SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY | A REGIONAL WATER AGENCY SINCE 1954

AGENDA

SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT
380 E. Vanderbilt Way, San Bernardino, CA 92408

REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
2:00 PM Tuesday, September 1, 2026

ZOOM INFORMATION
Online: https://sbvmwd.zoom/us/j/83910934313
Telephone: (877) 853-5247 US Toll-free

Meeting ID: 839 1093 4313
PASSCODE: 3802026

If you are unable to participate online or by telephone, you may submit your comments and questions in writing for Board consideration by emailing comments@sbvmwd.com with the subject line Public Comment Item # (insert the agenda item number relevant to your comment) or Public Comment Non-Agenda Item. Submit your written comments no later than 6 p.m. the day prior to the meeting. All public comments will be provided to the Board President and may be read into the record or compiled as part of the record.

IMPORTANT PRIVACY NOTE: Online participants MUST log in with a Zoom account. The Zoom app is a free download. Please keep in mind: (1) This is a public meeting; as such, the virtual meeting information is published on the World Wide Web and available to everyone. (2) Should you participate remotely via telephone, your telephone number will be your identifier during the meeting and available to all meeting participants; there is no way to protect your privacy if you elect to call in to the meeting.

CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/ROLL CALL

1) PUBLIC COMMENT
Members of the public may address the Board regarding any item within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board; however, no action may be taken on off-agenda items except as authorized by law. Each speaker is limited to a maximum of three (3) minutes.

2) CONSENT CALENDAR

2.1 Approve Minutes of the Board of Directors Special Meeting - Resources/Engineering Workshop - July 14, 2026
Approve Minutes of the Board of Directors Special Meeting - Resources/Engineering Workshop - July 14, 2026

3) DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS

4) REPORTS (Discussion and Possible Action)

4.1 Directors' Report of Activities and Travel Requests in accordance with Resolution 1100

4.2 General Counsel Report

4.3 Ad-Hoc and Standing Committee Reports

4.4 SAWPA Meeting Report

5) FUTURE BUSINESS

6) ANNOUNCEMENTS

6.1 List of Announcements
List of Announcements

7) CLOSED SESSION

7.1 Conference with Legal Counsel - Anticipated Litigation Significant Exposure to Litigation Pursuant to Paragraph (2) of Subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9: (1 Potential Case)

8) ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES
OF
THE
BOARD OF DIRECTORS SPECIAL MEETING
RESOURCES/ENGINEERING WORKSHOP
SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT

July 14, 2026

Directors Present: Gil J. Botello, T. Milford Harrison, Susan Longville, Jose Velasquez

Directors Absent: Paul R. Kielhold

Staff Present:
Heather Dyer, MS, MBA – Chief Executive Officer/General Manager
Wen Huang, PE, MS – Chief Operating Officer/Assistant General Manager
Jose Macedo, ML, CPT-P (USA Retired) – Chief Administrative Officer/Deputy General Manager
Cindy Saks, CPA – Chief Financial Officer/Deputy General Manager
Michael Plinski, PE – Chief of Water Resources

Stephanie Chesin, MA – Principal Communications Specialist
Anthony Flordelis – Senior Business Systems Analyst
Greg Herzog, BS – Principal Water Resources Analyst
Kelly Malloy – Manager of Strategic Communications and Special Initiatives
Matthew Olivo – Senior Accountant
Sayer Pinto, MBA – Principal Water Resources Analyst
Karen Resendez, MAOL – Human Resources & Risk Manager
Alliah Smith – Senior Administrative Assistant
Andreea Tanase, MPA – Administrative Analyst I
Francisco Wences – Associate Engineer
Ryan Kuruppu – Operator

Sam Bivins, Downey Brand
Meredith Nikkel, Downey Brand
Brad Neufeld, Varner Brandt

Members of the Public in Attendance:
Phil Goodrich, East Valley Water District
Michael Moore, East Valley Water District
James Morales, East Valley Water District
Mark Falcone, San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District
Melody McDonald, San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District
Jennifer Ares, Yucaipa Valley Water District
Allison Edmisten, Yucaipa Valley Water District

Matt Porras, Yucaipa Valley Water District
Nyles O'Harra, Yucaipa Valley Water District
Joseph Zoba, Yucaipa Valley Water District

The Resources/Engineering Workshop of the Board of Directors was called to order by Chair Susan Longville at 2:00 p.m. A quorum was noted present.

