

MINUTES

**TEHACHAPI-CUMMINGS COUNTY WATER DISTRICT
REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
March 19, 2025 *Adjourned to* March 26, 2025, 3:00 P.M.
22901 Banducci Road, Tehachapi, CA 93561**

Item 1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Directors Present: Ables, Hall, Sasia, Schultz Davis arrived at 3:04pm

Legal Counsel Present: Robert Kuhs

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.

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. Director Sasia seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Ables, Hall, Sasia, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Davis. Motion passed.

Item 5. Comments by any Party on Items of Interest and Within the Subject Matter Jurisdiction of the Legislative Body

Neisler stated he received an email yesterday from Jay Schlosser (City of Tehachapi) containing a letter addressed to him with a request to distribute to the Board. He distributed the email as soon as it was received. Hard copies of the letter have been placed at each Director's seat as well as on the back table for the Public.

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 19, 2025
- b. Approve Financial Report and Payment of Bills
- c. Receive and File 2024 Annual Watermaster Report for Tehachapi Basin and Cummings Basin

President Schultz asked if there were any items the Board, Staff or Public would like to remove for discussion, and Director Ables removed Item b and Neisler removed Item c.

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

For Item b, Director Ables asked questions on the type of ballast that was purchased, and Curry explained the details. Director Ables moved to approve Item b of the Consent Calendar. Director Sasia seconded

the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Ables, Davis, Hall, Sasia, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. Motion passed.

For Item c, Neisler noted that the Base Water Rights table contained in the Tehachapi Basin Watermaster Report is as of March 1, 2024. In accordance with the Judgment, water rights transferred after that date will be effective next year and will appear on the 2025 report. The Tehachapi Basin report will be filed with the Kern County Superior Court and even though the court no longer files the Cummings Basin report, it will still be published as it contains a lot of useful information. President Schultz moved to approve Item c of the Consent Calendar. Director Sasia seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Ables, Davis, Hall, Sasia, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. Motion passed.

Item 7. General Manager's Report

Neisler reported on the following:

- The Table A Allocation increased from 35% to 40%. The State Water Contractors (SWC) reported that exports into the system have been approximately 6,000 CFS against a 15,000 CFS capacity. SWC discussed the amount of water that has been lost to the ocean and made a plea once again for an adaptive management program rather than an unrestricted flows approach to managing endangered species.
- He displayed the current Reservoir Conditions chart noting that Lake Oroville is at 121% of average, Lake Shasta is at 111% of average, and San Luis Reservoir is at 104% of average. The capacity that is available in the San Luis Reservoir is Central Valley Project capacity, not State Water Project capacity. He further explained how DWR reported one capacity amount and then changed it, yet San Luis Reservoir has been full for weeks and the allocation is only at 40%.
- He reported on the biological operations under which the two projects operate, the fish counts and Incidental Take Permits limits and the affect this is having on the flows into the project.
- With water flowing into the ocean since January, the San Luis Reservoir is not spilling and an unintended consequence is that there is no Article 21 water available.
- The Northern Sierra snowpack is 118% of the April 1st average. The snow water content in that snowpack is more than 110% of the April 1st average.
- If the Delta Conveyance Project (DCP) was operational, it is estimated that more than 750,000 AF of water could have been captured and used through the DCP this water year, and more than a million acre-feet last year.
- The State reported that the Los Vaqueros Reservoir Expansion Project has been abandoned. The project was funded primarily by local water contractors, but with a \$500 billion state contribution through bond proceeds. The local contractors had been supporting the project for 10 years, and since it was not making any progress, they said, "enough is enough" and walked away from it. The State has \$500 million unspent bond revenue funds and a stack of approved, shovel-ready off-stream storage projects but they are not working to move any projects forward.
- The District experienced a significant mainline failure where the pipe split longitudinally. The Pipeline crew removed and replaced almost 30 feet of pipe, encased it in concrete and backfilled it. Kudos to Curry, Oldham, and the crew for overcoming the obstacles to procure the pipe and getting it installed.
- He reminded everyone the Pump Plant Tour is scheduled for April 17th and 18th.
- He reviewed the precipitation charts noting that the Northern Sierra station is at 119% year-to-date, Central part of the state is at 76%, and the Southern part is at 95%.
- He offered to answer any questions the Board or Public may have.

Director Sasia asked where the mainline break was, and Curry described the location. Director Hall asked if the Metropolitan Water District is doing anything about the allocations and Neisler confirmed they are actively engaged and complaining about it as well. President Schultz asked questions on the Incidental

Take Permit and Neisler described the restrictions on flow are based on the flows in the San Joaquin River and explained the how the restrictions are calculated, and discussion took place.

