

MINUTES

TEHACHAPI-CUMMINGS COUNTY WATER DISTRICT
REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
March 16, 2022, 3:00 P.M.
22901 Banducci Road, Tehachapi, CA 93561

CALIFORNIA DPH RECOMMENDS ALL PERSONS CONTINUE WEARING MASKS INDOORS IN PUBLIC SETTINGS

- Item 1. Call to Order and Roll Call**
Directors Present: Cassil, Pack, Schultz, Zanutto, Hall arrived at 3:04 p.m.
Legal Counsel: Robert Kuhs
Staff in Attendance: Catherine Adams, LaMinda Madenwald, Jon Curry, Tom Neisler
- Item 2. Announcement**
President Schultz announced this meeting is being audio recorded, including all Board, Staff, and Public comments.
- Item 3. Flag Salute**
The Pledge of Allegiance was led by President Schultz.
- Item 4. Approval of Agenda**
Director Zanutto moved to approve the agenda. Director Cassil seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Cassil, Pack, Schultz, Zanutto; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Hall. 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 February 16, 2022
 - b. Approve Financial Report and Payment of Bills
- President Schultz asked if there were any items the Board, Staff or Public would like to remove for discussion. There were none.
- President Schultz moved to approve the Consent Calendar. Director Zanutto seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Cassil, Hall, Pack, Schultz, Zanutto; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. Motion passed.
- Item 7. General Manager's Report**
Mr. Neisler reported on the following matters:

- The image on the report is the 3-month precipitation outlook (March, April, May). The orange area over the Lake Tahoe/Feather River Basin area is not good. He presented a bar graph showing precipitation for January/February as the driest in history by a factor of four.
- The Table "A" Allocation remains at 15%, and he is concerned at how much the allocation will be reduced. DWR's calculations only consider precipitation through April 1st, so if there are additional rain events after that date, they do not factor into the allocation. The snowpack is now down to 57%.
- The Delta Conveyance Project (DCP) planning continues and will be discussed today in Closed Session.
- He included a letter from Karla Nemeth with DWR, talking about conservation and alluding to the fact that the allocation was in jeopardy as of March 2nd.
- The reservoir charts show Lake Oroville is at 46% of capacity and 70% of average YTD, and San Luis Reservoir is 44% of capacity and 53% of average YTD.
- The Cummings Basin Allocations are posted and on the agenda for approval today.
- All the District's extraction wells are pumping. The new transducer was replaced so he has included a Brite Lake Level chart again.
- He distributed copies of an LA Times article and read some of the highlights: In January, Californian's increased urban water use 2.6% compared to 2020. The Governor asked for a voluntary cutback of 15% in July, and the actual reduction at the end of January has been 6.4%. Hydrologist Peter Gleick stated, "I think mandatory cuts are not only warranted – I think they are long overdue." Researchers found that the American West just experienced its driest 22 year period in at least 1,200 years.
- The next State Water Operations meeting is next Tuesday.
- The La Nina forecast continues out until the fall. The temperatures and water temperatures have not risen, so this cycle appears to not be breaking down.

He offered to answer any questions from the Board, Public, or Staff. Director Hall asked if it was true that the heavy rains we experienced were atmospheric rivers and Mr. Neisler confirmed they were. He added that more sophisticated forecast modeling has been developed for atmospheric rivers.

Item 8. Operation Manager's Report

Mr. Curry reported on the following matters:

