MINUTES

TEHACHAPI-CUMMINGS COUNTY WATER DISTRICT
REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
June 17, 2026, 3:00 P.M.
22901 Banducci Road, Tehachapi, CA 93561

Item 1. Call to Order and Roll Call
Directors Present: Davis, Hall, Schultz **Absent:** Ables
Legal Counsel Present: Legal Counsel joined Closed Session via Zoom
Staff Present: Catherine Adams, Jon Curry, Tom Neisler, Crystal Sampson

Item 2. Announcement
President Schultz announced this meeting is being audio recorded, including all Board, Staff, and Public comments.

President Schultz stated that on Monday, the Tehachapi area had an extreme tragedy with the crash of a B-52 Stratofortress on Edwards Air Force Base that tragically killed 8 people. Some of these people were Tehachapi residents and friends. He held a moment of silence after the flag salute to honor those who were lost in this tragedy.

Item 3. Flag Salute
The Pledge of Allegiance was led by President Schultz.

Item 4. Approval of Agenda
Director Hall moved to approve the Agenda. President Schultz seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Davis, Hall, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Ables. Motion passed.

Item 5. Comments by any Party on Items of Interest and Within the Subject Matter Jurisdiction of the Legislative Body
There were none.

Item 6. Consent Calendar - Consent items are considered routine and are intended to be acted upon as a single item, without discussion. During this portion of the meeting, the Consent Calendar will be read aloud. Prior to approval, the President will give the Board the opportunity to remove any item from the Consent Calendar to be discussed and voted on individually. The President will also give staff and the public the opportunity to request any item be discussed individually, in which case the President will determine whether the item will be removed from the Consent Calendar. The remaining calendar will be acted upon. Any removed items will then be heard and acted upon individually.

a. Approve Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting of May 20, 2026, and Special Board Meeting of June 5, 2026
b. Approve Financial Report and Payment of Bills
c. Receive and File Actuarial Valuation for Other Post-Employment Benefits (Retiree Medical)

President Schultz asked if there were any items the Board, Staff or Public would like to remove for discussion, and there were none.

Director Hall moved to approve the Consent Calendar. President Schultz seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Davis, Hall, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Ables. Motion passed.

Item 7. General Manager's Report

Neisler reported on the following:

-The photo shows the scale and debris that is in the heat exchangers at Pump Plant 4 and this is common when system operations increase to a third engine. It is a calcium salt chloride type of deposit that breaks off the inside of the pipe. Mechanics were working more or less around the clock to clean the heat exchangers and keep the system operating.

-Over the weekend, a very severe algae bloom plugged the heat exchangers at Pump Plant 1 and caused numerous problems up and down the Delta.

-A new mechanic, Garrett Frankland, started work this week and the team is getting him up to speed.

-Golden Mussels are still present in the system and steps are being taken throughout the state water supply to combat this menace. At this month's Common Interest Group, Neisler was able to thank County Supervisor Chris Parlier for issuing an emergency declaration on the issue. Supervisor Parlier asked if the District would participate in an Ad-Hoc Committee that the Board of Supervisors is forming to address the issue and Curry is going to participate. Curry is doing a great job staying up to speed on these issues and it is appreciated.

-Lake Oroville is 118% of historical average and 96% of capacity which is extraordinarily high for the middle of June. Conditions coming into this summer and into the fall are almost unprecedented in terms of El Nino and the large-scale atmospheric river events that could trigger and the reservoirs are full to the point of almost overflowing. Lake Shasta is 103% and San Luis Reservoir is 110% of historical average. The ability to deal with excess water is very limited on a statewide level.

-Brite Lake level is not gaining despite importing as much water as possible and that is the ideal situation as customers are using the water. He displayed the Brite Lake Level chart stating the purple line is current year, so it is below the five-year average line and he described how conditions will change as the season continues.

-The Supreme Court declined to hear the appeal of the appellate court decision for the first validation action, which they ruled as being too broad. DWR did not think that the second course of action had a strong likelihood of being successful, and they chose not to burn several more years in ongoing legal battles. They are regrouping now and deciding how to proceed to get the project validated so it can be refinanced.

-Supervisor Parlier indicated that Kern County has an Illegal Dumping Recovery Fund to reimburse agencies who have these problems. Curry described the problem the District had at Blackburn Dam at last months meeting and he is working with Karen Sanders, East Kern Representative for Supervisor Parlier, to get recompense for the $3,200 in fees that were paid to Kern County for that dumping.

