

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR BOARD MEETING
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
RAINBOW MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT
MARCH 27, 2012**

1. **CALL TO ORDER** - The Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Rainbow Municipal Water District on March 27, 2012 was called to order by President McManigle at 12:30 p.m. in the Board Room of the District, 3707 Old Highway 395, Fallbrook, CA 92028. President McManigle presiding.

2. **ROLL CALL:**

Present: Director Lucy
Director McManigle
Director Sanford
Director Brazier

Absent: Director Griffiths

Also Present: Finance Manager Buckley
District Engineer Lee
General Manager Seymour
Operations and Maintenance Manager Sneed
Board Secretary Washburn
Legal Counsel Moser
Customer Service Manager Atilano
Superintendent Maccarrone
Superintendent Miller
Superintendent Walker

There were no members of the public present before Open Session. Seven members of the public were present for Open Session.

3. **ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA (Government Code §54954.2)**

President McManigle suggested putting Items #16 and #17 on the Consent Calendar. There were no objections. He also proposed moving Item #22 to after Item #18.

Director Griffiths joined the meeting at 12:32 p.m.

Director Griffiths requested delaying Item #19 until the next meeting to allow more time for more review. Director Lucy agreed with Director Griffiths; however, he felt it should be discussed at this meeting and possibly take action at a later date. It was decided to keep it on this agenda for discussion purposes.

**4. ORAL/WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC
OPPORTUNITY FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE BOARD REGARDING
CLOSED SESSION AGENDA ITEMS (Government Code § 54954.2).**

There were no public comments.

Time: 12:35 p.m.

5. CLOSED SESSION

- A. Conference with Legal Counsel—Existing Litigation (Government Code §54956.9(a))**
- Case No. 37-2011-00053015-CU-PO-NC

The meeting reconvened at 1:02 p.m.

6. REPORT ON POTENTIAL ACTION FROM CLOSED SESSION

This item was addressed under Item #8 herein.

Time Certain: 1:00 p.m.

7. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

8. REPEAT REPORT ON POTENTIAL ACTION FROM CLOSED SESSION

Legal Counsel reported the Board approved the settlement in the case against the District for a mutual release of claims.

9. REPEAT ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA (Government Code §54954.2)

President McManigle noted the changes made under Item #3 herein.

**10. ORAL/WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC
OPPORTUNITY FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE BOARD REGARDING
ITEMS NOT ON THIS AGENDA (Government Code § 54954.2).**

There were no public comments.

***11. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- A. February 28, 2012 - Regular Board Meeting**

Action:

Moved by Director Sanford to approve the minutes as submitted. Seconded by Director Lucy.

Director Griffiths referenced Page #11A-4 when he asked for if this comment where he showed photos of him and Mr. Sneed could be moved to Item #23. It was noted the minutes should reflect what actually occurred at the meeting.

President McManigle referenced Page #11A-13 when he pointed out the word “to” should be inserted before “RMWD” and “Campus Park” after “RMWD” in the last paragraph.

(*) - Asterisk indicates a report is attached.

Director Sanford amended his original motion.

Action:

Moved by Director Sanford to approve the minutes as revised. Seconded by Director Lucy.

After consideration, the motion CARRIED by the following vote:

AYES: Director Lucy, Director Griffiths, Director McManigle, Director Sanford and Director Brazier.

NOES: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

ABSENT: None.

12. BOARD OF DIRECTORS' COMMENTS/REPORTS

Directors' comments are comments by Directors concerning District business, which may be of interest to the Board. This is placed on the agenda to enable individual Board members to convey information to the Board and to the public. There is to be no discussion or action taken by the Board of Directors unless the item is noticed as part of the meeting agenda.

A. President's Report (Director McManigle)

1. CSDA

No report given.

B. Representative Report (Appointed Representative)

1. SDCWA

Director Sanford talked about his initial orientation and first meeting as the SDCWA representative. He noted he was sworn in on March 22, 2012.

Mr. Seymour reported SDCWA was putting together a committee to see whether or not the SAWR program would be extended.

