

**Minutes of the Board of Directors
Ramona Municipal Water District
Ramona Community Center
434 Aqua Lane
Ramona, California 92065
June 14, 2011
4:30 p.m.**

PRESENT

Bryan Wadlington	President
Darrell Beck	Vice President
Red Hager	Secretary
Joe Zenovic	Treasurer
Kit Kesinger	Director

A. Opening of Meeting

A.1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Ramona Municipal Water District was called to order by President Wadlington at 4:30 p.m., at the Ramona Community Center, 434 Aqua Lane, Ramona, County of San Diego, State of California.

Also present: Ralph D. McIntosh, Jr., General Manager; Sophie Akins, Legal Counsel; Phillip Dauben, District Civil Engineer; David Barnum, Chief Financial Officer; Johnny Brean, Water Operations Superintendent; Annette Finley, Human Resources Manager; Saul Villagomez, Battalion Chief/Ramona Fire Marshal; Doug McIntosh, Meter Services Supervisor; and Sherry McGarry, Administrative Secretary.

A.1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

President Wadlington led the Board and members of the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

A.2. Consideration of Non-Agenda Items Which Arose Subsequent to the Posting of the Agenda

None.

A.3. Adoption of Agenda for Meeting of June 14, 2011.

A.4. Opportunity for Members of the Public to Address the Board on any Subject within its Jurisdiction but not on the Agenda

Maggie Johnson, 24912 Via Lopez Court, Ramona approached the Board. [Johnson is Chair of the Water Resources Management Committee, a committee appointed by the Board of Directors of San Diego Country Estates Association] She addressed the Board as a follow-up to Ernie Garrett, [February 8, 2011 RMWD Board Meeting] whereby he asked for assistance in applying for Proposition 84 funds [grants funding projects related to safe drinking water, water quality, & supply...state & local park improvements...], since RMWD would have to be a lead agency in grant money application.

She stated that that SDCEA would like to work with RMWD in seeking Proposition 84 funds, and commented there was about \$7 million appropriated in 2010 to various projects in the State. Johnson added for the next grant application, there appears to be \$30million in funds available.

SDCEA would like to pursue those funds for their important projects and to see if RMWD and SDCEA can work together in a grant application to pursue the funding. SDCEA has set aside money to apply to the consultancy firm that is needed to be used for details of grant application and submission. She suggested forming a RMWD/SDCEA Ad Hoc Committee to investigate projects that are mutually beneficial. SDCEA has plans to continue by themselves in development of ponds and storage for acceptance of recycled water and to be able to maintain the acceptance of distribution of the recycled water from San Vicente Plant over the longevity of the Association. They feel this opportunity and teamwork is something that all could consider and benefit.

A.5 Announcements and/or Informational Reports from Board and/or Staff

A.5.a. General Manager's Report

Ralph McIntosh, General Manager stated pursuant to his authority under the management section of the Legislative Code, he reduced water charges for a customer from \$2,326.46 to \$1,333.85. After reviewing substantial documentation from customer and consulting with legal counsel and the District staff, it was determined that the water charge could be reduced under his authority as general manager without triggering a "gift of public funds". He commented that this situation was completely different than the Agenda Item tonight.

A.5.b. Committee Reports

President Wadlington advised that the Board of Directors' Role during Emergencies & Fire Ad Hoc Committee [Wadlington & Beck] met May 13 [with the Ramona Community Planning Group] to discuss the concept of providing a secondary emergency access and evacuation route, which may have an effect on RMWD's District property at the Santa Maria Plant area. It was a meeting to explore the concept and the

concept is based on a route or designated route, with no improvements or modifications set aside to the property; just identification of a route; in other words just an exploratory phase. They are looking at all the ramifications of such a designation, and are working with the County as well. More information will be forthcoming.

A.5.c. Staff Reports

Letter for **A.5.c.-1 Status Report Regarding Fire Availability
the Ramona Air Center.**
Recommendation: None

Director Zenovic asked if Battalion Chief Villagomez had identified what the requirements will be for the Ramona Air Center. General Manager McIntosh responded that on Thursday, June 16, there is a Fire Ad Hoc Committee [Wadlington & Beck] and based on their recommendation, it may come forward to the Board at the next meeting.

