

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
October 7, 2021
RUBIDOUX COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

DIRECTORS PRESENT: John Skerbelis
Bernard Murphy
F.Forest Trowbridge
Hank Trueba, Jr.

DIRECTORS ABSENT: Armando Muniz

STAFF PRESENT: Jeffrey Sims, General Manager
Brian Laddusaw, Director of Finance
Ted Beckwith, District Engineer
Brian Jennings, Customer Service Manager

Call to order: the meeting of the Board of Directors of the Rubidoux Community Services District by President Skerbelis, at 4:00 P.M., Thursday, October 7, 2021, by teleconferencing at District Office, 3590 Rubidoux Boulevard, Jurupa Valley, California.

ITEM 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of Minutes for September 16, 2021, Board Meeting.

Director Trueba moved, and Director Murphy seconded to approve the September 16, 2021, Regular Board Minutes.

Roll call:

Ayes – 4 (Murphy, Skerbelis, Trowbridge, Trueba)

Noes – 0

Abstain – 0

Absent – 1 (Muniz)

The motion was carried unanimously.

ITEM 5. Consideration to Approve the October 8, 2021, Salaries, Expenses and Transfers.

Consideration to Approve the October 8, 2021, Salaries, Expenses and Transfers.

Director Trowbridge moved, and Director Trueba seconded to Approve the October 8, 2021, Salaries, Expenses and Transfers.

Roll call:

Ayes – 4 (Murphy, Skerbelis, Trowbridge, Trueba)

Noes – 0

Abstain – 0

Absent – 1 (Muniz)

The motion was carried unanimously.

ITEM 6. PUBLIC ACKNOWLEDGE OF NON-AGENDA MATTERS

There were no members of the public to address the board.

ITEM 7. CORRESPONDENCE AND RELATED INFORMATION

Nothing to offer at this time.

ITEM 8. MANAGER’S REPORT

Brian Jennings reported to the board regarding Director Murphy’s inquiry on how many people are owners, renters, or business owners. The billing software was looked at, and we were unable to do a query. We had application cards in boxes from A-Z. Staff randomly picked 600 cards which is a little less than 10% of the total district customers and with that, they were able to identify from the cards if they were owners, or tenants. We summed up the numbers. That was our estimate before we pulled the cards, so we were pleased with the preview. It was about 21% renters vs. 79% owners.

Director Murphy: I appreciate that effort, it’s good information. My concern was the people that are behind. We have 300 people that are behind. If we can pull 30 of those and get a distribution on that. My concern is that there are two income streams with this assistance for COVID: 1) United Lift – for renters; and 2) Community Action Partnership – property owners. My understanding from the last meeting was that we had received five payments of assistance for people that were having trouble paying the bill due to COVID. I don’t know if that came from United Lift or Community Action Partnership or a combination. What I did since the last meeting is go online to United Lift and they’ve got an application to download. I went to Community Action Partnership, but I couldn’t find an application to download. Community Action Partnership says they assist people, but I don’t know how they go about getting that assistance. What I’m concerned about is are the people that are behind in payment, are they all renters, I don’t know. The question was for the people that are behind, are they renters or are they homeowners? I still have that concern, and I’d like to get a handle on that. I think 10% is a reasonable statistical approximation. Randomly select 10% of people that are behind; get their account number; find out when their application was received; go to the card file; pull out the application; find out if it’s a business, a renter, or an owner. What I’m trying to get a handle on is how do we best get people that need assistance that assistance and it differs whether not they’re renters or owners or businesses. My guess would be that it’s probably 5 to 1, like we see here. I would like to find that information out if that’s possible to do that before the next meeting.

Sims: We can certainly look into that. In the bills, there is a flier. At the top it says something to the effect - "If you're an owner disregard", or "If you're a renter disregard". It is in both English and Spanish to advise them that they have these opportunities.

Director Murphy: So, one says, "This is not a bill?"

Jennings: Yes

Director Murphy: So, I received that?

Jennings: Yes

Director Murphy: I don't know what it says, but I got it.

Jennings: Director Murphy, when I was inquiring with United Lift and had a contact, initially before United Lift, there was the CAP (Community Action Partnership) group. From what I understand, they're done with helping.

Director Murphy: So, there is a program that Community Action Partnership has that when you go to the website says we are no longer accepting applications?

Jennings: Right

Director Murphy: So, it could be they have expended all the money they had allocated for that. That could be the case. So, you can't download an application because there's no more money to award. What I'm interested to know is we have received payments from these assistance programs?

Jennings: We have 5.

Director Murphy: Who did we get the checks from?

Jennings: Unitedlift.org

Director Murphy: Not from the actual partnership?

Jennings: No

Director Murphy: There was another one. Not from somebody out there helping businesses.

Jennings: No

Director Murphy: So, United Lift just helps rental.

Jennings: They'll help renters with the rent, along with utilities.

Director Murphy: So, United Lift helps people that rent.

Jennings: Ok

Director Murphy: That answers my question as far as percentage of what we've received. What I'm interested in is there are people that are behind. Do they need assistance? Do they own? Do they rent? Or is it a business?

Sims: We'll check. We'll pull 30 out of these 600 and try to match them up with our arrearages and we'll determine if they are a business, a renter, or an owner. It's undetermined as to why some people are in arrearages. Some people may choose not to pay.

Director Murphy: If we pull 30 arrearages and we find that 10 are businesses and 20 are rentals, then the people we would contact would be United Lift to say we have people who are in arrears, but we're not getting it from you. United Lift says that they will process in 45 days.

Sims: We'll look and see if we can find 30 of these people. Maybe we will have our CSR's call them and ask, "this is what we're sending out in the billing and here is what you have to do". It's very clear.

Jennings: They've been going out in the mail, Mr. Murphy, every month.

Director Murphy: Alright, so renters may be eligible for assistance?

Sims: It's pretty straight forward. They either want to do it or they don't.

Director Murphy: Right, not everyone rents. So, when I get these talks on assistance that's out there, they list these different programs. Then I hear from the District that only 5 people have received assistance, maybe more. I'm interested to know is it because the program is not set up right or because people aren't asking? You cannot know here who has asked over there. You just wouldn't know. If I'm going to go talk to United Lift or Community Action Partnership, I'd like to be able to give them some number. If I go to Community Action Partnership and I say there's 325 people, that doesn't mean they're owners or renters. The number I was looking for was a statistical representation of the people that are behind. I understand that you pulled 600 random accounts. That's a lot of work. I was only interested in the people that are behind. I expect to be going and talking to these people about this need. What I need is information and the information is here. So, do we know who it is that's behind?

Laddusaw: We can get what you want.

Director Murphy: It sounds like it's laborious. I'm just looking for a statistical sample.

Sims: I think we've put in quite a bit of time and effort on this. I think we understand that there's statistically about 21% of the accounts of the district are renters. I personally wouldn't have a problem if I went to go talk to United Lift and said we have approximately 325 accounts that are 60+ days in arrearages, in an amount over \$89,000 – Total. This is the water bill only. Based on our statistical analysis, we have a reasonable suspicion that 21% are renters. We've only received 5 participants in the program.

Director Murphy: So, you think that failure to pay is randomly distributed?

Sims: I cannot pre-suppose that. I do not know people's intentions and why they don't pay their bills.

Director Murphy: What I'm interested in is there are people that haven't paid. Are they more likely to be renters or owners? So, I don't think that applying this statistical value to that population group is reasonable. I understand that polling 600 random cards just to find out if people were renters or not renters was a laborious task. I was only interested in a population group of 325 and 32 would have been plenty. I apologize for not being clear as to what information I was asking at the last meeting.

Laddusaw: If I know the account number, can't I just use that and go backwards?

Sims: Yes, it's going to be laborious because if we don't have it in the computer, they'll have to go back and pull them. We'll pull 30.

Director Murphy: Are these applications alphabetical?

Jennings: Yes

Director Murphy: Randomly select 10% of the people that are behind. Get the customer account number. Find out when their application was received, go to the card file, pull out the application, find out if this is a business, a renter, or an owner.

Jennings: Ok.

Director Murphy: I apologize for not being clearer.

Sims: We've been working on getting assistance from the State Water Resources Control Board. The state is going to allocate money and we will apply that to all accounts that are in arrearages for their water bill, whether or not they are a business, an owner or a renter. This assistance will not take effort on the customer's side. They will get the award if we get the award and then it will be allocated out in a proportionate manner. We will track on this. We will get 32 accounts.

Brian Laddusaw reported on recent vandalism and theft both at the admin building as well as at Station 38. There was graffiti on one of the walls, which was taken care of immediately. At the end of last month, one of the service vehicles was broken into and the utility boxes were stripped of tools. The vehicle was in the back on the property. A claim was filed, and the estimate is \$8,000 which is expected to be recovered, minus the deductible. Two weeks ago, overnight, there was a catalytic converter stolen out of one of the trucks that was sitting outside. The Ring camera did not catch anything. The repair was about \$2,500. A claim was filed, and the district should get it all back, less the \$500.00 deductible. These incidents all took place at the admin building. These were all recent events. At the fire station there were additional things that happened. In the summer of 2021, there was graffiti on the engine bay doors – the ones that face Mission Blvd. In the beginning of September there were two fire personnel's personal vehicles that were broken into behind the fire station. The storage shed (or gas house) was broken into, which stores chain saws, driving tools, pressure washer, etc. It's being targeted at night or when they are on calls. The estimate of things stolen is approximately \$3,600 and no insurance claims were filed. Shortly after these things happened, the fire station also had graffiti on the wall. We need to think of a long-term solution for both the Administrative Building as well as at Fire Station 38 to help deter this moving forward. Some of the things we are thinking are alarming it and enhancing the barbed wire on the perimeter.

Director Skerbelis suggested an alarm system that is monitored.

Laddusaw: We had security cameras at one time, but that is now old technology. We need cloud based.

Skerbelis: Yes, I'm talking about cloud based. You can add as many cameras as you need. The cameras have a magnetic base on them. Nobody will even know they're there. At night-time the night resolution is amazing. I've had this system over five years. It's worth looking into and the ratings are number one.

Laddusaw: It is something we can consider. We were informed by the captain of Fire Station 38 that when they investigated their MOU, there's only a specific outfit that will allow them to get security cameras. I don't know why that is, he didn't know why either. We are looking into this right now. The lot behind the fire station is bad. They suspect people are hopping the fence. They are talking about possibly adding the angled wrought iron across the top of the masonry fence that is already there. At the water treatment facility, we have talked about enhancing the perimeter walls with that same thing. The fire station not only has no cameras, but it also has no internal security system. Perimeter lighting might be an easy cost-effective way to deter people. Maybe investigate filling these holes so it's not easy for people to just hop the fence. The fire captain seems to think that people are getting over the fence through the holes and then escaping easily through these exterior doors. We wanted to update the board on some of the things that are stressing to the district currently.

Sims: We're going to start doing some problem solving.

Skerbelis: Viven is another system to look at. It detects glass break, motion, the whole gamut. This stuff is very reasonable.

Murphy: So, there are people that likely don't own that land behind the fire station that are residing there?

Laddusaw: Yes

Skerbelis: I don't know why the city can't go in there.

Sims: I think it's an issue. They go and then come back.

Laddusaw: After this month's recent break in the firemen talked to the sheriff's and I think they had them leave, but how long will that last until they come back?

Skerbelis: I noticed that the city has gone through and fenced by the freeway and kept them out.

Sims: People are trying to make a buck and they're trying anything. Today was to let you know there is an issue, and we need to look into the options.

Operations Report:

Presented at the second board meeting of the month.

Emergency and Fire Report:

Presented at the second board meeting of the month.

ITEM 9. Recognizing Steve Appel for Service to Rubidoux Community Services District. DM 2021-63.

BACKGROUND

Former General Manager Steve Appel retired from Rubidoux Community Services District (“District”) on May 17, 2020, after a distinguished 26-year career with the District. In recognition of his leadership and commitment to the District Board of Directors, employees, and customers, the Board of Directors at its April 16, 2020, Board Meeting adopted Resolution No. 2020-863.

Starting in March 2020 due to COVID-19 and in compliance with Governor Newsom’s Executive Order N-33-20 in-person Board Meetings were suspended and limited to remote meetings, which the District conducted via Zoom. In recent weeks the Board has resumed in-person attendance to Board Meetings.

The Board and staff at the District desire to celebrate Steve for the service he provided to the District and formally present adopted Resolution No. 2020-863.

The Board of Directors presented adopted Resolution 2020-863 to Steve Appel recognizing his dedicated and faithful 26 years of service to the District.

ITEM 10. Consider Professional Services Agreement with Water Resources Economics. DM 2021-64.

BACKGROUND

Periodically a comprehensive cost of service study is performed to confirm adequacy of revenues to operate, maintain, and replace system assets to meet current and long-term needs of Rubidoux Community Services District (“District”) customers. A Comprehensive Cost of Service Study (“COSS”) evaluates many variables on the expense side of the business and then establishes a rate and fee methodology to generate sufficient revenues to cover expenses as they are planned to incur. To understand variables impacting expenses related to the water and sewer enterprises staff has undertaken the following:

1. Updates to the District Water and Sewer Master Plans
2. Inspected all potable water tanks and have identified estimates for their refurbishment/replacement
3. Added PFAS treatment systems on all District potable wells

4. Initiated condition assessment evaluations on District lift stations, and water treatment plants (Anita B. Smith and Leland Thompson)
5. Developed a worst-case cost scenario for the City of Riverside lawsuit in the event the District's appeal being unsuccessful
6. Evaluating building options
7. Initiated a valve-turning program
8. Started evaluating ways to address discrepancies between water production and water sales
9. Negotiations with West Valley Water District to purchase water with low total dissolved solids (TDS) to address compliance issues with TDS in wastewater delivered to the City of Riverside for treatment and disposal

In addition, the District has also recently executed a five-year contract extension with the County of Riverside for fire services, and a three-year extension of the District's Memorandum of Understanding with staff.

Inflationary factors on energy and chemicals, and staff benefits will impact future expenses experienced by the District. These will be included in the COSS.

Staff has developed a draft COSS Request for Proposal (RFP). The RFP will be sent out to qualified consultants to assist the District with developing a financial model to project rates (fixed and variable), capacity fees, and reserve policies. The rates and fees will be developed so they are compliant with state legislative rules, which in part will include ability to meet various water conservation requirements.

Sanjay Gaur is the owner of Water Resources Economics. Prior to starting his own company, he spent many years in leadership with Raftelis, a premier consulting firm with specialty in rate and fee development. Staff has discussed with Mr. Gaur the District's efforts to seek out proposals for development of a COSS. Mr. Gaur would be a valuable resource for the District to review the draft COSS RFP, review submitted proposals, and act as an extension of staff in an advisory role to manage the COSS consultant and assist with development of rate and fee methodology. His expertise would greatly augment current staff capability in this type of work, which is foundational to successful long-term strategic planning for the District.

Included in the approved FY 2021-22 Budget specifically line 39 of the Water Fund Operating Budget and line of the Sewer Fund Operating Budget, a total of \$200,000 was budgeted for the COSS work. It is proposed of this total \$25,000 (not to exceed without prior written approval) be approved to utilize Water Resources Economics.

Director Murphy moved, and Director Trowbridge seconded the Board of Directors authorize the General Manager to hire Water Resources Economics in the amount not-to-exceed of \$25,000 using approved Water and Sewer Operating Funds.

Roll call:

Ayes – 4 (Murphy, Skerbelis, Trowbridge, Trueba)

Noes – 0

Abstain – 0

Absent – 1 (Muniz)

The motion was carried unanimously.

Director Murphy made a motion for a seven minute recess to resume at 5:35. Granted.

ITEM 11. Consider Adoption of Draft Water Supply Assessment for the Proposed Rio Vista Development. DM 2021-65.

BACKGROUND

On April 6, 2021, Rubidoux Community Services District (“District”) received a request from the City of Jurupa Valley for the District to prepare a Water Supply Assessment for the Rio Vista Specific Project (City Case No. MA 16045). A copy of this request is attached. State Water Code Section 10910-10915, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15155 (a) (1) (G) requires the City of Jurupa Valley to request the District to provide a Water Supply Assessment (“WSA”) due to the size and scale of the project to confirm the District’s long-term ability to meet the project’s water demand.

The Rio Vista Project has gone through several development proposals over the years and is included in the District water and sewer master plans. In mid-2018 this Board approved a WSA for the Rio Vista Project. At that time the project envisioned 1,674 residential dwelling units, 13.3 acres for school use, 18.6 acres for parks, and 608.6 acres of open space with an annual water demand of 2,000 acre-feet.

The current Rio Vista Project proposal envisions 1,641 residential dwelling units, 3,289,216 SF of light industrial and business park, 1.4 acres for water tanks, 13.4 acres for schools, 14.3 acres for parks, and 567.9 acres for open space, roads, and trails with an annual water demand of 963.86 acre-feet. The lower water demand is reflective of lower unit demands used with current District master planning efforts. Through analysis done in the draft WSA updated August 17, 2021, the District is determined to have access to surplus pumping rights with the Colton/Riverside Groundwater Basins and can assure a 20-year water supply for the Rio Vista Project. Page IV-2 of the draft WSA concludes:

As a result of the 1969 Judgment, RCSD is guaranteed a sufficient water supply from the Riverside South Groundwater Basin to meet current and future water demands, including the demands of the proposed Project.

