Exemption, and Fish and Wildlife filing fee receipt.
- Plan for Services (1):** prepared per GC §56653, and §56824.12 if applicable, and include a schematic diagram of water, sewer, and storm drainage systems where appropriate.
- Pre-Zoning Documentation (1):** for City annexations per GC §56375, include proof of CEQA compliance.
- Project Design Plans (1):** reduced size plans (site plan, development plan, subdivision map, etc.).
- Campaign Contribution Disclosure form (attached) (1):** required per GC §84308 and the Political Reform Act.
- Disclosure of Political Expenditures form (attached) (1):** required per GC §56700.1 and the Political Reform Act.
- Tax Share Agreement (1):** adopted by each applicable legislative body (RTC §99), if already completed.
- Filing and Processing Fees:** in accordance with the LAFCo Fee Schedule and the State Board of Equalization Fee Schedule.

Note: Additional information may be required during staff review of the proposal and/or in response to the public hearing.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION TO COMMISSIONERS DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

LAFCo is subject to the campaign disclosure provisions detailed in Government Code §84308 and the Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC), 2 Cal. Adm. Code §18438. 1 – §18438. 6.

Please carefully read the following information to determine if the provisions apply to you. If you determine that the provisions are applicable, the Campaign Disclosure Form E-1 must be completed and returned to LAFCo of Mendocino County with your application.

1. No LAFCo commissioner shall accept, solicit, or direct a contribution of more than \$250 from any party¹ or agent² while a change of organization proceeding is pending, and for three months subsequent to the date a final decision is rendered by LAFCo. This prohibition commences when your application has been filed, or the proceeding is otherwise initiated.
2. A party to a LAFCo proceeding shall disclose on the record of the proceeding any contribution of more than \$250 made to any commissioner by the party, or agent, during the preceding 12 months. No party to a LAFCo proceeding, or agent, shall make a contribution to a commissioner during the proceeding, and for three months following the date a final decision is rendered by LAFCo.
3. Prior to rendering a decision on a LAFCo proceeding, any commissioner who received a contribution of more than \$250 within the preceding 12 months from any party, or agent, to a proceeding shall disclose that fact on the record of the proceeding, and shall be disqualified from participating in the proceeding. However, if any commissioner receives a contribution that otherwise would require disqualification, and returns the contribution within 30 days of knowing about the contribution and the relevant proceeding, that commissioner shall be permitted to participate in the proceeding.

To determine whether a campaign contribution of more than \$250 has been made by you or your agent to a commissioner within the preceding 12 months, all contributions made by you or your agent during that period must be aggregated.

Names of current LAFCo commissioners are available <https://www.mendolafco.org/commission>. If you have questions about Government Code §84308, FPPC regulations, or the Campaign Disclosure Form, please contact the LAFCo Executive Officer at eo@mendolafco.org.

¹ “Party” is defined as any person who files an application for, or is the subject of, a proceeding.

² “Agent” is defined as any person who represents a party in connection with a proceeding. If an individual acting as an agent also is acting as an employee or member of a law, architectural, engineering, or consulting firm, or a similar entity or corporation, both the individual and the entity or corporation are agents. When a closed corporation is a party to a proceeding, the majority stakeholder is subject to these provisions.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION DISCLOSURE FORM

N/A

1. Proposed change(s) of organization:

2. Name and address of any party or agent who has contributed more than \$250 to any commissioner within the preceding 12 months.

Name of Party/Agent	Address

3. Date and amount of contribution:

Date of contribution	Amount of contribution

4. Name of commissioner to whom contributions were made:

a. _____

b. _____

Certification

The undersigned hereby certifies that the above information is provided to the best of my knowledge.

<i>Signature</i>	
<i>Print Name/Title</i>	
<i>Date</i>	
<i>Telephone</i>	
<i>Email</i>	

DISCLOSURE OF POLITICAL EXPENDITURES FOR/AGAINST LAFCO PROPOSAL

Expenditures for political purposes, which are related to a change of organization or reorganization proposal that will be or has been submitted to Mendocino LAFCo, are subject to the reporting and disclosure requirements of the Political Reform Act of 1974 and the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH).

Please carefully read the following information to determine if reporting and disclosure provisions apply to you.

1. Any person or combination of persons who for political purposes, directly or indirectly contributes \$1,000 or more, or expends \$1,000 or more, in support of or in opposition to a proposal for a change of organization or reorganization that will be submitted to the Commission, must disclose and report as required for local initiative measures under the Political Reform Act of 1974 (commencing with Government Code §84250) and the CKH (commencing with Government Code §56700).
2. Pursuant to Government Code §57009, any person or combination of persons who directly or indirectly contributes \$1,000 or more, or expends \$1,000 or more, in support of or in opposition to the conducting authority proceedings for a change of organization or reorganization, must comply with the disclosure requirements as required for local initiative measures under the Political Reform Act of 1974 (commencing with Government Code §84250).
3. Applicable reports must be filed with the Secretary of State and the appropriate city or county clerk. Copies of reports must also be filed with the LAFCo Executive Officer.

CHECKLIST FOR DISCLOSURE OF POLITICAL EXPENDITURES

The following checklist is provided to assist you in determining if the requirements of the Political Reform Act of 1974 (Government Code Sections 81000 et seq.) apply to you. For further assistance contact the Fair Political Practices Commission at 428 J Street, Suite 450, Sacramento, CA 95814, (866) 275-3772, or at <http://www.fppc.ca.gov>.