2. LAFCO

There was no report.

C. Meeting, Workshop, Committee, Seminar, Etc. Reports by Directors (AB1234)

Director Griffiths talked about his recent visit to Lift Station 2 with Mr. Seymour. He inquired as to whether or not the final as-builts would be made available prior to the final payment to the contractor. Mr. Lee explained typically the as-built drawings are submitted before the District issues of Notice of Completion at which time there is a waiting period before the contractor gets his retention.

Ms. Brazier talked about the recent complimentary Webinar she and Mr. Sanford attended on March 13th at the District offices. She noted the Webinar provided some litigation and legal flash points on open meetings and public records. She said it was an interesting presentation and that it provided contact for future Webinar access.

(*) - Asterisk indicates a report is attached.

Director McManigle talked about a meeting he attended regarding the Rosemary Mountain mining project that has been taking place for three years. He noted this was the first time they have gone over their financial limits due to having to install a sprinkler system to keep dust down to a minimum.

D. Directors Comments

Director Lucy apologized for his comment regarding male clothing at the last meeting.

***13. COMMITTEE REPORTS (Approved Minutes have been attached for reference only.)**

A. Budget and Finance Committee

1. February 2, 2012 Minutes

Mr. Buckley reported there were two issues before the Board for consideration, the first being the reduced meter sizes and the second was selection of an audit firm.

B. Communications Committee

1. February 6, 2012 Minutes

Mr. O'Leary presented the report on behalf of Chairperson Daily. He said at the next meeting it will be brought to the Board to consider appointing Kelly Bednarski as a member of the committee. He said at the next meeting he hopes to have a review of the committee's accomplishments over the past five years and solicited for input in regards to the committee Purpose Statement.

C. Engineering Committee

1. February 7, 2012 Minutes

Mr. Lee reported the committee voted to make a recommendation to the Board regarding reducing the meter sizes.

***14. CONSENT CALENDAR**

(The consent calendar items are matters voted on together by a single motion unless separate action is requested by a Board member, staff or member of the audience.)

A. ADOPT RESOLUTION 12-08 FIXING THE TIME AND PLACE OF HEARING AND MEETING ON PROPOSED WATER AVAILABILITY CHARGES FOR IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1

***16. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 12-07 – CHECK SIGNING AUTHORITY**

This item was moved to the Consent Calendar per Item #3 herein.

***17. SELECTION OF AUDIT FIRM FOR FY 6/30/12, 6/30/13, AND 6/30/14**

This item was moved to the Consent Calendar per Item #3 herein.

Action:

Moved by Director Brazier to approve the Consent Calendar. Seconded by Director Lucy.

After consideration, the motion CARRIED by the following vote:

AYES: Director Lucy, Director Griffiths, Director McManigle, Director Sanford and Director Brazier.
NOES: None.
ABSTAINED: None.
ABSENT: None.

BOARD ACTION ITEMS

***15. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE ADDENDUM NO. 4 TO EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN RAINBOW MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT AND DAVID D. SEYMOUR**

Action:

Moved by Director Sanford to approve Addendum No. 4 to the Employment Contract between Rainbow Municipal Water District and David D. Seymour. Seconded by Director Brazier.

After consideration, the motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Director Lucy, Director McManigle, Director Sanford and Director Brazier.
NOES: Director Griffiths.
ABSTAINED: None.
ABSENT: None.

Director Griffiths mentioned his alternate proposal he submitted recommendation to extend the contract for six months in order to allow the new Directors to vote on their new general manager in 2013. He said the cost for the position was overpaid and RMWD does not want to increase the salary of a well-paid official when there may be the need to hire someone else in the future it would raise the starting salary when it may not be necessary to pay that much for the next general manager. He said he would vote for his suggestion presented in the Board packet.

Director Brazier said it would be irresponsible for the Board to set up a time schedule in which new Directors and a new general manager come on board at the same time. She noted RMWD has had this problem in the past and RMWD needed continuity.

