



**BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
SAN LORENZO VALLEY WATER DISTRICT  
MINUTES  
February 21, 2019**

**MISSION STATEMENT:** Our Mission is to provide our customers and future generations with reliable, safe and high quality water at an equitable price; to create and maintain outstanding service and community relations; to manage and protect the environmental health of the aquifers and watersheds; and to ensure the fiscal vitality of the San Lorenzo Valley Water District.

**Thursday, February 21, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.,** SLVWD, 13057 Highway 9, Boulder Creek, CA 95006.

1. Convene Meeting 5:35 pm  
Roll Call: Dir. Swan, Dir. Fultz, Dir. Smallman, Pres. Henry present. Dir. Bruce absent.  
Staff: District Manager Rogers, District Secretary Hossack  
Dir. Smallman made a motion to excuse the absence of Dir. Bruce, Dir. Swan seconded. All present voted in favor. Motion passed.
2. Additions and Deletions to Closed Session Agenda:
3. Oral Communications Regarding Items in Closed Session:
4. Adjournment to Closed Session 5:36 pm  
Closed Session Note:  
**The Brown Act prohibits the disclosure of confidential information acquired in a closed session by any person present and offers various remedies to address willful breaches of confidentiality. These include injunctive relief, disciplinary action against an employee, and referral of a member of the legislative body to the grand jury. It is incumbent upon all those attending lawful closed sessions to protect the confidentiality of those discussions. Only the legislative body acting as a body may agree to divulge confidential closed session information; regarding attorney/client privileged communications, the entire body is the holder of the privilege and only a majority vote of the entire body can authorize the waive of the privilege.**
5. Convene to Open Session at 6:31 p.m.
6. Report of Actions Taken in Closed Session  
Closed session agenda item no. 4d pertains to anticipated litigation related to the District's Conflict of Interest Code. Any members of the public that may be curious about the nature of the threatened litigation may refer to a letter sent by

Mr. Bruce Holloway to the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors on or about January 14, 2019, copies of which will be provided as informational material in the next agenda packet, or can be provided by the District upon request. The Board has directed District Counsel to request an opinion from the FPPC regarding whether Board Members and any District staff are subject to Section 87200 of the Political Reform Act.

7. Roll Call

8. Additions and Deletions to Open Session Agenda:

R. Rogers requested removal of item 11d the Valley Gardens Will Serve Letter at the request of the developer.

R. Rogers also requested that the Board consider moving item 8f the Environmental Committee Meeting Suspension and 8g Watershed and Education Grants Suspension to the beginning of the agenda as he believed there were a lot of the public there for those items.

The Board agreed.

9. Oral Communications:

Pres. Henry explained the procedure for Oral Communications.

D. Loewen said that she recommends that everyone attend Committee meetings.

J. Ricker, County of Santa Cruz Water Resources Division Director, took the time to compliment the District on the work we're doing on the sustainability of water resources.

B. Holloway-Boulder Creek said that the County pursued a policy of scouring creek beds to remove all of the logs and now they are saying to put large, woody debris in the creek bed. This District has violated Felton water permit for 10 years.

V. Champlin-Brookdale complimented the budget summary and asked about legal fees last year.

J. Fasolas-Felton requested the District set up meeting with guest wi-fi.

11. New Business:

f. ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE MEETING SUSPENSION

This item was introduced by Pres. Henry this item. The Board is not proposing the canceling of the meeting but suspension until a public member of members can be appointed. Also the 2 Board members and the public have to agree on a time and place for the meeting.

Roberta McPherson-Boulder Creek said, "this place of all places I've been, except for my home, is the epitome of who my husband was. He spent a lot of time here and he spent a lot of time serving on the Environmental Committee, before he was on the Board and after he was on the Board. I appreciate very much that it isn't a done deal that you're just getting rid of the Environmental Committee. It was very important to him and it gave him a voice for really important matters that happened from the

Watershed Management Plan". She encouraged the Board to continue the committee in the future.

R. Moran-Ben Lomond said it's difficult for people who work to make it to Committees.

J. Gomez-Lompico said works full time and makes it to meetings and thinks there are qualified applicants that can make those times.

G. Ratcliffe-Felton said environmental work is core to everything the District is trying to get done. She said that she understands the pressure the Environmental Dept. is under and thinks that anything that can be done to make the committee work better for staff is important. She also was working full time when she was on the committee and made arrangements to attend meetings.