- Two members of the Pipeline Department, Graysen Oldham, and Cale Lykins, attended a two day, hands-on training for CLA-VAL. CLA-VAL is a manufacturer that used to be known as Clayton Valve Company and they have shortened their name. They make pressure reduction and pressure sustaining valves and we have a number of these on our system, so it was a valuable training.
- The Pump Plant painting project began at PP1 on February 24th, and Wm. Salah has completed Plants 1, 2, and are almost finished with Plant 3. They are ahead of schedule and things are good.
- All four extraction wells are running, and the lake is rising. On March 11, 2022, the lake data was: elevation 4345.5', volume 652.1 AF, and the level was 19.5'.
- On March 8th, the mainline in Cummings Valley was shut down to install a new 24" Victaulic-style flange assembly at the Cogen facility. This allows for easier removal of the Limitorque back-pressure valve for maintenance.
- The Pumping Systems Department has wrapped up the maintenance projects and are ready for pumping season. The last of the rebuilt 7-stage pumps were installed at PP1, Engine 1 along with the column, discharge head and right-angle drive. Engines 1 and 2 at Plant 1 have alignments scheduled for March 17th and those are the last two needed to be ready for startup.
- Waukesha sent a technical bulletin about the O-rings that seal the oil inspection doors on the engines at Plant 1, and those have been replaced.
- The Pipeline Department installed the long awaited lake level transducer on March 8th and our Controls and Emissions Specialist set the scaling. The second transducer they ordered will be a backup.
- Pipeline Staff discovered leaking check valves at PP5 and repaired those which has reduced the pump cycle frequency.

- The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) notified Staff that the Electronic Annual Report (EAR) for the Public Water System will be released next week.
- The skid steer mower has arrived at Quinn Caterpillar and is currently being prepared for delivery at the end of March.

He offered to answer any questions that the Board, Public or Staff may have. President Schultz complemented their work.

Item 9. Approve Requests for Temporary Assignment of Water Rights

Ms. Adams stated that every year, water rights owners in the Tehachapi Basin have the option to temporarily lease their rights to another party for one calendar year. Attachment B contains copies of all the Temporary Assignment of Water Rights forms received this year. Attachment A is a summary list of the transfers that includes who the rights are leased from and to, as well as the amount of Allowed Pumping Allocation being transferred. All forms were received by the deadline of March 1st, and this item is for the Board to approve these temporary transfers to be used for the calendar year 2022. She offered to answer questions.

Director Zanutto asked if these leases use Wheeled Water. Ms. Adams explained that that only a couple of these customers will receive the water through Wheeled Water.

President Schultz moved that the Board approve the 2022 Temporary Assignment of Water Rights for all parties listed in Table 3, Attachment A. Director Cassil seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Cassil, Hall, Pack, Schultz, Zanutto; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. Motion passed.

Item 10. Approve Request from Bear Valley Community Services District to Transfer TCCWD Banked Water Reserves to BVCS D Banked Water Reserve Account

Mr. Neisler stated the District entered into a Term M&I Agreement/Conjunctive Use Agreement with Bear Valley CSD (BVCS D) on 01/01/2017. That agreement requires BVCS D and TCCWD to coordinate to bank a five year, imported water supply of their conjunctive use water within a 10 year period (by 12/31/2026). They purchased 250 AF in 2018, 303 AF in 2019, and 314 AF in 2020 for recharge into their Banked Water Reserve Account (BWRA). In 2021, they were informed that there was insufficient surface water available to meet BWRA demand. As previously outlined in the Water Operations Plan, the District does not anticipate having sufficient surface water available in 2022 either. He referenced Attachment B, a summary of their BWRA, stating 867 AF is in their account as of the beginning of this year. Their remaining banked obligation to reach the goal of 3,555 AF by the end of 2026 is 538 AF per year but this goal and obligation can vary as it is based on a rolling 5-year average.

During discussions with Bill Malinen, BVCS D GM, and Don Davis, BVCS D General Counsel, they expressed concerns about incurring further deficits in their BWRA. Mr. Neisler suggested BVCS D request the TCCWD Board consider selling and transferring water from the TCCWD banked water account in Cummings Basin to the BVCS D BWRA. Attachment C is a request letter submitted by Mr. Malinen that requests banking a total of 1076 AF (full 2021 and 2022 requirements). The current recharge rate is \$400/AF. TCCWD's banked balance in Cummings Basin is 11,255 AF and Mr. Neisler reviewed three options the Board can consider to respond to this request.

