MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
ZONE 7
ALAMEDA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING
August 19, 2009

President Palmer called the regular meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The following were present:

DIRECTORS:	SANDY FIGUERS JOHN GRECI STEVE KALTHOFF CHRISTOPHER MOORE SARAH PALMER DICK QUIGLEY BILL STEVENS
DIRECTORS ABSENT:	NONE
ZONE 7 STAFF:	JILL DUERIG, GENERAL MANAGER AMY NAAMANI, GENERAL COUNSEL KURT ARENDS, ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER, ENGINEERING VINCE WONG, ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER, OPERATIONS JOHN YUE, ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER, FINANCE TOM HUGHES, HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGER BARBARA MORSE, BOARD SECRETARY

Item 3—Citizens Forum

Mrs. Margaret Tracy, 52-year resident of Livermore, spoke regarding her water bill which was $266.51 for the past month and $183.44 for the previous month. This is a big bill and hard for an elderly person to bear. She asked why the bill was so high.

There was general agreement that the bill did appear to be high. It was suggested that Mrs. Tracy contact her water retailer, either Cal Water or City of Livermore, to get an explanation.

Ms. Athena Watson, Associate Civil Engineer in the Water Supply Engineering Section at Zone 7, stated she wanted to give the Board some staff perspective on the Management Partners study.

1. She called attention to the minutes from the Special Board Meeting of April 1, 2009, where Directors Greci, Palmer and Stevens are quoted as either asking if staff will have input on the study or expressing concern of what staff think of this and whether they will be protected.

2. Since the April meeting, we have had 2 brown bag sessions (at 2 locations each) held at lunch time. The meetings provided staff some general information primarily on the financial portions of the draft report with brief mention of HR but nothing that provided any real detail on the separation of HR/Civil Service portion.

3. Ms. Watson stated that she had contacted Executive Management asking about the HR portion and the “new civil service commission” that I had heard about so briefly. She specifically asked when staff input could be provided and received no answer on this or any of her other questions until the second set of brown bag lunches held last week. Because she was

persistent and asked numerous times, she was provided a copy of the study the Friday that it became available—two business days before the brown bag.

She believed that few other staff members were aware that the report was ready and therefore did not have copies.

4. The brown bag session presentation by Management included ONLY reading of the summary page of the draft board agenda item along with reading the list of 24 recommendations. Ms. Watson noted that she came prepared with a list of questions only to find that there was not enough time allowed to get to ask all of her questions in the 1 hour that had been allotted for the meeting. She believed that something this important should be covered during business hours rather than expecting staff to hear this important news on their lunch hour. She distributed her notes from the session to the Directors.

As can be seen from the notes, the answers we received to our questions were mostly "I don't know," "I can't answer that," or in more than one case, "that's an inappropriate question." She gave several examples of the non-responsive answers to questions.

5. What these examples are trying to show is that staff is very concerned with what appears to be a plan to change the rules and regulations that govern and protect us as employees, and we are not being engaged or being provided with any answers to our questions. Those answers that we do get are generally vague, evasive or non-answers. It appears that management has totally disregarded the Board's directive to engage and inform staff. In fact, she had heard that executive management has no interest in staff input. This causes great concern as it seems like there is a cloak of secrecy surrounding this whole process. We are talking about the fundamental employer/employee relationship being changed and that is a BIG deal. The Management was very clear that they had not had a chance to fully read and absorb the report. Yet, up until last Friday, the intent was to proceed in asking the Board tonight, to accept the report and go forward with implementing the separation.

6. Since Tuesday 19 staff members of all levels have approached her and expressed their overwhelming support saying "THANK YOU for asking those questions!!!" They told me that those were the questions they would have wanted to ask had they been able to read the report. I've also counted several additional staff who feel the same way… a total of nearly 30 staff just in the North Canyons building that feel this way—Lost, confused, concerned, questioning, skeptical, scared, and disenfranchised.

7. This past Friday we received an email from the GM stating that the report would be split into two parts, and the HR portion would be slowed down and that "recognized unions" would be talked to during a meet and confer process. She had also heard that an Administrative Committee meeting would be held soon to discuss staff concerns. Why weren't we engaged in the process well in advance of this point? It seems that the decision had already been made to recommend separating from County Civil Service & HR. It seems like the intent was to just 'ram it through.'