Ms. Rhyne stated if she had her say she would try to keep Mr. Seymour on board for the next twenty years as she felt he was the best general manager she has seen at RMWD since 1980.

Discussion went to Item #18.

***16. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 12-07 – CHECK SIGNING AUTHORITY**

This Item was addressed and approved under the Consent Calendar per Item #3 herein.

***17. SELECTION OF AUDIT FIRM FOR FY 6/30/12, 6/30/13, AND 6/30/14**

This item was addressed and approved under the Consent Calendar per Item #3 herein.

***18. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO CONSIDER REINSTATING 5/8” AND 3/4” WATER METER CAPACITY CHARGES**

Mr. Lee noted at the last meeting the Board approved in concept the reinstatement of 5/8” and 3/4” meter capacity charges at RMWD and pushed the issued back down to the Engineering Committee and Budget and Finance Committee to establish the perimeters under which those capacity fees would be allowed.

Mr. Lee pointed out Pages 18-4 and 18-5 of the agenda packet provide a feel of where these charges put RMWD in relationship to the other water districts in the area. He noted the recommendation to the Board to establish the proposed fees was approved by a unanimous vote by the Budget and Finance Committee. He continued by noting the conversation that took place at the Engineering Committee level.

Mr. Lee walked the audience through Page 18-6 of the agenda packet in order to provide them with a better understanding of the calculations.

Mr. Lee noted the Engineering Committee agreed with staff and supports the one-third acre for 5/8” meters and two-thirds acre for 3/4” meter; therefore, staff was recommending the Board approve the capacity charges and the meter sizes for inclusion in the 2012-2013 budget with the understanding staff was working on the water policy which will include these new requirements.

Action:

Moved by Director Brazier to approve Option 1-Beginning with the 2012/13 budget the Board reinstates the 5/8” and 3/4” capacity charges as recommended by the Budget and Finance Committee for appropriate sized residential lots as recommended by the Engineering Committee. The Board direct staff to prepare modifications to the District’s Water Policy detailing the requirements concerning reduced capacity charges versus fire sprinkler requirements and lot sizes. The proposed water policy shall be brought back to this Board prior to adoption of the 2012/13 budget. Seconded by Director Lucy.

After consideration, the motion CARRIED by the following vote:

AYES: Director Griffiths, Director Lucy, Director McManigle, Director Sanford and Director Brazier.
NOES: None.
ABSTAINED: None.
ABSENT: None.

Director Sanford asked for clarification regarding building and/or fire code requirements, respectively. Mr. Lee explained RMWD would actually be installing 1” meters and charge the capacity fees based on domestic use. Director Sanford inquired as to the flow rate and fire protection requirements. Mr. Lee clarified the fire department requirements and how these will be met with the installation of 1” meters.

Director Sanford asked whether or not this reduction fits with the request of the developers and future ratepayers. Mr. Lee stated he believed they have established a policy that is fair to existing ratepayers, future ratepayers as well as the District.

Director Griffiths said he agreed with the concept; however, he wanted restrictions that address the situation should someone go over in their usage. Mr. Lee pointed out these types of restrictions would be written into the policy.

Discussion ensued regarding whether or not a tier system should be developed to assist with the monitoring the usage. Mr. Seymour stated it may be worth evaluating to see if a tier system would be worthwhile.

Mr. Lee stated he agreed with Director Griffiths regarding a making sure there are some “fail safe” provisions in order to keep RMWD for charging people for things such as inadvertent breaks.

Mr. Carlstrom asked whether or not the District Engineer would be capable of working out seasonal fluctuations. Mr. Lee explained the smaller parcels do not generally feel the impact of seasonal changes.

Discussion went to Item #22.

***19. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO AWARD A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT TO REVIEW ALTERNATIVE WATER SOURCES**

Action:

Moved by Director Griffiths to delay this item until the next Board meeting. Seconded by None. The motion died for lack of a second.

Action:

Moved by Director Sanford to discuss this matter with delaying possible approval until the next Board meeting. Seconded by Director Griffiths.

(*) - Asterisk indicates a report is attached.