-We also welcomed two new Staff members to the team in the Pipeline Department with another starting next week.

-He reminded the Board that the Annual Safety Picnic will be held next Friday at Brite Lake at 1:00 p.m.

-He offered to answer any questions the Board or Public may have.

President Schultz asked how the recompense is calculated for the dumping fees. Curry explained the funds come from the property tax component paid for solid waste. The County will reimburse the agency for the "tipping fee" or actual dump fees, not the fees imposed by Waste Management nor the expenses for roll-off bins or equipment rental. Neisler added that the illegal dumping case has been turned over to the District Attorney so if there is any action, the District can file for reimbursement of costs incurred.

Item 8. Operations Report

Curry reported on the following:

-The photo shows the algae at Pump Plant 1 and you can see there is trash in there as well. Staff worked closely with Wheeler Ridge as they were cleaning on their end as well and were very responsive. The new mechanic is getting a crash course in heat exchanger cleaning this week. The algae has diminished and Staff is down to one cleaning per day now, but that wasn't the case over last weekend.

-The Benz Well repairs have been completed and it is now operational. Last week it produced a steady 500 GPM, so Staff is watching the draw down.
-After all the cleaning and scratching was done on the casing in the Nunes Well, there just is not a lot of the old, riveted steel left. He attached the well run photos to the Staff Report. Bakersfield Well and Pump provided two options for repair. For around $60,000 they can put in a new liner that is part sold and part slotted, as well as a new pump. The second option is to drill a new well for $450,000. Staff is considering the options and doing more exploration on the liner work as that is the most likely move to get some production from that well. This is the smallest Tehachapi Basin extraction well the District owns. It produces about 350 GPM so something needs to be done to not lose the well all together.
-Director Hall asked the location of both wells and Curry provided the information. Director Davis asked if the liner would decrease the output of the Nunes Well. Curry explained it should not decrease it anymore than the decay would naturally decrease the output. One of the other issues you'll see from the well report is that it has lost a significant amount of gravel pack. Part of the new liner work will be to re-gravel, pack it and open everything back up again. The goal would be to get it operating close to 350 GPM again.
-Brite Lake data from June 12th were, elevation 4355.9', volume 1245.9 AF, and level 29.9'.
-The importation system is running on three engines at 19.5 CFS. Staff is hoping that once the algae issue at Plant 1 is to an acceptable point, pumping can increase to 21 CFS. Tehachapi Basin extraction wells are shut down.
-He provided details on the tasks and projects completed by the Pumping Systems and Pipeline Departments as listed in the Staff Report.
-The JPIA Risk Assessment/Inspection report is attached and the District received good remarks and some recommendations.
-Staff attended Hearing Conservation safety training.
-He attended the Golden Mussel Ad-Hoc meeting with Supervisor Parlier, Flores and other districts and treatment providers. There were some success stories with treatment processes. This District is different as we do not operate open canal systems and we cannot dewater our system. Staff will be doing some background water sampling from the water in Brite Lake to get an idea of potential treatment options for this system.
-The Streambed Alteration Permit notification was submitted to CDFW.
-The Golden Mussel Control Plan will be submitted to CDFW tomorrow.
-Staff will continue to wrap up the FY 2025-2026 projects and queue up the FY 2026-2027 projects.

President Schultz asked if they knew what year the Nunes Well was put in and Staff was unsure of the exact year but believe to be in the 1950s. Curry reminded the Board that the District leased that well for a number of years and just purchased it around five years ago. President Schultz shared his experience with trying to repair a well very similar to this and agreed that sleeving is the best option to save the Nunes Well. He appreciated the inclusion of the pictures in the report.

Item 9. Approve Fiscal Year 2026-27 Cost-of-Living Adjustment for all Employees

Neisler stated the Board graciously considers a Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) for all employees in conjunction with Budget discussions in June of every year. The basis of these considerations is the April Consumer Price Index, West Coast, Size Class B/C, Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (Attachment A). The report shows a 3.3% increase from April 2025 to April 2026. Last year the Board approved a 1.9% COLA based on the same index. Attachment B is a running chart showing how the CPI April Index compared to the Board approved COLA over the years. A 3.3% COLA would increase salaries and benefits for all employees by approximately $119,000 in FY 2026-2027. Should the Board adopt a different percentage or no COLA, the Budget will be modified accordingly prior to its final presentation at the August Regular Board Meeting with the appropriate adjustments included. The Ad-Hoc Budget Committee briefly considered this item during their budget deliberations and had no objections to the 3.3% recommendation.