Agenda Item 1. Introductions: None.

Agenda Item 2. Public Comment. None.

Agenda Item 3. Discussion and Possible Action Items.

3.1) 2027-29 California Special Districts Association Southern Network Election. Strategic Communications Manager Kelly Malloy explained the election for Seat C in the California Special Districts Association (CSDA) Southern Network.

The Board of Directors cast a vote for Nikki Winslow in the California Special Districts Association election for the 2027-2029 term for Seat C of the Southern Network by the following roll-call vote:

MOVED: Harrison	SECONDED: Kielhold	APPROVED: 5-0
AYES:	Botello, Harrison, Kielhold, Longville, Velasquez	
NOES:	None	
ABSTAIN:	None	
ABSENT:	None	

3.2) Workshop Report Regarding State Water Contract Fund Budget and Potential Ad Valorem Tax Rate for Fiscal Year 2026-2027. CEO/General Manager Heather Dyer presented a high-level, comprehensive overview of the major financial and policy considerations that will inform the Board's decision on the ad valorem rate. Ms. Dyer noted that the Fiscal Year 2025-2026 tax rate was $0.11 per $100 of assessed property valuation and that the new rate must be established before the end of July.

Ms. Dyer explained that property owners within SB Valley's service area currently pay, on average, approximately $300 to $350 annually toward the State Water Contract through property taxes, although actual amounts vary considerably as there are many long-held properties that have not been reassessed in years. She emphasized that revenues generated through the ad valorem tax are legally restricted and may only be used for costs associated with the State Water Contract.

Importance of the State Water Project
Ms. Dyer reviewed the purpose and significance of the State Water Project (SWP), explaining the California Aqueduct transports imported water from Northern to Southern California through an extensive system of dams, reservoirs, aqueducts, pumping plants, and related infrastructure. She noted the complexity and scale of the system make both its operation and long-term maintenance costly, while continued investment is necessary to preserve its reliability for future generations.

Ms. Dyer stated the Inland Empire's growth has long outpaced the region's natural water resources, prompting community leaders in the 1940s and 1950s to pursue a supplemental imported water supply. She noted that San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District was formed in 1954 to secure that supply and emphasized maintaining a reliable imported water system remains essential to supplementing local water resources and supporting the region's long-term economic growth and prosperity.

Ms. Dyer further explained the SWP benefits every retail water agency within SB Valley's 325-square-mile service area, via direct imported water deliveries or recharge into the regional groundwater basin. She emphasized that the imported supply functions as an integrated component of the region's overall water portfolio, supporting more than 700,000 residents throughout the service area.

State Water Contract Overview
Ms. Dyer reviewed SB Valley's participation in the SWP, noting the Agency executed its State Water Contract with the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) in 1960 and is one of 29 public agency contractors responsible for financing the SWP. Each contractor pays its proportional share of debt service, operating costs, maintenance, and capital improvements necessary to operate the system. She explained annual water allocations fluctuate based on hydrologic conditions and system constraints; however, many project costs remain fixed regardless of the amount of water delivered. She stated that although imported water represents approximately 20 percent of the region's overall water portfolio, it serves as the critical supplemental supply particularly during droughts, wildfire-related water quality impacts, and other periods when local supplies become constrained.

Restricted State Water Contract Fund and General Fund
Ms. Dyer explained the distinction between the Agency's two primary operating funds. The restricted State Water Contract Fund receives revenue from the ad valorem property tax and is used exclusively to pay SWP debt service, operating costs, capital improvements, repair and replacement activities, and other expenses authorized under the Burns-Porter Act adopted by the voters in 1960. She reiterated these revenues cannot legally be used for any other purpose.

By comparison, the General Fund receives revenue from the Agency's share of the countywide one-percent property tax, grants, and partner agency cost reimbursement agreements, and supports a broad range of regional water resource activities. Ms. Dyer described those responsibilities, including groundwater basin management as

Watermaster, administration of 2010 Santa Ana River surface water rights, regional recharge and recycled water projects, conservation incentive programs, environmental permitting, acquisition of conservation easements supporting stormwater capture projects, and overall Agency administration. She emphasized that maintaining the separation between the two funds is both a legal requirement and an essential principle of the Agency's financial management practices.