**A.5.c.-2 Status Report on Bargar Water Treatment
Plant.**
Recommendation: None.

No further action.

**A.5.c.-3 Status Report on the Santa Maria Sewer
Service Area Facilities Improvements.**
Recommendation: None.

No further action.

B. Ministerial Items

B.1. Consent Calendar

(All matters on the consent calendar are to be approved by one motion unless a Board Member requests separate action on a specific item)

B.1.a. Adoption of the Minutes for May 24, 2011
Recommendation: That the Board adopt the Minutes for May 24, 2011.

**B.1.b. Informational Report of Accounts Payable Listing For the
Period May 1 - 31, 2011**
Recommendation: None

B.1.c. Acceptance of Monthly Financial Reports – April 2011
Recommendation: None

**B.1.d. Informational Report on the Process to Complete the County
of San Diego’s Department of Planning and Land Use Project
Facility Availability Form for Sewer.**
Recommendation: None

B.1.e. Revision of the Fiscal Year 2011-2012 Budget Calendar and Proposition 218 Notice Timing.

Recommendation: That the Board adopt the revised Budget Calendar for Fiscal Year 2011-2012

M\S\C MOTION TO ACCEPT CONSENT CALENDAR (Hager/Beck)
Approved 5-0

C. Public Hearing/Bid Openings
(This space on the agenda is reserved in the event there is a public hearing or bid opening)

D. Agenda items which anticipate possible input from members of the public
(This space on the agenda is reserved in the event a member of the public is scheduled to address the Board)

D.1. Request by Mr. and Mrs. Trout, Owners of 18036 Dos Picos Park Road, Ramona, California, to Revise or Modify Their Water Bill for the Billing Period January 20, 2011 to March 17, 2011.

Recommendation: That the Board of Directors deny Mr. and Mrs. Trout's appeal and allow staff to continue to work on a payment arrangement with them.

General Manager McIntosh introduced this Agenda Item and stated the Trouts are property owners of a vacant home at 18036 Dos Picos Park. There has been a lot of investigation by staff, and Doug McIntosh has done most of the research.

M\S MOTION TO DENY MR. AND MRS. TROUT'S APPEAL AND ALLOW STAFF TO CONTINUE TO WORK ON A PAYMENT ARRANGEMENT WITH THEM.
(Hager/Beck)

Shannon Trout and husband, 18036 Dos Picos Park Road, Ramona.

Mrs. Trout addressed the Board and commented the property has been vacant for many years, and they had paid \$41 every two months for water during that time. In April they received a water bill for \$2,078.64, and at that point called customer service as to what happened.

She added her husband received a call in March, which they think was RMWD, that there was an incident with one of the neighbors, whereby all of the meters were shutdown. The person asked which meter was ours, but her husband wasn't sure, but stated it was already "off" because they had a broken pipe and please do not turn it back on. Subsequently, a bill arrived with the \$2078 charge and they are not sure where the 328,000 gallons of water leaked. They researched the area with the neighbors as well and couldn't find the leak. Thus, they are asking for having this matter resolved with the Board. It is not a typical leak, and this is different than what the Board usually deals with, and she understands about gifting of public funds. She is not pointing fingers but questions how it happened.

General Manager McIntosh stated there were eleven meters shut off and all at the customer valves. Our staff does not know if her customer valve was shut off or not. Staff was going through a process of trying to get everyone's water restored, that shouldn't have been shut off originally. When staff was making a call to her [the Trouts], he was trying to get verification. You obviously couldn't tell him which meter, and he didn't know. What he did in the process is turn the meters on, come to pressure, which is how it is done on a routine basis. In this process he noted one meter continued to run, and he investigated and shut the meter off. As you will note the meter read that day [March 5, 2011] was for 2085 units which is the same meter read as on your bill twelve days later [March 17, 2011]. There is no way 328,000 gallons of water would go through your meter in that short time span.

Shannon Trout stated from the information gathered it could have been running 50 gallons per minute down to 11 gallons per minute if turned on all the way. She stated she hasn't seen the 328,000 gallons on her billing, to which McIntosh stated it was in his letter, which is attached to this Agenda Item.

Mr. Trout added there was nothing green in the area to indicate that amount of water; no hole, nor green area.