The above conclusion from the draft WSA (Exhibit B) was prepared in compliance with SB 610 and SB 221. It determines the District has adequate local groundwater supplies to accommodate the proposed Rio Vista Specific Plan Development.

Director Murphy moved, and Director Trowbridge seconded the Board of Directors approve the adoption of the draft Water Supply Assessment report as presented.

Roll call:

Ayes – 4 (Murphy, Skerbelis, Trowbridge, Trueba)

Noes – 0

Abstain – 0

Absent – 1 (Muniz)

The motion was carried unanimously.

ITEM 12. Consider Funding for Replacement of Production (Wells) Meters. DM 2021-66.

BACKGROUND

The Rubidoux Community Services District (District) is required by the state Department of Water Resources to report water production and sales data on an annual basis to evaluate water loss. The state uses this information to determine if agencies are effectively working to address water conservation. Water loss occurs in many ways – leaks, theft, and meter accuracy. Known leaks are tracked and water loss estimated for each event. Staff is aware to look for unmetered hydrant connections to reduce theft. Meter accuracy, or lack thereof, is generally the variable where most loss is realized.

On average, over the last 4 years, the District has reported unaccounted water loss of approximately 150MG (150,000,000 Gallons) each year. There is 748 Gallons of water in a Billing Unit. This loss represents approximately 200,000 Billing units each year. Since this quantity of water is most likely in the second and third tier of billing at an average of approximately \$2.00 per billing unit it has an annual value to the District of approximately \$400,000. This quantity of water loss needs to be addressed.

The District recently had the production flow meter of Well 2 calibrated and found it is reading 7% “slow”. When a water meter reads “slow” it is not accounting for all the water passing through the meter. This means in this test case the meter has $[1/(100\%-7\%)]$ 7.5% more water passing through it than being metered. In other words, the District is actually *producing* 107.5% more water at Well 2 than reported. If this same variance of 7.5% is applied to all six (6) of the District’s production wells the quantity of water loss increases to approximately 160MG of water which in turn equates to an additional \$30,000 of annual revenue. Water meters “slow down” (under report) as they age and the District’s production meters at all six wells are as old or older than the meter at Well 2 and expected to have similar variance.

This is not the whole picture. In addition to aged production meters most all customer meters in the District are more than 10 years old. It is reasonable to expect customer meters are also reading “slow” resulting in customers being underbilled for the actual amount of water used. The customer meters are the District’s “cash registers” so to speak and this is where the District’s provision of service is metered for generation of monthly bills. In the future, Staff will consider developing a meter replacement program to reduce this lost revenue. This will be done in a pilot program by replacing some customer meters to compare water use before and after the meters are replaced to garner a better understanding of the quantity, and more importantly, the value, of the water lost. The District has approximately 6,400 water accounts and using a very preliminary estimate of \$600 to replace each meter, the District is looking at approximately \$3.8M to replace all meters. To help mitigate this large expense, staff will attempt to secure grant funding.

Given the cost to replace all customer account meters, staff proposes first replacing all the District’s production meters. This will provide greater confidence in the actual amount of water being put into the potable system and that volume can be compared to the sum of the customer meters to determine the amount of underbilling. There are two main types of water meters used for production meters, Magnetic and Positive Displacement. Mag meters remain more accurate

over time as they read flow via magnetic pulse rather than via an impellor in positive displacement meters. Currently the District has positive displacement meters on its wells.

Staff has obtained a cost proposal from McCrometer to provide new Mag meters on all six of the District's wells. The cost for all six meters is \$36,083.29, including tax and shipping. The meters will be installed by District Staff. Additionally, the District needs to provide power to these meters as well as connect them to SCADA. Staff has also obtained quotes from Center Electric to provide power and connect them to SCADA, including all necessary programming changes. For all six wells this cost is \$23,530.62. This amounts to a total cost of \$59,613.91 for the new Mag meters and required electrical and programming changes.

Director Murphy moved, and Director Trueba seconded the Board of Directors authorize the General Manager to:

- 1. Utilize \$59,613.91 of approved funding under Water Fund Budget Line Item #19, Repair and Maintenance Water System for this portion of the overall effort.**
- 2. Authorize the General Manager to Issue Purchase Orders to McCrometer in the amount of \$36,083.29 to supply the meters and to Center Electric in the amount of \$23,083.29 to perform the associated electrical work.**

Roll call:

Ayes – 4 (Murphy, Skerbelis, Trowbridge, Trueba)

Noes – 0

Abstain – 0

Absent – 1 (Muniz)

The motion was carried unanimously.

ITEM 13. Consider Right of Entry Agreement with County of Riverside. DM 2021-67.

BACKGROUND

The County of Riverside ("County") owns a building located at 5473 Mission Blvd., Jurupa Valley they plan to surplus and sell. This 3,528 SF building was built in the early 2,000's and could potentially be used by Rubidoux Community Services District ("District") as a new location for its Administrative Functions. To evaluate the facility for District use, the District's Board authorized staff to hire Ruhnau Clarke Architects. Ruhnau Clarke has provided three preliminary space layouts. The next step is accessing the building for staff, the Board, and District consultants to perform additional due diligence.

The County has provided the Right of Entry Agreement to allow District staff entry to the building. This document has been reviewed by staff and District Counsel and it is recommended the Board consider authorizing the General Manager to sign and return it to the County.

Director Trowbridge moved, and Director Trueba seconded the Board of Directors authorize the General Manager to sign the Right of Entry Agreement with the County for access to 5473 Mission Blvd., Jurupa Valley, CA.

Roll call:

Ayes – 4 (Murphy, Skerbelis, Trowbridge, Trueba)

Noes – 0

Abstain – 0

Absent – 1 (Muniz)

The motion was carried unanimously.

ITEM 14. Distribution for Review and Discussion – Rubidoux Community Services District Draft Financial Statements for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2021. DM 2021-68.

BACKGROUND

Attached for the Board of Director’s review and discussion is Rubidoux Community Services District’s draft financial statements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2021. The financial statements were prepared by the CPA firm of Rogers, Anderson, Malody, and Scot (RAMS). The financial statements include RAMS independent auditor’s report and contains management’s discussion and analysis, government-wide financial statements, fund financial statements, notes to the financial statements, required supplementary information, other information, and the independent auditor’s report on internal control.

As has been the District’s practice, staff is presenting the Board with an advance copy to review at your leisure. Staff will go through the report and answer any questions from the Board at the next Board meeting (October 21, 2021).

If you have any comments, questions, or concerns about anything in the draft financial statements, please bring it to staff’s attention anytime between now and Monday, October 18, 2021, to present a final version of the draft financial statements for the Board’s acceptance and filing.

No action necessary.

ITEM 15. Directors Comments

Director Murphy commented on the interagency council meeting at Jurupa. There were three board members in attendance. He stated that he took the tour of the facility. At the end of the tour, they offered us water, bottled water – not water to bottle. We had a talk on emergency preparedness. The district’s longest serving employee was in charge of their emergency preparedness. He talked about responding to an emergency out by Salton Sea. When he went out there he asked, “Where is the district staff?” The district staff that was normally employed there were not all showing up for the emergency. This kind of struck me as a problem. There was a focus on earthquakes where they would discuss what they would do if there was an earthquake. Next he talked about what happened during COVID and about employees staying home. He mentioned that there were employees during COVID that would get in their car, drive to work, get masks, then turn around and go home. It’s my expectation that that’s probably not the best thing because those masks were probably kind of important, that’s why the district bought them.

They were giving them out to employees who were not showing up for work; probably not the best use of that resource.

Director Skerbelis added that the presenter brought up some good points about the first responder training. It prepared the people if something really bad happened, they knew what to do. The training has some value to it if we were looking at any kind of program at all.

Director Murphy: I am convinced that at some point in the future there's going to be a big earthquake in southern California. When that happens, I think there's going to be some problems with many water districts having busted pipelines. I don't know how we go impressing upon the employees of this district that there's some big regional emergency, like a big earthquake, we'd like them to show up to work. What happened during COVID is we went with an A, B survivor schedule. We were paying people to not work. If there's going to be a big earthquake, we're going to need people here, probably working overtime and probably not just field personnel. I don't know when it's going to be, but I'd hate to be this example where it's the Salton Sea and people from outside the area come in to help and none of the people that work there normally are not there. That was an observation I made.

Beckwith: I remember one of the things that Jurupa District did was they issued to all staff two-week survival packs so they would not be scrambling around trying to get their family organized, they would already be prepared for that.

Murphy: My concern is what we do, and I don't know what we do about communicating to the employees that if there's a big earthquake, we'd like you to show up. I have no idea what to do about that, but I'd like to just comment on it.

Director Skerbelis adjourned the meeting at 5:57 PM.