President Schultz asked if the recharge rate includes spreading loss and Mr. Neisler clarified the base rate is \$363/AF plus 6% spreading loss and \$15/AF surcharge that works out to be \$400/AF. President Schultz commented that with the amount of water the District has banked, and the return flows it receives from agricultural, he does not see a problem with granting this request for 1076 AF. Director Zanutto

commented he feels the Board should only approve the 538 AF for 2021 and referenced the attachment showing that BVCS D had the opportunity to bank water in 2017 and they declined. He felt that since the Board is not banking water for anyone else in 2022, they should not for BVCS D either. Discussion took place between the Board, Staff and Public. Mr. Neisler offered that the 2022 deficit amount could be considered later in the year, and Mr. Schlosser (City of Tehachapi) appreciated Director Zanutto's comments on consistency between all agencies. Director Cassil felt it makes sense to honor their request since it is TCCWD's requirement they meet these goals, and President Schultz pointed out the District's limited extraction capabilities in Cummings Basin. Mr. Neisler mentioned it costs less to transfer ownership of the banked water rather than physically provide it, and Director Pack and President Schultz felt the District will still have to provide the recharge water at some point so it's better to take care of it now. Mr. Vickery (Grimmway) stated he is a proponent for approving the request as it reduces future demands on SWP water, and Director Hall commented on the moral hazard that has been created by BVCS D's lack of incentive and pondered how this situation can be prevented in the future.

Director Cassil moved that the Board transfer 1076 AF of Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District's banked water supply to the Banked Water Reserve Account of Bear Valley Springs CSD. Such transfer to occur upon payment by Bear Valley Springs CSD for such water. Director Hall seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Cassil, Hall, Pack, Schultz; Noes: Zanutto; Abstain: None; Absent: None. Motion passed.

Item 11. Approval of 2022 Water Operations Plan and Discussion of 2022 Water Priority Ordinance

Mr. Neisler apologized for the delay in getting the completed Staff Report out. He presented this Operations Plan at the February 16th RBM and the March 9th SBM and public comment was provided and accepted at both meetings. He noted the error he discovered at the last presentation has been corrected (sum of Combined M&I totals is 415 AF). He reviewed the main points of the previous discussions as listed in the Staff Report; 15% allocation gives limited supply, M&I surface water demand can be met 100%, Agricultural surface water demand will be significantly reduced (actual reduction depends on final allocation), and no recharge supply is available for any purpose. The Operations Plan includes extracting an estimated 3,000 AF of TCCWD banked water to meet some of the Agricultural demand.

The topic of voluntary banking for Term M&I customers was raised and discussed at both meetings. The proposed 2022 Water Operations Plan contains no allocation for this use based on previous Ordinances and Board discussions. Should the Board wish to revise the proposed plan to incorporate these requests, the plan will need revised accordingly. This item is on the agenda for the Board to approve the 2022 Water Operations Plan. He has advised the Board that the Water Priority Ordinance should be considered in conjunction with the final Table A Allocation. The Staff Report includes a copy of last year's Ordinance, only for reference. The Ordinance will be on the agenda for the April or May RBM and proper notification of the public hearing will be required. Last year the Board adopted a policy to include the Public in the preparation of the Ordinance, so he recommends scheduling a SBM/Workshop prior to the April RBM. He stated the Ad-Hoc Water Priorities Committee indicated that they may desire a different approach, so he asked for Board direction on the process for drafting and considering the 2022 Water Priority Ordinance.

He referenced Attachment A, Existing Use By Category and Estimated Supply and Demand charts and discussed the Agricultural amounts at various Table A Allocation percentages. The 5-year average use for Agriculture is 5,170 AF per year. The total Ag requests from customers for 2022 is 6,065 AF and he reviewed the amounts that could be provided at each allocation percentage. President Schultz noted that since the implementation of the Cummings Basin ARJ, Agriculture's groundwater allocation has been reduced, resulting in the need for more surface water to offset that amount. Mr. Neisler discussed different methods to determine how to allocate the available supply across all Ag customers. One option is to determine what percentage of Ag requests can be filled based on the available allocation and then reduce all Ag customers by the remaining percentage. He offered to answer any questions.

