



GDPUD



AGENDA ITEM

5.A.4.



MINUTES

SPECIAL MEETING

**GEORGETOWN DIVIDE PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS
6425 MAIN STREET, GEORGETOWN, CALIFORNIA 95634**

**WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 2020
12:30 P.M.**

David Souza, President
Michael Saunders, Vice President
Cynthia Garcia, Treasurer
Dave Halpin, Director
Dane Wadle, Director

MISSION STATEMENT

It is the purpose of the Georgetown Divide Public Utility District to:

- Provide reliable water supplies
 - Ensure high quality drinking water
 - Promote stewardship to protect community resources, public health, and quality of life
 - Provide excellent and responsive customer services through dedicated and valued staff
 - Ensure fiscal responsibility and accountability are observed by balancing immediate and long-term needs.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Director Souza called the meeting to order at 12:08, and led the pledge of allegiance.

Roll Call vote was taken:

Garcia: Aye
Halpin: Aye
Saunders: Aye
Souza: Aye
Wadle: Aye

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Director Saunders motioned to accept the agenda as presented. Director Halpin seconded the motion.

- 3. PUBLIC FORUM (ONLY ITEMS THAT ARE NOT ON THE AGENDA)** - Any member of the public may address the Board on any matter within the jurisdictional authority of the District. Public members desiring to provide comments, must be recognized by the Board President, and speak from the podium. Comments must be directed only to the Board. The public should address the Board members during the public meetings as President, Vice President, or Director, followed by the Board member's individual last name. No disruptive conduct shall be permitted at any Board meeting. Persistence in disruptive conduct shall be grounds for summary termination, by the President, of that person's privilege of address. Comments shall be limited to three minutes per person, or such other time limit as may be imposed by the President, to enable the Board to complete its agenda within a reasonable period of time.

Cherie Carlyon read from a document she submitted to be included with the Board packet:

I've been attending Board meetings for almost three years and I am very disappointed in the way these meetings have been conducted. It doesn't matter who is the General Manager or the Board President, because the ratepayers and the public are continually being disenfranchised. The ratepayers were not provided instructions of how to ask questions during a ZOOM meeting, and ratepayers are not asked for public comments after each agenda item. Also, agenda items are added to the meeting packet at the last minute but the public doesn't have time to access them. And, the public is not notified of these postings, and agenda items that are posted do not contain all the information discussed in the meetings. It's like the ratepayers are an afterthought of this Board and Management. At the Board meeting on February 25th, there was a Brown Act violation because the outside service contract with Interwest was not voted on in an open public meeting. It is an outside service contract and not an employment contract so the board should have voted on it in open session. Steve Palmer did not have the authorization to approve a contract over \$45,000, and the public didn't have the opportunity to ask questions about the outside service contract. At the meeting on April 14th, the Finance Committee agenda item 7E was listed as a "discussion" yet it was voted on. Then at the meeting on June 9th, Finance Committee agenda item 7C was also listed as "discussion" yet it was voted on. These are Brown Act violations. The water transfer agenda item on the June 1st Board meeting should not have been on the agenda until GDPUD had a public hearing. Also, leaving out the refill agreement information from the meeting packet was a critical lack of transparency. Is it proper accounting procedure to exclude the \$700,000 water transfer revenue yet include some of the water transfer expenses in the FY20-21 budget? I urge this board and management to start correcting these errors and treat the public with respect, because the next election will show that the voters have awoken and their vote on Nov. 3rd will show who is actually in charge of this district. Thank you.

ANNOUNCE CLOSED SESSION AND ADJOURN OPEN SESSION TO CLOSED SESSION

4. ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION – CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL

- A. Public Employment** – Pursuant to Government Code section 54957
Title: General Manager

ADJOURN CLOSED SESSION AND OPEN REGULAR SESSION

REPORT OUT OF CLOSED SESSION

Director Souza reported out of Closed Session at 12:58PM. He said the Board will continue to review applications for the General Manager position.

5. NEW BUSINESS

A. Consider Adoption of Fiscal Year 2020/2021 Budget

Possible Board Action: Adopt Resolution

Jeff said we are going to present the final version of the budget. It was included in the Board packet for the Special Meeting on Monday afternoon. Jeff asked Ms. Molloy to pull up the PowerPoint slide related to the budget presentation. He said it summarizes the budget that was presented on June 1, and the budget that was included for today's meeting. Jeff said the new budget includes rate increases for both treated water and a pro-rated increase for irrigation water. He included the minutes from the Board meeting from February 2020 where the Board voted to freeze rates until the beginning of this fiscal year. He said Director Halpin pointed it out in the last budget meeting. He said this budget includes an additional \$128K in revenue associated with a rate increase, and then irrigation water revenue would be \$17K associated with a pro-rated 10% rate increase for the irrigation water. The increase for irrigation equates to a 4% increase because the increase will only apply for two months out of five, which is four out of ten, which is 4% out of 10%.

There is an increase of \$205K to the balance of the General Fund. This was based on the analysis by Joe Aguilar, and Eide Bailey. He said that is also reflected in the ending balance as well. He said Operating Revenue was adjusted because we were anticipating a lower interest rate, so that reduced revenue by \$5,300. The zone expenses decreased. We allocated some medical benefits. Some employees chose different packages, which reduced the District's costs. There was a decrease in medical benefits. There was an increase in expenses associated with employees readjusting some of the longevity pay, and health insurance changes. There were changes all the way across. Health insurance allocations were also adjusted, and were increased by \$85K. He said there was a question about the flume. Those funds were added to the budget. Those are costs associated with expanding the flume right below Stumpy Meadows Reservoir. Director Wadle asked if the flume was in the operating budget, and Jeff said yes.

Adam said we had that money in the budget last year. The flumes were ordered in December, and we have not received them yet. He said COVID slowed the production. He said he would add them back to Main Canal. He said they were separate from the Stumpy flume. Jeff said with the adjustments, the projected revenue surplus for Fund 10 of \$128K. The Fund 40 balances out because there is a revenue deficit and the difference is made up by paying down the reserve fund. We are borrowing from that to cover the difference in operating costs.

Director Garcia asked if Joe Aguilar would be on the call today to talk to the Board about the transfers. Jeff said he is on the call.

Director Garcia asked if Joe would be going over his findings. Jeff said yes. Jeff asked if that was something the Board would like to have done now. Jeff said he was hoping the Board will accept this proposed operating budget for the next fiscal year. He said that is the goal of this meeting; however, he said if there are additional question, staff is prepared to come back more times if needed.

Director Garcia said in looking at the cash balance statements for the last six months, it looks like there have not been any transfers into Fund 43. The previous GM said \$1.46M was going to go into the reserve funds, and it doesn't look like those transfers happened. She said two previous adopted budgets, and look at the Fund 10. The beginning and ending balances, they do not match up exactly, which is understandable. She said the balances should be relatively close. She said if you do some of the calculations, looking at ending balances for 18-19 to 19-20, it looks like in FY 19-20, there was a surplus of \$1M, and I cannot find out where that is, in the presented budget.

Jeff said can we take these one at a time please. He said you asked about a transfer from the General Fund to Reserve Funds. He said Director Garcia mentioned a number of \$1.43M. He asked Christina to explain. She said the fund transfer that was done was for 18-19, which was based on the reserve policy and what is to be kept available. The reserve transfers get one at the end of the year, after all the books are closed. She said the amount \$652,932 was transferred to Fund 43. Director Garcia asked the date it was done. Christina said October 2019 because we had to wait until the audit was completed. She said those were the funds that were available to transfer from Fund 10 to Fund 43. Although the transfer was done in October, it went back to the June 2019 FY.

Director Halpin asked if these questions could be written down before the meeting. He said he didn't understand the questions, and they didn't have anything to do with approving the budget. He said using this meeting as a forum for Q&A session on accounting processes, not budget questions

Director Garcia said she didn't have the time to write them down.

Director Halpin said he didn't have the time either. He said his time was as important as hers.

Director Garcia said if you look at FY 19-20, and the expenses are subtracted, it does look like there was a surplus. She wanted to know where it went because it was not in the budget submitted. She said it does not look like it was added to the proposed 20-21 revenue or expenses. Jeff asked Director Garcia if she was asking about FY 19-20, versus this years budget. He said he doesn't know how to answer her question about last years' budget. She was looking at the Water Fund Summary for total revenues. She said it looked like there was a \$1.96M in surplus and doesn't look like it rolls into the proposed budget for 20-21. There is quite a difference from year to year.