Projected State Water Project Financial Obligations

Ms. Dyer reviewed the Agency's 18-month analysis of anticipated SWP expenses through 2035; a comprehensive review of both current and projected costs. She explained that the Agency's financial planning distinguishes between ongoing operational expenses and significant capital investments that are already known or reasonably anticipated over the coming decade.

Ms. Dyer explained the largest category of annual expenditures consists of the routine costs associated with operating the SWP, including debt service, operations, maintenance, and other fixed contractual obligations. In addition to those recurring expenses, the DWR has identified numerous capital improvements through its current five-year Capital Investment Program. Those projects include relicensing of the SWP's hydroelectric facilities through the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and major repairs to portions of the California Aqueduct. Ms. Dyer noted that these capital improvements represent known financial obligations that SB Valley will be required to fund through its proportional share.

Looking beyond routine maintenance, Ms. Dyer discussed the significant investments necessary to ensure that the SWP continues to operate reliably over future decades. She compared those investments to maintaining a home inherited from a previous generation, explaining that while routine maintenance is necessary each year, major reinvestments eventually become unavoidable to preserve the long-term usefulness of the asset. She stated that Sites Reservoir and the Delta Conveyance Project represent the next generation of investments needed to maintain the reliability and resilience of California's imported water system.

Ms. Dyer reviewed projected expenditures through approximately 2035, noting that annual SWP costs are expected to increase substantially, reaching nearly $350 million around 2031 before declining temporarily as construction phases are completed. She explained that the initial increase is driven largely by construction of the Sites Reservoir followed by construction costs associated with the Delta Conveyance Project, which are expected to accelerate after 2035.

Ms. Dyer advised that SB Valley's current participation in the Sites Reservoir project represents approximately 10 percent of the overall project, or roughly $750 million. She explained that the project would capture surplus Sacramento River flows during wet years, store that water in Northern California, and make up to 30,000 acre-feet available to SB Valley during future dry years. She described Sites Reservoir as one of the Agency's primary long-term resilience strategies because it would provide a new source of supplemental water that could allow continued water delivery in dry years.

State Water Contract Cost Analysis
Ms. Dyer detailed State Water Contract costs, explaining that annual obligations include fixed infrastructure charges, conveyance costs that vary with water deliveries, and the Agency's share of capital improvements identified by DWR. Based on current information, staff estimates total State Water Contract costs of approximately $86 million during Fiscal Year 2026-2027 and approximately $140.7 million during Fiscal Year 2027-2028.

Using those estimates, Ms. Dyer demonstrated the financial significance of the Agency's ad valorem property tax. She explained that if the SB Valley attempted to recover SWP costs primarily through water rates rather than property taxes, imported water costs would increase substantially for retailers. Assuming a 50-percent SWP allocation, recovering those costs through water rates would require an increase to approximately $607 per acre-foot. She explained that fixed SWP costs remain largely unchanged regardless of annual allocations, meaning that low-water years further increase the cost of each acre-foot delivered.

Ms. Dyer observed that SB Valley has historically relied upon the ad valorem property tax to absorb most SWP costs in order to maintain comparatively low wholesale water rates for its retail agencies. She compared the Agency's financial structure with that of Metropolitan Water District, noting that Metropolitan currently assesses a lower property tax but charges substantially higher water rates. She explained that SB Valley has intentionally sought to balance those two revenue sources in a manner that keeps imported water affordable while ensuring adequate funding for SWP obligations.

Relationship Between Imported Water and Groundwater Management
Ms. Dyer next explained that the Agency's responsibility as Watermaster for the Western San Bernardino Basin must also be considered. Reviewing cumulative groundwater storage data, she reported that groundwater levels have steadily declined since the mid-1980s and currently reflect an estimated cumulative deficit of approximately 600,000 acre-feet. Without imported SWP supplies, she explained, groundwater depletion would have exceeded approximately 1.5 million acre-feet because nearly 1 million acre-feet of imported water has been recharged into the basin over time. She noted that the figures presented do not include the additional benefit provided through direct imported water deliveries that reduced groundwater pumping.