President Schultz requested the Board and Staff determine and set dates for Ad-Hoc Water Priorities Committee Meetings, a Special Board meeting for public comment on Water Priorities Ordinance (prior to April RBM) and schedule the hearing and adoption of the Water Priority Ordinance at the April RBM. After discussion of timelines and coordination of schedules, the following meetings were scheduled: Ad-Hoc Water Priorities Committee meeting for March 24th at 9:00 a.m. and again on March 29th with time TBD. A Special Board Meeting/Workshop on March 28th at 11:00 a.m. for public discussion on 2022 Water Priority Ordinance (WPO). A Special Board Meeting on March 30th at 3:00 p.m. for Board to determine final draft of 2022 WPO to be presented at the public hearing. Hold the public hearing to adopt the 2022 WPO at the April 20th RBM. President Schultz suggested that based on the outcome of these public meetings, if more time is necessary to make adjustments to the Ordinance, the schedule may be revised.

Mr. Joe Hughes, Counsel for GHCS and City of Tehachapi, appreciated the difficult decisions the Board is faced with making and in looking at the plan, both agencies object substantively and from a process standpoint. He stated substantively, this plan zeros out M&I recharge which they do not think is appropriate. They do not feel this is fair given the history of the SWP water. Secondly, for the process, they feel the priorities should be driving this plan, and it seems to be the other way around. The long-term problem they see is no long-term strategy in water planning that is taking place. They feel it would be beneficial to have all the stakeholders be involved with the Board and Staff, to talk about what the long-term strategies should be for the use of the SWP water, groundwater, and anything else that affects all the stakeholders. He stated if the intent is for the Board to adopt a plan today, without the priority in place, then they object to that. President Schultz appreciated his comments and stated he also believes the WPO should be done earlier in the year and would like to see it be a longer term plan.

Mr. Matt Vickery, Grimmway Farms, stated this is an important decision and he thanked the Committee and Staff for the efforts they have put into this. He commented that farming is a huge part of this community and Grimmway has loved being a part of this community for over 20 years now. The cutbacks this year are unprecedented as they have been cutback on both groundwater and surface water. He described all the inputs they have already had to start and if a decision cannot be made on an operating plan until April or May, it does not work for their operation. He agrees with the comments that customers need to know now what the priorities are and supports the suggestions of a long-term plan that everyone can rely on. He understands that for 2022, M&I users have requested recharge be given priority and he pointed out that any acre foot of water that goes to recharge, is acreage that is not planted by Ag, and in a year when M&I is receiving 100% of their requests, it does not sit well that they would potentially be given recharge as well, especially when in some cases it would be voluntary. He feels this Board has an opportunity to bring all the users together and make policies that work long-term. He proposes the Board continue with the allocations as they have been in previous years and then set up a committee or process to decided long-term priorities going forward. President Schultz appreciated his comments. Director Zanutto commented that even if the Water Priorities were set in stone, everyone would still be waiting on the allocation.

Director Cassil sought confirmation that no voluntary recharge requests would be met this year and Mr. Neisler confirmed. She referenced Attachment A, SWP Supply & Demand Analysis- 2022 Forecast, and suggested that a chart like this, that shows scenarios based on different SWP allocations, could be very helpful to the customer's planning process. She commented the Board would love to meet everyone's demands, they just have no control over the State allocation. President Schultz added that the variable is still the priorities because even with this chart, if it were determined that the priority would be given to recharge, it could potentially remove all the water available to Ag. Director Cassil suggested the idea of not allowing voluntary banking as part of the WPO in years with a low allocation to prevent those situations from happening. Mr. Hughes agreed with Director Cassil's idea to utilize the allocation

percentage chart as part of the process. He suggested an Ordinance that is more robust than the existing; potentially a document that suggests in a 10% allocation year, these are the priorities; in a 20% allocation year, and so on. Bringing the Ordinance up-to-date will create more flexibility, while at the same time, giving the certainty that Ag, M&I, and all customers need for long-term planning.

Ms. Claudia Elliot, Writer for Tehachapi News, sought clarification on the timeline of events that have taken place regarding the Operations Plan and WPO, and Mr. Neisler provided the details and answered her questions.