1. Have you directly or indirectly made a contribution or expenditure of \$1,000 or more related to the support or opposition of a proposal that has been or will be submitted to LAFCo?

Yes

No

<i>Date of Contribution</i>	
<i>Amount</i>	
<i>LAFCo Proposal Name/Application Number</i>	
<i>Date Proposal Submitted to LAFCo</i>	

2. Have you, in combination with other person(s), directly or indirectly contributed or expended \$1,000 or more related to the support or opposition of a proposal that has been or will be submitted to LAFCo?

Yes

No

<i>Date of Contribution</i>	
<i>Amount</i>	
<i>LAFCo Proposal Name/Application Number</i>	
<i>Date Proposal Submitted to LAFCo</i>	

3. If you have filed a report in accordance with FPPC requirements, has a copy of the report been filed with LAFCo?

Yes

No

Resolution #25-07

of the
**Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control
& Water Conservation Improvement District**

**Approval of Application to the
Mendocino County Local Agency Formation Commission
to Initiate Proceedings for the Annexation
of the Complete Redwood Valley County Water District Service Area**

WHEREAS, Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control & Water Conservation Improvement District (RRFC) desires to initiate proceedings pursuant to Part 3 of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (GOV §56000 et seq.) to annex the remaining jurisdictional boundaries of the Redwood Valley County Water District (RVCWD) not already located within the RRFC jurisdictional boundary (Annexation), as shown and more particularly described in Exhibit A: Area to be Annexed, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

WHEREAS, GOV §56654(a) authorizes local agencies to initiate and request an annexation of lands by the adoption of a Resolution of Application; and

WHEREAS, both RRFC and RVCWD wish to partner in an annexation application as evidenced by the following actions:

1. On April 1, 2024, RRFC adopted Resolution No. 24-01, a *Commitment to Collaborate with Redwood Valley County Water District in Developing a Local Agency Formation Commission Annexation Application*; and
2. Subsequently, on April 18, 2024, RVCWD adopted a similar resolution (Resolution No. 24-01); and
3. RRFC and RVCWD entered a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to identify roles and responsibilities for development of an annexation application to the LAFCo, effective August 1, 2024.

WHEREAS, eligibility for the proposed annexation includes:

1. The proposed annexation area is within the RRFC current LAFCo approved Sphere of Influence; and
2. The proposed annexation area is within RRFC's State Water Resources Control Board water right license 13898 place of use.

WHEREAS, the reasons for the proposed Annexation are as follows:

1. RRFC can currently only provide to the portion of RVCWD outside the RRFC district boundary water surplus to RRFC customer demand when available as outlined in the 1980 Superior Court of the State of California No 42059 Stipulated Judgement and pursuant to California State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Order WR 79-15; and
2. Annexation of the entirety of RVCWD service area into the RRFC boundary would allow RVCWD to use RRFC water supplied through RVCWD's Uniform Water Supply & Purchase Agreement anywhere within the RVCWD service area.

WHEREAS, the proposed Annexation would be subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. It would not consist of a consolidation of services nor a consolidation of RRFC and RVCWD.
2. It would not negate, supersede, or otherwise impact the Stipulated Judgment No 42059.

WHEREAS, the Board hereby adopts the Plan for Services required pursuant to GOV §56653 set forth in Exhibit B: Plan for Services, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference; and

WHEREAS, RRFC prepared an initial study to analyze the potential effects of the proposed Annexation on the environment pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and determined the proposed annexation will have no significant effect on the environment, and subsequently adopted a Negative Declaration for the proposed annexation on October 6, 2025.

WHEREAS, a Notice of Intention to adopt this Resolution of Application has been given to each agency required pursuant to GOV §56654; and

WHEREAS, the subject territory of RVCWD to be annexed into RRFC is inhabited; and

WHEREAS, the RVCWD Board of Directors adopted Resolution #25-02, a Resolution of Support to the Mendocino County Local Agency Formation Commission in support of Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control & Water Conservation Improvement District's Application to Initiate Proceedings for the Annexation of the Redwood Valley County Water District Boundary dated April 17, 2025; and

WHEREAS, the RRFC Board has considered the oral and/or written testimony made by any affected local agencies or interested persons provided prior to or appearing at the properly noticed public hearing for adoption of this Resolution of Application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the RRFC Board of Trustees as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct.
2. This Resolution is hereby approved and adopted by the RRFC Board, and the Mendocino County Local Agency Formation Commission is hereby requested to take proceedings for the proposed Annexation in the manner provided by the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000; and
3. The lands proposed to be annexed into RRFC are depicted in Exhibit A: Area to be Annexed attached to this Resolution and incorporated herein; and
4. An application with supporting documentation as required by the Commission shall be submitted for the proposed Annexation to the Mendocino County Local Agency Formation Commission.
5. The proposed Annexation will have no significant effect on the environment and RRFC staff is hereby directed to file the approved Negative Declaration attached as Exhibit C: Signed Negative Declaration ” with the Mendocino County Clerk and online with the appropriate state clearinghouse.

ADOPTED 6th day of October, 2025, by the Board of Trustees of the Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control & Water Conservation Improvement District, by the following vote:

Christopher Watt, President	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes / No / Abstain / Absent
Tyler Rodrigue, Vice President	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes / No / Abstain / Absent
John Bailey, Treasurer	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes / No / Abstain / Absent
John Reardan, Trustee	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes / No / Abstain / Absent
Dave Koball, Trustee	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes / No / Abstain / Absent

Signed:  _____ Date 10/6/25

Christopher Watt, Board of Trustees President

Attest:  _____ Date 10/6/25


Elizabeth Salomone, General Manager



Exhibit A
 to Resolution #25-07
 Approval of LAFCo Application
 for Redwood Valley Annexation Project




THIS MAP HAS BEEN PREPARED BY STEVEN J. KLEIN.
Steven J. Klein
 STEVEN J. KLEIN, P.L.S. 8155
 06/18/25



LEGEND

	BOUNDARY OF LANDS TO BE ANNEXED
	EXISTING BOUNDARY OF RUSSIAN RIVER FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
	SECTION LINES
	OVERLAP OF RVCWD & RRFCO



Continued Exhibit A
to Resolution #25-07

Exhibit "A" Approval of LAFCo Application

Beginning at the southwest corner of the T17N, R12W, M.D.B. & M. being the southwest corner of Section 31 of said Township; thence East along the south line of said section, 1/4 mile; thence North 1/2 mile; Thence East 1/4 mile to the center of said Section; thence North 1/2 mile to the south line of Section 30; Thence East 1/4 mile; Thence North 1/2 mile more or less to the southwesterly corner of the lands described as the Gabrielli Winery Property Annexation to the Redwood Valley County Water District LAFCO No. 90-5 in the document recorded in Book 1882 of Official Records, at Page 294, Mendocino County Records;

Thence along the easterly boundary of said lands North 01°37'45" East 85.095 feet; Thence South 87°07'47" West 10.761 feet; Thence North 00°18'32" East 1322.596 feet to the northwest corner of said lands; Thence along the northerly boundary line of said lands North 86°02'03" East 1337.632 feet to the easterly line of Section 30;

Thence North along the easterly line of Section 30 to the southeast corner of Section 19; Thence West 1/4 mile along the south line of Section 19; Thence North 1/2 mile; Thence West 1/4 mile; Thence North 1/4 mile; Thence West 1/2 mile to the West line of Section 19; Thence North 1/4 mile to the southwest corner of Section 18; Thence East 3/4 mile along the south line of Section 18; Thence North 1/2 mile; Thence West 1/4 mile to the center of Section 18; Thence North 1/2 mile to the south 1/4 corner of Section 7; Thence North 1/2 mile to the center of Section 7; Thence East 1/2 mile to the west 1/4 section corner of Section 8; Thence South along the west line of Section 8, 208 feet, more or less, to the northwest corner of the lands of Donald J. Wright, as described in the deed recorded in Book 458, Page 571, Official Records Mendocino County, California; Thence along the north and east line of said lands of Wright, East 208 feet, South 208 feet more or less, and East 208 feet more or less, to the northeast corner thereof, being also the northwest corner of the lands of Marvin Cannon, as described in the deed recorded in Book 585, Page 134, Official Records Mendocino County; thence along the north line of said lands and the lands of R.W. Dorsey 2000 feet more or less, to the northeast corner of said lands as described in the deed recorded in Book 609, Page 247, Official Records Mendocino County, being the east line of the Southwest 1/4 of Section 8; Thence South along the east line of said Southwest 1/4, Section 8, 900 feet more or less, to the northeast corner of the Southeast 1/4 of the Southwest 1/4 of said Section 8; thence along the north line of said Southeast 1/4 of Southwest 1/4, Section 8, West 1/4 mile to the northwest corner thereof; Thence 1/4 mile South along the west line of said Southeast 1/4, Southwest 1/4 to the northeast corner of the northwest 1/4 of northwest 1/4, Section 17; Thence East 250 feet; Thence 1 mile South, more or less, along the east line of the west 1/2 of the west 1/2 of Section 17 to the northeast corner of the northwest 1/4 of northwest 1/4, Section 20; Thence East along the north line of Section 20, 3/4 mile to the northeast corner thereof; Thence 1/4 miles South along the east line of the northwest 1/4 of northwest 1/4, Section 21;

Continued

Thence East 1600 feet more or less along the south line of said section; thence South 3/4 mile to a point on the north line of Section 28; Thence East along said line 3/4 mile to the northwest corner of Section 27; thence 2/3 mile South along the west line of Section 28, more or less, to the southeast corner of the lands of Ford and Rawles as described in the deed recorded in Book 440, Page 512, Official Records, Mendocino County, thence West along the south line of said lands, 970 feet, more or less to a point on the east line of the lands of Geroge C, Halletux as described in the deed recorded in Book 582, Page 561, Official Records Mendocino County; Thence 1/2 mile south along the west line of said lands and the east line of the lands of M. Laforet; Thence East 2272 feet, more or less along the south line of said lands to the northeast corner of the lands of E.G. Lynch, as described in the deed recorded in Book 182, Page 43, Official Records, Mendocino County, said point being also the northwest corner of the lands described as the Redwood Valley Rancheria Property Annexation to the Redwood Valley County Water District recorded in Book 2171 of Official Records, Page 635, Mendocino County Records and northwest corner of the lands that are shown on that Record of Survey recorded in Map Case 2, Drawer 46, Page 56;

Thence around the boundary of said lands of Redwood Valley Rancheria Property Annexation North 87°57'52" East, 1434.66 feet to the northeast corner of Lot 19 of the Finnish Colony Subdivision thereof recorded in Case 1, Drawer 4, Page 89, Mendocino County Records; thence along an existing fence as shown on said Record of Survey the following courses: North 85°28'24" East, 368.20 feet; thence north 71°05'33" East, 121.36 feet; thence North 72°02'50" East, 99.31 feet; thence North 89°03'35" East, 64.30 feet; thence north 75°25'31" East 125.45 feet; thence North 71°34'19" East, 127.42 feet; thence South 75°51'55" East, 219.47 feet; thence North 74°53'05" East, 375.29 feet; thence South 44°18'56" East, 20.95 feet; thence South 52°00'55" East, 90.24 feet; thence South 53°28'34" East, 117.93 feet; thence North 68°51'22" East, 132.74 feet; thence South 77°52'39" East, 339.04 feet; thence North 88°29'31" East, 537.44 feet; thence South 25°52'03" East, 220.82 feet; thence South 38°00'11" East, 146.95 feet; thence South 65°57'46" East, 201.77 feet; thence South 20°46'37" East, 272.91 feet; thence South 48°08'19" East, 446.29 feet; thence leaving said fence as shown on said map South 81°28'32" West, 3884.84 feet; thence South 44°20'25" West, 1029.15 feet; thence South 82°11'42" West, 265 feet to the southwest corner of Lot 20 of said Finnish Colony Subdivision;

Thence South 8 degrees East 2924.8 feet, more or less, to the northwest corner of Lot 15 of said Finnish Colony Subdivision; thence south 64 degrees East 3265 feet; thence North 67 degrees East, 900 feet to the east line of the Yokayo Rancho; thence South 1 mile, more or less to the southeast corner of the lands of John Barrella as described in the deed recorded in Book 168, Page 295, Official Records, Mendocino County; thence South 55 degrees West 316 feet, more or less; thence South 37 degrees West 532 feet; thence South 55 degrees West 2657 feet more or less;

Continued

Thence South 530 feet to the northwest corner of the lands of Lee Sorelles as described in the deed recorded in Book 445, Page 6, Official Records Mendocino County; thence East along the north line of said lands 1089 feet to the northeast corner; thence 1390 feet South 13 degrees West along the east line to the southeast corner thereof; thence 220 feet West along the south line of the lands of Jay Long as described in the deed recorded in Book 4321, Page 320, Official Records, Mendocino County, to the southwest corner of said lands of Long; thence South 320 feet, more or less, along the east line of Calpella Fruit Land Tract, as shown on the map thereof recorded in Case 1, Drawer 3, Page 18, Mendocino County Records, to the southeast corner of Lot 5 thereof;

Thence West along the south line of Lot 5 to the southwest corner of Lot 5; thence North along the west line of Lot 5 to the northwest corner of Lot 5; thence West along the south line of Lot 12 to the southwest corner of Lot 12; thence North along the west lines of Lots 11 and 12 to the southeast corner of Lot 18; thence West along the south line of Lot 18 to the southwest corner of Lot 18; thence North along the west line of Lot 18 to the northwest corner of Lot 18; thence West along the southerly line of Lot 33 and the westerly projection thereof to the intersection of the west line of the County Road with the westerly projection of the southerly line of Lot 33; thence southerly along the west line of the County Road to the southeast corner of Lot 32; thence West along the south line of Lot 32 to the intersection thereof with the center of the channel of the Russian River, thence along the center of the channel of the Russian River to the northerly line of Lot 108, Yokayo Rancho; Thence along the northerly line of Lot 108, West, South, and West to the southwest corner of the lands of Fred Finne as described in the deed recorded in Book 405, Page 130, Official Records, Mendocino County;

Thence North 2200 feet along the west line of said lands; thence West 2900 feet; thence North 1900 feet to the southeast corner of the Del Arbbres Subdivision, as shown on the map recorded in Case 1, Drawer 10, Page 15, Mendocino County Records; thence North 85 degrees West 600 feet; thence South 17 degrees West 330 feet; thence West 400 feet; thence South 3 degrees West 490 feet; thence West 2570 feet on the south line of said subdivision to the southwest corner thereof; thence North along the west line of said subdivision to the southeast corner of Lot 3 of Section 7, Township 16 North, Rage 12 West, M.D.B. & M.;

Thence West along the southerly boundary of said Lot 3 to the southeast corner of the north 1/2 of the southeast 1/4 of Section 12, Township 16 North, Rane 12 West, M.D.B. & M.; thence West along the southerly boundary of said north 1/2 of the southeast 1/4 of said Section 12 to the northeast corner of the southwest 1/4 of the southeast 1/4 of said Section 12; thence South along the easterly boundary of the southwest 1/4 of the southeast 1/4 of said Section 12 to the southerly boundary of Section 12; thence West along the southerly boundary of Section 12 to the southwesterly corner of the southwest 1/4 of the southeast 1/4 of Section 12;

Continued

Thence North along the westerly boundary of the east 1/2 of Section 12 to Seward Creek; thence southeasterly along Seward Creek to the westerly boundary of the southeast 1/4 of the northeast 1/4 of Section 12; thence North along the westerly boundary of the southeast 1/4 of the northeast 1/4 of Section 12 to the southerly boundary of the north 1/2 of the northeast 1/4 of Section 12; thence West along the southerly boundary of the north 1/2 of the northeast 1/4 of Section 12 to the southwesterly corner thereof; thence North along the westerly boundary of the north 1/2 of the northeast 1/4 of Section 12 to the northerly boundary line of said Section 12; thence East along the northerly boundary line of Section 12 to the northeast corner of said Section 12 and the southwest corner of Section 6, Township 16 North, Range 12 West, M.D.B. & M.;

Thence North 1 mile, more or less, along the west line of Section 6 to the Point of Beginning.

This description was prepared by me or under my direct supervision in June 2025.



6/18/2025

Steven J. Klein, PLS 8155

Date



End of Description

Mendocino County

Russian River Flood Control & Water Conservation Improvement District

P.O. Box 2104 Ukiah, CA 95482 707.462.5278 Website: RRFC.net DistrictManager@rrfc.net

**Plan for Services
For RRFC Annexation of the Complete
Redwood Valley County Water District Service Area**

Summary of proposal

The proposal before LAFCo is the annexation of the remaining portion of the Redwood Valley County Water District (RVCWD) boundary and service area into the Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RRFC) boundary with no dissolution of RVCWD or consolidation of services.

RRFC wholesales water from the East Fork Russian River and Lake Mendocino under the terms of its State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) issued water right license 13898. RVCWD would join other water retailers within the RRFC boundary who currently purchase water from RRFC under a Uniform Water Sale & Purchase Agreement (Agreement.) These retailers include Millview County Water District, Willow County Water District, Hopland Public Utility District, Calpella County Water District, Rogina Mutual Water Company, and River Estates Mutal Water Company.

RVCWD services provided within the proposed annexation area consist of domestic water service to 1,105 equivalent dwelling units and 197 agricultural customers. Currently, RVCWD has an Agreement with RRFC that covers the small portion of its service area that falls within the RRFC boundary. RVCWD can receive RRFC surplus water, when available, for the remainder and majority of its service area pursuant to a 1980 Stipulated Judgement between the two entities (Stipulated Judgment). Annexation would provide an opportunity for RVCWD to expand the place of use in the Agreement to the entire RVCWD service area.



Lake Mendocino, September 2022 by Russian River Confluence

President
Christopher Watt

Vice President
Tyler Rodrigue

Treasurer
John Bailey

Trustee
John Reardan

Trustee
Dave Koball

District profiles

The Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation Improvement District (RRFC) was formed in 1956 to serve, along with the Sonoma County Water Agency, as the local sponsor for the development of Coyote Dam and Lake Mendocino. RRFC encompasses approximately 51,000 acres from the south end of RVCWD to just north of the Sonoma County line (Figure A.)

RRFC provides wholesale water under a State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) issued water right license 13898 (License.) RRFC is authorized to divert 7,940 acre feet a year from the East Fork Russian River and Lake Mendocino for domestic, municipal, and irrigation purposes within this RRFC licensed place of use.

The District offers water sales contracts to water users within its boundaries through the Agreement for delivery of water available under the License. The water is diverted and sold as raw water to customers for municipal water service uses, private agricultural entities for irrigation and frost protection purposes, and to others for industrial and domestic use. The Agreement specifies the amount of water that can be diverted annually, from what locations (or points of diversion), the purpose of use, and where the contracted water may be used. The Agreement defines terms for purchasing surplus water, measuring and reporting use, allocations during shortage, and responsibilities of each party to comply with all relevant laws and regulations by third parties. The term of the Agreements is twenty (20) years with an option to renew.



Lake Mendocino at Coyote Valley Dam, 2024 by CJ Watt

The quantity of water contracted to RRFC Customers remains relatively steady. Annually, any remaining uncontracted water supply is made available as surplus, first to RRFC customers as per the Agreement, and then to RVCWD, as per the conditions of the Stipulated Judgement. On an annual basis, RRFC customers may offer to make some or all of their contract quantity available to other District customers and RVCWD as surplus through a transfer agreement.

RRFC has a five-member Board of Trustees elected at large to serve staggered four-year terms and District operations are performed year-round by the full-time General Manager, the District's only employee. The District obtains additional operational and planning support by engaging consultants and legal services. The District does not own or operate any facilities or infrastructure other than meters; its contractors are responsible for their own treatment, infrastructure, and delivery systems.

RRFC is recently underwent a Municipal Service Review (MSR) and Sphere of Influence (SOI) update in coordination with this annexation application. The extent of the proposed annexation area is the RVCWD boundary which is within the RRFC SOI. There are no changes being requested in the SOI.

The Redwood Valley County Water District (RVCWD) was established on January 16, 1964 under Sections 30322 and 30323 of the Water Code. RVCWD has a dual distribution system; irrigation water service began in April 1979; domestic water service began in November 1979. RVCWD's service area is roughly 15 square miles and is located north of the Ukiah Valley area (Figure B), with only a small area of approximately 200 acres in the southern portion within the RRFC boundary. RVCWD serves a total of 1105 equivalent dwelling units and 197 agricultural customers.