S. Shettler-Ben Lomond agreed with G. Ratcliffe and added the Environmental Committee needs to be a presence in the community, promoting stewardship and everything the committee does.

T. Norton-Lompico asked for clarification on the suspension.

M. Fresco-Felton agreed with G. Ratcliffe. He said you ran on an environmental slate and it seems that the Environmental Committee is the least important thing to this Board.

J. Fasolas-Felton said that he has seen the Environmental Comm. through save the District a lot of money.

C. White-Ben Lomond encouraged the Board to think past face to face meetings and look for other options.

S. Shettler added its simple to find out if there is a quorum for a meeting.

B. Springer-Felton said she is confused as to why this is called a suspension. Instead you should be working on how to keep it going.

DM Rogers said that the District has been advertising for public members of the Environmental Committee with the plan of appointing at the March 7<sup>th</sup> meeting. At that time a meeting of the committee can be scheduled.

J. Michelsen said that once the committee is fully staffed, she will send out a scheduling request.

B. Smallman insists that he cannot make a daytime meeting. It is only one meeting a month, he said. He insisted that the Board approve the applications that have come in.

R. Rogers explained the process of going out for applications for public members of the committees. We prepare an announcement with a closing date, which is February 26<sup>th</sup> for the Environmental Committee, and then take the applications to the Board. The Enviro Comm appointments are scheduled for the March 7<sup>th</sup> BoD meeting.

B. Smallman reiterated that next meeting we will bring the applications to the Board.

B. Fultz said that he thinks there has been a misunderstanding.

M. Fresco asked if other committee meetings been canceled temporarily.

S. Swan everyone can attend and participate in all of the public meetings.

g. WATERSHED AND EDUCATION GRANTS SUSPENSION

This item was introduced by Pres. Henry she said people are not looking at this right, over 4 years the grants have cost the Dist. \$130,000. That is money the District doesn't have to spend. When the Dist. started these grants we had Waterman Gap money. We don't have money to maintain our infrastructure. Our job is not to hurt the environment while providing safe, clean water at an affordable price to our customers. Staff can go to grade schools and teach them about conservation.

B. Fultz questioned the budget for the Grants.

J. Michelsen explained that the budget is \$32,000/year. We don't always get applications for the Data Collection and Restoration Grant, those have mostly not been awarded over the last 5 years.

B. Fultz questioned the reason for the Data Collection Grants not getting applications.

J. Michelsen explained that perhaps the audience we have been reaching out to was more geared to education.

B. Fultz questioned the Commission appointment process.

R. Rogers answered that in the past the individual Board members each member has brought a name to the Board and the full Board has voted to accept.

B. Fultz questioned the historical information about the Waterman Gap funds. The previous Boards believed that a portion of the money needed to be returned to the community.

R. Rogers said that it is his recollection that the District thought that they had taken in a considerable amount of money from watershed and they needed to give money back to watershed. The money has been expensed to intertie projects and other District projects.

B. Smallman said that when you look at the numbers all you really need to do is divide by 7900 customers. He then started talking about stipends.

S. Swan said the Waterman Gap money is gone so the grants should be suspended. Other water districts have little or no grant programs.

L. Henry explained the process for Oral Communication regarding this item She limited the speaking time for each person to 1 minute.

J.? Boulder Creek, agrees with what everyone else is going to say. Schools are very important.

J. Fasolas SLV is unique. Not SV not Santa Cruz we have a responsibility. The environmental studies that we lead our children into comes back to us 2 or 3 fold.



S. Swan said that the public should contact the Santa Margarita Groundwater Agency for grant money. They have the ability to raise funds and use it however they choose. They have a much larger pool to pull from.

R. Moran SLV residents already supports schools.

K. Holl-Felton, she hears that the Board wants to manage the water resources and the habit cost effectively, it's called adaptive management. You try something and then monitor it to see if it's working. You have to actually do something and monitor it and you save a lot of money in the long run when you actually manage the land.

G. Ratcliffe-said the we are unique, we have stream sources and septic. Teaching children is the best way to infiltrate the population.

K. Springer-Boulder Creek, she's a teacher and knows the teaching young people about the watershed is important. They are our future committee members.

T. Norton understands what is being said but thinks our water money should be spent on infrastructure. She believes that all of the people in this room could form new organization to raise funds for education grants.

J. Orbuch said she is a retired teacher and she thinks the District should be proud of the fact that you have educated public and engaged students with these grants. No other districts are doing it. The District is a role model in the community.

