

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR BOARD MEETING  
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE  
RAINBOW MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT  
SEPTEMBER 24, 2013**

1. **CALL TO ORDER** - The Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Rainbow Municipal Water District on September 24, 2013 was called to order by President McManigle at 12:00 p.m. in the Board Room of the District, 3707 Old Highway 395, Fallbrook, CA 92028. President McManigle presiding.

2. **ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Director Griffiths  
Director Lucy  
Director McManigle  
Director Brazier

**Absent:** Director Sanford

**Also Present:** General Manager Brady  
Assistant General Manager Buckley  
Executive Assistant/Board Secretary Washburn  
Legal Counsel Lemmo  
Water Operations & Customer Service Manager Atilano  
Superintendent Maccarrone  
District Engineer Plonka  
Superintendent Walker  
Supervisor Zuniga  
Human Resources & Safety Manager Bush

No members of the public were present before for Open Session. Two members of the public were present for Open Session.

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

There were no changes to the agenda.

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 none.

***The meeting adjourned to Closed Session at 12:01 p.m.***

(\*) - Asterisk indicates a report is attached.

Time: 12:01 p.m.

**5. CLOSED SESSION**

- A. Conference with Legal Counsel-Anticipated Litigation (Government Code §54956.9)
  - Canyon Springs Enterprises dba RSH Construction
- B. Conference with Legal Counsel-Potential Litigation (Government Code §54956.9(d)(2))
  - Claims of Maghsoud Amirnovin and Farideh Amirnovin

**6. REPORT ON POTENTIAL ACTION FROM CLOSED SESSION**

This was covered under Item #8 herein.

*The meeting reconvened at 1:00 p.m.*

*Director Sanford joined the meeting at 12:30 p.m.*

Time Certain: 1:00 p.m.

**7. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**8. REPEAT REPORT ON POTENTIAL ACTION FROM CLOSED SESSION**

Legal Counsel reported the Board considered claims presented by Maghsoud Amirnovin and Farideh Amirnovin and the Board denied those claims.

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

There were no changes to the agenda.

**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 comments.

**\*11. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- A. August 27, 2013 - Regular Board Meeting

**Action:**

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

***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 Griffiths suggested inquiries made on information items either be more specific in the minutes or eliminated altogether.

President McManigle referenced Page #11A-6 noting “this was number based” should be replaced with “this number was based”.

**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)**

President McManigle read aloud a letter addressed to him from Special District Risk Management (SDRMA) formally acknowledging the proactive loss prevention and workplace safety efforts of the district’s governing body, management, and staff which have resulted in a no paid Worker’s Compensation claims for program year 2012-2013. He noted SDRMA recognized this as a great accomplishment and how RMWD received two credit incentive points as well as lower experienced modification factor EMOB; both of which reduce the District’s annual contribution. He thanked everyone at RMWD for their efforts.

**B. Representative Report (Appointed Representative)**

**1. SDCWA**

Director Sanford reported the continuing focus was on the Bay Delta. He also mentioned the various lawsuits filed against MWD appear to be going in SDCWA’s favor.

Dr. Brady added FPUD’s Board were interesting having a joint meeting the RMWD’s Board and have someone give a presentation on the Bay Delta. Director Lucy recommended notification of this meeting be sent out to the local organizations and realtor groups.

**2. CSDA**

There were no reports.

**3. LAFCO**

There were no reports.

(\* ) - Asterisk indicates a report is attached.

#### 4. San Luis Rey Watershed Council

Director Brazier reported the Council will hold annual elections in late October. She announced one seat was still open for an agricultural representative seat if anyone knows someone that may be interested. She noted the San Luis Rey Water Quality Improvement Plan will have a public workshop on October 7, 2013 in the Oceanside Community Rooms in hopes of receiving input on policies, priorities, strategies for improving the watershed. She concluded by reporting the Southern California Steelhead people were holding a meeting on September 25, 2013. Discussion followed regarding the Steelhead group.

#### 5. Santa Margarita Watershed Council

There were no reports.

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

There were no reports.

#### D. Directors Comments

Director Brazier noted she had received a phone call from a constituent inquiring why RMWD was purchasing new chairs for the board room when we are trying to save money.

Director Griffiths commented on the agenda packets being received later than usual. Director Sanford asked when agendas are emailed out that an estimated time the packets will be accessible on the website also be provided. Director Lucy pointed out the agenda packets were not as involved as they used to be; therefore, less time was needed to prepare for the meeting.