After consideration, the motion FAILED by the following vote:

AYES: Director Griffiths.
NOES: Director Lucy, Director McManigle, Director Sanford and Director Brazier.
ABSTAINED: None.
ABSENT: None.

Mr. Lee stated this potentially relieves the consultant from upholding their price; however, this was not a valid issue anyways.

Director Brazier suggested the Board discuss this matter and ask all the questions now and then determine whether or not it should be delayed for possible action after these discussions take place.

Director Lucy said he found the background and overall scope to be excellent. He noted the District has a responsibility to the ratepayers to try to find other sources of water. He added, however, that he sort of agreed with Director Griffiths in that it seemed like it was an awful lot to sort through.

Director Sanford said due to the fact there may be some changes in the valley floor that could potentially bring RMWD some water sources would it be beneficial to pay a consultant to determine the obvious. Mr. Seymour noted this may be possible but RMWD would only pay for the work the consultants are instructed to perform; therefore, they would be steered away from this until is it clearly necessary.

It was confirmed this matter was brought about by and researched thoroughly by the Engineering Committee. Director Brazier pointed out this item would remain on future committee agendas for continuous discussion.

Action:

Moved by Director Brazier to approve Option 1 - Authorize staff to enter into negotiations with JC Heden and Associates and execute a professional services contract for a price not-to-exceed \$92,868. Seconded by Director Lucy.

After consideration, the motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Director Lucy, Director McManigle, Director Sanford and Director Brazier.
NOES: Director Griffiths.
ABSTAINED: None.
ABSENT: None.

Director Griffiths said he believes any decisions made on this would cost multiple millions of dollars. He noted he was not too happy with Mr. Heden's record and his handling of other RMWD projects. He stressed he was very uncomfortable giving this project to Mr. Heden due to his personal performance with the Line Q3 project. He claimed Mr. Heden was too cozy with RMWD staff.

Mr. Seymour reassured the Board it was District's decision not to move forward with the plans and specifications suggested by Director Griffiths in 2004 and it had nothing to do with Mr. Heden. He noted that in regards to Line Q3, it was the District's decision to put in new pipe, not Mr. Heden's. He pointed out this was the same scenario with the Vallecitos Pump Station. He said Mr. Heden has done very good work for RMWD and had not caused any problems but rather has gone above and beyond to help RMWD solve problems the District had not anticipated. Director Griffiths stated he would have fired Mr. Heden way back; however, he was not his employee.

Director Lucy stated he like the fact this would be an ongoing evaluation by the Engineering Committee. He said it was RMWD's responsibility to be looking all the time for new water.

Director Sanford asked whether or not other bids were received. Mr. Lee stated other bids were received and after review, it was determined Mr. Heden's firm was comparable in cost and most qualified. It was confirmed the bid solicitations were published where the entire engineering community should have known about it.

Discussion went to Item #20.

***20. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO RATIFY CONTRACTS WITH CALTRANS FOR WATER AND SEWER FACILITY WORK ASSOCIATED WITH HIGHWAY 76/INTERSTATE 15 INTERCHANGE**

Mr. Seymour explained normally staff does not enter into contracts without Board approval; however, the District was cornered with running up against a deadline with the Caltrans contract due to the fact they were moving quickly on the clover leaf design of Highway 76 and I-15. He said although he approved the contract, it was subject to Board ratifications. He pointed out the drawings and work would be done by Caltrans; however, RMWD would pay them for these services.

Mr. Lee explained this was a six month project with his staff member working diligently to coordinate with Caltrans to get RMWD to this point. He noted coordinating the time between their contractor and RMWD's contractor has been difficult and that this contract was developed to remove the coordinating issues which will save RMWD money. He pointed out the cost for this project was incorporated into the RMWD's budget and that the District will be invoiced.

Action:

Moved by Director Lucy to ratify the contracts with Caltrans. Seconded by Director Griffiths.

After consideration, the motion CARRIED by the following vote:

AYES: Director Griffiths, Director Lucy, Director McManigle, Director Sanford and Director Brazier.
NOES: None.
ABSTAINED: None.
ABSENT: None.

Director Lucy stressed how beneficial it would be for RMWD to share in the expense with Caltrans by "piggybacking" on mutual services.

(*) - Asterisk indicates a report is attached.

Director Griffiths stated he believed this was a good opportunity that would allow RMWD to put all the blame on Caltrans for any problems with the project. It was confirmed RMWD would maintain inspections.

Discussion went to Item #21.

***21. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO EXECUTE HOLDING AGREEMENT 1082-0310-00, JOINT LIEN AND AMENDMENT TO JOINT AGREEMENT TO IMPROVE MAJOR SUBDIVISION COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO TRACT NO. 4763-1 (FINAL MAP 13856)**

Mr. Lee explained essentially the developer and the County are working to defer the project and the developer would be putting the property as collateral to ensure the project meets with the terms of the County. He said this was what these agreements would do due to the fact RMWD was the rider to the County process, they are asking RMWD to approve these contracts. He noted this would not impact RMWD at all in terms of cost or anything related to the District.

Legal Counsel added the third agreement that does affect RMWD, they would have to provide bonds to RMWD prior to starting construction. He explained these contracts were kind of a place holder.

Action:

Moved by Director Brazier to execute Holding Agreement 1082-0310-00, Joint Lien and Amendment to Joint Agreement. Seconded by Director Sanford.

After consideration, the motion CARRIED by the following vote:

AYES: Director Griffiths, Director McManigle, Director Sanford and Director Brazier.
NOES: None.
ABSTAINED: None.
ABSENT: Director Lucy.

Director Lucy asked whether or not RMWD had done this before. Legal Counsel stated this was common at other agencies; however, it was the first time for RMWD. He pointed out you will see these types of agreements in the slow economic times. He noted the County would be involved with RMWD should things not go right.

It was confirmed this subdivision would be located in Division 1.

Director Griffiths asked whether or not the maps have been provided to the County. Legal Counsel stated this was correct. Discussion followed regarding the steps that had taken place between the builder and the County. Mr. Lee pointed out the Water and Sewer Availability Letters must be resubmitted to RMWD at the time the developer wants to build. It was confirmed if there was no capacity to provide services they would be out of luck.

Discussion ensued regarding the plan checking and approval process.

It was noted Director Lucy needed to recuse himself from this discussion and left the room due to the fact he owned property contiguous to this property.

Director Lucy excused himself from the meeting at 2:07 p.m.

(*) - Asterisk indicates a report is attached.

Discussion went to Item #23.

***22. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO CONSIDER ADOPTION OF 1 12-06, ADJUSTMENT OF DIVISION BOUNDARIES TO BALANCE POPULATION TOTALS BASED ON THE FEDERAL 2010 CENSUS**

Mr. Seymour introduced Roxanne Shepherd noting she would provide a brief explanation on the legislation behind this matter as well as how the division changes were reached. Ms. Shepherd explained when the Census comes out every ten years, the jurisdictional agencies are required to look at the populations in their divisions to make sure they are as even as possible. She said when her firm looked at the 2010 Census, it was determined the goal would be approximately 3,900 in population for each RMWD division with a variance between 2%-5%. She said when she looked at this, it became obvious Division 1 had a great deal of people which in turn showed the need to balance the population of that Division and then work in a clockwise manner through adjusting the remaining divisions. She noted the next Census would be in 2020.

Director Brazier pointed out if there was a need to make adjustments to boundaries before the next Census, the RMWD Board could make them as deemed necessary. Mr. Lee explained the minor steps and minimal costs associated with making such adjustments.

President McManigle asked whether or not these changes would address the Dulin Road concerns. Mr. Lee confirmed it would.

Action:

Moved by Director Brazier to adopt Resolution 12-06. Seconded by Director Lucy.

After consideration, the motion CARRIED by the following vote:

AYES: Director Griffiths, Director Lucy, Director McManigle, Director Sanford and Director Brazier.
NOES: None.
ABSTAINED: None.
ABSENT: None.