8. Ms. Watson expressed her concern that the Board take a very active role in this process of deciding whether or not to separate from County Civil and HR Services and how it should be done. She stated that if the Board wants staff's input, you ask us and keep asking until you hear from us…directly—if possible. Otherwise, she was not confident that the Board will get the true staff input. This appears to be what happened with the Strategic Planning Process. Several Board Members had directed management and the consultant to 'involve the staff.' While an on-

line survey and interviews of many staff were conducted during which a common theme of staff being very concerned with institutional leadership and trust issues apparently emerged, these concerns were totally dismissed and minimized as just "administrative & management issues." The uniformity of what was being said, was of such a degree that the consultant referred to it as being "rehearsed." When that many people are saying the same thing, over and over, that's probably because its true! Many people 'spilled their guts' at risk to themselves and were assured that the interviews were confidential! Not only was what they said reported back to executive management, but those concerns didn't even get brought to the Board's attention and instead, were minimized and sanitized. If you all want to know what the staff's input is, it cannot be subject to a process of 'selective disclosure.'

9. Finally, Ms. Watson referred again to the minutes from the Special Board meeting of April 1st and said that that she and numerous other Zone 7 staff members do NOT feel fully aware of what is going on; do NOT feel fully involved; and do NOT feel protected by the proposal or by the way this is being handled.

Ms. Watson thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Alfonso Yasonia, Water Plant Operator at Zone 7, stated that he was present on behalf of the Water Plant Operators to speak on an issue that has been removed from the agenda but that we want to let you know how we feel about it. Regarding the whole issue of breaking apart from the County and losing the Civil Service Commission, we are totally against going to this Personnel Board of in-house people for the main reason we don't trust upper management, and we don't trust the Human Resources Department. Their tactics are very shady. Things they do are very shady; very questionable practices. He said that he didn't know how else or an easy or gentle way to put it. He knew the Board reports and surveys and things to look at but if you really want to know what is going on, interview the employees, one-on-one, in a non-threatening environment. You ask them one-on-one what they think, and you are going to hear a totally different story from what you see in these reports. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Allan Dahlquist, Water Plant Operator at Zone 7 and SEIU 1021 Union Shop Steward, thanked Ms. Watson for her comments. She put a lot of time and effort into making her report tonight, and it was well stated. He thanked Mr. Yasonia for expressing some feelings that, as a union shop steward, he has as well.

Mr. Dahlquist's comments related to the way in which employees were informed about the brown bag meeting to hear about the Management Partners study. On the close of business day, on the 4th of this month, an e-mail went out and this is the wording in the e-mail in part:

> "Two brown bag sessions are scheduled to update interested Zone 7 staff members on the recommendation that is being prepared for Board review at the August regular meeting. The first session will be at noon on August 10 at the Del Valle Conference Room and the second session will be at 12 noon on August 11 in Conference Room 150 at North Canyons. No food or drink will be provided so feel free to bring your own brown bag lunch if you are attending."

Does it sound to you that the item being discussed there is a 95-page document entitled "Zone 7 Water Agency's Comprehensive Economic and Operations Analysis and Draft Report"? There is no indication from that e-mail of the scope of the document being discussed, nor is it mentioned in there the title of the document, how it can be accessed, how it could be reviewed before the meetings. This came out at the close of the business day on the 4th; the first meeting was scheduled for the 10th.

People attended those Brown Bag meetings not really knowing what was going to be discussed and some, like himself, were not able to attend at all. Additionally, these meetings were scheduled at North Canyons and Del Valle, but they were not scheduled at Patterson Pass Water Treatment Plant, the Demin facility, or Parkside. At those sites we had interested staff who didn't have a chance to participate in these discussions, nor did it say where to access the document. It also didn't say to attend this Brown Bag meeting having read the document, thought about the document, digested it, and with some pertinent questions to pose. On the contrary, the comments he heard from people who did attend were that the well-thought out questions were glossed over, not answered, evaded, and it seemed like the intention was to hope that maybe people didn't show up, or didn't show up with good questions, or didn't show up having read the document.

Mr. Dahlquist continued by saying that he has been fielding a lot of calls of anger, resentment, and people saying “Hey, how do you get this document?” It was word of mouth. He couldn’t recall seeing an announcement at Zone 7 at all. Word of mouth leaked out that it could be accessed by going to the Zone 7 Intranet website. It's a "read only" document; it cannot be downloaded to print for comments, etc. It seems like the intention is to make it difficult to access this document, difficult to discuss this document among ourselves before we went to the meeting or after the meeting was held. Further, it seems like that if things went as planned, you would be discussing this issue tonight and taking some form of action but it was pulled from the agenda.

