

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF
SIERRA LAKES COUNTY WATER DISTRICT**

Date: Friday July 9, 2021 / **Time:** 6:00 p.m. / **Place:** 7305 Short Road, Serene Lakes, CA

The meeting was teleconferenced as provided by Governor Newsom’s Executive Order N-25-20 (“Executive Order”), declared on March 12, 2020. The Executive Order temporarily granted state and local agencies certain powers to aid in the implementation of social distancing measures recommended by state and local public health officials that suspended certain Brown Act requirements.

I. Open Meeting:

Roll Call: No Directors were in attendance at the Sierra Lakes Boardroom

Directors in attendance by teleconference:

Director Dan Stockton
Director Karen Heald
Director Michael Lindquist
Director Jon Harvey

Director Bob McCormick was absent

Staff members present: Anna Nickerson, Financial Consultant

Staff present by phone: Paul Schultz P.E. Inc., General Manager
Jeffrey Mitchell, District Counsel

Guests present by Zoom: Cathy MacLeod
Dick Simpson
Roger Drosd
Jen Jackson
Alice Mansell

Minute Recorder: Anna Nickerson, Financial Consultant

II. Public Forum: An opportunity for members of the public to address the Board on items that were not on the agenda. Director Heald said she wanted to recognize Bob McCormick for his contributions to the Board and to say she was sorry to hear about what happened to him.

III. Approve Agenda: The agenda was presented to the Board for approval. Director Harvey said he would have comments on the minutes during the Consent Items Calendar discussion.

A motion was made by Director Lindquist and seconded by Director Heald to approve the agenda. The motion passed by a rollcall vote: Directors Stockton, Heald, Lindquist and Harvey.

IV. Public Comments: An opportunity for the Board to consider comments received from the public after the agenda was posted, regarding items on the agenda. Mrs. Nickerson said there were no comments received.

V. Operations: Paul Schultz P.E. Inc., General Manager, presented his operations report to the Board for consideration and possible action. Mr. Schultz reported the following:

- Donner Summit Public Utility District (DSPUD) was discharging to the ski hill.
- Tom Skjelstad, DSPUD's General Manager, would be retiring on July 31, 2021. DSPUD interviewed several candidates and were in final negotiations for Mr. Skjelstad's replacement.
- The Lake Management Committee met once in June.
- Dock inspections resulted in three docks that were out of compliance and some junk stored on the strip. The issues noted were less than last year's issues. Mr. Schultz felt a few letters were needed.
- District Policies & Procedures were nearly complete. Director Heald's comments were being incorporated in to the documents. Adoption of updated Policies and Procedures anticipated for August or September. There were still some issues with the Employee Handbook that were being addressed.
- SLPOA's request for a new sailboat launch and storage area on Lake Dulzura would be discussed during New Business.
- Arsenic filter was ready to be installed. It was anticipated that the project would be complete in two to three weeks.
- The kick-off meeting with Far West Engineering went well.
- A meeting was held with Placer County regarding road repaving. Placer County had to propone the repaving projects in the community due to budget issues so District's projects would not interfere with their work. He also said Serene Lakes was on Placer County's five-year plan.
- The kick-off meeting with Great Basin was held. Work was to begin immediately. The work would be done in phases and it was anticipated that the plant would only be down for a few hours.
- The installation of the technology improvements was progressing. Hardware should be installed in the next few weeks. It was also noted that the providers and consultants selected for the project did not get hacked in the recent cyber attach.
- CalFire was schedule for 10 days the summer.
- More calls were being received regarding hazardous debris along the strip. Mr. Schultz said he was considering contacting an arborist for next year.
- Field activities for the Water Quality project began. Mini measuring stations were installed around the lake along with some other devises for measuring ultra violet lights.
- Soda Springs Road bridge project began. Originally there were some conflicts with the District's force main but the problems were mitigated and a solution was found.

- District Counsel determined that a contribution from the District to the LRAD project would not be a gift of District Funds because there was a benefit to both the District and the homeowners.

Director Harvey asked if the District actually received a formal or informal request for financial support of the LRAD system or was the request just for support and cooperation. Mr. Schultz said he thought it was a request for support and cooperation.

Director Harvey said, in regard to the Contemporary Water Quality study, he had received comments from homeowner along the shoreline that hundreds of cat fish were dying. Mr. Schultz said he was gathering information but believed the fish were choking on pollen. He initially thought it was a low oxygen problem but the oxygen level in the lake was fine. Director Harvey asked that updates be provided as the Water Quality project progresses. Mr. Schultz said he would be providing a report on the progress of the project at the August meeting.