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

#### A. Budget and Finance Committee

##### 1. August 8, 2013 Minutes

There was no report given.

#### B. Communications Committee

##### 1. August 5, 2013 Minutes

Mrs. Bednarski reported at the last meeting the Committee discussed upcoming newsletter topics, the newsletter forwarded via the website, staff assisting with the "road show", as well as inviting a Director to become a member of the Committee. She announced the next meeting would be held on October 14, 2013 at 3:30 p.m.

#### C. Engineering Committee

Mrs. Plonka reported a meeting was not held in August.

## **BOARD ACTION ITEMS**

### **\*14. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO EXECUTE A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING POSSIBLE COORDINATION WITH VALLEY CENTER MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT (VCMWD) IN REGARDS TO INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE HORSE RANCH CREEK VICINITY**

Mrs. Plonka noted staff was moving forward with trying to combine infrastructure with Valley Center Municipal Water District and how this was the first step in the process. She explained the Memorandum of Understanding provided in the packet has been reviewed by both legal teams and was basically to serve Meadowwood and Horse Creek Ridge developments. She explained this was a broad agreement and how staff intends to complete a Joint Use Facility Agreements for specific infrastructure.

Dr. Brady added this was non-binding and negotiating in good faith.

#### **Action:**

***Moved by Director Lucy to authorize the General Manager to execute the Memorandum of Understanding. 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 inquired about the recycled water. Mrs. Plonka confirmed RMWD would be buying it and Horse Creek Ridge development will utilize it. She noted there was not a contract; however, RMWD was requiring the developer to build recycled water infrastructure in their development.

Director Sanford called for the question.

Director Lucy commended Mrs. Plonka for her impressive efforts on this project.

Mrs. Plonka pointed out the Joint Facility Agreements will outline the details.

### **\*15. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 13-11 REGARDING ANNEXING CAMPUS PARK WEST INTO RAINBOW MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT**

#### **Action:**

***Moved by Director Brazier to approve Resolution 13-11. 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.

Mrs. Plonka pointed out the language provided was required by SDCWA and MWD and came from SDCWA.

Director Lucy asked whether or not any inquiries have been received by San Luis Rey Municipal Water District. Dr. Brady answered no.

**16. CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPOINT A RMWD BOARD MEMBER TO SERVE ON THE COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE**

Dr. Brady explained why he and the committee believed having a Board Member serve on the committee would be useful.

No action taken.

**17. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION OF A MONITORING GROUP (REQUESTED BY: DIRECTOR SANFORD)**

Mrs. Plonka stated she had given the Board the summary regarding the survey letters mailed out and updated numbers; however, the percentages have not changed. She reported as of today RMWD has received 253 survey cards from the customers out of 1,495 with 95 that said yes (37%), 140 that said no (57%), 14 said neither yes or no (6%), and total staff hours spent was 63. It was confirmed the 95 that said yes were in favor of putting together a monitoring group and the 140 were opposed to doing such.

Director Sanford pointed out with only 20% of the people responding all the surveys are based on 5% response.

Mrs. Plonka added she had talked with Roger Mitchell at the Regional Water Quality Control Board on September 10, 2013 who told her the Regional Water Quality Control Board does not recognize Rainbow as a monitoring group right now even though a Notice of Intent has been submitted that RMWD was going to pursue it. She also noted Mr. Mitchell told her when the Regional Water Quality Control Board does enforcement, there will be fines; however, he was unable to provide a timeframe for when enforcement would commence.

Director Griffiths claimed staff did not following Board direction to start an organization as well as not to send out a survey as stated in the meeting minutes. Director Sanford asked when staff was directed to start a monitoring group. President McManigle stated four years ago. Director Sanford also inquired as to when staff was directed not to send out a survey. President McManigle stated this direction was given; however, the survey was supposed to be reviewed by the Directors first to ensure it was validated.

(\*) - Asterisk indicates a report is attached.

Director Sanford asked Mrs. Washburn to pull the minutes from the July 23, 2013 Board meeting. Dr. Brady recalled staff was directed to do a survey; however, it was not stated the Board wanted to review it first.

President McManigle stressed how the survey could have been more valid by simply asking whether or not the customer wanted to join The Farm Bureau to be a part of their monitoring group with one check box.

Director Griffiths read from the meeting minutes where staff was told to proceed accordingly, yet he felt they did not. Director Sanford stated staff did exactly what they were directed to do.