Ms. Dyer stated that maintaining affordable imported water is essential to protecting the groundwater basin. She reminded the Board that, pursuant to Resolution 888, SB Valley has not changed wholesale water rates since 2002, and a comprehensive cost-of-service study is underway. She explained that if imported water becomes significantly more expensive, retail agencies would have a financial incentive to rely more heavily upon groundwater extraction, particularly because the Western San Bernardino Judgment does not impose pumping limits. Maintaining relatively low imported water costs therefore supports the Agency's long-term groundwater management responsibilities by encouraging retailers to purchase supplemental imported supplies rather than increase groundwater pumping.

Detailing the Agency's long-term supply strategy, Ms. Dyer emphasized that both Sites Reservoir and the Delta Conveyance Project are fundamental components of maintaining a balanced regional water portfolio. SB Valley's 10 percent portion of the Sites project totals an investment of about $750 million, providing up to 30,000 acre-feet of supplemental supply during dry years. The Agency's 3 percent share in the Delta Conveyance at a cost of about $600 million would improve the reliability of imported water deliveries by reducing the system's vulnerability to Delta levee failures, earthquakes, sea level rise, salinity intrusion, and other operational risks. Together, these projects are intended to strengthen the long-term reliability of water supplies.

Financial Policy and Reserve Planning
Ms. Dyer reminded the Board that Resolution 1060 established a policy to cash-finance the Delta Conveyance Project whenever feasible in order to reduce long-term borrowing costs and preserve the Agency's AAA credit rating. She noted that the policy received unanimous support from both the Advisory Commission and aligns with the direction of this Board and prior Boards, reflecting the Agency's longstanding philosophy of minimizing debt whenever practical while preserving financial flexibility for future infrastructure investments.

The Reserve Policy complements this financial strategy by establishing target reserve levels that correspond with anticipated SWP obligations. Ms. Dyer stated that the reserve policy, projected capital expenditures, and the annual property tax analysis are parts of a comprehensive long-term financial strategy for maintaining reliable imported water supplies while protecting the Agency's financial condition.

Finally, Ms. Dyer outlined several policy considerations that would guide staff's recommendations and the Board's deliberations at the following week's tax-rate hearing. Those considerations included:

- Compliance with the newly adopted Reserve Policy.
- Maintaining a stable and predictable property tax rather than allowing significant year-to-year fluctuations.
- Preserving affordable imported water rates to encourage groundwater replenishment and sustainable basin management.
- Funding known SWP obligations while preparing for future capital investments and emergency contingencies.
- Recognizing continued growth in assessed property valuations, which has allowed the Board to reduce the tax rate on four occasions during the previous six years while maintaining adequate revenues for State Water Contract obligations.

Growth in Assessed Valuation and Revenue Stability
Ms. Dyer pointed out that one favorable factor influencing the Board's tax-rate decision is the continued growth in assessed property valuation throughout the service area. She reported that the Agency's total assessed valuation has increased from less than $30 billion in 2013 to approximately $55 billion today and, based on current trends, is expected to continue increasing. As a result, the Board has been able to reduce the ad valorem tax rate while maintaining sufficient revenues to support the SWP costs. She noted that

growth in assessed valuation has been one of the primary reasons the Board has lowered the tax rate four times during the previous six years.

Historical Changes in State Water Contract Revenues

Ms. Dyer reviewed the historical fluctuations of the ad valorem revenues to explain how current reserve levels have developed over time. She noted that prior to 2013, the Agency's ad valorem tax generated substantially less revenue than it does today despite a significantly higher tax rate. At that time, a portion of the property tax collected on behalf of SB Valley was diverted through redevelopment agencies to support redevelopment Agency activities. As a result, although the Board established a tax rate of approximately $0.1625 per $100 of assessed valuation, only a portion of those revenues was actually delivered to the Agency by the Counties and therefore available to support SWP obligations.

Ms. Dyer explained the financial landscape changed significantly following the dissolution of redevelopment agencies in 2013 under Assembly Bill 126. The legislation redirected property tax revenues generated by taxing agencies back to their originating public taxing agencies. Senate Bill 107, enacted in 2016, further clarified that property tax revenues established for specific governmental purposes should remain available to those agencies to fulfill those purposes.

