

# GREENHORN CREEK COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

## Minutes

Thursday, July 17th, 2014

6:00 p.m. – Greenhorn Fire Station

### 1. Roll Call

Board-Cecilia Williams, Zeke Awbry, Janice Bishop, Gayle Higgins, and Candy Miller

Public-Danielle Jabbour, Tyson Rael, Chuck & Pat Jarvi, Fred Mc Grew, Kris Parton, and Scott Mickleson

### 2. Public Comment Opportunity

Any member of the public may address the Board on matters that are within the jurisdiction of the Board not exceeding 3 minutes. Pursuant to the Brown Act, no action or discussion shall be undertaken by the Board on any item not appearing on the posted agenda, except that the Board Members or their staff may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed by the public or they may ask questions for clarification related to such statements made or questions posed by the public. If you are addressing the Board regarding a matter listed on the agenda, you are requested to hold your comments until the Board takes up that matter.

\*Wahooo...the roads are dust coated---double wahoo!

\*Zeke stated that the plan was to water the roads once a week.

\*Kevin Goss told Kris that he would not be able to attend this meeting.

### 3. Board Comments and Reports

Candy printed off pictures of the Greenhorn VFD participating in a training and brought them in to share so everyone could see how dedicated our fire department is.

### 4. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of June 19th, 2014

Cecilia made the motion to approve. Gayle seconded. Motion Approved.

### 5. Finance Report

a. Review monthly financial reports.

Cecilia made the motion to approve. Candy seconded. Motion Approved.

b. Board Responsibility—Checks and Balances

The discussion was that checks written for either the CSD or the Fire Department be signed by Board Members. In doing so this would make the Board more accountable with Public Funds. This would also be a protection for the Public Funds, Susan, and Roy. That the invoices would go to Susan, and then 2 Board members would go in and sign the check(s).

**\*\*The intent of this motion is put into place a process to protect our employees, contractor, and Board members, and in NO way reflects on the previous performance or process. \*\***

Cecilia made the motion that starting today the checks must be signed only by Any 2 Board members, and the checkbook and invoices are to be kept in Susan's office. Zeke seconded. Motion approved.

### 6. Water Department

a. Update on Water systems.

Gayle and Candy went on a tour of the water system. Both were impressed With the complexity and noticeable improvements in the system. Roy was not able to be at the meeting tonight for a status update.

b. Discussion of Draft water policy and possible acceptance.

Chuck handed out a proposal for the Board to consider before the Board Approves the policy. (see attached). It appears that on CSD deeds to lots there is a requirement that the buyer has to a house over 1,000 excluding the garage. Apparently it is not on all deeds. Candy made a motion for the Attorney to tell us our options on this. Cecilia seconded. Motion Approved. Zeke and Cecilia will work on this together, starting with the County Counsel, and then go to the Attorney.

c. Cost of watering roads for Unit I and Unit II—discussion and possible action

Due to the request for a legal opinion this item is tabled until next month. A Request has been in for several weeks by Janice as to what our legal options are in order to be legal in providing water to the Road Associations. It was felt that we needed an actual citation of a court case for this and not just an opinion. Candy made a motion that each Board member fill out the electronic form that Janice will send to them to fill out so that maybe we will get a response by our August meeting for resolution on this subject. Zeke seconded. Motion Approved.

## **7. Fire Department**

a. Update on Fire Department Activity.

There were 3 medical runs with 1 assist from Long Valley. Luckily no Fires! There are currently 12 members, 8 active. On the 24<sup>th</sup> they had 5 members attend Vital Signs training. They have also done Water Cannon and Pump Training this month. July 8<sup>th</sup> they had medical training. With 6 members. At the Rapelling training 5 members attended. Emgine 8325 is running, and 8322 is running, but still has some minor fixing to be done. Charlie Read has been doing a lot of Volunteer mechanical work on the engines for the department. There was discussion on various ways to acknowledge our Volunteers dedication and work.

There was discussion in regards of making easier for Fire Department to purchase approved needed items. Tyson will check on pre paid type debit cards, and Cecilia will check with Bank Of America for ideas for ways of purchasing. Information will be brought back to the August meeting.

b. Fire Safe & Fire Wise Community update

**July 26<sup>th</sup> Community Firewise Potluck**—discussion and possible action.

Candy will check with FS prevention to see if they handouts for kids to also Be given out at our potluck and leftovers to be used by the Fire Department for Handouts. There was discussion on last minute details for Firewise Community Potluck.

c. Office Space

The Fire Department will bring a proposal for office space the Fire Department in the Fire House. They will also bring us a listing of excess property so that we can see about getting rid of it as needed.

## **8. Adjournment—Next Meeting August 21, 2014.**

Thursday, March 20, 2014

Greenhorn Creek Community Services District (CSD)  
For: Board President Janice Bishop  
Quincy, California 95971

Madam President:

Via this formal letter I wish to make you and the CSD Board aware of what I believe are very serious situations/conditions involving lots owned by the CSD that I believe merit CSD Board knowledge, investigation, research and follow up action.

#### The Facts

1. From Plumas County Assessors Records there are roughly 37 properties that Plumas County lists as being currently owned by the CSD, with many more that were previously owned by the CSD and subsequently bought by private parties.
2. From the Plumas County Recorder's Office there are no CCRs related to either Subdivision 1 or Subdivision 2 that indicate there is a minimum square foot size that a constructed home must meet.
3. Recently a gentleman who is the process of trying to buy two vacant lots in Greenhorn 1 (Lots 134 & 135) learned via his contacts with a local realtor and a local Title Company that one of the two lots he is interested in, which previously was owned by the CSD, now has a 1,000 sq ft minimum for a home constructed on that lot.
4. Of the numerous people this potential buyer talked to in various offices within the County no one in the County is aware of any such restriction.
5. As this gentleman continued to pursue with his Realtor and Title Company the source for this 1,000 sq ft limitation, he began getting recommendations from the Realtor and/or the Title Company to contact people who are or possibly were members of the CSD Board, people who do business with the CSD, people who either are or were involved in some way with the Architecture Control Committee, or possibly people who have some other relationship with people involved with the CSD or people on the CSD Board.

#### My Summation of the Facts

1. It seems obvious that there is a connection between this 1,000 sq ft limitation information floating around and the CSD Board or parties related to it in some way.
  2. From my research in to County Records, and what is and is not in those records, any 1,000 sq ft limitation, if it does exist, is both discriminatory and illegal.
  3. If a potential buyer loses an opportunity to buy a property he/she wants because of this 1,000 sq ft limitation, or proceeds with buying and later is denied the opportunity to build a home because of this restriction, it seems to me this buyer would have cause for an action in court against both his/her Title Company and the CSD.
-

4. To me, placing or attempting to place such a restriction to prevent a certain people from buying property at the Greenhorn, or restricting under what conditions they may buy, which in turn is contrary to the CCRs that govern what may be done at the Greenhorn, is a violation of law.

My Recommendation(s)

1. Now that, via this formal submission, the CSD is aware of this problem, I believe it is both an obligation and a duty for this CSD Board to take immediate action to:

- a. Determine the source of this 1,000 sq ft limitation
- b. Correct the mistakes and damage this restriction has inflicted
- c. Put safeguards in place to see that it, or anything like it, does not occur in the future

2. I would recommend these actions be taken immediately because it affects and impacts people, such as the buyer above, now.

Sincerely,

  
Charles Jarvi  
President

Greenhorn Road Association #1

---