President Schultz shared his thoughts on the use of this Consumer Price Index and his own theory, however he thinks the 3.3% is justified. He shared his findings on inflation across the United States with regard to food, housing and energy.

Director Hall moved that the Board approve a 3.3% Cost-of-Living Adjustment increase for all employees. Director Davis seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Davis, Hall, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Ables. Motion passed.

Neisler thanked the Board on behalf of the entire team and appreciated their consistent and ongoing support.

Item 10. Adopt Resolution 04-26 Amending a Publicly Available Salary Schedule for Authorized Positions

Neisler stated this Resolution approves the new salary schedule in accordance with the COLA that the Board just granted. It also updates the Authorized Positions list that is maintained for Board approved positions. The General Manager has the ability to fill these authorized positions as District needs warrant, but he cannot create new positions without the Board's authorization. This year, he is requesting to create an Assistant General Manager of Administration position. The District currently has an Assistant General Manager of Operations, Jon Curry, and he would like to assign Cat Adams to the Administration position. She is currently the Administration Manager and has demonstrated a great benefit to the District. He feels the District is best suited to have equivalent positions in both the Administration and Operations side for the future. Neisler is requesting the Board authorize this new position at the same salary range as the current Assistant General Manager position which is Range 151.

With this updated Authorized Positions list he would like to reflect the Operations Manager and Administration Manager positions as vacant as well as the Controls and Emissions Technician as a Controls and Emissions Specialist was hired. The new Assistant General Manager of Administration position will not be advertised as the best qualified candidate is available to step right into that role.

President Schultz asked questions on the new job description and discussion took place on this position maintaining the duties of the Administration Manager with some additional duties and increased responsibility. Neisler shared that Adams has applied to attend the JPIA Leadership Course in the fall. All of these things will ensure the District is configured for succession in the future. The Board discussed the financial impact of this addition and felt it was appropriate.

President Schultz moved that the Board adopt Resolution 04-26, Amending the District’s Salary Schedule for Authorized Positions. Director Hall seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Davis, Hall, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Ables. Motion passed.

Item 11. Adopt Resolution 05-26 Approving the Fiscal Year 2025-26 Preliminary Budget, Appropriations Limit, and Reserves Policy

Sampson stated each year in June, the Board approves a Preliminary Budget to provide estimates for Public review before further information is available for the Final Budget. The Ad-Hoc Budget Committee met on Friday, May 29th to review and discuss the Preliminary Budget, the Appropriations Limit and the Reserves Policy. The Appropriations Limit increased by approximately $961,000 (5.05%) to $19,986,244. With the information available at this time from Kern County, the District is expecting $11,176,900 from general taxes, special taxes, and Benefit Assessment taxes. The Appropriations Limit is 56% so this would bring the District to about $9.77 million below the limit. There are no proposed changes to the Reserves Policy that was adopted at the May 2025 Regular Board Meeting.

She provided a thorough review of the Preliminary Budget as summarized in the Staff Report and noted:

-The District-wide budget shows expenses exceeding revenues by $1.2 million and this loss is attributable to the losses in Funds 82 (State Payment Fund) and Fund 76 (Improvement District No. 2 Fund). This is a purposeful budgeted loss as it is planned to decrease the amount to be assessed over the next period for Fund 82.
-The Operating budget is balanced with revenues exceeding expenses by $25,000, which is a 35% increase overall. With the increase in Table A Allocation to 45%, there is adequate water to meet demands.
-Non-Operating Revenues which are general tax revenues in Fund 70 are expected to be about $7.8 million.
-Total Interest Earnings will decrease about $120,000 from last year as reserves were spent over the last period on the Engine Project and rates continue to drop. Even with this slight decrease, the District is expected to have over $900,000 in interest earnings. The District has $19.2 million invested in maturities laddered over the next five years with an average yield of 4.33%. The liquid pooled funds, currently in LAIF, amount to about $8.15 million, currently earning 3.81%.
-Operation Expenses will increase 27% and are made up of the Salaries and Benefits, Operations Maintenance, Debt Service, and Capital Outlay. Salaries and Benefits will increase 13% which does include the COLA increase. This Budget includes 22 full-time employees and 3 part-time seasonal employees. Health Insurance premiums include an estimated 10% increase which is conservative as the numbers are not available yet.
-The Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) valuation (included in the Consent Calendar) showed positive results with an OPEB asset so there are no actuarially determined contributions required over this next Fiscal Year.
-The District has been working hard to manage the CalPERS Unfunded Accrued Liability (UAL) and it has been successful so there is no expectation of any UAL liabilities due this next Fiscal Year.
-Operations and Maintenance is decreasing 5% due to securing favorable natural gas prices bringing the blended price down for 2026 to $3.83/MMBTU. The blended price for 2027 is about $3.97/MMBTU.
-Debt Service has no overall change in the amount due each year. The only change is moving the record debt service payments from the Engine Project Fund 73 to the General Fund 70. The Engine Replacement Project has been completed as of the end of FY 2025-2026.
-Capital Outlay is decreasing by 61% overall due to completion of the Engine Project and there is an increase to operations of 89%.
-Reserves will decrease $1,238,961 due to the budgeted loss mentioned for Funds 82 and 76. Completing FY 2025-2026 requires some Reserves transfers that will be presented in the next Agenda Item. This will be $110,000 from General Fund 70 to Tax Revenue Liability Fund 85 and then $3,035,000 from Equipment/Infrastructure – Replacement/Upgrade Fund 83 to Engine Project Fund 73. With those transfers, all the reserve targets for FY 2025-2026 will have been met or exceeded with the exception of the three Flood Control Improvement Districts and Fund 83. After the finalization of the FY 2025-2026 Audit process, another transfer will be brought to the Board from Fund 70 to Fund 73 to finish the Engine Project as well as a transfer from Fund 70 to Fund 76 for Improvement District No. 2.
-The State Water Payment Fund reserves balance will decrease by about $2 million as mentioned above.

Director Hall asked for the location of Improvement District No. 2 (Fund 76) and Staff provided the location and discussion took place on the location of multiple Flood Control facility locations and funding.

At this time, Curry described the projects list in the Capital Expenditure Budget located on page 1 – 24 of the Preliminary Budget document. President Schultz asked about the SCADA Platform Upgrade item ($200,000) and Curry clarified the cost is for the system software and hardware here in the Control Room. President Schultz asked the impact to operations if the SCADA system when down and Curry clarified that the system would continue to operate, it would just have to be run manually at each plant as there would be no remoting capability. Neisler noted that this Capital Expenditure Budget is about $3 million when the typical budget is about $1.5 million. He explained some important projects are coming due and there's plans for long-term improvements and that is why there is this accelerated spending in the budget. The Ad-Hoc Budget Committee recommended the District spend some of the remaining funds from FY 2025-2026 towards improvements rather than replacing some of the Equipment Reserve Funds that were spent down on the Engine Replacement Project. Neisler wanted to point this out because he really appreciates the support and feels it is the right thing to do.

Sampson offered to answer any questions the Board or Public may have and noted the Ad-Hoc Budget Committee recommended approval of the Preliminary Budget, Appropriations Limit and Reserves Policy.

Director Hall moved for adoption of Resolution No. 05-26, Approving the FY 2026-2027 Preliminary Budget, Appropriations Limit, and Reserves Policy. President Schultz seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Davis, Hall, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Ables. Motion passed.

Item 12. Adopt Resolution 06-26, For Transfer of Funds

Sampson stated adoption of this Resolution will authorize the transfer of funds per the results of the FY 2026-27 Preliminary Budget document. Per the Reserves Policy in the adopted Preliminary Budget, transfers need made for the conclusion of the FY 2025-2026 Budget. As mentioned in the prior item, $110,000 is needed from General Fund 70 to the Tax Revenue Liability Fund 85. This is based on the Kern County report of contingent liability and this is the amount that must be set aside for property tax appeals and such. This transfer will meet the full reserve target.

The second transfer will be $3,035,000 from the Equipment/Infrastructure – Replacement/Upgrade Fund 83 to the Engine Project Fund 73. This is to pay for the excess costs of the Engine Project that went beyond bond proceeds. This transfer will leave about $100,000 in that fund. As mentioned previously, at the December Board Meeting, the Board will finalize moving any extra funds that are needed to complete the project.

The combined total of both transfers is $3,145,000, which will meet reserve targets. The Ad-Hoc Budget Committee recommended the Board approve these transfers. She offered to answer any questions and there were none.

President Schultz moved for adoption of Resolution No. 06-26, For Transfer of Funds, as described. Director Hall seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Davis, Hall, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Ables. Motion passed.

Item 13. Adopt Resolution 07-26, Setting Water Rates for 2026

Sampson stated approval of this item will maintain water rates at their current levels. Each year, Staff analyzes expected costs and does calculations for each rate. Table 4 in the Staff Report shows the calculation for the Regular M&I Rate. The five-year average is $2,232/AF and the current rate is $1,385/AF. Staff is not recommending an increase because that would require a Proposition 218 protest hearing which is costly and at this time, there is only small quantities of this water sold (17 AF in 2024 and 12 AF in 2025). As presented in the Capital Expenditure Budget, there is plans in the future to conduct a full rate study, but it is not warranted at this time. She reviewed the tables in the Staff Report and explained how the price of natural gas and debt service costs affect the rates.

The fiscal impact is a projected $684,389 deficit in costs to revenues for FY 2025-2026 and projections for FY 2026-2027 and FY 2027-2028 suggest deficits of $560,179 and $598,500 respectively. There was no

Ad-Hoc Water Rate Committee meeting held as there was no change to the rates proposed, but it does still require Board adoption of a Resolution to maintain the same rates.

President Schultz moved that the Board adopt Resolution 07-26, Setting Water Rates for 2026. Director Davis seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Davis, Hall, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Ables. Motion passed.

Item 14. Schedule Ad-hoc Audit Committee Meeting

Sampson stated this item is for Board direction on setting a desired date and time to hold the Ad-Hoc Audit Committee meeting. In August of 2026, the auditors of Brown Armstrong Accountancy Corporation will be on site to start the audit. The Ad-Hoc Audit Committee consists of Directors Ables and Schultz. This meeting will be held to facilitate introduction and provide an opportunity for the committee members to have private access to the auditors without the presence of Staff. They will be able to receive information about the audit, discuss the process, ask any questions or state any concerns, etc. Last year this meeting was scheduled to take place prior to the Regular Board Meeting in July. The fiscal impact is $105 per Director per day of service and those have been included in the FY 2026-2027 Preliminary Budget.

The meeting was scheduled for July 15, 2026, at 2:15 p.m. President Schultz stated the Director Ables previously confirmed he can attend that date.

Item 15. Authorize Staff to Solicit Bids for District Vehicles

Curry stated that Staff has identified four District vehicles that are in need of a replacement or reassignment from their current roles in District operations. This item is for the Board to consider authorizing Staff to solicit bids for purchase of four vehicles in the Operations department. The four vehicles identified are 2014 Ford F250 (PL16), 2014 Ford F150 (PP35), 2018 GMC 1500 (PP37), and 2013 Chevrolet 2500 (PL15). “PP” indicates the Pumping department and “PL” indicates Pipeline department in the numbering system. Staff desires to retain and repurpose PL15 and PP35 for other District operations such as Summer Intern vehicles or for spare back-up uses. Staff would like PL16 and PP37 to either be offered as trade-ins for the new vehicles or surplus depending on the feedback from the dealer. Currently is non-operational.

Staff is requesting authorization to solicit bids for the following vehicles, 3 half-ton pickup trucks and 1 one-ton cab/chassis with a service bed. The half-ton trucks will be for the Controls and Emissions Specialist, the Operations Assistant and the GIS Technician. The one-ton cab/chassis with a service bed is for the Pipeline department. New CARB regulations do not require half-ton trucks or fleet-side trucks to count against you with regard to the electric vehicle inventory requirements.

If approved by the Board, Staff would send out solicitations June 18th, with a bid deadline of July 8, 2026, at 3:00 p.m. The bids will be presented to the Board at the July 15th Regular Board Meeting. The Capital Expenditure Budget includes $290,000 for these purchases. The Bid Notices are attached to the Staff Report.

President Schultz suggested Staff include a designation of engine size and rear differential gear ratio to the specifications as that can affect fuel mileage. Discussion took place on towing and the weight of service beds and Curry indicated he will contact the vendors.