Mrs. Washburn quoted the final action from the July 23, 2013 meeting stated "Moved by Director Sanford the Board directs staff to communicate with the RMWD agricultural customers providing them with the estimated costs determined by staff for administering a monitoring group program." She noted this motion was passed 4-1 with Director Griffiths being a no.

Director Sanford disputed the claims staff did not follow Board direction. President McManigle disagreed with the type of communication and survey sent out. Dr. Brady said it was staff's perspective that RMWD communicated with customers and provided a response card from which to give their feedback; therefore, the Board may want to provide very specific direction as to who to proceed. President McManigle suggested it was too late to give more direction.

Director Lucy reminded the Board how staff came to the Board reporting they did not think implementing a monitoring group was a good idea due to it being very costly. He recalled how he opposed the idea from the very beginning; however, it was decided to pursue it. He stated it was his belief the Board was incorrect. Director Griffiths disagreed stating staff needed to move forward with formation of the group. Director Lucy inquired as to whether the Board wanted Mrs. Plonka spending her time dealing with the monitoring group matters when she has more important issues to which to attend. Director Griffiths said he did not want Mrs. Plonka working on this because it was not an engineering function.

President McManigle stated the monitoring should not be conducted by staff, but by the Regional Water Quality Control Board who will notify the customers of any issues discovered which will be handled by the RMWD monitoring group.

**Action:**

***Moved by Director McManigle to let these people know RMWD will have a monitoring group. Seconded by Director Griffiths.***

Director Griffiths claimed the numbers provided were nonsense and reiterated this was not an engineering function.

President McManigle confirmed the differences between the regional water boards with those from the San Diego Regional Board. He found it concerning that the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board would dictate the terms and that this should be challenged. He asked Legal Counsel how this could be done without it being considered taking without approval.

Legal Counsel noted this matter has been highly controversial for approximately ten years with San Diego Regional Board leading the way with an aggressive approach and has been the subject of several lawsuits.

Director Griffiths suggested it would be easier to fight this as a group as opposed to individually.

Director Sanford asked Mrs. Plonka to clarify what happens if RMWD does not have a group. Mrs. Plonka explained if RMWD does not have a group, the Regional Water Quality Control Board will continue to contact agricultural customers notifying them they will be fined for not starting or completing this process which they have already started to do. She confirmed if there is no group in existence for RMWD, the Water Quality Control Board can come in and fine anyone who is not part of another group or filed paperwork to do it themselves. Director Sanford asked what happens if there is a group. Mrs. Plonka said if RMWD has a functioning group that the Regional Board recognizes, they will first ask for the group's testing plan which they will review as well as make the group responsible for testing for specific items at locations they provide. Director Sanford reconfirmed if RMWD does not have a group, the responsibility for all the testing falls to the individual and if there is a group, the responsibility will stop at the group level which will in turn need to enforce the tests. Mrs. Plonka said it was her understanding the Regional Board would not be testing specific parcels, but rather doing sampling from the river at which time any hits will be addressed; however, how those hits will be addressed has not been clearly answered.

Legal Counsel added this was a process being invented as it moves along. He stated the Regional Board wants to have other people self-police their own group and rat themselves out to the Regional Board thereby doing the Regional Board's job.

Director Griffiths stated how he was told when he visited the Regional Board that they were considering only conducting tests once per year. Dr. Brady pointed out this was more extensive due to it involving biological testing twice per year.

Director Lucy questioned how the Regional Water Quality Control Board can levy a fine without providing notification first. President McManigle asked how a fine can be levied without legislation to back it up. Dr. Brady said it was staff understanding that the sampling was far more extensive than what Director Griffiths indicated.

Director Sanford asked how many acres are represented by the 95 people who responded to the communication. Mrs. Plonka said she was unsure of the exact number of acres; however, some of those that answered no explained they had already joined The Farm Bureau or were taking another route. Discussion ensued regarding the possible costs involved with the testing per customer based on the acreage impacted.

President McManigle amended his original motion

**Action:**

***Moved by Director McManigle to set up a monitoring group and open it to any and all agricultural interests in the North County area that would like to be a part of the RMWD monitoring group. Seconded by Director Griffiths.***

***After consideration, the motion CARRIED by the following vote:***

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

Director Sanford stated it would all come down to a matter of money whether or not another group can do it for half the cost of RMWD.