J. Gomez this grant money is a fraction of a percent of the operating budget. It will not make or break any Capital Improvement project.

B. Holloway data collection grants should be reframed as requests for proposals. This program costs just as much in staff time as is spent on the program.

D. Ziel was the chair on the commission. She thinks the District should be proud of program. She submitted a written report. She added that Jen has been a strong staff member.

P. Smart said she was also on the commission. She noted that SLVWD gave a grants to Scotts Valley, O'Neill, the Santa Cruz Museum, and others. Kids are still benefitting from the grants.

Unidentified Felton middle school student said that since grade school people have been coming to the schools to teach them about the watershed. He said it is very important to teach kids about conservation. He feels lucky to live in this special place and to understand how to preserve this for generations to come.

N. Macy shared flyer produced through an education grant to the general public. The Valley Women's Club matched and exceeded grant funds from the District to get this out to every single resident of the Valley. She pointed out that the District is not educating the public all by yourselves.

Rachel?-Felton, said she was an SLV High student benefitted greatly from J. Orbuch's program funded by grants. If you value the children learning about the watershed, you'll find the money.

N Gird(sp?)-Felton said that this is a legacy program. It has touched many people over the years and the District should be proud that you are part of it.

E. Fresco-Felton said she understands why this educational program needs continue. She reminded the Board of their Mission Statement to maintain outstanding service and community relations and that Fred McPherson helped start these grants and has created an incredible legacy and it should be continued.

N. Moore-Felton she said that she has been to the Science Night at the school we all learn from these programs. She got a grant for an educational sign in Fall Creek.

D. Alley-Brookdale said he took part in grants, 2005, 2006, 2010 he collected data on water temperature and was able to use that data recently. Students benefit so much.

C. Baughman said that he also participated in data restoration grants. He became involved in the District because of that. The District is not in a financial malaise, it's in the best financial health in decades. This is the time to educate the people.

D. Loewen wants to go back to what Toni said. Fire hydrants and water flow is what the District should be focused on. She doesn't think education is going to come to a stop if this program is discontinued.

A. Benkert said watershed education is very important it is also included in the strategic plan.

L. Dolson is on the SLV School Board she said that these programs allow students to work with scientists on data collected directly on SLVWD property and pertinent to what is happening in the District. Students go onto careers in science because of it.

B. Springer-Felton this money represents about \$.25 per household per month. The tiny amount of money that is spent on these programs does more for the District than for anyone that receives a grant. Please continue.

L. Farris-Felton said infrastructure needs to be funded. Don't eliminate the program, simply reduce the funding.

S. Schettler said this District is a leader not a follower building for the future.

Pres. Henry thanked everyone for their comments. She said she has values and she also has money sense. Our infrastructure is in bad shape. Money needed to make sure you get water.

B. Fultz thanked everybody for coming out. Asked Dist. Counsel if under Ordinance 100, do we have to appoint people to the commission right now. Counsel responded that if the Board wants to make changes to the program we can deal with tidying up any legal issues in order to make

the changes. How do we understand the direct benefit from these programs to the District?

J. Michelsen it's critical for a District like ours that gets its water from our own watershed-surface water. It's critical that we have a population that's environmentally literate to understand how the stewardship of the watershed impacts water quality and quantity. These grants provide the scientific learning that needs to start at young age in a repetitive way.

B. Fultz said that at some point we need to understanding the direct benefit to the District. He has concerns about how the program is currently structured. We need to focus on the infrastructure for the next few years.

B. Smallman said benefits are hard to measure but educating children is priceless. His entire time on the Board he has offered cost saving measures. Environmental regulations take a lot of money and don't really help the environment. \$4.00 dollars a year per person, come on folks, the benefits are priceless.

S. Swan said that he doesn't fault the grants but the grants are being confused with entitlements. This is a water district, not an educational foundation. If there is a particular item that the grant is serving that is of necessary value, then it should be put on the budget as operational expense. He suggested that this be taken to SMGWA to deal with.

B. Fultz said that the voting public let him know that they don't want any funding going to anything that is not operations and infrastructure.

B. Smallman respects Dir. Fultz position but he feels that most people would agree to funding this much money.

Pres. Henry says she wants to fix the water district so there's water.

B. Smallman made a motion to continue the Education Grant Program for \$32,500 per year.

S. Swan made a motion to suspend the Watershed Educational Grants Program be suspended at this point.

B. Fultz suggested that the motion be amended to suspend program but to send the program review to the Environmental Committee and the and the numbers to the Budget & Finance Committee and through the process of the budget we'll be able to see where the District stands. It is not permanent. This means that the Commissioners appointments will also be suspended.