Mr. Simpson said he heard an informal request for funding of the capital expenditures for the LRAD system. He expected a formal request would be submitted after the testing. Director Heald said she agreed that a very informal request was made and that it was that request that initiated the request for Mr. Mitchell determination.

Mr. Simpson said he attended the 5:00pm LRAD meeting and learned that an anticipated Measure T, a Fire District Ballot Measure, for covering the operating expenses would be on the next ballot and that the system would belong to Placer County.

Mr. Drosd said he had been collecting dozens of dead fish and was surprised to hear that it was due to pollen. He thought the pollen level was worse last year.

Director Lindquist said, since there had been three comments about dead fish, it would be appropriate to contact a fishery biologist. He said if the problem was due to something bad, the Board should know as soon as possible. Mr. Schultz said he would first reach out to the University and get as much information from them before calling another professional.

Mr. Schultz continued his report. He said:

- There were no sewer overflows in the month of June.
- The Hazardous Material Plan was completed and submitted in June.
- Water consumption was up and a discussion regarding water conservation would be discussed later in the meeting. He also said last year was the highest water use of all times and it was looking like this year would be even higher.
- Sewer flows were down

VI. Consent Items Calendar: The Consent Items Calendar was presented to the Board for action. The Consent Items Calendar included the minutes from the June 11, 2021, Regular Meeting; June 2021 Check Register; financial reports for the month ending June 30, 2021; and Disbursements for Board Approval. Director Harvey said on page 10 of the board packet, under New Business regarding the actuarial analysis, second to the last sentence where it said “he also said he wanted to be able to say the District had an unfunded liability...”, the thought he

wanted to be able to say “we did not have an unfunded liability”. The change was accepted by the other Board members.

A motion was made by Director Heald and seconded by Director Harvey to approve the Consent Items Calendar with the change as Director Harvey indicated. The motion passed by a rollcall vote: Directors Stockton, Heald, Lindquist and Harvey.

VII. Old Business:

A. Cathy McLeod from McLeod Watts attended the meeting to answer any questions the Board had regarding the OPEB Actuarial Report that was presented at the June 2021 Board Meeting. Director Stockton asked that she provide a general background about the report.

Ms. McLeod said the dates in the report could be confusing but that the Board previously made a decision to value the liabilities as of the last day of the prior fiscal year; for this report that date was June 30, 2020. She said that decision provided more time to get the needed calculations done. She also said the purpose of the report was to give value to the projected future retiree health premiums and was based on the active employees and seven retirees. She said a description of the Valuation Process could be found on page 4, Section B of the report.

Ms. McLeod provided a general overview of the process that was used and the types of assumptions that were made in calculating the District’s unfunded liability. She said because the District did not have a trust setup to prefund the liability, a really low rate of about 2.2%, the rate of a high quality municipal bond, was used to discount the future benefits. This resulted in a much higher unfunded liability. The District’s current unfunded liability was determined to be \$1,463,570; up about \$300,000 from the year before. She also said most of the increase was due to the drop in discount rate.

Director Harvey asked if the Board was “doing what we need to be doing, not just to meet the minimum threshold, but, sort of from a best practices perspective, in terms of being able to say we have something close to a funded liability.” Ms. McLeod said she understood from Mrs. Nickerson that there were funds set aside towards the liability. However, per GASB 75, those funds cannot be matched up to the liability unless those funds have been placed in an irrevocable trust. Therefore, the financial statements will reflect the total unfunded liability.

Director Harvey asked if Ms. McLeod’s firm was in a position to advise the Board on the appropriate way to account for the money. Ms. McLeod said she was not an investment advisor and that the Board would need to seek other counsel. However, her firm had a lot of experience helping employers’ transition from unfunded to funded plans. She said she could quickly illustrate the potential benefits on the financial statements.

Ms. McLeod said the District was probably only earning about 1% to 2%, maybe 4% over the long-term. By putting the funds into an open trust, the Board would be able to choose a level of investment risk anywhere from low to high. Then, depending on the level of risk, the funds could earn somewhere between 5% and 6%. By placing the funds in a trust and earning between 5% and 6%, the higher rate would be used to discount the future benefits reducing the

\$1.4 million unfunded liability down to maybe \$900,00 and could be considered fully funded. She said \$1 in a trust goes a lot further. The biggest reticence about placing the funds in a trust was the concern that the funds could not be withdrawn except for an amount equal to the annual benefit expenditures.

Director Lindquist said, about three years ago, the Board made a conscious decision to put money away in an informally restricted account towards the liability. Annual contributions to the account would continue until the liability was fully funded. He also said the District made a large payment towards the CalPERS unfunded pension liability to avoid future surprises. In response to Director Harvey's question, Director Lindquist said it might be a good time to revisit the District's investment strategy. It was agreed by all the Directors to place the topic on a future agenda. Ms. McLeod said, if the Board wanted, her firm could do a "what if" calculation to see what the effect would be on the unfunded liability if the funds were transferred to a trust.

B. Mrs. Nickerson said she left the item regarding Allison Wagner and yoga classes on the lake on the agenda in case Ms. Wagener attended the meeting. Since Ms. Wagner did not attend the meeting, the item was not discussed.

C. Director Stockton said it probably wasn't fair that Director Harvey was the only member of the Lake Management Committee and asked if Director Heald would help finish the plan. She said she would be happy to but felt it was just about complete. Director Heald noted the following:

Piers and Docks on District Property:

- Page 52 of the board packet, #2, after Initial and annual fees, "is" should be "are" to read "as the Board determines are reasonable..." The change was accepted.
- Page 52 of the board packet, #1, second sentence said "The District may provide an application...". She asked if there was a reason for using "may" vs "will". Director Lindquist thought "may" was used just to provide wiggle room in case there wasn't a form. Mr. Schultz said people have been submitting plans in their own form and probably would not require a form unless the submissions became a problem. A form could be added in the future without having to change the ordinance.

Director Lindquist said he concurred with the two edits.

Chapter 4 Use of District Property

- Section 30.06 – at the previous meeting there was a discussion about providing property owners with a process to appeal a decision made by District Manager to the Board in order to avoid court. Director Harvey said the topic had not been discussed any further. Director Head suggested "the District Manager shall determine if personal property is portable and if the adjacent homeowner disagrees to the District Manager's determination, they can appeal the decision to

the Board”. Director Harvey said he hoped that any disagreement with any provision could be brought to the Board. Director Heald agreed that it could be a general statement and confirmed with Mr. Mitchell that if the statement wasn’t made, homeowners would have to go to court. She said the issue was with the General Manager making a decision of what was or wasn’t portable personal property and if a homeowner disagreed with that decision. He said if language was added to Section 30.06 regarding the ability to appeal that would imply that other sections could not be appealed. Director Heald asked Mr. Mitchell if nothing was said then that would imply that any decision could be appealed to the Board. Mr. Mitchell thought that would be the case and that he would look to see if there was a place for a general statement like “any decision of the General Manager could be appealed to the Board”.

A motion was made by Director Lindquist and seconded by Director Harvey to approve the draft of Attachment A as presented with the cumulative changes, including the one change suggested by Director Heald, the Hold Harmless agreement and Chapter 4. The motion passed by a rollcall vote: Directors Stockton, Heald, Lindquist and Harvey.

Director Harvey said Director McCormick was really instrumental in a lot of the work, that he was great to work with and although they didn’t agree on everything, they were able to talk through the issues. He also said he missed Director McCormick.

D. The Board discussed Water Conservation. Mr. Schultz said Governor Newsome came out with a new Executive Order looking for a state wide voluntary reduction in water use. He said the District was bumping up against surface water treatment capacity. He also said as far as he could tell, the Governor’s previous resolution was still valid and the District’s Ordinance included limitations on outdoor watering and low flow fixtures.

Director Heald said the Board did not have the Ordinance or the Resolution at the June meeting but thought the Ordinance was good and about as inclusive as possible. She also said the Board needed to discuss enforcement, the reason why the Ordinance existed and the District’s capacity to produce.

Director Lindquist said there were two issues. One was the need to conserve water and the other was the District’s ability to produce. Although there was still a fair amount of water in the lake, the District was limited on the amount of water that could be made each day. He said it was always a good idea to conserve water and wanted to focus on the ways people could use their water wisely.

Mr. Schultz said installing the meters have helped in reducing leaks but the outdoor water use was a big problem. It would be great if water use could be reduced to the 2018 level, then there be plenty of treatment capacity.

Director Lindquist said the Board previously sent notices to homeowner reminding them that water consumption starts on the Summit and that water conservation practices apply here too. Director Harvey said maybe metering would be the “silver bullet” to get people to pay attention to their water consumption.

Ms. Jackson said, in regard to the comment about homeowners not being able to compare their use, there was plenty of statewide data available about average water use. There was also Nextdoor and Facebook in Serene Lakes that could be used to get the message out.

Mr. Drosd said one of the problems with comparing water use was the homes with variable occupancy. Some were occupied very sporadically and others occupied more often and with more people. He also said SLPOA would be happy to post any notice the Board wanted posted and to send out reminders to homeowners about conserving water.

Mr. Schultz said the District had everything in place requiring water conservation with the Resolution and Ordinance leaving community education. He would pull some of the previous drought messaging information and work on getting it distributed to the community.

VIII. New Business:

A. SLPOA's boat storage request was presented to the Board for consideration and possible action. Mr. Schultz said the proposal was for a new sailboat storage/launch area by the dog park. He said he thought it was a good idea, that it would take some pressure off of the Swiss Court access point but the request needed to be brought to the Board. Mr. Drosd said there was no storage for sailboats on the lower lake and navigating through the channel from the upper lake to the lower lake was challenging especially when the water level was low.

Director Lindquist asked if the storage would be reduced at Swiss or if it was going to be additional storage. Mr. Schultz said it would be additional storage but felt people would voluntarily move to the new location. Mr. Drosd said he was hopeful that people would move their boat from one location to the other.

Director Harvey said having a better access point for sailboats, particularly in the lower lake, would be nice to have. His concern was the impact to the shoreline where there hadn't been prior activity. He would like to see a plan for preserving the shoreline.

Director Heald said she was more concerned about increasing use because the previous General Manager was clear about the limitations on boat storage around the lake because of his concerns for the shoreline. She asked Mr. Schultz how many boats he thought should be allowed at the proposed location to mitigate possible erosion. Mr. Schultz said the limit should be six or eight. Director Heald confirmed that the plan would be brought back to the Board for approval.

Mr. Simpson said most of the sailboats have been on Lake Dulzura, very few on Lake Serena, and was curious about what the distribution of sailboats would be. He also said it looked like it would be an amendment to the License Agreement and his recollection was the license agreement gave SLPOA the right to provide a certain number of boat storage units, at various places around the lake, not the types of boats that could be stored. He also said the fact that they were sailboats was irrelevant; the request was for an increase in boat storage. Mr. Mitchell said the agreement was specific about what could be stored at each location. Mr. Drosd said the plan was for sailboats.

Director Lindquist said the process would be to walk the boat into the water so their feet would be on the bottom of the lake stirring up the mud. Mr. Drosd said people swim in the lake by walking in from the shore. He didn't think launching the boat would result in a significant increase. Mr. Schultz said part of the plan would be to determine if a small amount of lake bottom material would reduce the erosion of the shoreline.

Director Heald said she would like to see the final design with mitigating measure before approving anything. She also said a revision to the License Agreement could be submitted with the final plan. The final plan would be presented to the Board for approval.

Director Lindquist said, this was the sixth time the Board was revisiting an increase of boat storage around the lake. He said he was sure it was because the community wanted more boat storage but water quality still needed to be protected. He wanted to keep the community informed of the consequences that go with increased boat storage. Director Heald said she also had a concern with SLPOA issuing more permits than the number of boats allowed at Bales. She knew that previously not all the permits were used consistently and that there were unused spaces but if the racks were full and there were boats on the ground, then there was a problem. Mr. Drosd said he agreed with the statements and that their enforcement was lacking, partly due to people being out of town, but that SLPOA would be looking at and modifying their rate of overselling permits.

B. Placer County's requirements for filling a vacancy on the Board, due to the loss of Director McCormick, was presented to the Board for consideration and possible action. Mr. Mitchell said, according to Placer County requirements, the Board had two options for filling a vacancy. The Board could fill the vacancy by appointment or call by Special Election. He said the Board had until August 20, 2021, to appoint a replacement or call for a Special Election.

Director Harvey said he was in favor of appointing a new Director and asked how an appointment would be done. Mr. Mitchell said the appointment had to be done in open session. He said a notice would be posted, an application with instructions for submission would be provided to interested parties and the applications would be presented to the Board prior to the meeting. He also said it was up to the Board whether or not they wanted to interview the applicants.

Director Harvey said, in the case of an election, to ensure candidates met the qualifications to serve on the Board, they were qualified and required to sign an affidavit. He asked how that would work with an appointment. Mr. Mitchell said the information that would be provided to prospective appointees would contain qualifying requirements specifically, that the applicant had to own property in Serene Lakes. Mrs. Nickerson said she would verify that the applicants were property owners. Mr. Mitchell said it was unlikely that there would be a conflict that would prevent someone from being a board member.

Director Lindquist said he was in favor of appointing a Director. Director Heald said she was in favor of appointing a Director at the August 2021, meeting. She also said the questions used for the last appointment were acceptable.

A motion was made by Director Heald and seconded by Director Lindquist that the Board fill the vacancy by appointment and review the criteria to make the appointment in the Regular August meeting and that District Counsel and Mrs. Nickerson create and post the required documents necessary to fulfil the legal requirements. The motion passed by a rollcall vote: Directors Stockton, Heald, Lindquist and Harvey.

C. The topic of Agenda Distribution was presented to the Board by Director Heald for consideration and possible action. She said after the June meeting, she and Mr. Mitchell had some discussions about the apparent confusion regarding the difference between Public Comments, Public Forum and actual agenda items; what the Board could discuss and what it couldn't. They agreed that the confusion was having Public Comments on the agenda. She said Public Comments was added during the development of the Lake Management Plan because of all the comments received after the agenda was posted. She felt the item was no longer necessary and proposed the following changes to agenda and distribution of information for board meetings:

1. Remove Public Comments
2. Send just a draft agenda on the first Friday of the month to allow board members to review and add items.
3. On the Monday prior to the meeting, post the agenda and send the board packet.
4. Provide comments received after the agenda was posted regarding items on the agenda, to the Board just prior to the meeting.
5. For comments received after the agenda was posted regarding items not on the agenda, Mrs. Nickerson would send an invitation to attend the meeting to present the comments during Public Comments or add the item to a future agenda.

Mr. Simpson said the agenda was covered in the Policies and Procedures manual and was wondering why it was being discussed now. He said there was a whole section on putting the agenda together. Director Heald said she was proposing a change to the process to reduce the confusion due to the number of changes made to the board packet. She also said the policy for preparing the agenda stated that the Secretary would work with the Board President to prepare the agenda and that any Director could contact the Secretary, by 5:00 pm on Thursday one week prior to the regular meeting date, to add items to the agenda. She said she didn't see anything that would require a policy change in order to change the process for sending out the packet and agenda. Director Lindquist asked if the packet would be sent out on Friday with the draft agenda. Director Heald said no, the purpose of her proposal was to wait until Monday to send that packet to have only one packet sent out.

Mr. Mitchell said the problem wasn't the emails distributed, the problem was if an item was on the agenda, then the item had to be an item the public could comment on. He also said it wasn't uncommon for a Board to allow the public to make comments in writing or in person. He said one of the realities of the Brown Act was the frustration when a problem was brought to the

Board by a member of the public but the Board was unable to discuss the issue or make a decision because the item wasn't on the agenda.

Mr. Simpson said there was a list of agenda items and standard reports in the policies and procedures manual. He said the documents were part of the information provided to the Policies and Procedures Committee last August. Mr. Simpson said he would forward the documents to the Board and Mr. Mitchell.

There was a continuation of the discussion. Mr. Mitchell suggested that Ms. Nickerson provide the complete set of original digital Policies and Procedures documents to the Board, the Board agreed with his recommendation, and Ms. Nickerson said she would follow through. Mr. Simpson was left with no action.

No change to the agenda and board packet procedures was made pending further review.

D. A contract for the completion of the Arsenic Installation was presented to the Board for consideration and possible action. Mr. Schultz asked the Board to approve the contract for signature by the Board President.

A motion was made by Director Lindquist and seconded by Director Heald to approve the contract. The motion passed by a rollcall vote: Directors Stockton, Heald, Lindquist and Harvey.

E. A discussion regarding meeting days and times was led by Director Harvey. He said he wanted to have a conversation with the Board regarding the need for Friday night meetings. He said it was an odd time to hold a public hearing and wondered if there was another time, other than Friday nights or the weekends. He said Friday nights were bad for him and if any other Board members were interested in changing the meeting days and/or time. He suggested a different weeknight sometime between Monday and Friday noon. He also asked what the guidelines would be at the end of the current COVID in person meeting waiver.

Director Lindquist said he would support another meeting time. The Board had originally moved the meeting back an hour to give him time to pick his kids up from school and get to the District. Director Heald said in the current environment Zoom meetings could be held at anytime on any day and that meetings were schedule on Fridays because that was when people would come up to Serene Lakes. She said if Zoom meeting continued it would be easy to move the meeting time.

Mr. Mitchell said, setting aside the rules for the pandemic, the Brown Act required that a majority of the board members had to physically be within the District boundaries. He said he heard that there was an effort by some Bay Area communities to get the rules requiring that board members be physically present loosened. But there was no current legislation. He also said if there were no changes made, board members would be required to attend in person starting with the October 2021 meeting.

Director Lindquist asked if Director Harvey thought there was a better day or time for Directors, staff and the community to hold meetings. Director Harvey said he would not be

attending another meeting on a Friday night unless he had a burning issue. He also said Friday night meetings made it hard to attract board members.

Mr. Drosd said, as a member of the public, he too found Friday night meetings difficult to attend. He also said low public participation was an indication that Friday night meetings were hard to attend.

Director Lindquist said the public has been attending the meetings by Zoom and asked if there were any restrictions to continuing that practice. Mr. Mitchell said there were no limitations on allowing the public to attend remotely. However, there was a pending bill that would require remote participation for the public, but that was for communities of 200,000 or more.

Ms. Jackson said she works for a city in the Bay Area and that there had been so much greater public participation with remote participation and planned to petition her legislator to allow the practice to continue. She also suggested taking a poll of the community to see if there was another night of the week that would be better.

Director Heald said she would like to wait to see what the legislature decides before continuing the conversation.

Director Lindquist said, in regard to the poll, he would only support holding meetings at a time that supported the customers. He said he would support another day if customers were able to attend remotely otherwise, he felt meetings should be held when customers were in town which would likely be a Friday, Saturday or Sunday.

Mr. Simpson said Mr. Drosd offered to send information to SLPOA members and wondered if he would be interested in taking a poll of the community. Mr. Drosd said he would if asked but didn't see a need to ask the general public. He felt asking the community what night would be good for them would result in a rainbow of answers. He said it was really about the Board and that more people would participate remotely if available.

F. The Placer County Grand Jury Report was presented by Mrs. Nickerson for discussion and possible action. Mrs. Nickerson said she sent the information to the District's web designer who created two options to satisfy the Grand Jury. Mr. Mitchell said he looked at the Grand Jury report and felt it was wrong because the District had an integrated agenda management system as defined by the Brown Act. He also said it would be easier to do something than arguing with the Grand Jury. Director Lindquist said he liked the unhighlighted version.

Mr. Simpson said he agreed with Mr. Mitchell that the change was not necessary. He also said that it wasn't until earlier in the week that he saw there was a meeting. He requested that the next meeting date be posted immediately. Mrs. Nickerson said she could post the date of the next meeting as soon as the day after the current meeting.

A motion was made by Director Lindquist and seconded by Director Harvey that the Board agreed with the findings and changes would be made. The motion passed by a rollcall vote: Directors Stockton, Heald, Lindquist and Harvey.

IX. Administration:

- A. There were no Follow-up Items from the June 11, 2021, Board meeting.
- B. A Status of Action Items list was presented to the Board for consideration and possible action.
 - 1) AMR Data Collection – Meter installation continued. Progress was increased to 5%
 - 2) District’s Policies and Procedures – Progress was increased to 95%
 - 3) District’s ownership of the Dam – No progress was made.
 - 4) Upcoming Metered Rates – Director Lindquist created a draft 4-year schedule. Mr. Schultz said he would meet with Director Lindquist to review the schedule and present reviewed scheduled at the August meeting.
 - 5) Develop recommended method for providing customer access to their personal water use data. Director Lindquist would begin work on the item after the August meeting.

X. Adjournment

A motion was made by Director Lindquist and seconded by Director Harvey to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed by a unanimous rollcall vote: Directors Stockton, Heald, Lindquist and Harvey.

The minutes were approved at the Regular Meeting held on August 13, 2021, as part of the Consent Items Calendar. A motion was made by Director Harvey and seconded by Director Heald to approve the Consent Items Calendar. The motion passed by a unanimous rollcall vote.