McIntosh pointed out on the incident day, March 5, there was a water meter read for 2085 units the same as March 17, 2011. [Prior meter read 1645 units was January 20, 2011. Difference between 2085-1645 = 440 units. Each unit is 748 gallons. Thus $440 \times 748 = 329,000$ gallons of water].

Director Zenovic asked how long the meter was shut off prior to this event to which Mrs. Trout responded – years. Zenovic asked if anyone ever looked at the prior meter read; to which Mrs. Trout responded the billing is received every other month and she just pays \$41.44 routinely.

Zenovic stated if the meter was shut off for years what was the last read, and McIntosh responded 1645 units on January 20, 2011, as well as the same read on June 3, 2010. On June 3, 2010, it was that read, because Service Order #25971 on that day was for an “unlock” request and to leave the valve “on” as per Mrs. Trout. This means they had control of their account at that time.

Mrs. Trout added at that time they thought they would be doing work on the house and may need the water, so had it turned on, but have not used water at all. Mr. Trout added the pipe was shattered so they wouldn't have utilized the water.

Director Beck commented that he doesn't understand why eleven meters were all turned off, and to different households. McIntosh responded there was a service order call that there was a leak for another customer on March 5, 2011. So at that point a plumber or customer shut off all the meters. We don't know who shut off the water either. At that time the RMWD duty operator received a call that there was no water, and he responded, and systematically was restoring water .

McIntosh stated her meter was not left on, and the meter read doesn't indicate that, to which Mrs. Trout responded she hasn't seen the meter read for that day.

Beck continued stating we have this problem quite a bit. If one leaves the meter shut off, unless locked, then anyone can turn it on. Anything that goes through the meter is the customer's responsibility.

Mrs. Trout understands, but her facts only show that it was turned off, but McIntosh states the report for that day shows it was turned off right away.

Beck stated the photograph of the pipe shows it on top of the ground, instead of three feet underground, and could have been broken by frost, to which Mr. Trout responded it was broken but not by a natural occurrence.

Director Hager stated this meter was turned off and reiterated on June 2010 McIntosh stated they received a call to unlock the meter and turn it back on.

President Wadlington questioned "no evidence of water flowing out of that pipe or other area", and Mrs. Trout added she couldn't locate the leak, she stated there were no obvious sign of water flowing, such as a lush green area or grooves from water flow. Wadlington continued that we have had incidents of water theft, and perhaps someone identified the unoccupied house, since there is no visual evidence of a leak. It is difficult to imagine where the water went.

Mrs. Trout has spoken with Doug McIntosh, RMWD Meter Services Supervisor, and there has been heavy rain, but this significant amount of water loss is a mystery. The only facts she has are the duty operator.

Director Zenovic asked and was advised that the break from the pipe to the meter was 18 feet.

McIntosh according to our records the meter was locked up until June 2010, at which time Mrs. Trout called to have it unlocked.

Mrs. Trout responded that no work was ever done on the property, so that water was never used.

McIntosh continued, the pipeline should be repaired or the same situation may occur if someone turns on the water; and it is just a standard ball valve on this meter.

Director Hager stated the Board cannot forgive the debt, but staff would continue to work with the Trouts for the bill payment over a period of time.

Mrs. Trout said someone stated it could have been a neighbor that turned it on.

Directors Kesinger and Beck reiterated it could have been someone stealing the water too.

McIntosh added the customer cannot lock their own meter; unless a provision of installing their own valve, but at the customer's request we lock it.

Beck responded to Mr. Trout that the leak must have occurred between the meter reads of January 20 and March 5.

Mrs. Trout stated four years of \$41.44 each billing, and then 440 units used; wouldn't someone call her and notify her of high water usage.

McIntosh responded it happened in between the time when the last bill and twelve days after the incident on when the duty operator showed up.

Director Kesinger added that we only use manual read, and not automation, and it is usually the same person.

McIntosh further stated if the duty person hadn't gone out on March 5 and the meter reader came along on March 17, then you would have had an abnormally high use.

M\S\C MOTION TO DENY MR. AND MRS. TROUT'S APPEAL AND ALLOW STAFF TO CONTINUE TO WORK ON A PAYMENT ARRANGEMENT WITH THEM.