Director Griffiths suggested RMWD have an initial cost for setting up the paperwork for each customer and then implement minimal monitoring to protect all the impacted customers. He proposed RMWD not hire any consultants to perform of the work, but rather use individuals.

Director Sanford asked Legal Counsel if RMWD sets up a monitoring group but do not really do anything with it would RMWD be opened up for some type of liability. Legal Counsel stated ultimately the liability falls to the actual land owners; however, in order for the monitoring group to help those land owners it must be a monitoring group that meets the criteria and recognized by the Regional Board. He noted the monitoring group needs to be functioning.

President McManigle suggested reverting to the plan established four years ago. Mrs. Plonka noted plan was found to be incomplete. Dr. Brady pointed out the work that needs to be done to set this up was not purely administrative due to the fact plot plans must be developed for each parcel and onsite inventory surveys must be conducted. He reiterated the Regional Board will dictate to a large extent what type of monitoring will be required.

**Discussion went to Item #18.**

Director Brazier said she has a very hard time justifying telling her constituents to join a monitoring group without there being enough information available, especially when it comes to the costs involved. Director Sanford said The Farm Bureau would be able to provide costs; however, RMWD would not be able to provide the same.

President McManigle suggested the response would be those costs yet to be determined will be split among the members of the monitoring group.

President McManigle asked whether or not there was any insight as to how the San Mateo group was moving forward and their justification. Dr. Brady agreed this should be researched in order to find out the specifics. It was confirmed the Hines monitoring group was not open for membership.

Director Lucy asked Legal Counsel what would happen legally should one of the RMWD agricultural customers did not follow the regulated requirements. Legal Counsel explained the monitoring group concept came up at the Regional Board approximately 10-15 years ago in order to "fend off" fines by assuring through its monitoring group to prove all the discharge requirements are being met. He said is one of those honor yards were in violation, there was a problem. Director Lucy asked for clarification members of the monitoring group would not receive legal protection from District counsel. Legal Counsel reiterated this was a new process and legal protection would be in the membership arrangement; however, he has not seen one as yet.

Mrs. Bednarski said it appears as though the Regional Water Quality Control Board was seeking a means of policing the groves for any type of runoff within RMWD.

Dr. Brady said given the current staffing levels, he does not see any place for existing staff to do any of this work; however, it would have to be contracted out. He said based on verbal estimates from consulting firms the costs could range from \$75,000-\$100,000. He also pointed out even if it could be done for these estimated costs with some use of existing staff, RWMD will still be directly billed by the Regional Board each time contact is made between the two entities.

Director Sanford asked when staff surveys the San Mateo monitoring group, could they also ask all of the neighboring boards or districts in Southern California as to why they elected not to join a monitoring group. President McManigle stated FPU and Valley Center MWD did not want to have to deal with the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Director Sanford said he would like to know why other neighboring agencies were not starting their own monitoring groups.

Dr. Brady clarified the Board was approving the fairly significant expenditure of funds. President McManigle confirmed this to be correct.

President McManigle asked for a breakdown of what was done by staff in the 63 hours spent on this matter.

Director Sanford wanted it stated clearly for the record the Board has directed staff to form a monitoring group that is open to everybody interested in the monitoring area (San Luis Rey and Santa Margarita) and authorizing the expenditure of funds to set it up.

Director Griffiths suggested utilizing assessor maps and interns. Dr. Brady pointed out this will be done by consultants due to the fact there was no staff available to manage interns.

Director Brazier asked whether or not the Request for Proposal results come back to the Board. Dr. Brady affirmed the results would be presented.

Discussion returned to Item #18.

**18. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RMWD AND FPU  
JPA/CONSOLIDATION: CUSTOMER SERVICE TRANSITION PLAN DRAFT**

Mr. Steve Youell expressed his opinion that the customer service department should not be moved due to the fact RMWD has the best customer service department with which he has ever worked. He pointed out how the phone is always answered promptly, he can come by and pay his water bill, and that it was currently in an extremely convenient, easy to find location. He said to drive the roads to the other proposed location was just not very convenient. He noted although he does not represent all RMWD customers; however, he wanted to express his opinion that it would probably be best to leave it at RMWD where it is extremely easy to find.

Discussion returned to Item #17.

(\*) - Asterisk indicates a report is attached.

Dr. Brady reported out the results of the customer walk-in survey. He pointed out it was clear there needed to be options available for individuals to pay their bills locally; thus, he had a call into Daniel's Market regarding possibly utilizing their facility as a payment drop off location. President McManigle suggested staff talk to El Toro Market regarding the same.