President Schultz moved that the Board of Directors approve the 2022 Water Operations Plan and authorize the General Manager to implement it, subject to any revisions required based on the 2022 Water Priority Ordinance. Director Hall seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Cassil, Hall, Pack, Schultz, Zanutto; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. Motion passed.

Item 12. Approve Cummings Basin Groundwater Allocations in Accordance with Amended and Restated Judgment

Mr. Neisler stated in accordance with the Amended and Restated Judgment (ARJ), Staff posted and distributed the calculated M&I and Irrigator groundwater allocations for 2022. They are included in the Staff Report as Attachment A and notifications were mailed to each pumper on February 28th. The Board conducted a Special Board Meeting/Public Workshop on March 9th, to allow for Public comment on the Draft Water Operations Plan and the Draft Cummings Basin Groundwater Allocations. The details of the calculated allocations were presented, Public input was invited, and no revisions were proposed subsequent to that meeting. This recommended motion is intended to set or establish the allocations for 2022, in accordance with Attachment A.

Director Zanutto inquired about the irrigation allocation for BVCS D. Mr. Neisler explained that is property that BVCS D owns that is currently irrigated. Discussion took place on how the BVCS D irrigation allocation was calculated, the use of the water, emergency year allocation rules and President Schultz and Director Zanutto felt this allocation is incorrectly being applied. Mr. Neisler commented this is the first year of implementation, so he did his best based on his interpretation of the judgment, so he suggested the item be tabled to allow for review and direction from Legal Counsel. President Schultz also questioned whether parties should receive an Irrigation allocation if they did not complete and submit their own Irrigation Allocation Request. Mr. Kuhs, District Counsel, made suggestions for options to handle late filings in future years and stated he was not familiar with the particular issues being raised and supported bringing this item back at a later date, to allow him time to review the judgment and specific facts and give the Board a recommendation. Mr. Vickery, Grimmway, commented he has similar objections to the 318 AF allocation for BVCS D and explained why he thinks it is inconsistent with the ARJ. He also objected to the roughly 90 AF allocation given for a livestock operation, as he feels the calculation does not align with the net irrigated acreage provisions. Director Cassil expressed her appreciation for everyone that has spoken up today and made suggestions for improvements.

Director Cassil moved that the Board of Directors table Agenda Item No. 12 to the next Regular Board Meeting. President Schultz seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Cassil, Hall, Pack, Schultz, Zanutto; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. Motion passed.

Item 13. Approve Engineering Contracts with Agilitech and Provost and Prichard Consulting Group for Importation System Electrification Studies

Mr. Curry stated the Board of Directors has asked Staff to evaluate the feasibility of electrification of the District's pumping facilities, including costs, infrastructure improvements and operational needs. The contracts that are Attachments A and B provide for the requested engineering study. Staff has struggled to find consulting firms because of their lack of understanding of our system. Staff reached out to Provost

& Prichard Consulting Group (PPCG) as the District has an existing Consultant Services Agreement with them and requested they assist in identifying a qualified consultant. PPCG is familiar with our operations as they have done a number of projects with the District, including the Engine Replacement Project at Plant 1. They identified Agilitech as a qualified firm to perform the study, so Staff had a meeting with PPCG and Agilitech to walk through the system operations, the scope of the study, locations, and State Water Project. With both firms being local to Kern County, they had a good understanding due to their experience with other local agencies.

Staff is requesting that PPCG work together with Agilitech to complete the study. PPCG would participate by Task Order (listed in Attachment A) to provide engineering assistance, analysis review, and report review. Agilitech would study electrification feasibility of the plants as detailed in the Staff Report. The project schedule per the Agilitech proposal is to begin work within two weeks of the contract approval and receiving all the prerequisite documentation. The project should take approximately 12 weeks.

PPCG's proposal is Task Order based on a Not To Exceed (NTE) amount of \$6,000 and Agilitech's proposal is Time and Materials based with the NTE amount of \$34,100. The FY 2021-22 CIP Budget includes \$75,000 for preliminary engineering for the Engine Replacement project, so this electrification study would be a component of this as we want to answer those questions prior to starting the new engine project.

Director Hall has been doing some research on this topic and shared his findings on the State energy market, curtailments, free energy, grid storage, and price differentials. Director Pack commented on some of the details of Director Hall's statement regarding free energy. He feels that as stated in the past, electrification is too expensive, and he does not think this study is necessary. President Schultz asked if the data we would receive from this study would provide sizing and power requirements down to even installing a single electric motor at a Plant. Mr. Curry responded that was the intent at Plant 4 because of the existing infrastructure. President Schultz commented that since there is a State push for electrification, he feels it will be good to have this knowledge. Director Zanutto commented that there are a lot of questions being raised on electrification and the Board will never get an answer to those unless a study like this is done. When it comes time to put the new engines in, more of these questions will be raised, so he feels to do it now is money well spent. Director Cassil agreed with Director Zanutto.

Director Zanutto moved that the Board accept the proposal from Provost and Pritchard Consulting Group in the NTE amount of \$6,000 and the proposal from Agilitech in the NTE amount of \$34,100 and authorize the General Manager to execute contracts for same. President Schultz seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Cassil, Hall, Schultz, Zanutto; Noes: Pack; Abstain: None; Absent: None. Motion passed.

Item 14. Board of Directors Comments

Director Hall made comments on the Water Priorities Ordinance regarding voluntary recharge and also asked the other Directors to consider having an item addressing agricultural water in less than 30% allocation years.

Director Cassil mentioned a conversation with Mr. Neisler in which she mentioned the fluctuations in the price of rent, oil, natural gas, etc. She asked Mr. Neisler to elaborate on the natural gas pricing information he has. Mr. Neisler provided the following information: for 2022, he purchased 366,000 mmbtu at \$2.78/mmbtu (this is more than he usually purchases but he anticipated price increases with the new administration), he asked for a buyback quote from Shell on 2022 gas and they estimated \$5.13/mmbtu, he also asked for a quote for 2025 gas and was quoted \$3.91/mmbtu. He did not make a purchase for 2025 gas yet. For 2023 gas, his purchase price was \$2.76/mmbtu, and for 2024, \$3.31/mmbtu. Director Cassil thanked him.

Director Zanutto asked if there is a minimum amount of water the District has to keep in its Banked Water Account. Mr. Neisler stated it is discretionary on the Board's behalf, and there have been technical discussions of this in the past, and he feels a reasonable minimum limit for either basin is about 5,000 AF. Director Zanutto suggested the Board have a policy stating a limit and provide some details on emergency uses. Mr. Neisler stated that is a reasonable suggestion and there would need to be more work put into a viable way to calculate what that limit should be. President Schultz recalled figures he had on the 10-year average of the District's banked water amounts and Mr. Neisler suggested that taking a percentage of that long-term average could be a way to determine a safe minimum.

Item 15. 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, DWR v. All Persons Interested in Authorization of WaterFix Revenue Bonds, et al; All Persons interested in the Matter of the Authorization of Delta Program Revenue Bonds, et al.

The Board went into Closed Session at 6:09 p.m.

Item 16. Return to Open Session

The Board returned to Open Session at 7:27 p.m. President Schultz announce Director Cassil had to leave at approximately 7:10 p.m.

Report Action Taken in Closed Session:

- a. No reportable action.
- b. No reportable action.

Item 17. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:28 p.m. on a motion made by Director Hall, seconded by President Schultz, and carried on the following vote: Ayes: Hall, Pack, Schultz, Zanutto; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Cassil. Motion passed.



Robert W. Schultz, Board President



Catherine Adams, Board Secretary



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: KCSC No. BCV-21-102184 KCT
Name of Case: TCCWD v. City of Tehachapi *Et al.*

2. Anticipated Litigation: _____
Gov. Code § 54956.9 (b): _____
Gov. Code § 54956.9 (c): _____

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: 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 (b): _____
Gov. Code § 54956.9 (c): _____

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: _____