Item 8. Operations Report

Curry reported on the following:

- The Pump Plant 3 Engine Replacement project is moving forward but there has been another setback. The engine side couplings were ordered months ago, but the contractor supplying those had reorganization and relocation of their manufacturing facilities overseas and stated they could not deliver those until the end of the year. Staff has been working to procure the couplings from an alternate source and those should be delivered in three to four weeks. These will require some alterations to the new drive lines, but it is better than not having the engines available. The right angle drives have been delivered and installed. The current goal is to have the engines up and running by May 1st.
- The two lower pictures attached to the Staff Report illustrate the new structure that's been completed for the exhaust and the silencers, as well as the new right angle drives in the backside of the engines at Plant 3. The first exhaust piping was installed out the back on Engine 3-1, and the silencers have been delivered.
- Brite Lake data for March 21, 2025, was: elevation 4350.2', volume 899.4 AF, and level 24.2'. The Tehachapi Basin extraction wells and recharge facilities are currently shut down.
- He described the details of the projects and tasks completed by the Pumping Systems and Pipeline Departments as listed in the Staff Report.
- He described additional tasks completed this month such as completion of the Property Schedule update for the JPIA insurance renewal, reviewed and processed Pay Request #5, received proposals for weed abatement and met with CALCAD, the GIS contractor to discuss goals and needs of the District.
- The new GIS Technician, Brandon Kirby, was onboarded and hit the ground running. He is doing a great job and was able to participate in the CALCAD meeting.
- Looking ahead, Operations Staff will be completing the Electronic Annual Report for the Public Water System and the Cross Connection Control Plan according to SWRCB guidelines.
- He offered to answer any questions the Board or Public may have.

Neisler described further details of the engine side coupling issue Curry discussed at the beginning of his report and commended WM Lyles, Curry and the operations team on staying engaged and figuring out solutions to make this project work. They are all doing a great job. Neisler displayed the picture of Plant 4, Engine 4 attached to the Staff Report that was reinstalled this month and pointed out how great it looks. That engine is 30 years old and was removed, torn down in the District shop, rebuilt to this condition in-house and reinstalled. He stated that the work the District's mechanics do is phenomenal and he enjoys sharing the great condition of these plants on the tour so people can see what these employees do every day. He is proud of these crews and honored to be a part of the team.

Item 9. Approve Requests for Temporary Assignment of Water Rights

Adams stated this is an annual item in which Tehachapi Basin water rights owners are allowed to temporarily lease out their water rights for one calendar year at a time. The process involves submitting a Temporary Assignment of Water Rights form, signed by both parties and notarized prior to March 1st of each calendar year. In this particular year, that date fell on a weekend, so the deadline was extended to the following Monday, March 3rd. Attachment A is a table listing the names of those transferring rights and the amount of Allowed Pumping Allocation it equates to. Attachment B is copies of the actual transfer forms submitted by the deadline. This item is for the Board to consider approving these transfers for this calendar year, ending December 21, 2025. She offered to answer any questions the Board or Public may have. Director Hall asked where the water Kern County is leasing will be applied and Adams stated it is used at the landfill each year.

Director Sasia moved that the Board approve the 2025 Temporary Assignment of Water Rights for all parties listed in Table 3, Attachment A. Director Hall seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Ables, Davis, Hall, Sasia, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. Motion passed.

Item 10. Approve Fulfillment of 2024 Voluntary Banked Water Reserve Account Requests

Neisler stated this item was tabled at last month's meeting, hoping to resolve some outstanding items and although that didn't happen, we have an alternate approach to present today. The District received requests for 2024 voluntary banked water from the City of Tehachapi for 500 AF, from Grimmway Farms for 250 AF, and from Chanac Creek Mutual Water Company for 10 AF.

Neisler recommends that the District retain the "right of first refusal" to buy banked water back at the cost it was sold, in the event that the buyer chooses to dispose of it. The water is sold at a very heavily subsidized price, about a third of the actual cost of importing the water. In Tehachapi Basin, the cost for the District to recharge that water to the customer is \$477/AF. The full unsubsidized cost for that water is \$1,385/AF. In Cummings Basin, the District sales the water for \$400/AF but the cost to import is the same, \$1,385/AF. The intent would be for the "right of first refusal" to be a condition contained in any Term M&I Agreement and any Voluntary Bank Water Reserve Agreement (non-M&I customers).

The District has one Voluntary Bank Water Reserve Agreement in effect, and it contains a provision to buy back the water at the cost in effect at the time they choose to sell, so the District would pay the increased rates. The existing Term M&I Agreements do not contain any provision to buy back the water. Because the proposed revisions have not been agreed to by the parties the District is negotiating with, Neisler suggests that some other form of agreement, a legally enforceable contract, with the "right of first refusal" provision, the Staff recommendation is to honor those requests subject to the provision being executed and payment received for those supplies.

The 2025 banked water requests have been received, and they will be considered at the end of calendar year 2025, once the District knows exactly what the importation was and how much water is available. The 2025 requests were 200AF from the City and 250 AF from Grimmway. He offered to answer any questions the Board or Public may have.

Director Hall asked questions about the fully amortized cost of the water and Neisler discussed the costs and provisions of the water. President Schultz confirmed with Neisler that the District has water available to fulfill 100% of the 2024 banked water requests.

President Schultz moved that the Board of Directors allocate 100% of the requested amounts of 2024 voluntary banked water transfers requested, subject to a "right of first refusal" clause and payment being received. President Schultz seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Ables, Davis, Hall, Sasia, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. Motion passed.

Item 11. Adopt Resolution 04-25, Regarding Various Aspects of Continuing Delta Conveyance Project Participation

Neisler stated this is a complicated topic and he is going to give a deep dive into the information, so he offered everyone to stop him at any time. The Delta Conveyance Project (DCP) is at a point of full participation and is in the pre-construction and planning phase. The Board originally approved the District's participation in 2020 with funding for the calendar years 2021 and 2022. In 2022, the Board approved Amendment No. 1 to the contract to provide funding for 2023 and 2024. It was anticipated that there would be a request for additional funding for 2025 and 2026, but there has been significant questions raised from the contractors that are participating in the project about the details of the funding that's been provided, what the ultimate costs are going to be, etc. Rather than putting forth this second

amendment last year, DWR absorbed the cost of operating the Delta Construction Authority, the entity doing the planning and pre-construction work on the project, internally and through the funding they had on hand for 2025. There was no request in 2025, and the second amendment has been brought forth for consideration in 2026. The Kern County Water Agency is the one who will actually hold the contract amendments with DWR is considering these amendments at their board meeting tomorrow. He will be providing the District's decision to KCWA tonight after the meeting. He pointed out that the proposed resolution includes consideration of the final Environmental Impact Report and findings for the project.

Attachment A is a copy of the original contract signed in 2020. Attachment B is Amendment No. 1 and Attachment C is the District resolution. Attachments D and E are the costs associated with the entire KCWA for this contract amendment. The total cost for the 2026 and 2027 requests for the entire DCP is \$300,000,000. The KCWA is slightly less than 25% of the entire project and the cost to the agency member units who are choosing to participate is about \$32,000,000. Of that amount, the cost for the District for the next two years combined is about \$1,400,000. The total cost to the District to date (first 5 years of the project) is \$1,621,000. If the Board approves this amendment and the District's certification that they comply with or agree to the EIR, the total cost to the District through commitment will be \$3,048,000. These costs are paid entirely out of proceeds from the Ad-Valorem Tax that is set annually and collected with county property taxes. For the next several years, the District will fund its DCP commitment from the existing reserves without having to raise the Ad-Valorem Tax rate. Now as the project continues and starts being built, the tax rates will have to go up to cover those costs over the next 20 years.

Attachment F is the DCP Schedule showing that the original proposed completion date of 2037 has been pushed back to 2044, primarily because of the delays in approving the EIR, which is now approved and certified. Several lawsuits have been filed against the project but the Governor's Administration has stated they are in favor of the project so it can be assumed that they will work to streamline the litigation. The original estimate of total project costs was \$16 billion in 2020 and now the estimate is \$20 billion with a 35% contingency amount. Neisler explained there was a change from the original two alignments to the Bethany alignment into the Bethany Reservoir. That eliminates two lift stations and two tunnel boring stations, which saved billions of dollars.

This item is for the Board to consider adoption of Resolution 04-25, which states findings and authorizes the President and the Board Secretary to adopt the resolution as a standard and authorizes the General Manager to execute the contract amendment. This approach is the way it's being done for consistency and ease of transmittal amongst all the member units. Approval of this resolution also indicates that the District anticipates maintaining 100% participation in the project.

Claudia Elliott asked questions regarding the overall purpose of the project and Neisler confirmed that the primary benefit of the DCP is to increase State Water Project delivery reliability. It will provide additional water in certain water year types. The last two years, there would have been more than a million acre feet of additional water available for export into the projects if the tunnel project had been built. That will not be the case every year, in low flow years, the project will not provide any water at all, but in high flow years, it will provide additional supplies through Article 21 water and additional Table A Allocation. Elliot asked further questions on the concern for fish and Neisler explained how the pumping and flow affect the habitat, and the new design will take the water into Clifton Court Forebay before it gets to the pumps and the Delta will mitigate a lot of the concerns. Robert Kuhs had a follow up question to Elliott's regarding whether this year would have been a year Article 21 water would have been available. Neisler stated it would have and explained the reasoning.

Director Hall moved that the Board adopt Resolution 04-25, (1) CONSIDERING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE DELTA CONVEYANCE PROJECT (STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO.

2020010227); (2) MAKING RESPONSIBLE AGENCY FINDINGS FOR THE DELTA CONVEYANCE PROJECT PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT ("CEQA") AND STATE CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15096; (3) ADOPTING CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT FOR THE DELTA CONVEYANCE PROJECT UNDER STATE CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15091; (4) ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS UNDER STATE CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15093 FOR PRE-CONSTRUCTION WORK RELATED TO THE DELTA CONVEYANCE PROJECT; AND (5) AUTHORIZING THE BOARD PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY TO EXECUTE SECOND AMENDMENT TO FUNDING CONTRACT WITH KERN COUNTY WATER AGENCY SETTING FORTH THE DISTRICT'S CONTRIBUTION OF ADDITIONAL MONEY FOR THE DISTRICT'S SHARE OF THE DELTA CONVEYANCE PROJECT PLANNING AND PRE-CONSTRUCTION COSTS FOR CALENDAR YEARS 2026-2027 IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$1,427,443.00. Director Sasia seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Ables, Davis, Hall, Sasia, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. Motion passed.

Item 12. Appoint Real Property Negotiator for Lease Agreement APN 402-091-16

Neisler stated he has been working with a vendor that provides services that are valuable to the District, but he cannot discuss proprietary commercial information in Open Session. He is interested in acquiring data in the future at a reduced cost by leasing a very small parcel of land to this vendor on Pump Plant 1. The small facility will be approximately a two foot square concrete pad that will require not require any District utilities; it will use solar power and cellular communications. This item is to appoint Neisler as the Real Property Negotiator. A full disclosure will be provided to the Public prior to the proposal that the lease be executed.

Director Sasia moved that the General Manager be appointed as the Real Property Negotiator for potential transactions involving APN 402-091-16. President Schultz seconded the motion, and it was carried on the following vote: Ayes: Ables, Davis, Sasia, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: Hall; Absent: None. Motion passed.

Item 13. Provide Update on Proposals for New Storage Facility

Curry stated he was hoping to bring back some bids for approval but unfortunately no qualified bids were received. Requests for Bids were sent out on February 21st and a job walk was scheduled for February 28th, but no contractors attended. The bid submission deadline was March 13th and only one proposal was received for materials only, so the bid was disqualified.

Staff would like to create a new project scope with timelines that are not as aggressive. The feedback given from a couple of contractors was that it was just too aggressive of a contract and schedule to get the project completed. The project will be rolling over into the 2025-26 CIP and the timeline will be extended. The updated project scope is attached with the new dates. Hopefully, this will result in receiving some qualified bids to bring back to the Board. He offered to answer any questions and there were none.

Item 14. Board of Directors Comments

Director Hall commented that the economic conditions for contractors that build steel buildings will be very good for a little bit and then they won't be very good at all.

President Schultz stated the letter from the City of Tehachapi is available for public on the back table. He is extremely disappointed to read that they do not want to negotiate, or talk, just go to court. He feels that is a waste of taxpayer resources and he is not happy to see it. It would be great if the City was willing to work within the needs of the people of the area, as well as the duty of this District, which is the role as a watermaster. It is our duty to make sure that the basins are kept safe and healthy. The District is willing to work with the City, but it looks like the City is no longer willing to negotiate. Director Hall added that

the reclaimed water issue is unfortunate, but it follows the law; this Board has not made any arbitrary decisions, it is just following the law.

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.; DWR v. All Persons Interested In The Matter of the Authorization of Delta Program Revenue Bonds, *Et al.*
- c. In Accordance with Exhibit C Attached hereto, Rosedale-Rio Bravo WSD *Et al.* v. Kern County Water Agency *Et al.*
- d. In Accordance with Exhibit D Attached hereto, City of Tehachapi vs. TCCWD

Neisler announced earlier this month, the District celebrated its 60th anniversary of the formation and acceptance by the California Secretary of State. The District had a big ceremony last year for the 50th anniversary of importing water so it did not warrant the expense of having another big ceremony. It is a significant milestone that does deserve acknowledgment and in celebration, a commemorative cake is provided in the back. He asked the Directors to pose for a photo with the cake prior to it being cut and shared. Congratulations on 60 years of excellent service to our community and thank you for your involvement!

The Board adjourned to Closed Session at 4:30 p.m.

Item 16. Return to Open Session

The Board returned to Open Session at 6:17 p.m.

Report Action Taken in Closed Session:

- a. No reportable action.
- b. No reportable action.
- c. No reportable action.
- d. No reportable action.

Item 17. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:17 p.m. on a motion made by Director Hall, seconded by Director Sasia and carried on the following vote: Ayes: Ables, Davis, Hall, Sasia, Schultz; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. 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: County of Sacramento Superior Court Case No. Case No. 34-
2022-80003892
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: _____



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 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 (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: KCSC Case No. BCV-23-104134
Names of Cases: City of Tehachapi vs. Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District

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: _____