Discussion went to Item #19.

***23. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING BOARD ASSIGNMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION (REQUESTED BY: DIRECTOR GRIFIFTHS)**

Mr. Seymour pointed out this was discussed at the last Board meeting and it was recommended staff bring back a recommendation that a staff member attend LAFCO meetings. He said Mr. Lee has offered to attend LAFCO meetings where discussions would take place pertinent to RMWD. He pointed out Director Sanford would remain as the Board appointed representative should a need arise where it would be beneficial for a Board Member from RMWD to attend.

Director Griffiths stressed he would rather Director Sanford attend the meetings as the District representative and that he decides when and if Mr. Lee should attend.

Action:

Moved by Director Brazier to adopt staff recommendation the District Engineer, Brian Lee, attend LAFCO meetings on a regular basis, and that the Board Representative, Dennis Sanford, attend as-needed. Seconded by Director Sanford.

After consideration, the motion CARRIED by the following vote:

AYES: Director McManigle, Director Sanford and Director Brazier.
NOES: Director Griffiths.
ABSTAINED: None.
ABSENT: Director Lucy.

Director Sanford stated he would not want to go to LAFCO as a “spokesman” for the District without the knowledge Mr. Lee and/or Mr. Seymour has due to the fact he did not have enough knowledge and background as did Mr. Lee and Mr. Seymour. He said he would prefer between him, Mr. Seymour, and Mr. Lee they determine whether or not he should attend.

Mr. Seymour pointed out any decision making would be left to the General Manager. He also noted whether he, Mr. Lee, or Director Sanford attended none of them would have the ability to take any action due to the fact they were not able to take action on behalf of the entire RWMD Board.

Director Griffiths emphasized his point that a Board Member would be provided with precise information which assists them in the decision making process.

Director Brazier pointed out no matter who attended, that individual would have to report back to this Board of any potential action that may need to be taken.

Director Griffiths reiterated that it should be up to Director Sanford to invite staff to attend with him.

Discussion went to Item #24.

***24. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING BOARD ASSIGNMENTS TO THE SAN LUIS REY WATERSHED AND SANTA MARGARITA WATERSHED COUNCILS (REQUESTED BY: DIRECTOR GRIFFITHS)**

Action:

(*) - Asterisk indicates a report is attached.

Moved by Director Brazier to approve staff recommendation the General Manager attends the Watershed Council meetings on an as-needed basis. Seconded by Director Sanford.

After consideration, the motion FAILED by the following vote:

AYES: Director McManigle and Director Brazier.
NOES: Director Griffiths.
ABSTAINED: Director Sanford.
ABSENT: Director Lucy.

Director Griffiths stressed why he felt it was necessary for Director Sanford to represent RMWD at these two councils with RMWD Board support.

Director Sanford said given Mr. Seymour's relatively short time in the future with RMWD, it may be advantageous to the District to maintain continuity so that when Mr. Seymour does leave, there would be some stability going forward.

Director Griffiths stated he did not agree with the motion due to the fact he would like Director Sanford in control of the actions at Santa Margarita.

Mr. Seymour stated it made sense to have continuity at these councils especially with talks of consolidation. He pointed out; however, these councils hold numerous meetings and there may not be anyone available to attend all of them whether it was a Director or staff member. He noted that when discussions being held are pertinent to RMWD, someone should attend as a representative, but not every meeting.

Director Griffiths explained some meetings are held for policymakers and other for technical individuals.

Director Brazier stated in view of the elections in November there was no guarantee who the Division 5 occupant will be.

Action:

Moved by Director Griffiths that the Director of Division 1 attend the San Luis Rey Watershed Council meetings on a regular basis. Seconded by Director Sanford.

After consideration, the motion CARRIED by the following vote:

AYES: Director Griffiths, Director McManigle, Director Sanford and Director Brazier.
NOES: None.
ABSTAINED: None.
ABSENT: Director Lucy.