President Schultz moved that the Board authorize Staff to solicit bids for the purchase of four vehicles for the Operations department as listed in the Staff Report. Director Hall seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Davis, Hall, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Ables. Motion passed.

Item 16. **Board of Directors Comments**

There were none.

Item 17. **Adjourn to Closed Session**

President to reference Closed Session items as presented on Agenda, then Board to adjourn to Closed Session.

a. In Accordance with Exhibit A Attached hereto, TCCWD v. City of Tehachapi *Et al.*
b. In Accordance with Exhibit B Attached hereto, TCCWD v. City of Tehachapi
c. In Accordance with Exhibit C Attached hereto, DWR v. All Persons Interested in Authorization of WaterFix Revenue Bonds, et al.; DWR v. All Persons Interested in the Matter of the Authorization of Delta Program Revenue Bonds, et al.
d. In Accordance with Exhibit D Attached hereto, Rosedale-Rio Bravo WSD *Et al.* v. Kern County Water Agency *Et al.*
e. In Accordance with Exhibit E Attached hereto, City of Tehachapi vs. TCCWD
f. In Accordance with Exhibit F Attached hereto, City of Tehachapi vs. TCCWD

The Board adjourned to Closed Session at 4:44 p.m.

Item 18. **Return to Open Session**

The Board returned to Open Session at 5:38 p.m.

Report Action Taken in Closed Session:

a. No reportable action.
b. No reportable action.
c. No reportable action.
d. No reportable action.
e. No reportable action.
f. No reportable action.

Item 19. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:38 p.m. on a motion made by Director Hall, seconded by Director Davis and carried on the following vote: Ayes: Davis, Hall, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Ables.

Robert W. Schultz

Robert W. Schultz, Board President

Catherine Adams

Catherine Adams, Board Secretary

Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District
Our Water • Our Future

CLOSED SESSION ITEM DESCRIPTIONS
(Gov. Code § 54954.5)

A. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR (Gov. Code § 54956.8.)

Description of Property: ______
Proposed District Negotiator: ______
Negotiating Parties: ______
Subject of Conference: ______

B. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL (Gov. Code § 54956.9.)

1. Existing Litigation Gov. Code §54956.9(d)(1): County of Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2022-80003892
   Name of Case: Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District v. City of Tehachapi *Et al.*

2. Anticipated Litigation: ______
   Gov. Code § 54956.9 (d)(2): ______
   Gov. Code § 54956.9(d) (4): ______

C. PUBLIC EMPLOYEES (Gov. Code § 54957.)

1. Appointment: ______
   Title: ______

2. Employment: ______
   Title: ______

3. Performance Evaluation: ______
   Title: ______

4. Discipline/Dismissal/Release: ______

D. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov. Code § 54957.6.)

Agency Negotiator: ______
Employee Organization: ______
Unrepresented Employee: ______

CLOSED SESSION ITEM DESCRIPTIONS
(Gov. Code § 54954.5)

A. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR (Gov. Code § 54956.8.)

Description of Property: __________
Proposed District Negotiator: __________
Negotiating Parties: __________
Subject of Conference: __________

B. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL (Gov. Code § 54956.9.)

1. Existing Litigation Gov. Code §54956.9(d)(1): KCSC Case No. BCV-25-103013
   Name of Case: Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District v. City of Tehachapi

2. Anticipated Litigation: __________
   Gov. Code § 54956.9(d)(2): __________
   Gov. Code § 54956.9(d)(4): __________

C. PUBLIC EMPLOYEES (Gov. Code § 54957.)

1. Appointment: __________
   Title: __________

2. Employment: __________
   Title: __________

3. Performance Evaluation: __________
   Title: __________

4. Discipline/Dismissal/Release: __________

D. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov. Code § 54957.6.)

Agency Negotiator: __________
Employee Organization: Not Applicable
Unrepresented Employee: __________

Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District
Our Water • Our Future

CLOSED SESSION ITEM DESCRIPTIONS
(Gov. Code § 54954.5)

A. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR (Gov. Code § 54956.8.)

Description of Property: ____________
Proposed District Negotiator: ____________
Negotiating Parties: ____________
Subject of Conference: ____________

B. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL (Gov. Code § 54956.9.)