Pres. Henry seconded.

3 voted in favor of the motion, Dir. Smallman voted no.

Motion passed.

Recess taken 8:14 pm

Reconvene 8:20 pm

#### 10. Unfinished Business:

- a. NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION - PUBLIC HEARING

This item was introduced by J. Michelsen on Jan. 17<sup>th</sup> the Board agreed to open the public comment period for the Mitigated Negative Declaration which is a CEQA process for the Sequoia and Lyon Pipeline project. She said that one comment was received from the Department of Transportation.

Pres. Henry opened the Public Hearing

J. Michelsen continued with the comment from the Dept. of Transportation regarding working inside the roadway. No concerns regarding the environmental conditions.

R. Rogers all of their concerns were handled in the encroachment permit.

B. Fultz asked if there is anything in the document that will cause us to do anything different than we had already planned to do.

B. Smallman pipeline projects spend money on consultants and he wants to cut costs that aren't really helping the environment.

J. Michelsen explained the process for the CEQA. First there is an initial study, that document is submitted to County. Then it is available to the public for comment, that's where we are now.

B. Smallman says his goal is to show the public where their money is going.

J. Michelsen said that the main dollar amount for the CEQA process is the development of the initial study.

R. Rogers said we've seen in the past pie charts that show in a project, how much is environmental, how is engineering, etc. These are easy things we can do to show the costs.

B. Smallman these aren't benefitting the environment.

M. Lee said that the CEQA process is not as complicated as you think.

B. Fultz questioned how much of this or any of it can be reused.

J. Michelsen said none, the CEQA process is site specific.

Pres. Henry closed the public hearing.

B. Smallman made a motion to adopt Res. 29 (18-19)

B. Fultz seconded the motion.

All present voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed.

b. WATER AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT FOR SAN LORENZO RIVER  
WATERSHED CONJUNCTIVE USE PLAN

This item was introduced by Pres. Henry. She said that it is her understanding that we are saying, yes received this plan.

J. Michelsen spoke about this in depth at the workshop last Board meeting. She said this is a very complex report. There are 3 major issues. One is the compliance with the Felton Water Right. Second is to improve streamflow in the main stem of the San Lorenzo River for fish habitat. Third is to recover the aquifer overdraft. It's important to understand that the potential transfers from the North System to Felton to relieve the Water

Right issue, there are insufficient water resources in the ground when we are pumping during the summer. And serving the North System there is not enough water supply to be able to serve the town of Felton. If we tried to use the South System, it would be an unprecedented amount of pumping from an already over drafted basin. The use of Loch Lomond Water Right would allow the Felton Water Right to completely comply with its Water Right and would reduce the South System pumping by 60-70%. Finally, with the addition of the Loch Lomond Water Right, we can optimize the use of the North System and Felton potential to restore the aquifer in the South System. Aquifer restoration is a critical component moving forward. The grant was \$300,000 and we agreed to match \$300,000, those projects have already been accounted for and they have already been submitted as matched funds. Those projects include the intertie project, the stream flow monitoring, the temperature monitoring, the Bull Pipeline replacement project, the fish monitoring program and project management.

L. Henry said she had spoken with R. Rogers that it's totally possible to treat that Loch Lomond water and get it into our system. Of course it's going to cost money.

R. Rogers said we start by looking at the water and then look at the infrastructure. Yes, we can treat the Loch Lomond water.

J. Michelsen said this is the first step. If you choose to accept this, the next step is to do a fish assessment to see how moving this water will impact fish resources. That's 100% grant funded. Then if you choose to we will move to the CEQA process for the interties.

R. Rogers said that is real important, whether we use Loch Lomond water or not, to be able to freely move water with no environmental restrictions.

J. Michelsen noted there are funds in the grant the CEQA as well.

B. Smallman doesn't believe we need to vote on it. We don't need to approve this document at all. This report will cost \$285,000 and the \$310,00 that came from a grant. We basically paid \$75 each for this report. He then read a prepared statement against this plan.

R. Rogers explained that staff is not asking the Board to evaluate or approve the report, if you want to evaluate the report we will put together a workshop. Staff is asking that you receive the report so that we can put it on our website so that the public can look at it.