Although those legislative changes substantially increased the Agency's revenues, Ms. Dyer explained that uncertainty remained because ongoing litigation created doubt regarding whether SB Valley would ultimately retain those additional revenues. Until the litigation concluded in the Agency's favor in approximately 2019, the Board proceeded cautiously because it remained possible that a significant portion of those revenues could ultimately be awarded to other parties.

Ms. Dyer explained the combination of increasing assessed property values, the elimination of redevelopment agency revenue diversions, and the receipt of redevelopment pass-through payments enabled the Board to reduce the ad valorem tax rate while simultaneously increasing revenues available to the restricted SWP fund. She emphasized that this financial transformation accounts for the SB Valley's current reserve balances. She further noted that the timing and amount of redevelopment pass-through payments remain outside SB Valley's control because those payments depend upon the retirement of redevelopment agency debt obligations, which is a County-led effort.

Recognizing this improved financial position, the Board adopted Resolution 1060 expressing intent to cash-finance the Delta Conveyance Project whenever feasible. The Agency has continued to preserve those revenues within the restricted fund, reinvesting interest earnings while preparing for anticipated infrastructure investments. She stated financial advisors have estimated that cash financing major capital projects rather than issuing debt could avoid approximately $350 million in future interest costs.

Discussion Regarding Catastrophic Events and Reserve Planning

Director Botello observed that, while the presentation thoroughly addressed known infrastructure costs, the Board must also prepare for significant unforeseen events, including severe economic downturns, catastrophic failures, or major earthquakes that could interrupt imported water deliveries. He stated that the recently adopted Reserve Policy established dedicated funding categories for such events and requested additional explanation regarding how those contingencies were incorporated into the Agency's financial planning.

In response, Ms. Dyer explained that the Reserve Policy establishes minimum funding targets for several distinct categories of future obligations. Those categories include maintaining sufficient reserves to fund approximately one year of normal SWP operating expenses during a major economic disruption; financing emergency repairs to critical SWP infrastructure such as the California Aqueduct or Delta levees; and purchasing replacement water if a catastrophic event interrupts imported water deliveries for an extended period. She noted that a major Delta levee failure could require as much as two years before normal operations resume, making it essential for the Agency to maintain sufficient financial capacity to purchase replacement supplies for both treatment plant deliveries and groundwater replenishment during such an emergency.

Ms. Dyer explained that while approximately $700 million in reserves is substantial, those funds must be viewed in the context of the Agency's known capital obligations, emergency response requirements, replacement water needs, and long-term infrastructure investments. She advised that several hundred million dollars have already been effectively committed to the reserve categories established by Board policy, with additional hundreds of millions of dollars anticipated for known capital improvements identified by DWR and future participation in major statewide infrastructure projects. Accordingly, she stated that reserve balances should be evaluated against the magnitude of both known and potential future obligations rather than viewed as discretionary funds.

Director Botello further commented on the significance of the Sites Reservoir Project, and stated the Board has an obligation to prepare financially for the Agency's participation. This long-term responsibility should remain an important consideration during the upcoming tax-rate deliberations.

Ms. Dyer agreed, explaining that Sites Reservoir represents a rare opportunity, as few opportunities remain in California to develop meaningful new water supplies. Other supply alternatives such as recycled water, desalination, and local stormwater capture, are each constrained by operational or hydrologic limitations. She concluded that Sites Reservoir, together with the Agency's ongoing investments in local recharge and other regional projects, forms an essential component of a diversified and resilient long-term water supply portfolio.

Board Discussion

Director Kielhold commented that the workshop clearly illustrated the elements and the influence of each. He pointed out that the funding collected and reserved for specific projects does not make that revenue the property of the Agency, it is specific and the Agency has no discretion over that designation.

Director Velasquez requested clarification regarding the projected Fiscal Year 2026-2027 SWP cost of approximately $86 million presented on Slide 9, asking whether the amount reflected only the annual Statement of Charges or also included the additional SWP-related capital costs discussed on the previous slide. Ms. Dyer explained that the total includes both the annual Statement of Charges and the capital improvement costs identified in DWR's Five-Year Capital Investment Program, noting that the costs appear together on the Statement of Charges but were presented separately to illustrate their respective components. Director Velasquez stated that while the presentation contained a significant amount of information, he appreciated the Agency’s long-term financial planning approach and its focus on preparing for future obligations rather than waiting until major costs arise.