(Hager/Beck) Approved 5-0

President Wadlington said he was sorry and wished there was something the District could do.

E. Agenda items which anticipate possible input from other agencies/consultants

(This space on the agenda is reserved in the event another agency/consultant is scheduled to address the Board)

E.1. Discussion and Possible Action on Setting a Date for a Public Hearing for the Possible Adoption of a Resolution for the Fire Mitigation Fee, Multi-Year Facilities and Equipment Plan.

Recommendation: That the Board set the date for a Public Hearing for August 9, 2011 at 4:30 pm. At the Ramona Community Center, 434 Aqua Lane, Ramona, California.

M\S\C THAT THE BOARD SET THE DATE FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR AUGUST 9, 2011 AT 4:30 P.M. AT THE RAMONA COMMUNITY CENTER, 434 AQUA LANE, RAMONA, CALIFORNIA

(Kesinger/Beck) Approved 5-0

F. Agenda items which anticipate possible input from staff

F.1. Discussion and Possible Action to Adopt Resolution 11-1447 Readopting a Services Priority Policy for Lower Income Developments in Accordance with Government Code Section 65589.7.

Recommendation: That the Board adopt Resolution 11-1447, readopting a services priority policy for lower income developments in accordance with Government Code Section 65589.7.

Legal Counsel Akins introduced this item to the Board and stated in 2005, the California Legislature approved Senate Bill 1087 which requires Water Agencies to provide a water service priority to lower income housing. The statute was enacted in order to protect against what the Legislature perceived to be discriminatory practices in terms of denying water service to lower income housing elements versus normal rate housing elements.

Further, the Association of California Water Agencies opposed this statute because they felt it was unnecessary that such discriminatory actions were prohibited by existing law. Nonetheless this statute was enacted. As a result of SB 1087 now, every five years the District must adopt a Resolution which adopts a service priority policy for lower income housing elements. The Board adopted such a policy in accordance with SB 1087 in 2006 and now in accordance with SB 1087 must again readopt this statute. As a practical matter, it really only impacts the District, for instance, if we were in a water rationing stage, under California Water Code Section 350. Then, the low income housing provisions would be triggered and we would be required to give preference to lower income housing elements in the event of water rationing. We haven't gone to this point yet, but it must be taken into account.

M/S THAT THE BOARD ADOPT RESOLUTION 11-1447, READOPTING A SERVICES PRIORITY POLICY FOR LOWER INCOME DEVELOPMENTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65589.7. (Hager/Kesinger)

Discussion followed.

President Wadlington commented that a point of clarification that SB 1087 was enacted to prevent discrimination but the enactment of this Code during rationing would in fact result in discrimination. In other words priority is just a better way of saying discrimination. Akins responded not really, and not use the word discrimination, but this is an attempt by the Legislature to provide some assistance to construction elements to promote low income housing

General Manager McIntosh replied to President Wadlington to his knowledge there has not been discrimination of providing water to low income housing.

Director Kesinger asked what form of priority do they take.

Akins stated in a water rationing situation, the governing board would make certain findings and adopt certain policies pursuant to Water Code 350 and those policies

would have to reflect the intent and language of Senate Bill 1087. She continued, that is where we would see in those emergency findings, shortages, and policy that this Board would adopt reflecting Senate Bill 1087.

Kesinger asked what are the practical implications of providing water service, to which Akins stated, none, as long as we have an abundant water supply.

Akins responded in a drought situation, preference would probably be given to developments which have a lower income housing element. Of course, it would be set forth in the Board's policy, but the Board's policy would reflect this preference.

Kesinger stated then we wouldn't be able to implement the same use restrictions as for other customers. Akins said you would, but for instance, if the District received an application for water service from a housing element that had a lower income unit versus one without, then you would be providing service for the lower income component.

McIntosh stated it has been in effect for five years, and he doesn't recall in our conservation ordinance either.

Akins responded it hasn't been triggered yet because we haven't faced a water shortage emergency which required rationing, and our Water Conservation Ordinance took us up to water shortage emergency and rationing. In response to Director Beck to her knowledge there is no similar component for sewer.