1. Existing Litigation Gov. Code §54956.9(d)(1): Two Cases
   Names of Cases: DWR v. All Persons Interested in Authorization of WaterFix Revenue Bonds, et al.; DWR v. All Persons Interested In The Matter of the Authorization of Delta Program Revenue Bonds, et al.

2. Anticipated Litigation: ____________
   Gov. Code § 54956.9 (d)(2): ____________
   Gov. Code § 54956.9 (d)(4): ____________

C. PUBLIC EMPLOYEES (Gov. Code § 54957.)

1. Appointment: ____________
   Title: ____________

2. Employment: ____________
   Title: ____________

3. Performance Evaluation: ____________
   Title: ____________

4. Discipline/Dismissal/Release: ____________

D. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov. Code § 54957.6.)
Agency Negotiator: ____________
Employee Organization: Not Applicable
Unrepresented Employee: ____________

Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District
Our Water • Our Future

CLOSED SESSION ITEM DESCRIPTIONS
(Gov. Code § 54954.5)

A. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR (Gov. Code § 54956.8.)

Description of Property: ______________________
Proposed District Negotiator: ______________________
Negotiating Parties: ______________________
Subject of Conference: ______________________

B. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL (Gov. Code § 54956.9.)

1. Existing Litigation Gov. Code §54956.9(d)(1): KCSC No. BCV 21100418 TSC
   Name of Case: Rosedale-Rio Bravo WSD *Et al.* v. Kern County Water Agency *Et al.*

2. Anticipated Litigation: ______________________
   Gov. Code § 54956.9 (d)(2): ______________________
   Gov. Code § 54956.9 (d)(4): ______________________

C. PUBLIC EMPLOYEES (Gov. Code § 54957.)

1. Appointment: ______________________
   Title: ______________________

2. Employment: ______________________
   Title: ______________________

3. Performance Evaluation: ______________________
   Title: ______________________

4. Discipline/Dismissal/Release: ______________________

D. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov. Code § 54957.6.)

Agency Negotiator: ______________________
Employee Organization: ______________________
Unrepresented Employee: ______________________

Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District
Our Water • Our Future

CLOSED SESSION ITEM DESCRIPTIONS

(Gov. Code § 54954.5)

A. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR (Gov. Code § 54956.8.)

Description of Property: ______________________

Proposed District Negotiator: ______________________

Negotiating Parties: ______________________

Subject of Conference: ______________________

B. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL (Gov. Code § 54956.9.)

1. Existing Litigation Gov. Code §54956.9(d)(1): KCSC Case No. BCV-23-104134

   Names of Cases: City of Tehachapi v. Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District

2. Anticipated Litigation: ______________________

   Gov. Code § 54956.9 (d)(2): ______________________

   Gov. Code § 54956.9 (d)(4): ______________________

C. PUBLIC EMPLOYEES (Gov. Code § 54957.)

1. Appointment: ______________________

   Title: ______________________

2. Employment: ______________________

   Title: ______________________

3. Performance Evaluation: ______________________

   Title: ______________________

4. Discipline/Dismissal/Release: ______________________

D. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov. Code § 54957.6.)

Agency Negotiator: ______________________

Employee Organization: Not Applicable

Unrepresented Employee: ______________________

Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District
Our Water • Our Future

CLOSED SESSION ITEM DESCRIPTIONS
(Gov. Code § 54954.5)

A. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR (Gov. Code § 54956.8.)

Description of Property: ______________________
Proposed District Negotiator: ______________________
Negotiating Parties: ______________________
Subject of Conference: ______________________

B. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL (Gov. Code § 54956.9.)

1. Existing Litigation Gov. Code §54956.9(d)(1): KCSC Case No. BCV-24-101512
   Names of Cases: City of Tehachapi vs. Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District

2. Anticipated Litigation: ______________________
   Gov. Code § 54956.9 (d)(2): ______________________
   Gov. Code § 54956.9 (d)(4): ______________________

C. PUBLIC EMPLOYEES (Gov. Code § 54957.)

1. Appointment: ______________________
   Title: ______________________

2. Employment: ______________________
   Title: ______________________

3. Performance Evaluation: ______________________
   Title: ______________________

4. Discipline/Dismissal/Release: ______________________

D. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov. Code § 54957.6.)

Agency Negotiator: ______________________
Employee Organization: Not Applicable
Unrepresented Employee: ______________________