Dr. Brady referred to the Customer Service Integration Schedule provided in the handout at the meeting as he reviewed each of the projected steps in the process. He noted one customer service employee would be kept at RMWD for an unspecified amount of time to assist with customers until such time it is determined how many customers will walk in for assistance.

President McManigle suggested the customer service survey specify what "frequently" and "occasionally" entails as well as utilize a time stamp in order to show when customers actually visit RMWD.

Dr. Brady pointed out the customer service move will be much more extensive than relocating engineering. He also stated the biggest concern was making sure there are no glitches in the computer and telephone systems. He also pointed out there will be a thirty-day assessment conducted from which the Board will be provided with updates.

Director Sanford suggested any additional surveys should include a breakdown as to the types of customer service being provided to the walk-in customers. Mr. Atilano stated the majority of the "walk-ins" are paying their bills; however, other concerns are developed during those visits. He pointed out the Meters report shows how many calls and walk-ins are received per month.

Director Lucy expressed why he felt moving customer service needed to be handled delicately due to the great customer service RMWD does provide. He highly recommended the person who staffs the RMWD location be a highly motivated and outgoing individual. He suggested this be stretched out for six months as opposed to a short term. He also cautioned safety for the employees at RMWD be thought through carefully. He stated although he thinks the move is a good idea, it needed to be handled with caution. He concluded with noting RMWD was a convenient location for payment drop off.

Director Brazier pointed out the intersection of I-15 and Highway 76 makes RMWD a very convenient location.

***Director Lucy excused himself from the meeting at 2:59 p.m.***

No action taken.

**\*19. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RMWD AND FPUD JPA/CONSOLIDATION**

Dr. Brady talked about the information provided under the JPA Expense Report numbered as Page #22A2-2 of the agenda packet.

Director Sanford asked for verification that RMWD was saving \$60,000 per month due to the steps being taken so far. Dr. Brady confirmed this to be true. Director Sanford suggested this information be included in the newsletter to the ratepayers.

Dr. Brady addressed the employee comments. He pointed out one of the reasons the customer service integration plan was taking place now was due to having a few months with Mr. Buckley to assist with the accounting system transition in customer service.

(\*) - Asterisk indicates a report is attached.

Dr. Brady addressed the question about why the transitions were moving so fast if the two agencies were to remain separate prior to LAFCO approval. He explained the reasons for moving so quickly: 1) saving money; 2) it proves whether or not these are good moves or not while still reversible; and 3) should both agency Board Members decided to move forward there would be more data available in going through the LAFCO process to ensure it goes smoothly in the event of a full consolidation.

Dr. Brady spoke on the engineering staff not being able to perform their jobs efficiently and how it was causing a financial burden to RMWD. He said he was unaware of any financial burden; however, he did know staff was working on resolving computer issues engineering was experiencing. President McManigle asked whether the statements made regarding engineering were true. Mrs. Plonka confirmed they were. Discussion ensued regarding moving the server and how it was being looked into in order to accommodate everyone utilizing it. President McManigle stated having employees waiting for this matter to be resolved was costly to RMWD it would be best to get it resolved soon. Dr. Brady disagreed this was not costing RMWD money as far as personnel was concerned; however, the matter of moving the server was being addressed aggressively.

President McManigle inquired as to the need for RMWD staff members having to visit RMWD from FPUD on a daily basis. Mrs. Plonka explained although staff does try to make these trips as efficiently as possible, it is true that daily trips are necessary, especially with money transactions. She noted pointed out moving the server would solve some of the issues, but not necessarily all of them.

Dr. Brady noted a combined budgeting process was being modeled after RMWD's. He also recalled initially there were talks about functional consolidation with Yuima and Valley Center; however, these two agencies were not being considered part of a possible full consolidation at this time.

Dr. Brady pointed out the initial estimate to move System Operations from FPUD to RMWD was over \$100,000; however, it has since been revisited and the cost was reduced. He also pointed out when the NCJPA was formed one or the other utility codes had to be adopted and how due to the fact a public utility district has more latent powers than a municipality this was the platform selected.

Dr. Brady clarified Mr. Ragsdale was working on coming up with combined policies with taking the best management practices from either district.

It was confirmed the public will be made aware of all the expenses involved with merging the districts. It was also noted the new business cards will have the respective addresses and phone numbers on them according to where each employee are located.