Director Beck added the wording in adopting the resolution is "reserving" water and sewer capacity for lower income housing developments. "Reserving" is an unusual word, like we are saving something for this event to happen, he suggested wouldn't it be better to say we are "not denying water and sewer capacity" instead.

Akins stated for the purposes of the Board meeting tonight, we are proposing that the Board readopt this Resolution for the purposes of complying with mandates of SB 1087. To the extent the Board has any further questions, regarding the technical aspects, she would be happy to submit additional information to the Board. To her knowledge the Best Best & Krieger water district clients in San Diego County have not been required to implement the policies of SB1087 because we have not been in a water rationing situation yet. She would be happy to provide the Board with additional information on how this works as a practical matter because she is sure that a few of her clients in California have run across this issue.

Beck continued stating it is like we are discriminating against someone. The fact that they haven't had this problem before, but to him every project is the same, you provide the meter if they ask for it. Akins responded it was a perception by the State Legislature on the statewide level, not targeting any particular water agency. She added this statute was drafted primarily for counties and cities and has a secondary impact on water agencies and sewer agencies. Again, she doesn't think it was drafted with the intent of addressing any particular discrimination.

M/S/C THAT THE BOARD ADOPT RESOLUTION 11-1447, READOPTING A SERVICES PRIORITY POLICY FOR LOWER

**INCOME DEVELOPMENTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH
GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65589.7. (Hager/Kesinger)**

Approved 4-1 Beck Opposed.

**F.2. Letter to the San Diego County Board of Supervisors Regarding
Spray Field Capacity Issues.**

Recommendation: None.

Assistant General Manager Barnum addressed the Board and commented that we never received a response to our first letter [July 15, 2009].

He stated there is no anticipation of action from the County immediately. This is our second attempt regarding spray fields. Mr. Driscoll of Cummings Ranch offered to draft a letter for the Board to sign and addressed to the County to partner with us for 150 acres of spray field expansion within the Santa Maria plant service area after the RMWD Phase III plan. Staff has reviewed it for accuracy.

Legal Counsel Akins suggested some reference be made to Proposition NN, it presumes that the District is able to move forward with all three Phases of the RMWD plan, without having to go to a vote of the people.

Director Beck this is a follow up to a Board letter written a year ago. The County General Plan update will tell us how many more units will be needed in Ramona, especially downtown area, and which would require sewer service. The Board wrote a letter to the County awhile ago trying to get more acreage on the grasslands, but the County never even responded. We are trying again and feel that the County Plan has placed an environmental impact on our District by requiring so many more hookups, and we are asking for mitigation, which is exactly what they would ask us for if we wanted to use a piece of our current sprayfield for an emergency ~~grove~~ route [*Minutes corrected Board Meeting June 28, 2011*]. Thus, we are trying again to see if we can obtain a response for growth, otherwise we can't handle the growth they are anticipating in Ramona. We didn't include the Proposition NN, which was an initiative by the public requiring the public vote for any expansion that the District does, which makes it difficult for us to respond to any growth that the County wants. We need to revise the letter to take into consideration Proposition NN.

Barnum stated if the Board chooses, a volunteer could draft up an amendment to the letter from the Board including information on Proposition NN to which President Wadlington responded it was a good point and could be sent as an addendum, as additional information, and it could be brought back at a later date for the Board's approval.

Director Kesinger added spray fields technology is one of the least desirable approaches for disposing of wastewater stream. It doesn't use water in productive ways it can be used. At the Santa Maria Recycled Water Ad Hoc Committee a few things were discussed as recycling water and groundwater recharge which would require treating water to a certain level; none of which required additional spray field land. Both of those methods have significant political obstacles to getting them achieved and it might be beneficial to encourage the County Supervisors to give us assistance at the

political level to achieve some of those options. If the Board is inclined perhaps the next draft of the letter could address some of those issues.

President Wadlington stated it is a good point, but he thinks what Kesinger is proposing would be a lengthy ongoing discussion to not only come up with a practical plan but with the practical hurdles.

Kesinger stated the former District Engineer Stanton advised him that it would take fifteen years to develop and implement ground water recharge program. But if you don't start, you will never finish.

Wadlington commented that the appropriateness to ask staff to devote their efforts at this time, and suggested Kesinger bring it up at a later date, since there is so much for the staff to work on presently.