Joe Aguilar said when you look at last years' budget worksheets, that were presented last May and June 2019. Steve Palmer, just like every GM, estimated what the reserves are going to be when the books closed. Steve only had the ability to look at the activity through the end of April. The budget is adopted before the fiscal year ends. You are looking at data that is maluable, and is going to change. The budget worksheets are estimates, of where Steve and the staff thought where closing reserves were going to be. What we did last week, is took your final audit for June 2019, reconciled back to the budget worksheets, figured and calculated for all of the earmarks for the unrestricted reserves. Made sure all of those were consistent with the Districts intentions for the reserves, and then that difference is trued up. The estimates will always be different. He said the third bullet in the presentation is \$205K adjustment based on our work, based on your audit, budget worksheets, your current activity, the closing out of last year. In your budget worksheets, there is a true up for \$205K. If you had a better year than what Steve thought you would have it would in this number. He said we adjusted and gave the information to Jeff and Christina. The other reserves were materially accurate. It is not very substantive for budget discussion. We did provide a true up number. Your budget presentation is a different set of books. It is a different track, it doesn't track all of the full accounting activity. When we get to the end of the year we know how much we have paid. He said this is a one time a year reconciliation to get you caught up. What you are asking when you are looking at last years worksheets Ms. Garcia, we have done that reconciliation which is in the third bullet point on the presenation. He said once again, Jeff and Christina are only estimating what you are going to close out by June 30. For budgeting purposes, they are only estimating.

Director Garcia said the proportionality is done for the CalPERS unfunded liability across the departments. She said it is heavily weighted. Jeff said Christina can address that. Director Garcia said if a generalized calculation was done, it looks it could be as much as 30% evenly distributed based on the projected revenues in the beginning of the fund summary per department.

Christina said we cannot spread out the unfunded liability to all the departments. The three different tiers are based on which plan people are in. The participants that are in a specific tier, and what department, and it just happens to be the participants are in the department of 5200. Director Garcia said the CalPERS unfunded liability is for staff that are retired? Or is it all employees. Christina said retired, and current employees.

Director Saunders said this question was asked approximately two months ago; he said the transfer for the CIP was done in October. Christina said yes, it was done in October but it went back to the 2018-2019 FY. Christina said when we transfer for 2019-2020 that transfer won't be able to be done until the year end audit is done, and staff knows what funds are available. Jeff said if there is a transfer done. Director Garcia said the amount was \$642,932. Director Saunders said this question came up because there was a transfer that was not done in the amount of \$550K which was recommended to add on to the \$642,932 and it was not transferred. He said that is the question that Cindy was asking. Director Saunders said the previous GM stated that the \$550K wasn't transferred in, and the Board had an option to determine what to do with those funds. The recommendation was to add it to the transfer to the CIP, which increased the transfer to \$1.2M. Christina said the amounts were based on if the rates were going up, and they were frozen every year. Director Saunders said it wasn't transferred the year before. Christina said it couldn't be transferred the year before, the District didn't have the money to transfer for 17-18. Director Saunders said those numbers were in error then. Christina said those are the numbers we hope to, with the revenue, that we hope to transfer following the reserve fund policy.

Director Wadle said with the revised numbers, roughly \$128K operating surplus, have there been any thoughts to what would be transferred to the Capital Reserves? Jeff said his initial thought is to keep the funds in the General Fund. Director Wadle asked about the ALT debt payment. He asked were that was in the budget. Christina said, those monies have to be in Fund 20 because those funds have to be put aside. Instead of transferring the supplemental fee every year, staff has cut down on the journal entries needed to be done at the end of the year so all of those monies they are billed to Fund 20, and have a separate department they are coming to, so staff is not having to transfer from Fund 10 to Fund 20. Director Wadle said he thought the debt payment comes out of there as well, and it is not showing up in Fund 20. Christina said she would need to look into that.

Jeff said he tried to reconcile the proposed budget with some of the policies that the District has and the District needs to have 120 days of operating reserves in the general fund, and that equates to \$1.7M. He said there is \$2.2M, and we close at \$2.3M. He said that requirement is met. He said after speaking with Joe, for a District this size, 120 is too little. He suggested that 180 days may be better. Director Garcia said that would leave approximately \$500,000 over the reserve. She said the expenses would have \$628K left. She suggested adding the reserve policy to a future Board agenda. Jeff said that is a good idea to revisit all of the different reserves and reconfirm what they are earmarked for. He said with Tyler coming on board, a reevaluation would be timely.

Director Garcia said when she reviewed this policy, Resolution 2005-05, it does state it shall be reviewed on an annual basis. Christina said it was reviewed in 2018. Jeff said the current policy is what is included in the Board packet. Ms. Molloy said there is a Resolution 2018-53 that she can email to everyone.

Director Garcia said the current rate study is tied to the assets and the assets are tied to the

the CIP. She said she was concerned. She said to Jeff with the capital acquisition equipment within the budget, it was mentioned that it is part of operations, but it seems like some of the equipment may be tied to CIP, and may need to be tied to assets under the rate study. Director Garcia asked how some of the equipment be acquired if it was not attached to the CIP. Jeff said that is a misnomer. He said they are normal operation and maintenance expenditures that the District makes every year to keep the water flowing. Director Garcia asked about the gunnite machine. She said it would seem like that piece of equipment would be tied to a CIP project.

Joe said the terminology that the District uses for its' different reserves, CIP, or Capital replacement reserve. He said the use of CIP, is a very generic term. He said all it is, is a budget for larger items. He said the way staff has used CIP, is for big-ticket items. He said it can cross over funds. All it is, is just the big-ticket items to plan for them. It might coincide with something else you are doing. All of this needs to be forecasted, that is all it is. The CIP is just a plan. That is it. If you move it back and forth into your reserves, you are going to get confused. It is a good forecast. Many of his clients use CIP. The only policy you have is where is your dollar amount threshold.

Director Garcia said if the rate study was done to increase the rates to stay to a certain time frame, or CIP, it seems like we have the CIP to show what those projects are. She said it seems like the capital acquisitions equipment is part of the operations budget, but her concern is a high dollar amount for expenses that could be saved, because some of the equipment could be rented, and money could be saved. She wants to make sure the District is doing its' due diligence according to the rate study.

Joe said your point is well taken. There is always an analysis on cost benefit approach for any asset acquisition. His clients struggle with it. He said your staff has been in this business, and he trusts the judgment of staff. He said it would be more cost effective to your financial needs. Those are things you will need to talk to staff about. He said whatever was put in the water rate study, that is what is being planned out. If you want to take a different cost benefit approach, you should talk about the policy level. He said he trusts the staff, your staff has been very frugal for several years. They have done the analysis thus far for the items thus far. He said you have a good question, and is it cost effective. Director Garcia asked Joe if he had been asked to do any cost benefit analysis' on any of these capital acquisition items? Joe said no.

Jeff said the CIP that was presented in the board packet, was put in the packet for comparison purposes. The projects have been scheduled for last year, or two years ago and have been deferred. There is a much larger CIP that can be presented in July, such as the water meter program, that is not included in the CIP, but is something that needs to happen. Jeff said he isn't used to this, as many other municipalities spend much more on CIP. They are always improving things.

Director Garcia said will you put what you think the CIP projects are in priority order. Jeff said yes, but the projects that are in this current Board packet are projects that should have been done one or two years ago. He said regarding a cost benefit analysis for the gunnite machine, there is a good data point. He said when we hired a contractor to go and perform the ditch lining last year was very costly. Darrel said it was \$750K for less than 3K feet. The gunnite machine would pay for itself within the first few months. Jeff said it also allows us to take advantage of down time for staff. We can do spot repairs. Jeff said it is really going to be much more efficient. The only cost variable would be the cost of the gunnite itself.

Director Garcia said when you put together the comprehensive CIP, can you include a project schedule for each of the projects. Darrell said that was done last time, but the problem is the world is happening, and doesn't mean it will happen on time. Darrell was hoping all of this would have already been done.

Director Saunders said it is helpful with schedules, it is more about how long does it take to do a project, to regulate the cash flow.

Jeff said we can put in a schedule. Director Saunders said a project management schedule. Jeff said some of the projects are seasonal. Director Garcia said just general time frames. Jeff said it is an estimated schedule, and as Darrell said we have to adjust based on the world. Director Garcia said the other benefit for a schedule is to know when you need seasonal help to finish projects.

Director Wadle said, Jeff, Darrell, staff, just so he is clear, the CIP that is what is being proposed, correct? He said this is the priority for 20-2021, correct? Jeff said yes, but does not include water meters. Director Wadle said yes, he understood. Darrell said the staff will not be doing these projects, they will all go out to bid. He said timelines make it very difficult when District staff isn't doing the work.

Director Wadle said in the Capital Acquisition there is \$75K for the gunnite machine. He said there is \$100K for the gunnite itself. Jeff said yes. Director Wadle asked if the gunnite itself is the pre-cast in the materials and supplies Darrell said yes. Director Wadle said to use the gunnite, it is approximately \$175K. Jeff said yes, that is what we think.

Director Saunders said the Capital Asset Policy, is there a policy where there is a source of funds to get loans from? He thought we had a tiered system for funding the assets.

Jeff said he was unaware of a policy.

Darrell said no. Darrell said over a certain price, we have to get three bids.

Barbara said the rate study took at it from that perspective. She said no, there is not a policy.

Joe said most agencies your size do not have a policy on when they use debt or borrowing. It is on an as need basis. He said a project by project basis.

Director Garcia asked Jeff about the temporary water transfer and the \$600K revenue. She asked if there be a discussion with the Board, or where that money is allocated. Jeff said when the Board approved the water transfer, the condition was that the revenues that come in from that transfer will go into the CIP fund. Jeff said Director Halpin made that motion. Director Halpin said yes, the funds would go to CIP.

Director Wadle said in the interest of moving this along, he said it is a bare bones budget, and we have heard that from staff. There will be no transfer to the capital reserve, and we are exhausting the capital reserve balance with the projects that we have. That is a problem in general. He said if the water transfer happens, it will replenish some of the funds. He said he and Jeff spoke a lot yesterday. He said with the gunniting and that kind of operation that we are doing in house. He wanted to suggest to the Board that the District utilize some of the SMUD revenues that we have to cover some of that. He said there are two reasons for that. He said the first is, we have an agreement with the County of El Dorado and they will give us monies from SMUD revenues. He said there is an agreement for it, and that agreement says GDPUD can use the funds for water conservations efforts, and the development of water conservation projects. He said he feels water conservation projects includes the gunniting project. He said it is an applicable way to use the SMUD resources. It would help alleviate some of the budget and put some of the money to use. Secondly, the County has been having some conversations at their Board meetings, where they have been looking at this fund, as they spend part of it as well because some of it goes to County projects, and part of it goes to GDPUD. He said we need to look at it now. It is in our interest to put some of that money to use for a very good reason, to line ditches to conserve water. He said that is his recommendation.

Director Saunders said he was going to bring up the same comment, and it is one of his philosophical suggestions to the Board. He said the gunning and the casting and gunniting adds up to \$200K plus. He said the District can use some of the reserve funds to cover, and decrease the tightness of the budget, also look at some of the acquisitions to use some of the reserve funds for, or not.

Director Souza said unrestricted reserve funds under SMUD. He said it shows revenues of \$115K, and the ending balance is \$541K. He asked what the \$541K was allocated to. Jeff said yes, we have the \$541K. He said that is one of the different things about this District. It appears that, that money can be used. Director Wadle said there is an agreement between the District and the County and there is a provision to be used for water conservation efforts and development for new water projects. He said that is how it is meant to be used. He said it is a reasonable use for the District. Director Saunders reiterated the water smart grants, projects that are included for water conservation include canal lining, ditch lining, and metering. Director Wadle said it would be \$200K being brought in. Jeff said yes, that would provide more breathing room in the operating budget. He said it needs to be used. Director Saunders said that would be a good thing to review with the reserve policy review. Director Garcia said there was past discussion about the reserve policy when it was developed of not only tracking funds movement from one fund to another, but we talked about ceilings and

caps on the funds. Jeff said you could form a Board ad hoc committee to help staff review or reprogram the reserve funds.

Director Wadle said he is prepared to make a motion.

Director Saunders said it would be a source of funds, so the Board can change the source of fund in the budget.

Director Wadle motioned to approve the budget as presented by staff, with the change of bringing in \$200K from the SMUD reserve fund for the purposes of funding the gunniting operation as proposed.

Director Halpin said his question would be, and he agrees, but do we need to put the cavate in the motion to approve the budget. He said the money is in the budget. We could direct the Staff to move money around accordingly, we are not increasing or decreasing the budget within the budget we are approving. My sense is we should not get down to that level of detail.

Director Wadle said the only reason he thought of adding the verbiage to the motion is because he thought it would need to shown for a specific fund. He said if I don't need to specify that, he is fine with it. He said it needs to be shown on the revenue summary. It would be a water non-operating revenue for FY 20-21 budget proposed, SMUD revenue. Director Saunders said it would decrease the amount we are taking out of the water fund.

Director Halpin asked if Joe could help with how to proceed.

Joe said Director Wadle's approach to memorialize it in the motion, is a good way to document it.

Director Garcia asked if this would be under transfers. Joe said if you make the motion with the caveat that some of the SMUD reserves, the \$200K, be used for the gunnite machine, Jeff would notate it that way. Joe said he always memorializes it.

Christina said once we get the gunnite machine we can put it in as an expense in Fund 8, to show a long-term trail.

Director Halpin said he would feel comfortable seconding Director Wadle's motion.

Public Comment:

Cherie Carylton said the reserve policy states its \$1.7M that needs to stay in Fund 10. Would any amount larger than that be transferred to Capital Reserves Fund 43. Jeff said no. Cherie Carylton said that is what the reserve policy states.

Jeff said the amount of money in the general fund is constantly fluxuating depending on when invoices come in. He said if that is moved down to the penny, within the next few days we could drop below that number. He said the 120 days is too short of a duration.

Cheryle Carlyon said yes, but that is the current policy. Then she asked if Joe was going to find out when the tax revenue was going to come in. Chirstina said the tax comes in three times a year. Cherie said Joe said the County wasn't sure if the tax revenue would be in July or August. Joe said the County isn't sure yet.

Roll Call vote was taken:

Garcia: Aye
Halpin: Aye
Saunders: Aye
Souza: Aye
Wadle: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Director Garcia thanked Jeff and Joe, and the staff and she will look forward to speaking soon. Director Wadle also thanked staff. Director Saunders thanked Adam, Darrell, Kelly and Christina.

Director Saunders motioned to adjourn. Director Garcia seconded the motion.

Roll Call vote was taken:

Garcia: Aye
Halpin: Aye
Saunders: Aye
Souza: Aye
Wadle: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

6. NEXT MEETING DATE AND ADJOURNMENT – Next Regular Meeting is July 14, 2020, at 2:00 P.M.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you are a disabled person and you need a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting via teleconference, please contact Jeff Nelson by telephone at 530-333-4356 or by fax at 530-333-9442. Requests must be made as early as possible and at least one-full business day before the start of the meeting.

Jeff Nelson, Interim General Manager

Date

GDPUD Special Board Meeting June 17, 2020 12 pm

I've been attending Board meetings for almost three years and I am very disappointed in the way these meetings have been conducted. It doesn't matter who is the General Manager or the Board President, because the ratepayers and the public are continually being disenfranchised. The ratepayers were not provided instructions of how to ask questions during a ZOOM meeting, and ratepayers are not asked for public comments after each agenda item. Also, agenda items are added to the meeting packet at the last minute but the public doesn't have time to access them. And, the public is not notified of these postings, and agenda items that are posted do not contain all the information discussed in the meetings. It's like the ratepayers are an afterthought of this Board and Management.

At the Board meeting on February 25th, there was a Brown Act violation because the outside service contract with Interwest was not voted on in an open public meeting. It is an outside service contract and not an employment contract so the board should have voted on it in open session. Steve Palmer did not have the authorization to approve a contract over \$45,000, and the public didn't have the opportunity to ask questions about the outside service contract.

At the meeting on April 14th, the Finance Committee agenda item 7E was listed as a "discussion" yet it was voted on. Then at the meeting on June 9th, Finance Committee agenda item 7C was also listed as "discussion" yet it was voted on. These are Brown Act violations.

The water transfer agenda item on the June 1st Board meeting should not have been on the agenda until GDPUD had a public hearing. Also, leaving out the refill agreement information from the meeting packet was a critical lack of transparency. Is it proper accounting procedure to exclude the \$700,000 water transfer revenue yet include some of the water transfer expenses in the FY20-21 budget?

I urge this board and management to start correcting these errors and treat the public with respect, because the next election will show that the voters have awoken and their vote on Nov. 3rd will show who is actually in charge of this district.

Thank you,

Cherie Carlyon