That's the background he wanted to discuss here. That this seems to be an effort, remember it was two weeks ago that the e-mail went out and within days they were doing those Brown Bag sessions, and it is a 95-page document. He emphasized that he is not arguing the specifics of what is in the document because he did not have the time to read it yet. What is being argued tonight are the tactics used to ram this by employees and give the impression that we were informed about meetings, that we were provided information, that we had time to discuss it, and that any action you would be taking would be done with the informed consent of the employees—to lend voice to that would be to lend voice to a fraud. At some point in the future we all will have time to read and discuss this and we will have some responses to some of the points brought up here but for now, we are really disappointed in the way employees were approached with this. Thank you.

Ms. Duerig distributed e-mails which had been sent to staff. She noted that it was because of the comments by staff voiced at those brown bag meetings that we did pull the item from the agenda. We were trying to be responsive. And as the memo that went out to all employees indicates, we hope to use this additional time to meet in an appropriate manner with staff. Many of the staff are members of represented units so we will be meeting with their representatives. An e-mail went out earlier today to each of the represented units, and we have already heard back from one of them, Local 21, that they are very happy for the opportunity to meet with us and represent the views of staff. Because we are dealing with bargaining units, which is how we as staff have to deal so it won't be one-on-one staff meetings, instead it will be through the represented process. She indicated that since this is not an agendized item, she really could not say a lot more.

Director Figuers asked Mr. Dahlquist, as a shop steward, what are the employees scared of?

Mr. Dahlquist responded that while he could not talk about specifics having yet to read the report, the main concern being expressed tonight is not what is being proposed, it is, once again, how this was presented to the employees. This is the game plan for restructuring this Agency, and it is going to affect all of us. We would like to have input in this process. We would like to know where it is going. We would like to at least talk to you about it. It was clear from the e-mails announcing the Brown Bags that what was done here was an attempt to ramrod something through. It appears the Brown Bag sessions were downplayed; they were held on people's lunch hours, there were no specifics in terms of announcing the meeting and, when people showed up with real questions and concerns, they seemed to be taken aback.

Director Figuers responded that he doubted there was anything nefarious. This study was actually discussed in the last two board meetings. However, he could understand the concerns about restructuring.

Director Greci stated that the last thing the Board wanted to do is ram anything down employees' throats. That will not happen. You are entitled to your feelings, and there is no way we are going to be judgmental about it. We want to be sure that staff, and that means everybody that works for this agency, fully understands what this is study is all about. We want to hold an open forum where you can say what is on your mind. One thing we talked about in our offsite yesterday was improving communication in this organization. Here is a perfect opportunity to start. He applauded the people tonight who got up and talked and said he had a lot of respect for them. However, try to focus on the responsibilities of the Board. We don't want to orchestrate anything that will harm employees. He stated that he is on record stating that his concerns are for staff during this process. And it is not going to happen if there is any chance of hurting staff. That's from anybody working in the treatment facilities or in this building, we are all equal. It is our livelihoods, your livelihoods, and you have to like your job to be a top performer. If you don't like your job because of poor communication, that is a problem that we are going to work on. Tonight was a great start. Do not be afraid to talk to the Board. We are not elite individuals who are off limits to you by any means.

Director Greci continued by saying that the Management Partners Study was pulled from the agenda tonight because of the awareness of concerns on the part of the staff. We are going to address them, and hopefully it will bring up the level of communication. The last thing the Board wants to create is paranoia. We want to pull this organization together. We want to do what is good for everybody not just a select few in this organization and forget the rest of them. This is a 100 percent program and that is the way we want to keep it so we can work together.

Director Palmer commended the speakers on their courage for speaking up. She added that she agreed with Director Greci regarding the importance of communication.

Director Quigley also thanked the speakers. He added that any time you folks want to come forward and tell us something, we are here to listen and we will take it under serious consideration because we all want to move this agency to a better place, and employees are an integral, very important part of it.

Item 4—Minutes of Regular Meeting of July 15, 2009

President Quigley had one correction to the minutes of July 15, 2009. On page 9, under Item 14, Reports—Directors, he stated that he had helped staff the East Bay Regional Park Booth at the Alameda County Fair not the Clean Water booth as was stated in the minutes.

On a motion by Director Moore with second by Director Kalthoff, the minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 17, 2009 were approved as corrected.

Item 5 —Consent Calendar

Items 5a and 5b were pulled from Consent by Director Kalthoff for discussion.