Kesinger remarked judging by County's response, there will probably be another letter next year.

Barnum replied it has been a year and nothing lost by asking the County again and perhaps with Mr. Driscoll's help there will be some sort of response from the County.

Director Beck added that fifteen years waiting for ground water recharge program, then the County will be here with another general plan update, because they haven't finished the twenty-year one they just did. He feels it is a good idea because there has been discussion of injecting into San Pasqual Valley. Further, right now we need to try to ask them for mitigation for the growth the County is creating in Ramona because unfortunately this Municipal District has no control over land use. If we did, we could make up a Master Plan for the Community and have a better idea what we are going to do, but we don't right now.

Barnum stated it was the prior Board that sent a letter to the Supervisors, so that ultimately this Board has the chance to do the same with this letter. As we go down this path our requests will be more significant.

Hager expressed he has a problem with these lengthy letters, and suggested for the future a short letter with enclosures indicating specifics.

M\S MOTION THAT THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS SIGN THE LETTER AND SEND TO THE COUNTY. (Hager/Zenovic)

Director Zenovic related that adding Proposition NN is superfluous and he feels there is sufficient information to get the Supervisors' attention. He agrees with Director Hager to sign the letter and get it to the County, and Proposition NN for future letters, since it may be counterproductive and distract from the original intention.

President Wadlington agreed, and stated lets hold off on any addendums and see how far this letter will get.

General Manager McIntosh added this letter was brought forward at this time because in early August, the County will be making their final decision on the General Plan update.

M\S\C MOTION THAT THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS SIGN THE LETTER AND SEND TO THE COUNTY. (Hager/Zenovic) Approved 5-0

G. Remaining Agenda Items

G.1. Directors' Comments

Directors' comments are comments by directors concerning District business which may be of interest to the Board. Directors' comments are placed on the agenda to enable individual members to convey information to the Board and the public. There is to be no discussion or action taken on comments made by Board members.

President Wadlington mentioned that he received a copy of a letter from Joint Powers Insurance Authority commending five RMWD employees for their outstanding contributions to the District's health and safety programs. The employees were instrumental in designing programs that enhanced safety or safety related programs. For these recommendations and programs, the employees were recognized and awarded a certificate and monetary reward. He commended the following employees:

Jim Anderson	Wastewater Treatment Supervisor
Tiffany Friend	HR Assistant
Wes Stalker	Utility Supervisor
Kyle Syverson	Collection Worker II
Johnny Brean	Water Operations Superintendent

As President of the Board, he thanked the employees for not only what they have done, but the intangibles that they have brought to the Board and the District.

G.2. Directors' Reports of Meetings

Pursuant to Legislative Code Section 2.08.140, members of the Board who receive reimbursement from the District for their actual and necessary expenses for attending meetings outside the District shall either prepare a written report to be submitted at the next subsequent Board meeting or make a verbal report during the next regular Board meeting. The report shall detail the information that may be of benefit to the District that was presented at the meeting.

H. Closing Agenda Items

H.1. Items for Subsequent Meetings

Director Kesinger asked that at our next meeting a possible discussion on having Ad Hoc Committee related to grant applications.

H.2. Date and Time for the Next Regular Meeting

June 28, 2011 - 4:30 p.m.

I. Adjourn Meeting

M\S\C **MOTION TO ADJOURN REGULAR MEETING AT 5:27 P.M.**
(Beck/Kesinger) Approved 5-0

J. Closed Session **NOT OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**

J.1 CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - ANTICIPATED LITIGATION

Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Section 54956.9 (b):
1 case

J.2 PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT

Pursuant to Government Code Section § 54957
Title: General Manager

J.3 PUBLIC EMPLOYEE APPOINTMENT

Pursuant to Government Code § 54957
Title: General Manager

J.4. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS

Pursuant to Government Code § 54957.6
Agency designated representatives: Board of Directors,
Ralph McIntosh, General Manager;
Annette Finley, Human Resources Manager and
Legal Counsel

Unrepresented employee: General Manager

Adjourn Closed Session and Report if Action Taken

Closed Session adjourned at 7:30 p.m. President Wadlington advised no reportable action from the Closed Session.

**Bryan Wadlington,
President,
Board of Directors
RAMONA MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT**