

2011-2012 GRAND JURY

SDR-2011-2012-001

REPORT

Trinity PUD Report

Let There Be Light

BOS RESPONSE

RECEIVED
JUN 26 2012

TRINITY COUNTY
SUPERIOR COURT



TRINITY COUNTY

Board of Supervisors

P.O. BOX 1613, WEAVERVILLE, CALIFORNIA 96093
PHONE (530) 623-1217 FAX (530) 623-8365

TO: The Honorable James Woodward,
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: Trinity County Board of Supervisors

CC: Trinity County Grand Jury

SUBJECT: Response to Recommendations of 2011/12
Grand Jury Final Report SDR 2011/2012-001

DATE: June 19, 2012

The Grand Jury Special Districts Committee has requested a written response to their final report on the "Trinity PUD Report, Let there be light", SDR 2011/2012-001. The Trinity County Board of Supervisors is required to respond to Findings/Recommendations 7a, 7b, 7c, 7d. The Board of Supervisors' response is as follows:

Finding 7: *"Through the good efforts of those who formed and served the TPUD throughout the years Trinity County residents are making beneficial use of approximately one third of the Preferential Power made available by the Trinity River Act of 1955. If TPUD were to act on all the above recommendations, that beneficial use might to up as high as 50%. At the current rate of growth, it will take decades to reach the level of commitment made in the Trinity River Act of 1955."*

Response: The Board of Supervisors disagrees with part of the finding. The Board agrees with and wholeheartedly thanks those who formed and served with TPUD throughout the years. The Board agrees that Trinity County residents are making beneficial use of a portion of the Preferential Power made available by the Trinity River Act of 1955. Since TPUD is a stand-alone special district, and therefore, not within the jurisdiction of the Board of Supervisors, the Board will not take a position on whether "TPUD should act on all the above recommendations", "the beneficial use rate percentage" or the projected growth rate & the time needed to reach the level of commitment made in the Trinity River Act.

Recommendation 7: *" A. The BOS should evaluate the feasibility of building a pumped storage hydro electric facility and publicize the results. A properly sized Pumped Storage Facility could make beneficial use of some of the excess power allocation, while creating good paying jobs and a substantial increase in the tax base."*

JUDY PFLUEGER
DISTRICT 1

JUDY MORRIS
DISTRICT 2

ROGER JAEGL
DISTRICT 3

DEBRA CHAPMAN
DISTRICT 4

WENDY OTTO
DISTRICT 5

Response A: Will not be implemented. Trinity County and the BOS do not have jurisdiction over the power inflow and usage in Trinity County, therefore, the recommendation is not within the jurisdiction of the Board of Supervisors. The BOS recognizes that there may be merit in the recommendation; however, it should be addressed to the proper power entity for implementation.

“B. The BOS should have the County’s general plan updates, specifically the housing and land use elements, with the intent of making it easier and less expensive for housing and other developments, thus increasing the employment base, the tax base and expanding the benefits realized.”

Response B: The Board of Supervisors agrees in part with the finding. Updating of the County’s general plan has been discussed with the BOS and Administration, an attempt to fund an update occurred several years ago and there are on-going attempts to fund updates of portions of the General Plan. Unfortunately, the revenues that the County receives are stretched so thin with our current debt obligations that funding even the most essential of services will be a challenge for several years to come. The BOS will continue to encourage staff and partner organizations to seek grants to fund General Plan updates. The BOS cannot agree with the Grand Jury’s comment *“with the intent of making it easier and less expensive for housing and other developments, thus increasing the employment base, the tax base and expanding the benefits realized.”*, as that pre-assumes an outcome to a process that is governed, to a degree, by the rules and regulations of the State of California, with input from the public. There is also an expectation that development, whether for housing or businesses, “pay for itself”. To pre-determine that an effort should be made to entice development with “less expensive methods” of creating such development is not a position that the BOS will put itself into.

“C. The BOS should encourage the location of energy intensive industries, such as an internet server farm, thus expanding the tax base and employment opportunities.”

Response C: The recommendation requires further analysis. There are infrastructure capacities that fall both inside and outside of the BOS jurisdiction that need to be explored before attempts are made to encourage the location of energy intensive industries. Several of the infrastructure capacities in question include but are not limited to: Internet access, land-line telephone access, water/sewer capacity; road maintenance capacity, the availability of commercial “turn-key” properties, job skills, assessment and training capacity to name a few. Further discussion will occur on this recommendation by October, 2012.

“D. The BOS should aggressively pursue grants which aid in the financing of high speed internet infrastructure.”

Response D: The recommendation has been implemented. The BOS has partnered with several organizations on the coast, as well as USFS Six Rivers, Shasta-Trinity and private businesses to bring high-speed broadband along the Highway 36 corridor. Currently the same organizations, agencies and businesses are working on high-speed broadband along the Highway 299 corridor.