

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE VALLECITOS WATER DISTRICT
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 7, 2019, AT 5:00 PM AT THE DISTRICT OFFICE,
201 VALLECITOS DE ORO, SAN MARCOS, CALIFORNIA

President Martin called the Regular meeting to order at the hour of 5:00 p.m.

Director Hernandez led the pledge of allegiance.

Present: Director Elitharp
Director Evans
Director Hernandez
Director Sannella
Director Martin

Staff Present: General Manager Pruim
Legal Counsel Gilpin
Administrative Services Manager Emmanuel
District Engineer Gumpel
Finance Manager Owen
Operations & Maintenance Manager Pedrazzi
Accounting Supervisor Glenn
Development Services Senior Engineer Scholl
Financial Analyst Arthur
Executive Secretary Posvar

Others Present: Scott Goldman, Woodard & Curran
Erica Wolski, Woodard & Curran

ADOPT AGENDA FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF AUGUST 7, 2019

19-08-03 MOTION WAS MADE by Director Sannella, seconded by Director Evans, and carried unanimously, to adopt the agenda for the Regular Board Meeting of August 7, 2019.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mike Hunsaker, member of the public, addressed the Board stating he wanted to correct three errors, one of which was his. He previously mentioned that from 2011 to 2019 the budget tripled. It actually more than doubled from \$99 Million to \$213 Million. The mistake that was not his was that it was reported that the budget was almost entirely unchanged over these eight years, but that did not include the capital projects costs which more than doubled. As a consequence, there is a 10% a year average increase. Regarding the water quality report, staff indicated the boron content was an error as shown on the report by a factor of a 1,000. In the quality analysis report, the 2018 water quality report is a little

misleading. It indicated the District was receiving desalinated water directly from the plant. That was not what happened at the end of 2017, all of 2018, and part of 2019. He assumes the District is wrestling with refunds that will be coming should this be protested strong enough.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Director Evans requested clarification on several dates listed in the Raftelis proposal for the Cost of Service Study on page 41 of the Board packet: Finance Committee meeting on September 16, 2018, final report on January 8, 2019, and Board adoption January 14. It was clarified that the September date is in 2019 and the January dates are in 2020.

19-08-04 MOTION WAS MADE by Director Evans, seconded by Director Elitharp, and carried unanimously, to approve the Consent Calendar as presented.

1.1 Approval of Minutes

- A. Regular Board Meeting – July 17, 2019
- B. Finance/Investment Committee Meeting – July 29, 2019

1.2 Warrant List through August 7, 2019 - \$7,167,672.79

1.3 Operations & Maintenance Metrics Quarterly Report – June 30, 2019

1.4 Construction Contract Acceptance for Solar Panel Inverter Replacement

1.5 Notice of Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the District Wide Solar Project

1.6 Water Cost of Service Study Consultant Selection

ACTION ITEMS

PRESENTATION OF SAN MARCOS GROUNDWATER BASIN SUPPLY OPTIONS EVALUATION

Development Services Senior Engineer Scholl stated that on October 17, 2018, the Board approved a professional services agreement with Woodard & Curran in the amount of \$77,590 to evaluate and develop groundwater basin options. This item was presented to the Engineering/Equipment Committee on May 30, 2019. The Committee's suggestions were incorporated into today's presentation. He introduced Scott Goldman of Woodard & Curran who provided a presentation on the Evaluation of San Marcos Groundwater Basin Supply Options as follows:

- San Marcos Basin
- Groundwater Production
- Groundwater Quality
- Water Balance
- Options Development
- Option 1 – Non-Potable Use
- Option 2 – Desalter
- Option 3 – Potable Reuse
- Estimated Costs
- Desalter Production Cost Sensitivity at 100 gpm
- Conclusions

Mr. Goldman stated the project feasibility is dependent on the amount of extraction from wells and how many wells would have to be constructed. The potable desalter option appears to be feasible if production over 100 gallons per minute or more could be obtained. The other two options require higher production. Additional studies would be necessary to better estimate the quantity and quality of the water being withdrawn.

General discussion took place regarding what additional steps would be necessary to move forward and the cost, possible grant funding, potential yield from the basin, and the high expense of the water produced.

The consensus of the Board was to note and file this item.

Mike Hunsaker, member of the public, addressed the Board expressing his concern about supply uncertainty and suggesting any further evaluation should take at least a year, testing should be done every two weeks, and the cost of water would need to include the District's 15% bond covenant requirement. All of the options are very power cost related. The basin is under some very high future development. Would the District have to pay a surcharge to the developers for use of the groundwater underneath their new properties?

MODIFICATION OF WATER AND WASTEWATER CAPITAL FACILITY FEES

General Manager Pruim stated staff is seeking to obtain Board approval of proposed water and wastewater capital facility fees (Cap Fees) increases.

District Engineer Gumpel provided background information on the origin of the Cap Fees and how it relates to the District's 2018 Water, Wastewater, and Recycled Water Master Plan (Master Plan). The District's Master Plan is 100% based on growth to ensure that growth pays for growth and that rate payers are not burdened with the costs associated with growth. As the District does not make land use decisions, it must rely on other documents adopted by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), a regional

agency that projects population growth, local cities, and San Diego County. The District hired a third-party consultant to perform a water/sewer study utilizing data collected to determine the Cap Fees.

District Engineer Gumpel stated staff initially presented the proposed Cap Fees to the Finance/Investment Committee on February 20, 2019, and three financing options (“A”, “B”, and “C”) to the Board on May 15, 2019. Staff met with all interested stakeholders including members of the Building Industry Association (BIA) and individual developers. On July 29, 2019, the Cap Fees were presented to the Board based on concerns from the BIA and recommendations from the District’s consultant and financial advisors to reduce interest rates on short-term and future debt. District Engineer Gumpel discussed the components of the three Cap Fees options in detail, with Finance Manager Owen explaining that the shortfall component is a result of collecting less than what the District expended since the last Cap Fees study.

District Engineer Gumpel stated that at the July 29 Finance/Investment Committee meeting, staff and the Committee recommended bringing Option “C” to the Board for consideration. With Option “C”, the Cap Fees for water would increase from \$7,756 to \$8,254, and from \$9,963 to \$16,570 for sewer.

Finance Manager Owen provided information on the proposed Cap Fees and how they affect the District’s overall financial condition. Staff incorporated the three options into the District’s five-year financial plan ending in Fiscal Year 2023/24 to forecast the resulting shortfall for each option. District Engineer Gumpel noted that the current shortfall of approximately \$14 Million would be reduced with either Option “B” or Option “C” to \$7.6 Million and 8.4 Million respectively.

District Engineer Gumpel provided a comparison of the District’s proposed water and sewer Cap Fees to other local agencies.

President Martin stated that the BIA requested 10 minutes to speak. In fairness, all speakers were limited to five minutes and no bundling of time was permitted.

Michael McSweeney, representative of the BIA, addressed the Board requesting the Board postpone adoption of new fees until the District completes a legally sufficient nexus study. He stated the District’s former Assistant General Manager is spreading falsehoods and misinformation, it is appropriate for organizations such as the BIA to meet with the District’s management team and members of the community, there is no give away allowing the developer to defer fees until the unit is finished as this is allowed under state law, and that previous management tried to impose an excess sewer capacity fee without proper justification and rescinded those fees after they were legally challenged. He further stated that since 2006, the City of San Marcos has averaged approximately 400 residential units per year over those 13 years after a spike in the early 2000’s, and that a building

permit to remodel a kitchen, reroof a house, or an office tenant improvement doesn't impact the water or sewer system.

Mr. McSweeney stated the proposed fees do not have a true nexus study resulting in many unanswered questions. He requested the Board direct staff to hire a consultant to prepare a legally sufficient nexus study with fresh data and not rely on data that goes back to 2008. The BIA requested the Board postpone action tonight, and when action is taken on fees, that fees be phased in so the market can adjust to this new large cost.

Dave Lanferman, member of the public, addressed the Board stating he is a land use partner at Rutan & Tucker specializing in development fees and mitigation of environmental impacts. He was asked to review the documentation that has been provided to the public in connection with the proposed increase in these fees. His client, the BIA of San Diego County, and its members are very concerned not just about the increase in these fees, but also on a legal level, with the absence of necessary information to bridge the gap between the District's Master Plan approved earlier this year that identifies capital improvement programs and facilities needed to accommodate both existing development and replacement of aging facilities and to accommodate anticipated needs from future growth. What is missing and legally required is evidence that the cost of building the capital improvement facilities identified in the Master Plan is being allocated fairly and legally between existing users and the cost of replacing equipment or upgrading equipment to meet new regulatory standards which cannot be funded by fees on new development. Only the portion of the capital facilities that is truly caused by needs generated by new housing can be funded through the proposed new fees. He is not disputing the Master Plan's projections of the needs and costs of the facilities, but there is no evidence that shows what portion of those new facilities are costs that can be transferred by way of fees to home builders and new home buyers to meet their needs.

Mr. Lanferman further stated the Master Plan report concedes that there is roughly a 3.57 million gallon per day deficiency at peak water flow in the land outfall system. That deficiency exists now whether or not another a new home is built in the District. Some part of that cost of replacing or upgrading the outfall has to be shared with existing rate payers, property owners, or tax payers. That information can be provided. There is an attempt to do so in Appendix B and C in which footnotes have been added to the end of the Keze report, but those do not describe or explain on what basis portions of these costs were shifted back and forth. This should be easily fixable to demonstrate to the public that these costs are being fairly allocated. This is not the BIA complaining. The state legislature has written it in to the government code 66013 and it's in Proposition 26 approved by the voters in 2010 that a development fee has to be shown to be reasonable with relation to the overall cost of what is being built and it has to be shown to be fairly and proportionately allocated among those who would bear the fees. That's what is missing. He asked the Board to take its time and direct staff to complete and provide the public with the information that is missing to demonstrate to everyone concerned that the cost of building

new facilities is being fairly and equitably shared in accordance to the manner required by law. Mr. Lanferman stated he updated a letter he had provided to the Executive Secretary on August 5 and requested the updated letter be included in the record.

Director Evans asked for clarification of cap fee and development fee. General Manager Pruim responded that development fee is a generic term commonly used. From a water and wastewater perspective, the correct term is Capital Facility Fee, which is money the District collects from developers to pay for the impacts their development has on the District's infrastructure. Director Evans asked Mr. Lanferman what he meant when he said development fee. Mr. Lanferman agreed with General Manager Pruim's explanation; however, both terms require a nexus to demonstrate a connection between needs caused by new development and that the cost of meeting those needs is being allocated fairly.

Dr. Lee Brown, member of the public, addressed the Board stating he is rate payer and well-known hydrologist in the Western United States for 45 years working with hundreds of water districts. He commented on his positive experience working with Tom Scaglione at Cal State San Marcos on the water management program. He has been asked to serve as a scientist consultant to review the documentation concerning the District's Cap Fees.

Jim Simmons, member of the public, addressed the Board stating he has several projects moving forward; however, the high cost of doing the projects is delaying progress and it looks like rates are going to increase to the point where it will kill projects. He expressed his concerns regarding growth rates projected by SANDAG. If the District raises these rates and the growth doesn't happen, what happens to the money? He commented on a nexus situation a few years ago for a project in which a developer said the District was wrong and sued the District, resulting in a settlement. What happens now? We go back into exactly the same nexus study, update it, put a new date on it. It's the same study that was rejected then and it's going to get rejected again. The request from the BIA and people who work in this industry is to be a little more careful this time. Let's look at things directly, see whether or not the projections are accurate, don't overestimate those projections, figure out a mechanism that will collect the fees in a manner that will fit the growth pattern, don't overpay for it and put us in a situation where the District will have money for facilities they don't build. He requested time for the developers to bring some alternatives to the table and let's see if we can get it right this time.

Matt Simmons, member of the public, addressed the Board stating staff is projecting approximately 750 units per year based on the SANDAG numbers and the City of San Marcos' Master Plan versus the reality of the permits that have been released, which is about 400 permits per year. That is a big difference in numbers. He is concerned about how that gets applied. As a local land use developer, he has never seen a point where they've had 750 units come forward per year. Numbers are being used that have never been achieved. He also questioned past debt. It appears that new growth is paying for past debt. If new growth is being asked to pay for its impact on the system, then that's

what it should do, not paying for past debt. He noted that this could be a misunderstanding on his part, but it is something he is concerned about and would like to know how exactly that works. He stated he currently has several projects approved by the City of San Marcos, and in moving through the process with Vallecitos, he is not clear on how the implementation of the fees will be handled and how those particular projects are going to be affected. Will there be some sort of grace period for existing projects that have run all their numbers and information off of existing numbers? In some cases, this will turn projects into unbuildable projects which is not anyone's goal. What will the cutoff be for those particular projects to implement the new fee on new development that is not approved, entitled, or shown in the zoning map but actual maps that are approved?

Matt Simmons read statements that Mr. McSweeney did not make earlier. Very little backup has been provided for the treatment plant improvements at Encina which totals over \$50 Million. The sewer fee has a component, the pipeline that incorporates a phase five improvement that does not include phase five EDU counts in its calculation. If calculated correctly, this should drop the price per EDU by approximately \$3,300. Furthermore, no backup documentation has been provided stating that infrastructure built for phases one through four will not continue to be used by future development during phase five. Vallecitos is proposing to collect fees for phase five wastewater improvements that have an undefined timeframe of being needed beyond 2035. Vallecitos also identifies water expansion improvements in phase five and is now proposing to include those in the fee calculations. Why does Vallecitos take a different approach on water and sewer? A couple of years ago they were told that the phase five improvements for neither water or sewer were going to be in the fee calculation.

Marlene Walder, member of the public, addressed the Board stating she is a resident of San Marcos since the early 80's and had several different properties, one being a nursery which was connected to the City's water line. When new homes were being built in 1987, she was going to be charged a minimum of \$5,000 to move her water line because the existing water line would not hold the number of houses that were to be built. She is neither for or against the rate. Her concern as a rate payer is the General Plan for the City of San Marcos that is being updated now. They are talking about reaching their capacity in the next two to three years of building out the city. What she perceives for the future is not what city planners seem to see. More and more families are doubling up. Ms. Walder lives in a mobile home park that was supposed to limit two people per mobile home per space, built originally single wide, and has now has double and triple wides. As many as seven people are living in the mobile homes which means excessive use of city sewer lines. The infrastructure of her mobile home park has not been upgraded. She's been in other cities where upgrading didn't get done and then it's turned back to all of the home owners. If we have no more houses, how are we dividing up all the expenses to everyone in a good, equitable manner? Houses are being built with 800 square feet for two people, some with more than one bathroom. That puts stress on the sewer as well as the water. Even if they cut back on water, it's still using more. Rate payers are really feeling the

pinch right now and yet we're saying so are the developers. The developers need to at least bring all the sewer and water lines and pay for that much to the main sewer and water lines. Every time you add 100 houses, how much larger does the sewer facility have to be? Someone has to pay for it, and it shouldn't be the rate payers who've been paying all along for the existing sewer line.

Mike Hunsaker addressed the Board as President of the Twin Oaks Valley Property Owners Association stating he shares some of the BIA's concerns about the nexus. There is no backup information on fire service and water lines for fire sprinklers or documentation on mobile home park consumption. He is concerned that if new developments use facilities, are they paying their proper share of which there are two components. What needs to be built in the future for their needs and what has been built and paid for ahead of need? There are 416 apartments in a village. One two-inch meter is supposed to serve 10 apartments and there are only 11 meters. How does the District recapture the costs through these service fees if there are not enough meters and the whole study is based on EDUs? A nexus study needs to recapture all costs to include the Twin Oaks Reservoirs, the San Marcos Interceptors, and all other projects that are being started and funded to be built today for the far future. He didn't understand the shortfall argument and thinks it needs to be presented carefully. He is very concerned that the District will be adjusting capacity fees annually. If there is any increase, a 60-day notice to the public is required. If costs decrease, staff can do that right away on their own volition. How is that legal under Prop 218? Is it policy to cut fees without notice to the public at any point in time? What is the nexus? Why isn't the District charging enough? Why is the District only looking forward and ignoring what people have invested for the future already and should be recompensed?

Director Sannella stated that as Chairman of the Finance Committee, he attended the meeting Mr. Hunsaker referred to when speaking about the annual adjustment of capacity fees. He clarified that the Committee discussed monitoring interest rates more closely and frequently.

Tom Scaglione, member of the public, addressed the Board stating that as proposed, if all assumptions of the rate calculation are correct, the deficit in the developer funds will be paid back to rate payers by 2035, 16 years from now. Only if all the assumptions are correct, will customers get paid back. Significant assumptions include the following: 1) In the first phase, 4,400 water EDUs will be paid for by July 1, 2020 at the higher proposed rate. Less than 1,400 have been paid for to date at the lower existing rate. That means the District needs to collect on 3,000 EDUs within the next 10 months. The District hasn't collected on 3,000 EDUs in the last ten years. 2) Same for sewer, 4,800 EDUs, sewer EDUs will be paid for by July 1, 2020 at the proposed rate but less than 1,600 have been paid for to date at the lower existing rate. 3) The assumed finance rate of Option 3 is less than possible for Vallecitos to obtain according to the District's financial advisor. These aggressive and unachievable assumptions have created a revenue shortfall of scores of

millions of dollars. This revenue shortfall is in addition to the developer fund deficit that the District calls a shortfall now and has not been adjusted for in the proposed rates. If these rates, as proposed are adopted, rate payers will never be paid back. Particularly in water CIP, there are no projects to push beyond the planning period to mitigate a revenue shortfall. He further stated it is this agency's explicit intent to continue to finance developer obligations with rate payer cash. There's been no reimbursement resolutions adopted during the budget process that is intent not to debt finance. He sent a letter to the District on May 28 in anticipation of the public hearing then scheduled for June 5 detailing and supporting deficiencies in the rate calculations. The public hearing was postponed. His letter was not responded to while meetings were held in private with developers and the District was in "constant communication with the BIA." As unwilling creditors, rate payers are stakeholders but were excluded from private meetings with developers that resulted in the reduction of the proposed rates. Rates, that before the reduction, were not sufficient to pay back rate payers. Rate payers do not receive the benefit for the money they pay toward developer obligations. Money that rate payers pay toward developer obligations is not a cost of service. Mr. Scaglione asked the Board to make the adjustments suggested in his May 28 letter. He provided a copy of that letter and a copy of his comments for the record.

President Martin stated that due to comments heard today, the Board had a Closed Session meeting to consult with legal counsel. Based on that, he would like to continue this meeting to October 2 when a decision will be made. A workshop meeting will be held on August 29 for all interested parties.

Director Sannella stated that as the Board must consider staff's recommendation, the BIA's thoughts and disagreements with that recommendation, and members of the public who have their own opinions, a workshop meeting would be prudent to bring all parties together for further discussion and to give staff an opportunity to respond.

19-08-05 MOTION WAS MADE by President Martin, seconded by Director Sannella, and carried unanimously, to continue this item until the October 2, 2019 Regular Board meeting.

ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING ADMINISTRATIVE CHARGES TO RECOVER INDIRECT COSTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019-20

Finance Manager Owen stated this item is brought to the Board annually to adopt the ordinance for the overhead rate. The rate was calculated using the same methodology used the previous year which combines the budgeted indirect costs plus employee benefits and divides that number by the direct labor costs. As a result of direct labor costs increasing by more than indirect costs, the proposed overhead rate is going to decrease from 219% in the current year to 217%.

Staff recommended the Board adopt the ordinance establishing the new overhead rate for Fiscal Year 2019-20.

19-08-06 MOTION WAS MADE by Director Hernandez, seconded by Director Evans, and carried unanimously, to adopt the Ordinance.

Ordinance No. 211 - The roll call vote was as follows:

AYES: Elitharp, Evans, Hernandez, Martin, Sannella
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR REPORT ON DISTRICT WATER QUALITY RELATIVE TO PUBLIC HEALTH GOALS

Operations & Maintenance Manager Pedrazzi stated California Health and Safety Code §116470 requires water utilities with more than 10,000 service connections prepare a special report once every three years if their water quality constituents have exceeded any Public Health Goals (PHGs). PHGs are non-enforceable goals established by the California EPA's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). The law also requires that where OEHHA has not adopted a PHG for a constituent, the water suppliers are to use the Maximum Contaminant Level Goals (MCLGs) adopted by USEPA. Only constituents which have a California primary drinking water standard and for which a PHG or MCLG has been established need to be addressed.

Operations & Maintenance Manager Pedrazzi further stated the law requires a public hearing be held for the purpose of accepting and responding to public comment on the report. The law also requires the report be made available to the public at least 15 days prior to the acceptance of the report. The report will be available at the District office for public review.

Staff recommended the Board set the public hearing for September 4 as part of the Regular Board meeting.

19-08-07 MOTION WAS MADE by Director Sannella, seconded by Director Evans, and carried unanimously, to set the public hearing for September 4.

CALL FOR BALLOTS - SAN DIEGO COUNTY CONSOLIDATED REDEVELOPMENT OVERSIGHT BOARD

General discussion took place regarding the nominees listed on the ballot for the San Diego County Consolidated Redevelopment Oversight Board. Director Evans endorsed

Mitch Thompson of Otay Water District.

19-08-08 MOTION WAS MADE by Director Evans, seconded by President Martin, and carried unanimously, to support Mitch Thompson for the San Diego County Consolidated Redevelopment Oversight Board.

REPORTS

GENERAL MANAGER

General Manager Pruim reported the following:

- On August 4 District wastewater crews started routine sewer cleaning along San Marcos Boulevard. The City of San Marcos requires work on high volume roads be performed at night between 6:00 p.m. to 3:00 a.m. Night sewer cleaning will also be done in Rancho Santa Fe, Mission, Los Posas, and a few other areas, and should be completed by the end of this week.
- Fallbrook Public Utility District (FPUD) and Rainbow Municipal Water District (RMWD) have expressed their desire to detach from the San Diego County Water Authority's (SDCWA) service area. He recently received an email from the SDCWA's Interim General Manager, Sandy Kerl, to all General Managers of the member agencies expressing what the cost impacts to those remaining member agencies may be. The SDCWA performed a worse-case analysis in which FPUD and RMWD don't pay an exit tax and the cost for the facilities that were built to support all of the member agencies, including FPUD and RMWD, are now borne by the remaining agencies. The SDCWA estimates it would be a \$13.5 Million per year total impact to the remaining agencies. Vallecitos alone would pay approximately \$.5 Million extra per year if the FPUD and RMWD departures go through and they don't pay any exit tax.
- There is a potential leak in SDCWA's Pipeline 4 located in Aqueduct 2 which distributes treated water. Vallecitos receives the majority of its treated water through that connection. A firm shutdown of Pipeline 4 has not been scheduled yet. In the meantime, affected agencies are filling their reservoirs. The shutdown will last approximately ten days. In addition to filling the District's reservoirs, staff is replacing a valve connection that goes to Aqueduct 1.

DISTRICT LEGAL COUNSEL

Legal Counsel Gilpin offered to provide the Board further information about the possible impacts from the de-annexation of FPUD and RMWD as outlined in the SDCWA's email if they so desired. It will be a lengthy process during which LAFCO will need to assess the impacts on the remaining agencies.

Legal Counsel Gilpin stated President Trump signed the American Water Infrastructure Act last October which will trigger the District's compliance with assessing different sources of vulnerability to its system.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY

Director Evans reported the Imported Water Committee updated the SDCWA's Bay Delta policy to include the portfolio approach that Governor Newsom is considering. SDCWA awarded a contract to Black & Veatch to implement the first scope of work for the new conveyance system which will include three possible routes. Metropolitan updated their emergency storage after the recent earthquake and determined that a 7.8 earthquake will now cause a longer than six-month duration in a break. Metropolitan is recommending increasing emergency storage to 124,000-acre feet in storage capacity which put us at 750,000 in total. The SDCWA wants to increase its outreach to their member agencies and has amended its contract with Strategic Communications and contracted with two other communications firms in this regard.

ENCINA WASTEWATER AUTHORITY

Director Hernandez stated the Capital Improvement Committee meeting has not met since the last Board meeting.

President Martin stated the Policy and Finance Committee will meet on August 13.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Director Sannella stated the Finance/Investment Committee met on July 29 at which the Committee discussed capacity fees, the Cost of Service Study, status of PERS payments, and received an update on the overhead rate.

President Martin stated that the Ad Hoc Committee met on July 23 during which they toured the hillside property adjacent to the District office.

DIRECTORS REPORTS ON TRAVEL/CONFERENCES/SEMINARS ATTENDED

President Martin reported on his attendance to the Meet the Elected Officials event at Palomar College on July 25 and the ACWA Region 10 Program on July 30.

Director Hernandez reported on his attendance to the Southern California Water Coalition luncheon on July 19.

Directors Evans reported on her attendance to the ACWA Region 10 Program on July 30.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

DIRECTORS COMMENTS/FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, President Martin adjourned the Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors at the hour of 7:09 p.m.

A Regular Meeting of the Vallecitos Water District Board of Directors has been scheduled for Wednesday, August 21, 2019, at 5:00 p.m. at the District office, 201 Vallecitos de Oro, San Marcos, California.

Hal J. Martin, President
Board of Directors
Vallecitos Water District

ATTEST:

Glenn Prum, Secretary
Board of Directors
Vallecitos Water District