Dr. Brady mentioned the comment regarding the Board being a little upset with employees not putting comments in the suggestion boxes and how this may be attributed to the employees not feeling as though they are being heard. He also read the comment regarding how too many things were happening without being looked into more closely to not have this appear to be a hostile takeover. It was acknowledged looking into things was what the Board was doing right now.

Director Brazier made comments as a ratepayer, long time observer, and member of the RMWD Engineering Committee. She pointed out how RMWD did not start turning a corner and going uphill until engineering was brought in-house. She said before the JPA and RMWD had additional staff, members of the Engineering Committee were concerned that some district projects were being slowed down and pushed aside due to inadequate staffing. She pointed out a study was conducted by the committee; however, it went unaddressed. She noted how since that time there is one fewer staff member and more projects that are increasingly more complex. She proposed an honest assessment be conducted as to whether or not additional engineering staff members were needed in order to ensure the work of the district is completed, especially those projects involving being in compliance. Director Sanford agreed and noted he would have to turn to Dr. Brady or Mrs. Plonka to come back to the Board to address this matter. Director Brazier asked that this be on the next agenda for Board consideration.

**\*20. RECEIVE AND FILE INFORMATION ITEMS FOR AUGUST 2013**

**A. General Manager Comments**

1. Meetings, Conferences and Seminar Calendar
2. North County Joint Powers Authority Report (NCJPA)
3. Update on Customer Service Transition Plan

**B. Construction & Maintenance Comments**

1. Construction and Maintenance Report
2. Valve Maintenance Report
3. Garage/Shop Repair

**C. Engineering & Wastewater Comments**

1. Engineering Report
2. Wastewater Report

**D. Customer Service & Water Operations Comments**

1. Water Operations Report
2. Electrical/Telemetry Report
3. Water Quality Report
4. Field Customer Service Report
5. Meters Report
6. Cross Connection Control Program Report

**Action:**

***Moved by Director Brazier to receive and file information items for August 2013.  
Seconded by Director Sanford.***

(\*) - Asterisk indicates a report is attached.

***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.

Dr. Brady talked about the Revitalization meeting him and President McManigle attended where discussions took place regarding the I-15 corridor developments. He mentioned there will be a joint meeting with the RMWD and FPUD Board with SDCWA present to discuss the Bay Delta project. He also reported he will be giving a presentation at the SDCWA Board meeting on September 26, 2013.

Mr. Maccarrone announced the new back hoe has arrived and already being put to use.

Mrs. Plonka reported RMWD has received conditional approval via email from CDPHS to go ahead with Beck Reservoir. It was clarified that both Mrs. Plonka and Mr. Bebee would be working on this project together. Dr. Brady agreed to provide Director Griffiths with the RFP for Beck Reservoir.

Discussion ensued regarding Items #20C1, #20C2, and #20D4.

Director Sanford asked for confirmation as to whether or not the meters are read every month. Mr. Atilano confirmed meters are read monthly as well as the fact duplicate reads would generate a service order to ensure there are no problems with the meter.

**\*21. RECEIVE AND FILE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND INFORMATION FOR AUGUST 2013**

**A. Finance Manager Comments**

1. Interim Financial Statement
2. JPA Expenses
3. Monthly Investment Report
4. Visa Breakdown
5. Directors' Expense
6. Check Register
7. Office Petty Cash
8. Water Purchases & Sales Summary
9. Statistical Summary
10. Projected CIP Cash Flow Report
11. RMWD Sewer Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDU's) Status

**Action:**

***Moved by Director Brazier to receive and file financial statements and information.  
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. Buckley pointed out RMWD has not received anything additional in regards to the loans, but an update was provided under Item #21A-2. He confirmed RMWD has billed for the total amount of the State Revolving Fund Loans. He also pointed out the proposed rate increases provided under Item #21A-1 had been included in the September edition of the newsletter.

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

It was confirmed Director Brazier's suggested item regarding engineering staffing levels and a presentation by Jack Wood from the Planning Group would be on the next agenda.

Director Sanford announced he would not be present at the October Board meeting.

**23. ADJOURNMENT - To Tuesday, October 22, 2013 at 1:00 p.m.**

***The meeting was adjourned with a motion made by Director Brazier and seconded by Director Sanford to a regular meeting on October 22, 2013 at 1:00 p.m.***

The meeting was adjourned at 3:54 p.m.

---

**George McManigle, Board President**

---

**Dawn M. Washburn, Board Secretary**