B. Fultz questioned the cost of the report -\$75,000. He questioned if there is anything in this report that we didn't know before the report. He would like to know the entire program scope and cost to be incurred. He questioned the CEQA application, is this a requirement in this fashion.

J. Michelsen said that if it is deemed that we need an EIR, this study and the fish study will both be important assets of the environmental impact work. She hopes we can do a mitigated negative dec.

B. Fultz said that his point is that he wants this to be sure what it is we are going to undertake. It's not just the cost of the study, it's also your time and everybody else's. Focus on exactly what is necessary. He would be

happy to look items other than the injection well. And he would be happy to receive but not accept this report. And if it is posted on the website, it should have context that states this is raw material and not a set of conclusions.

A motion was made by Smallman to receive the report.

R. Rogers said there is a lot of good information in this report that we will use.

B. Holloway said he hasn't read the report so he's not aware of what it says. He said he kinda thinks the District's in an untenable position. It's just a matter of time before the State realizes that we have a water agency her that's stepping all over its permit.

C. Finnie asked Dir. Smallman who he meant when he said "they" are going to make us do this or that.

B. Smallman said the State.

J. Ricker responded to Mr. Holloway that the District inherited the Felton and is trying to address all of their diversions, they are not just sitting back. The District is restoring the fish ladder. The State knows that the District is in violation and the State knows that the District is taking proactive measures to try to address all of their diversions. This is a Streamflow Enhancement grant. This is good quantitative data. There's not a plan in the document, there's an analysis of different scenarios. It is groundwork for moving forward.

M. Lee has read the report and is disappointed. A lot of money was wasted on this report. He agrees with Dir. Smallman.

A. Benkert asked when was the project started.

J. Michelsen responded that the grant was applied for in Aug. 2016, it was awarded in spring of 2017, funds were initiated in Aug. 2017, RFPs were done in 2018.

D. Loewen said the report has quite a lot of data. It's high level overview not to be used for planning. What are we going to do with it then?

J. Ricker said that is standard consultant language.

M. Lee said using injection wells doesn't work. The use of reservoirs is missing from the report.

B. Fultz made a motion to receive the Final Water Availability Assessment Conjunctive Use Plan for the SLVWD report with context saying this does not reflect final decision of the Board.

S. Swan seconded.

B Smallman said the report is not that complicated. It doesn't say anything about his plan.

3 Board members voted in favor of receiving the report, Dir. Smallman voted no. Motion passed.

## 11. New Business:

- a. SPECIAL DISTRICT RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY 2019 ELECTION NOMINATIONS

This item was introduced by L. Henry. No discussion or action taken.

b. SAN LORENZO VALLEY LEAK DETECTION - FINAL REPORT

This item was introduced by J. Furtado. He described the process. At this time 32 of 40 leaks found have been repaired. It was estimated that the leaks were 128 gallons/minute. This is about 4.2% of the water produced in 2018. The cost of the leak detection is \$25,000 and it is preformed every 3 - 5 years as recommended by the State.

B. Fultz said of the 700 million gallons produced per year the leaks added up to just about what we sold last month. Why not do the rest of the system next year?

J. Furtado answered that a lot of the pipeline that wasn't done is above ground lines that SLVWD crews inspect regularly leaks. The majority of the leaks found in this process are leaks that are not surfacing.

L. Henry questioned if hydrants were listened to.

J. Furtado said they found that some hydrants had leaks sub surface.

B. Fultz questioned if we geo coded the leaks.

J. Furtado explained that our GIS System does not allow us to do that.

B. Smallman this is a good example the leaky pipelines are performing ASRs.

S. Swan questioned how does the leak report that was performed 4 years ago compare

J. Furtado said that at that time it was 10% of the water produced that year.

R. Rogers asked that they keep in mind that that was the first time the District did a sub-surface leak detection.

L. Farris questioned what is the status of leaks not repaired.

J. Furtado said they are on our priority list. There are leaks ahead of them that are more substantial that come in from calls by the public or other ways.

A. Benkert asked if District staff does the work.

J. Furtado said District staff is involved with the leak detection crew.

T. Norton questioned the percentage of the District that was done.

J. Furtado said it was about 60%.

Bill Smallman made a motion to accept the SLVWD Leak Detection Final Report.

B. Fultz seconded.

R. Rogers said it is not necessary to approve, just accept the report.

c. AWARD OF BID FOR LOMPICO PRESSURE RELIEF VALVES

This item was introduced by R. Rogers. Final engineering report found only 6 of 8 were needed. The bid came in 52% higher than the engineer's estimate.