RVCWD has three sources of water supply. Treated municipal supply is purchased from Millview County Water District surplus groundwater supply via an intertie. Untreated water is purchased from RRFC, pumped by RVCWD from its Lake Mendocino pump station into the agricultural supply lines and to a holding reservoir. Water can be routed through the water treatment plant then stored in tanks for municipal supply. Untreated water can be routed from the reservoir to the irrigation distribution system. RVCWD also holds a largely un-exercisable right to divert up to 4,900 acre feet a year directly from Lake Mendocino between November 1 and April 30 of each year. Water diversions under this right can only occur in instances when stream flows in the Russian River main stem (as measured at the confluence of the East and West forks) exceed 150 cubic feet per second and Lake Mendocino storage is within the flood pool. This represents a relatively narrow window of opportunity and RVCWD has not exercised this right in the last 5 years. Additionally, in order for this winter-diverted water to be useful to RVCWD, it must be stored and the District's only pond is grossly insufficient in size.

RVCWD pump & intake at Lake Mendocino, by E. Salomone

RVCWD is currently under a court-ordered moratorium for domestic connections and a district board initiated moratorium on irrigation connections. The proposed annexation will not meet the requirements to lift this moratorium.

RVCWD has a five-member Board of Directors elected at large to four-year staggered terms. In 2024, RVCWD joined the Ukiah Valley Water Authority (UVWA), a newly consolidated water management joint powers agency. Members of UVWA include the City of Ukiah, Calpella County Water District, Millview County Water District, Redwood Valley County Water District, and Willow County Water District, creating coordination which aims to modernize water infrastructure and governance while maximizing water access and resilience. The day-to-day operations of UVWA are managed by City of Ukiah employees and as of January 1, 2025, all RVCWD operational services were transferred to the City of Ukiah. UVWA is actively working with the SWRCB to obtain funding under the Safe and Affordable Funding for Equity and Resilience (SAFER) program to enhance and secure municipal water supplies which will include improving the municipal water supply services to RVCWD. UVWA is a functional consolidation of water agencies and while not an actual reorganization/consolidation under LAFCo, UVWA intends to move forward with formal LAFCo applications for reorganization/consolidation over the next few years.

History

The concept of consolidating water services has been discussed off and on in the greater Ukiah Valley for well over 30 years and has been the subject of numerous reports and studies.

In 2011, RRFC and RVCWD signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) in pursuit of consolidation. In 2014, progress was made toward an annexation and dissolution of RVCWD before the Districts jointly concluded it was not a viable option.

In 2019, RRFC once again began to explore how to elevate the customer status of RVCWD from surplus only. An Agreement to Terms of Service was developed by a joint Ad Hoc Committee and approved by both Districts. The agreement lays out the terms under which RRFC provides surplus water to RVCWD.

In early 2024, RVCWD and RRFC resumed the collaboration toward annexation. On April 1, 2024, RRFC adopted Resolution No. 24-01, a *Commitment to Collaborate with Redwood Valley County Water District in Developing a Local Agency Formation Commission Annexation Application* and on April 18, 2024, the RVCWD adopted Resolution No. 24-01 of the same title. On August 1, 2024, RRFC and RVCWD entered a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding the development of an annexation application to LAFCo including a cost sharing agreement. This latest attempt has successfully resulted in this annexation application to LAFCo.



Lake Mendocino 2019, by Bobby Cochran Photography

Description of current services

RRFC is restricted from providing a stable water supply source to the entirety of the RVCWD service area under an Agreement because RVCWD is not fully within the current RRFC jurisdictional boundary and RRFC does not currently have enough water available under its License not under contract to meet RVCWD demands.

RRFC's License authorizes it to divert 7,940 acre feet a year from the East Fork Russian River and Lake Mendocino for domestic, municipal, and irrigation uses within the RRFC licensed place of use. The License acknowledges that a prior State Order WR 79-15:

approved delivery of up to 4,000 acre-feet per annum of water under this right to the Redwood Valley County Water District and added the Redwood Valley County Water District as an authorized place of use, upon the following condition: Water to be utilized in this additional place of use shall be available only until the same is necessary to supply water for any existing or future use of water within the Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation Improvement District. Neither the Redwood Valley County Water District nor any user within that district will acquire a vested right to water available under this right as a result of this change in place of beneficial use.

RRFC currently provides water service to RVCWD pursuant to the Stipulated Judgment, which provides that RRFC must provide surplus water to Redwood, defined as "that portion, if any, of said 8,000 acre feet which is not put to beneficial use within the land situated in the Mendocino district." RRFC surplus water supply is determined by the amount of uncontracted water under this License. Additionally, RRFC customers can offer to make some or all of their contract quantity available to other customers and/or RVCWD as surplus through a transfer agreement on an annual basis.

Currently, RVCWD purchases water from both Millview CWD and RRFC that has been determined to be surplus to the ongoing needs of the two respective organizations. Millview CWD provides RVCWD with groundwater, which is not regulated by the SWRCB and has no assigned place or purpose of use. The amount of water that can be delivered by Millview CWD to RVCWD is limited by the size of the infrastructure, amounting to approximately 55 gallons per person per day to RVCWD municipal customers. With the recent formation of the Ukiah Valley Water Authority (UVWA) JPA, the expectation is that the UVWA will use State funding from the Safe and Affordable Funding for Equity and Resilience (SAFER) program to enhance and secure municipal water supplies through consolidation of the JPA member water rights and expanding groundwater pumping and delivery. Infrastructure improvements will include the delivery lines for the RVCWD municipal water supply.


RVCWD has purchased an annual average of 850 acre feet of surplus water from RRFC since 2016, which includes times of supply restriction. This water is used to serve RVCWD's agricultural customers and as a supplement to the surplus water from Millview CWD for municipal supply. This supplementation will remain important to RVCWD until the improvements in infrastructure from UVWA are complete. Afterwards, the RRFC water will provide a redundant source in place for emergencies. RVCWD agricultural customers depend on the RRFC surplus supply, only augmented by those few and far between times RVCWD can exercise its own water right. The Redwood Valley agricultural community also relies on surface water storage ponds and groundwater, where available. During a drought, both ponds and wells are at high risk of going dry and farmers then rely solely on water stored in Lake Mendocino under RRFC's water right.

While under the RRFC License, RVCWD is allowed up to 4,000 acre feet of surplus annually, that amount has historically not been available, nor has RVCWD needed that quantity from RRFC. Due to water supply availability impacts from climate change = and the restrictions of the Potter Valley Project there will be less and less surplus water available to RVCWD from RRFC in future years.

Service Challenges

The primary challenge in providing water in the Russian River watershed is reliable water supply due to both intensifying drought conditions and the impending changes to the Potter Valley Project.

The Potter Valley Project (PVP) has been rerouting water from the Eel River to the Russian River for over a century, growing and sustaining the economy in communities through agriculture, drinking water, and even recreation with additional water supplied as a byproduct of power generation. Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) as the current owner the PVP has determined in the last few years that the PVP is no longer a viable project to maintain and has issued a public draft application for surrender and decommissioning of the PVP. The final application will be submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) by July 29, 2025.




Potter Valley Project map by PG&E

The Russian River Watershed has been active for years in an effort to continue this trans basin diversion. Prior to 2019, a group of organizations representing both Eel and Russian River water user interests attempted to purchase the PVP with intent to relicense the entire project through FERC. Being unsuccessful, Russian River representatives reorganized and formed the Eel Russian Project Authority (ERPA) to develop solutions under the scenario of the PG&E decommissioning. ERPA met with Eel River Watershed interests, forming the Two-Basin Partnership and entered into talks to develop a proposal to submit to PG&E for a new diversion facility on the Eel River.



Lake Pillsbury by CJ Watt

In February 2025, the Two-Basin Partnership members established a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to advance a water diversion agreement associated with PG&E’s decommissioning of the Potter Valley Project. The MOU details how Russian River water users can continue to divert water, without harming the recovery of salmon species on the Eel River. It commits the parties to support the removal of the two dams on the Eel River, restoration in the Eel River watershed, developing water supply reliability and self-reliance in the Russian River, and sets terms for the proposed continued diversion. Under the current plan, a new water diversion facility will be designed to mimic a free-flowing Eel River and diversion to the Russian River will occur mostly in the wintertime and under strict rules designed to protect Eel River biological resources and ecological processes. These diversions are dependent on hydrological conditions in the Eel River and not guaranteed. It is expected that intensifying drought conditions will impact the ability to divert water in some years and the current lack of storage capacity in the Russian River watershed is another obstacle to addressing the significant deficit of diverted water.



Scott Dam at Lake Pillsbury by CJ Watt

Russian River water users will have to wait for several years as the decommissioning approval process moves through FERC. In the meantime, significant funding will need to be obtained to move forward with the plans. Mendocino County Inland Water & Power Commission (IWPC) is the local joint powers agency leading the effort in both the continued trans basin diversion and the feasibility of modernizing Coyote Valley Dam to, among other things, provide additional storage space in Lake Mendocino. Both RRFC and RVCWD are members of IWPC and contribute financially to the ongoing efforts.



Cape Horn Dam at the diversion site by Cal Trout

Intensifying climate conditions are a major concern for water suppliers through California. The region has experienced several significant droughts in the last 20 years, with the most recent one in 2020-2022 burdening the region with a drought declaration by the Governor of California and State Water Resources Control Board emergency regulations resulting in curtailment of water rights. Lake Mendocino reached its lowest point since filling and many community members were under strict water rations.

Both RRFC and RVCWD have guidelines to address water supply shortages.

RVCWD adopted a conservation ordinance in 2007 to deal with droughts such as those that occurred in 2007–2009. The ordinance includes six tiers, of which the most severe restrictions apply to Tier 6. Tier 4 was implemented in 2009 when Lake Mendocino water levels receded to record lows. At that time mandatory rationing was imposed by the SWRCB, which resulted in a 50 percent reduction in water use. During the 2013-2015 drought, Tier 4 was again implemented, resulting in limits of 50 gallons per person per day and no agricultural water deliveries. During the 2020-2022 drought, RVCWD had limited supply for agricultural customers, with no deliveries being made in all of 2021 and most of 2022. The physical limitations of the Millview CWD intertie required RVCWD to ration municipal supply to 55 gallons per person per day.



Lake Mendocino north boat ramp, January 2021 by E Salomone

RRFC has a Water Conservation Program outlined in District Ordinance #25-01 to enact when conditions limit the water supply available to its customers. In the 2013-2015 drought, RRFC implemented mandatory reductions on District customers and coordinated an emergency water supply for RVCWD. During the 2020-2022 drought, RRFC declared a Water Supply Emergency, when the District determined a major failure of supply and storage, including no surplus water supply to provide to RVCWD. RRFC customers were asked to voluntarily reduce water use and through resounding cooperation were able to continue accessing RRFC stored water in Lake Mendocino, though the SWRCB was close to curtailing that use.

In 2022, the District and Sonoma County Water Agency entered a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) concerning Lake Mendocino Storage Planning and Russian River Management. The MOU was developed in response to SWRCB terms during the drought and establishes planning and management activities related to the shared water supplies in Lake Mendocino. This MOU established the amount of stored water available to the various parties and will be a critical tool in years with reduced water supply.

RRFC, Sonoma Water, and other regional water interests worked with the SWRCB beginning in 2020 to develop the Upper Russian River Voluntary Water Sharing Program. The Program allows collaboration to share limited water resources within the water rights priority system regulated by the SWRCB. Work continues to enhance this Program.

Services Under Annexation

As mentioned, RVCWD currently holds an Agreement with RRFC for 328.85 acre feet for use within RVCWD's approximately 200 acres located within RRFC's jurisdictional boundaries. Annexation of the remaining portion of the RVCWD service area into the RRFC boundary will allow RVCWD to use the water supply available under the Agreement anywhere in its service area. In addition, annexation would allow RVCWD to put surplus water available under its Agreement to beneficial use anywhere within the entire Redwood service area, not just that portion currently within RRFC.

All infrastructure is already in place; there will be no interruption in the services provided to RVCWD. The annexation is not expected to increase RVCWD's historical use of RRFC's License or induce growth due to regional water supply challenges described above. RVCWD will continue to use RRFC water as it has, for agricultural customers and as an emergency backup for domestic supply until such time as the UVWA expands the groundwater supply and infrastructure.




RVCWD pump house and intake at Lake Mendocino, by CJ Watt

Financial or Fiscal Impact

RVCWD currently pays for water under its Agreement. In addition, it pays for surplus water used from RRFC as per terms of the 1980 Stipulated Judgement between the two entities. The purchase price of surplus water is determined by dividing RRFC's operational expenses by 7,940, the licensed amount under RRFC's License. RRFC does not budget revenue from the sale of surplus water since it is an unknown in any given year. Once annexed, the only change is that the cost per acre foot to RVCWD will be the same as for all RRFC customers if it includes its entire service area under its Agreement, determined by the Board of Trustees through the adoption of fiscal year budgets.

Figure A




Russian River Flood Control District

Source: This map was prepared by the Mendocino County Division of Information Services GIS Program, March 17, 2025.
 Note: This map is not a survey product.

- Russian River Flood Control District
- Incorporated City
- Parcels
- Highways
- Roads
- Streams



Figure B



Redwood Valley Water District

Source: This map was prepared by the County of Mendocino Information Services GIS Program December 18, 2024.
Note: This map is not a survey product and should not be used to determine legal boundaries.

 Water District	 Highways
 Parcels	 Roads
	 Streams

0.25 0.125 0 0.25 Miles



Exhibit C
to Resolution #25-07

**MENDOCINO COUNTY RUSSIAN RIVER FLOOD CONTROL
AND WATER CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
NEGATIVE DECLARATION REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

1. NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Project described below has been reviewed pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (Public Resources Code Section 21100, et seq.) and a determination has been made that it will have no significant effect upon the environment.
2. PROJECT NAME: Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation Improvement District Redwood Valley Annexation Project (“**Project**”).
3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT: Filing of an application with the Mendocino County Local Agency Formation Commission to annex the Redwood Valley County Water District (“**RVCWD**”) into the RRFC. The Project Description is more fully set forth in the Initial Study for the Project. The purpose of the annexation is to allow RVCWD to contract with the RRFC to receive surface water supplies available under the RRFC’s licensed water right.
4. LOCATION OF PROJECT: The Project is located within Mendocino County as shown on the areas identified on the map attached as **EXHIBIT “A”**.
5. NAME AND ADDRESS OF PROJECT PROPONENT: Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation Improvement District, PO Box 2104, Ukiah, CA 95482, (707) 462-5278.
6. MITIGATION MEASURES: None.
7. A copy of the Initial Study regarding the environmental effect of this Project is on file at the RRFC office at 304 North State Street, Ukiah, California, 95482. This study was:

 Adopted as presented.

 Adopted with changes. Specific modifications supporting reasons are attached.
8. The RRFC considered and adopted this Negative Declaration at a public meeting of its Board of Directors on October 6, 2025.
9. DETERMINATION: *(To be completed by the Lead Agency)*.

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed Project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

- I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the Project have been made by or agreed to by the Project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed Project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (1) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to the applicable standards, and (c) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the Project, nothing further is required.

Elizabeth Salomone

Elizabeth Salomone

October 6, 2025


Date



EXHIBIT "A"
TO NEGATIVE DECLARATION
MAP OF RVCWD AREA TO BE ANNEXED INTO RRFC
 October 6, 2025



THIS MAP HAS BEEN PREPARED BY STEVEN J. KLEIN.
Steven J. Klein
 STEVEN J. KLEIN, P.L.S. 8155
 06/18/25



LEGEND

- BOUNDARY OF LANDS TO BE ANNEXED
- - - - EXISTING BOUNDARY OF RUSSIAN RIVER FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
- SECTION LINES
- OVERLAP OF RVCWD & RRFC