President Harrison commented that the workshop provided valuable context in advance of the Board's upcoming tax-rate meeting. He emphasized the importance of helping the public understand that the Board's decision extends beyond setting an annual tax rate and instead reflects a long-term commitment to maintaining the reliability of the region's imported water supply and protecting the financial stability of the Agency.

Director Botello stated that the presentation of the logical progression from the recently adopted Reserve Policy to the upcoming ad valorem tax decision provided the Board with a solid framework for its deliberations. He agreed with previous comments regarding the Board's responsibility to make informed, long-term financial decisions and indicated he would continue evaluating the information. He requested that staff provide a historical graph of the Agency’s ad valorem tax rates extending back to earlier years to place the current rate in context. Ms. Dyer responded that staff could provide the historical tax-rate information, and Director Kielhold pointed out that the Agency's highest historical rate of $1.20 per $100 of assessed valuation had been established in 1962 dollars.

Director Longville stated that the workshop provided the most comprehensive information she had received regarding the annual ad valorem tax decision since joining the Board in 2014, making it easier to fully understand the relationship between reserves and the Agency’s long-term obligations. She observed that major statewide infrastructure projects, including the former California WaterFix proposal, Delta Conveyance, and Sites Reservoir, have historically experienced delays and that future project costs are likely to exceed current estimates as additional challenges arise over time. She stated that, in evaluating the proposed ad valorem tax rate, she would focus on ensuring that the Agency’s financial decisions remain consistent with the Board's newly adopted Reserve Policy and its long-term direction, acknowledging the significant progress the Board has made in developing a more comprehensive financial planning framework.

Ms. Dyer summarized the principal considerations that will guide staff's recommendation for the Fiscal Year 2026-2027 ad valorem property tax. She reiterated that the Agency must continue balancing several competing objectives, including maintaining affordable imported water supplies, protecting groundwater resources, complying with the Board's Reserve Policy, preparing for known capital investments, preserving financial capacity to respond to emergencies, and maintaining stable and predictable property taxes whenever feasible. She stated that the recommendation to be presented at the July 21, 2026, Board meeting would reflect those objectives while ensuring the Agency remains well positioned to fulfill its long-term obligations under the SWP.

Agenda Item 4. Future Business. None.

Agenda Item 5. Closed Session. District Counsel Brad Neufeld announced the Closed Session. President Harrison opened the Closed Session at 3:03 p.m.

7.1) CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - ANTICIPATED LITIGATION
Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Government Code section 54956.9
(one potential case)

Chair Longville returned the meeting to Open Session at 3:42 p.m. District Counsel Brad Neufeld stated that no reportable action was taken.

Agenda Item 5. Adjournment. Chair Longville adjourned the meeting at 3:42 p.m.

APPROVAL CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify to approval of the foregoing minutes of the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District

____

Secretary

Date __________________________

Respectfully submitted,

Lynda J. Kerney
Contract Assistant

SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY | A REGIONAL WATER AGENCY SINCE 1954

DATE: September 1, 2026

TO: Board of Directors

SUBJECT: List of Announcements

A. September 3, 2 p.m. – Board of Directors' Special Meeting – Policy/Administration by Teleconference or In-Person

B. September 7 – Agency Closed in Observance of Federal Holiday

C. September 8, 10:00 a.m. – SAWPA PA 22 Committee Meeting by Teleconference or In-Person

D. September 8, 2 p.m. – Board of Directors' Special Meeting – Resources/ Engineering by Teleconference or In-Person

E. September 9, 1:30 p.m. – SBVW Conservation District Board Meeting

F. September 16, 09:30 a.m. – SAWPA Commission Meeting by Teleconference or In-Person

G. September 15, 2 p.m. – Regular Board Meeting by Teleconference or In-Person

H. September 16, 8:30 a.m. – Upper SAR WIFA by Teleconference (Cancelled)

I. September 16 - 18 – San Bernardino Valley State Water Project Tour (Sacramento)

J. September 21, 6 p.m. – ASBCSD dinner (Location: Courtyard Marriott Hesperia 9619 Mariposa Road Hesperia CA 92344)

K. September 22, 10 a.m. – Regular Board Meeting – Santa Ana Watershed Hydro Authority (SAWHA) – Tentative