B. Smallman said that he thinks staff can do the work.

B. Fultz asked if anyone from the SLV will be working on the crew.

T. Norton asked about the reviews on this company.

R. Rogers responded that they are a licensed contractor we have worked with before.

D. Loewen said she and Toni have made themselves a nuisance. Lompico is not presenting a burden, the burden was imposed by previous Board decisions.

B. Smallman made a motion to approve the award for bid to Earthworks Contracting, Inc. in the amount of \$468,000 Res. 28 (18-19).

B. Fultz seconded.

All in present voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed.

e. CLOSED SESSION DOCUMENTS

This item was introduced by G. Nicholls. If a document goes to a majority of the Board, pertaining to an item on the agenda, it must be made available to the public. That rule applies to Open Session meetings and not to Closed Session meetings.

Pres. Henry questioned documents that are available to the public, for example lawsuits.

G. Nicholls said if a motion gets filed in a litigation, I may provide a copy of that motion to the Board for review and discussion. That document in public in the sense that somebody could go get it from the court file, however we do not make it available to the public at the meeting simply because the Board talked about it in Closed Session.

B. Fultz said something that is otherwise publicly available, it seemed odd that it would be disclosed at some point. Are there any copyright restrictions?

G. Nicholls said it's hard for her to imagine a situation where copyright would prevent you from releasing this kind of information.

B. Fultz in his view, if something is available from another source, it should be release as part of our packet. I can agree that we do that post meeting as opposed to pre-meeting.

G. Nicholls said just imagine a circumstance where there is a sensitive personnel matter and there might be things that are posted on line, it may not be a good idea, just as a matter of course, hand those out to the public.

T. Norton most people are very interested in what's going on with Vierra, for example.



h. 2016 STRATEGIC PLAN REVIEW

This item was introduced by Pres. Henry do we want a facilitator to help with the plan.

R. Rogers read the memo.

B. Fultz said he is unclear as to what is the facilitator going to deliver.

R. Rogers the facilitator will help us come together.

Pres. Henry if we try to do this ourselves this can take months.

R. Rogers described the process.

Pres. Henry

B. Fultz said he is working on a list of priorities. Some of the discussion can be done without a facilitator.

R. Rogers continued the describing the process.

A. Benkert said a facilitator would better allow public input.

Pres. Henry thinks the Board needs preparation before he gets here.

R. Rogers said he will bring this back to the March 21st BoD.

L. Farris asked to compare the 2014 and 2016 Strategic Plan.

12. Consent Agenda:

a. MINUTES FROM SPECIAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
JANUARY 23, 2019

B. Smallman asked that the January 23<sup>rd</sup> minutes be pulled from the Consent Agenda. He said he was there but the minutes list only President Henry and Dir. Fultz as being there.

Dist. Sec. Hossack explained that Dir. Smallman was 15 minutes late to the meeting and so when the meeting began he was not there, so there wasn't a quorum and the meeting was called a Community Meeting and not an official Board meeting.

G. Nicholls attempted to clarify.

B. Fultz has no problem with saying Dir. Smallman eventually arrived. The question is can we still run it as a Community Meeting.

H. Hossack added that presenter of the Brown Act Presentation advised that we could go ahead with the meeting as a Community Meeting.

G. Nicholls said that she isn't hearing anything that concerns her regarding the Brown Act compliance. Just change the minutes to say he came in and the time.

b. MINUTES FROM BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING FEBRUARY 7,  
2019

Pres. Henry said we can approve 12b.

B. Smallman made a motion to approve 12b of the Consent Agenda

B. Fultz seconded.

All present voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed.

13. District Reports:

- DEPARTMENT STATUS REPORTS  
Receipt and consideration by the Board of Department Status Reports regarding ongoing projects and other activities.
  - Administration/Engineering R. Rogers said all day during the week retreat.
  - Finance formal letter
  - Operations J. Furtado updated leaks
  - Environmental
- COMMITTEE REPORTS
  - Future Committee Agenda Items
  - Committee Meeting Notes/Minutes
    - Environmental Committee Minutes 1.17.19
    - LADOC Minutes 1.29.19

14. Written Communication:

- Letter from D. Cox
- Letter from K. Holl, K. Moore, I. Parker and J. Trumbo
- Claim Form from T. Vierra

15. Informational Material:

- Notice of Public Meeting - LAFCO

16. Adjournment 10:11 pm