On a motion by Director Greci with second by Director Palmer, the Board approved Consent Items 5c and 5d by a vote of 7-0. The following resolutions were approved:

Resolution No. 10-3321	Accepting the Cost Effectiveness Study that provides the basis for the expanded water conservation program; approving the expanded water conservation program; and authorizing the General Manager to implement any future planning projects contained therein with additional future funding as may be approved by the Board in the annual fiscal budget and Capital Improvement Plan. (Item 5c)
Resolution No. 10-3322	Accepting Aerial Easement Deed from Calmat Co., (dba Vulcan Materials Co.) for a telephone line for the Chain of Lakes Wells No. 1 & 2, No. 70122. (Item 5d)

Item 5a—Request for Out-of-state Travel Expense Reimbursement to Attend the AWWA California-Nevada Section Annual Fall Conference in Las Vegas, Nevada, October 5-8, 2009

Item 5b—Request by Director Dick Quigley for Authorization to Attend Upcoming California Special District Association Annual Conference

Director Kalthoff asked about the benefit to Zone from attendance at conferences.

Mr. Arends responded that the American Water Works Association (AWWA) Conferences, in particular, are a training and development opportunity for staff. It is unfortunate that the fall conference is in Las Vegas but this request is to send only one staff member. AWWA is a technical organization that is particularly valuable to operations and water quality staff. The requester, Ms. Karen Newton, is working with Operations to develop a distribution system operations plan, and this is an opportunity for additional training. Attending the AWWA conferences is a way to encourage staff to continue their training and to keep up with current technology.

Ms. Duerig added that more staff would probably be attending if the conference were local. There is only one attending this time.

With regard to 5b, President Quigley stated that attending the CSDA conference is an educational opportunity to gain information on trends in special districts. Additionally, they give special classes for their special district leadership academy with the goal of effective governance of special districts. He believed the conference to be worthwhile and besides registration, the only expenses would be travel and lodging.

Director Kalthoff asked for an explanation of the Board's current policy regarding conferences.

Ms. Duerig responded that pre-approval is needed if Directors want to attend more than one ACWA conference a year. In President Quigley's case, since he is a member of ACWA's Energy Committee and on the Region 5 board, he has pre-approval to attend both ACWA conferences as well as his committee meetings and Region Board meetings and receive reimbursement for his expenses.

Director Palmer moved for the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolution No. 3323	Authorizing out-of-state travel for one Zone 7 staff member to attend the AWWA California-Nevada Section Annual Fall Conference in Las Vegas, Nevada, October 5-8, 2009, and authorizing reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses associated therewith. (Item 5a)
Resolution No. 3324	Authorizing request of Director Dick Quigley to attend the California Special District Association Annual Conference, September 21-24, 2009, in Indian Wells, California, and authorizing reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses associated therewith. (Item 5b)

Director Stevens seconded the motion, and the resolutions were adopted by a vote of 6-1-0. Director Kalthoff voted no.

Item 6—Staffing Update

Ms. Duerig introduced Mr. Tim Brown, Instrument Technician in the Zone 7 Maintenance Section.

Item 7—Solid Waste Disposal Contract with Republic Services, Inc.

Ms. Duerig presented this item in Mr. Wong's absence.

Background

- Zone 7 has an on-going need for a designated disposal site for dried sludge and garbage pickup from its existing treatment plants. The water treatment plants generate about 10,000 tons of sludge per year. Zone 7 also needs a designated disposal site for flood control channel debris and silt with $50,000 budgeted for FY 2009/10 for this activity.
- Zone 7 has a current solid waste disposal contract with Waste Management of Alameda County, Inc., dba Altamont Landfill and Resource Recovery Facility, in the amount of $315,000 per year. The contract with Waste Management is not exclusive, and Zone 7 may reduce or terminate the contract with Waste Management at any time without penalty.
- Landfill disposal costs are budgeted at $315,000 for FY 09/10 under the current Waste Management contract. Republic Services (Vasco Road Landfill) has submitted a price quote of $22.00 per ton of sludge (greater than 75% solids), $26.00 per ton of sludge (50% to 75% solids), and $55.00 per ton of solid waste (e.g., garbage, refuse, or rubbish).
- There will be a significant potential savings ($40,000 to $130,000) if Zone 7 contracts with Republic Services for sludge disposal.

Ms. Duerig stated that this proposal came from the Maintenance staff as a way to save Zone 7 money. With two contracts, we will be able to send the solid waste to either location depending on which has the best rates. We are very excited when staff come up with these kinds of ideas.

Ms. Duerig continued that staff recommends approval of a services contract with Republic Services, Inc., in an amount not to exceed $250,000 per year for FY 2009/10 through FY 2011/12. Staff will administratively reduce a like amount from the Waste Management contract. A smaller services contract with Waste Management is still needed for dumpster drop-off/pick-up services at the water treatment plants as Republic does not provide this service. The sum of the two waste disposal contracts will not exceed the budgeted amount of $315,000 per year.

Director Greci moved for the adoption of Resolution No. 10-3325 approving a 3-year contract with Republic Services, Inc., for solid waste disposal for an estimated amount of $250,000 per year for FY 2009/10 through FY 2011/12. The motion was seconded by Director Quigley and passed by a vote of 6-0-1. Director Figuers abstained.

Mr. Barry Ivy, Maintenance Supervisor, was in the audience and stated that Zone 7 can transport as much as 100 tons/day and this would represent a $400/day savings.

Item 8—Request to Consider Water Connection Fees Related to Vasco Road Landfill Conditions of Approval

Mr. Arends told the Board that this item is related to connection fees. Mr. Dick Ward, a North Vasco Road resident, is present to answer questions.

Background

- There are approximately ten residential properties on North Vasco Road adjacent to the Vasco Road Landfill which have historically relied on shallow wells for their water supply.
- The ongoing operation of the Vasco Road Landfill has had negative impacts on the quality and quantity of the local water supply.
- In April 2006 the Alameda County Planning Commission approved new Conditions of Approval for the continued and expanded operation of the landfill which required the construction of a potable water line to extend water service to the local residents with the residents to pay connection fees.
- The Conditions of Approval indicate that each resident will be responsible for paying any applicable connection fees associated with connecting to the water line.
- In May 2008, the Alameda County Health Department concurred with the existence of a public health emergency.
- Residents neighboring the landfill have been receiving potable water delivered by tanker truck to meet their domestic needs.
- Construction of the municipal water line is now in progress with completion anticipated this fall.
- Since April 2006, Zone 7 water connection fees have increased from $13,500 to the current rate of $21,550 for a 5/8 inch connection.
- A request has been made by the Vasco Road residents and Alameda County Supervisors to consider a variance to the current Zone 7 connection fee.
- Staff has reviewed this request and similar requests in the past. Given the unique circumstances surrounding this situation, the residents have been unable to obtain a physical connection until now although it was part of an April 2006 county permit

and they have been obtaining Zone 7 water through truck deliveries. Therefore, staff recommends applying the 2006 connection fee plus interest to these ten homes.

Mr. Ward responded to Board questions about how the residents finally reached an agreement with the landfill.

Director Greci believed the residents had a valid concern, and they worked hard to get an agreeable conclusion to the problem. They were victims of circumstance. He was in favor of applying the 2006 connection fee plus interest to these ten homes.

Director Figuers stated he was opposed because of questions raised at a recent board meeting about whether changes to our fee structures would jeopardize the Installment Sales Agreement (ISA). At that time the question was whether Zone 7 could offer a deferred fee program for builders.

Ms. Duerig responded that it is a different situation because it is new development that brings in the fees that secure the line of credit.

Director Moore stated that this is a good example of how the community can work with development.

Director Palmer moved for the adoption of Resolution No. 10-3326 which recognizes the unique circumstances related to the ten residential properties location on North Vasco Road and approves a water connection fee equal to the April 2006 connection fee rate inflated to the time of payment based on the Engineering News Record Construction Cost, estimated at $15,786.53 per 5/8-inch connection. The motion was seconded by Director Greci and passed by a vote of 6-0-1. Director Figuers abstained.

Item 9—Increase Expenditure Authorization for Bay Delta Conservation Plan Consulting Services through February 2010

Mr. Arends gave a background report on the BDCP process and where we are right now.

Background

- As a Potentially Regulated Entity participating in the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and as the party designated in the BDCP Cooperation Agreement to act as the contract administrator, Zone 7 has entered into several consultant contracts to secure BDCP related services.
- The BDCP process has been steadily moving forward and recently reached a milestone of releasing a draft of Chapter 3 of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan which lays out the conservation strategy.
- The Steering Committee is pushing to release the Administrative Draft of the entire Conservation Plan at the end of the calendar year which is a very aggressive goal.
- In order to perform analysis and prepare documents, the BDCP process relies on consultants for whom Zone 7 is the Contract Administrator.
- In February 2009, the Board increased the total authorized amount up to $6.8 million for the period through June 2009.
- If the consultant’s work continues at the current pace, it is estimated that an additional $2.7 million will be expended between July 2009 and February 2010 which is the end of the fiscal

year for the San Luis & Delta Mendota Water Authority. This would increase the total authorized amount for BDCP contracts to $9.5 million.

- Zone 7 has reimbursement and cost share agreements in place with the Department of Water Resources, San Luis & Delta Mendota Water Authority, and Mirant Delta to ensure reimbursement to Zone 7.
- The estimated expenditures for BDCP related consulting services, are estimated at approximately $12 million through plan completion which could extend into 2011. Zone 7's proportional share is approximately 1% of the general BDCP contracts, plus 25% of a joint contract for environmental consultant services with Kern County Water Agency and San Luis & Delta Mendota Water Authority, for a total of $277,000.

Board questions/comments

In response to questions, Mr. Arends confirmed that Zone 7's share of the total cost for the BDCP is $277K. Tonight's action will increase that amount by $30K to $35K. He also explained how Zone 7 acts as the contract administrator for the BDCP participants and processes the monthly payments.

There were no further questions.

Director Kalthoff moved for the adoption of Resolution No. 10-3327 authorizing the General Manager to 1) authorize work and associated expenditures related to BDCP consultant contracts up to $9.5 million through February 2010; 2) negotiate and execute contracts and/or amendments for services with SAIC and other consultants as necessary in an amount not-to-exceed $9.5 million; and 3) execute amendments to existing reimbursement agreements or new agreements as needed with the California Department of Water Resources, Mirant Delta, and the San Luis & Delta Mendota Water Authority associated with the consultant contracts. The motion was seconded by Director Stevens and passed by a vote of 7-0.

<u>Item 10—Committees—None this month</u>

It was announced that a meeting of the Administrative Committee is scheduled for August 25 at 3:30 p.m. The time is limited to one hour because another meeting follows at 4:30 p.m. Any employee can attend.

<u>Item 11—Items for Future Agendas—Directors</u>

Nothing brought up at this time.

<u>Item 12—Reports—Directors</u>

a. Written report by President Quigley
b. Verbal reports

Director Palmer commented that she and Director Quigley had driven down to San Luis Reservoir. It is down to only 19% of capacity. On August 11, she had gone to Sacramento for a Delta Forum where it was good to see and hear the players in person.

Director Quigley remarked that seeing San Luis Reservoir with its 65 miles of shoreline at such a low level was startling. As Director Palmer said it is at 19% capacity, and it turns out we have some of our water stored there.

Item 13—Staff Reports (Information items. No action taken.)

a. General Manager's Report
b. Recent & Upcoming Public Outreach Activities
c. State Legislative Update
d. Quarterly Financial Report

Item 13e—Verbal Reports

Ms. Duerig announced that the first meeting of the State/Federal Contractors Authority was today, and Zone 7 Assistant General Manager, Vince Wong, was elected the president of that organization.

Referring to a letter received from EBMUD on water conservation, Director Quigley noted that they offered to meet with Zone 7 to share information.

# # # # #

The Board then took a short break before reconvening in Closed Session at 8:20 p.m.

Item 14—CLOSED SESSION

a) Conference with Legal Counsel –Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Subdivision (b) of Government Code Section 54956.9: 3 cases

b) Conference with Labor Negotiators:
Agency Negotiator: G.F Duerig
Employee Organization: Alameda County Management Employees Association; Alameda County Building and Construction Trades Council, Local 342, AFL-CIO; International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, Local 21, AFL-CIO; Local 1021 of the Service Employees International Union, CTW; Unrepresented Management

c) Government Code Section 549547: Public Employee Performance Evaluation
Title: General Manager

Item 15—Open Session and Report Out of Closed Session

President Quigley announced that there was nothing to report out of Closed Session.

Item 16—Upcoming Board Schedule
(All meeting locations are 100 North Canyons Parkway, Livermore, unless otherwise noted)

a) Administrative Committee Meeting: August 25, 2009, 3:30 p.m.
b) Joint Liaison Committee Meeting with DSRSD: August 25, 2009, 4:30 p.m.
c) Finance Committee Meeting: August 27, 2009, 3:00 p.m.
d) Regular September Meeting: September 16, 2009

There was no further business, and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:00 p.m.