Director Brazier brought to the Board's attention that the council to which Director Griffiths was currently referring has been moved to Division 4 due to the recent boundary changes. She pointed out she is in constant contact with this Council.

Director Sanford said it seemed that the objective was to have someone attend the meetings to report back to the full RMWD Board.

(*) - Asterisk indicates a report is attached.

Director Brazier stated she would make a conservative effort to attend these meetings; however, she could not commit to attend all of them. Mr. Seymour pointed out should someone appointed as the official representative to an organization, they would be eligible to receive a per diem for their attendance at those meetings.

Discussion continued.

It was confirmed a per diem would be paid for attendance at these meetings.

Discussion went to Item #25.

***25. RECEIVE AND FILE INFORMATION ITEMS FOR FEBRUARY 2012**

A. General Manager Comments

1. Meetings, Conferences and Seminar Calendar

B. Operations & Maintenance Manager Comments

1. Construction and Maintenance Report
2. Valve Maintenance Report
3. Garage/Shop Repair
4. Water Operations Report
5. Electrical/Telemetry Report
6. Project Management Report
7. Wastewater Report
8. Safety Report

C. District Engineer Comments

1. Engineering Report

D. Customer Service Manager Comments

1. Field Customer Service Report
2. Meters Report
3. Water Quality Report
4. Cross Connection Control Program Report

Action:

Moved by Director Brazier to receive and file information items. Seconded by Director Sanford.

After consideration, the motion CARRIED by the following vote:

AYES: Director Griffiths, Director McManigle, Director Sanford and Director Brazier.

NOES: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

ABSENT: Director Lucy.

Mr. Seymour announced this was formally Mr. Sneed's final Board meeting due to his retirement after 32 years in the water industry. He said although he would be missed, he may possibly be brought back in to assist with special projects in the future. He thanked Mr. Sneed for his many years of service.

Mr. Lee reported the Pala Mesa Tank was moving along at a rapid pace with the placing of the last two quadrants of the roof in early April and the spiral strapping starting in mid April. He also announced his D3 Certificate was on its way to him in the mail from the State of California.

(*) - Asterisk indicates a report is attached.

It was noted a presentation on electronic billings and payment options would be conducted at the next Board meeting.

Discussion went to Item #26.

***26. RECEIVE AND FILE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND INFORMATION FOR FEBRUARY 2012**

A. Finance Manager Comments

1. Interim Financial Statement
2. Monthly Investment Report
3. Visa Breakdown
4. Directors' Expense
5. Check Register
6. Office Petty Cash
7. Water Purchases & Sales Summary
8. Statistical Summary
9. Metropolitan IAWP Reduction Programs
10. San Diego County Water Authority SAWR Reduction Program
11. RMWD Domestic Reduction Program
12. Projected CIP Cash Flow Report
13. RMWD Sewer Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDU's) Status

Action:

***Moved by Director Sanford to receive and file financial statements and information.
Seconded by Director Brazier.***

After consideration, the motion CARRIED by the following vote:

AYES: Director Griffiths, Director McManigle, Director Sanford and Director Brazier.
NOES: None.
ABSTAINED: None.
ABSENT: Director Lucy.

Mr. Buckley stated the District appeared to be staying ahead of the budget to date. He also reminded the Board to keep in mind depreciation totals when reviewing Page #26A1-3.

Director Griffiths and Director Sanford made respective inquiries on Page #26A2.

Director Griffiths and Director McManigle made inquiries on Page #26A5, respectively.

Discussion went to Item #27.

27. LIST OF SUGGESTED AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE NEXT REGULAR BOARD MEETING

It was noted a presentation on RMWD billing processes, as well as updates on the functional consolidation and State Revolving Fund loans would be on the May agenda.

28. ADJOURNMENT - To Tuesday, April 24, 2012 at 1:00 p.m.

(*) - Asterisk indicates a report is attached.

The meeting was adjourned with a motion made by Director Brazier and seconded by Director Sanford to a regular meeting on April 24, 2012 at 1:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:47 p.m.

George McManigle, Board President

Dawn M. Washburn, Board Secretary