

**Los Osos Community Services District  
Minutes of the Special Meeting of April 7, 2020**

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION OR ACTION
<b>1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL</b>	<p>President Cesena called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.</p> <p>Roll Call:            Matthew Fourcroy, Director – Present            Vicki Milledge, Director – Present            Marshall Ochylski, Director – Present            Christine Womack, Vice President – Present            Chuck Cesena, President – Present</p> <p>The following staff was present:            Ron Munds, General Manager            Jeffrey Minnery, District Counsel            Jose Acosta, Utility Systems Manager            Laura Durban, Administrative Services Manager</p>
<b>2. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA</b>	<p>Administrative Services Manager Durban read a comment from Ellen Sturtz made available in the supporting documents for the Special Meeting on the LOCSO website.</p> <p>Julie Tacker gave a recap of the meeting that the County had on Jan 16<sup>th</sup> in regards to increasing the sewer rate; commented on outreach not being adequate and that there have not been any further meetings; on how the mailing outreach occurred; about online commenting with Supervisor Gibson; on lack of participation at the public meeting.</p> <p>President Cesena commented on the letter mailing; on concern regarding public participation.</p>
<b>3. GENERAL ACTION ITEMS A. Discussion of a Draft Letter from the Board of Directors to County of San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors requesting a delay to the Public Hearing regarding the adoption of a five-year rate increase for the Los Osos Wastewater Service Area scheduled for April 21, 2020</b>	<p>General Manager Munds gave a recap of the April 2 Board Meeting and why there is a Special Meeting for this letter to the County Board of Supervisors; commented on communication that he has had with the County in regards to the timing of the rate increase; proposed three alternatives for the letter, one, for the Board to delay the vote, two, recognizing that if the Board approved the rate increase, ask for delay in implementation, three, is a combination of one and two, asking to delay the hearing and delay the implementation if approved.</p> <p>Vice President Womack commented that the rates would not be raised during the COVID-19 Pandemic; that the County is not trying to make a profit, just pay what it costs to purvey the sewer.</p> <p>Public Comment - Administrative Services Manager Durban read comments from Ellen Sturtz, Cynthia LaPier and Vita Miller made available in the supporting documents for the Special Meeting on the LOCSO website.</p> <p>Julie Tacker commented on meeting procedures for participation for the April 21<sup>st</sup> Board of Supervisors meeting, that the Public Hearing will not be open, that there is no real time participation for the public to make comments in real time; supports alternative one adding that the District should ask the County to start the process over again; the Board of Supervisors can open the Public Hearing and continue it to another day; would like an opportunity to shape the formula in how the rate increase will be rolled out.</p> <p>Linde Owen commented that the Board send the letter in support that we need the time to finish the COVID-19 Pandemic; if the Board of Supervisors can delay or postpone the charges they can postpone the hearing; that the community has not received an update on how the Sewer Plant is running; that the County is trying to raise the rates without explaining why the rate change is needed; requested that the Board ask the County to postpone the hearing.</p> <p>Jeff Edwards commented that the Board should oppose the rate increase; the steep increase the County is proposing over 5 years is unacceptable, that the Board should tour the treatment facility; that the Board needs to take a position that supports the community.</p> <p>Director Ochylski commented on using alternative one and adding additional language asking the County to acknowledge implementation dates and if the economy has not yet recovered from the Pandemic at that time, that the Board of Supervisors will consider further delaying the implementation.</p> <p>Director Fourcroy commented on the vote that happened in Shandon and that the rate change would be implemented 30 days after the County releases the emergency declaration from the Pandemic; that the financial issue from the Pandemic will last longer than the health pandemic, and tying the rate increase to 30 days after does not address the fact that people will be still hurting financially; that the letter should influence when the increase takes effect; voiced concern that the Board of Supervisors will use the same language that was used in Shandon, and it not being considerate of those in Los Osos, Shandon, or anywhere else in the County.</p>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
<p><b>3. General Action Items (continued)</b></p>	<p>Director Ochylski commented that the language to add to the letter would be “until the economy has recovered.”</p> <p>President Cesena voiced agreement; commented that when the Pandemic is over that is when recovery can start; on support of starting the process over again when the community can participate and interact; that the plant is working at 50% capacity and the residents have already paid a lot of money; on revisiting the prohibition zone: that many of the items that would come up with a robust 218 process could only happen with full participation.</p> <p>Director Fourcroy commented how the District has no control over this rate increase and that the District is writing a letter to the County Board of Supervisors to consider this.</p> <p>General Manager Munds commented that in the last paragraph there is language asking the Board to reconsider the timing of the public hearing until full participation of the community is possible.</p> <p>Vice President Womack commented on it being okay to pay the workers a living wage; that redoing the rate study will add to the cost.</p> <p>Director Fourcroy commented that this is simply a letter from the District; that there are ways to submit public comment and how to protest on the Recycled Water website; that the District should help Los Osos residents know how to get to the information about the rate change.</p> <p>Director Milledge inquired if the District should be informing the residents on as many platforms as possible.</p> <p>Director Fourcroy commented that the information should be on the District website and that the District should be working with LOCAC and the Chamber of Commerce to help get the two links out for how to participate and how to protest.</p> <p><b>A motion was made by Director Ochylski that the Board adopt Alternative one with an additional paragraph asking the County to delay the Public Hearing until the Emergency Order of the County of San Luis Obispo is over and public meetings are able to occur with significant public participation; and acknowledge if the County proceeds with the implementations dates, November 2020 for the Base Fee and 2020-2021 for Water Consumption, that if the economy has not recovered from the Pandemic, the Board of Supervisors will consider further delaying the implementation of the rate increases. The motion was seconded by Director Milledge and carried with the following vote:</b></p> <p><b>Ayes: Directors Fourcroy, Milledge, Ochylski, Cesena</b>  <b>Nays: Director Womack</b>  <b>Abstain: None</b>  <b>Absent: None</b></p>
<p><b>B. Discussion if District should cast a protest vote for District owned properties in the Los Osos Wastewater Service Area.</b></p>	<p>Public Comment - Administrative Services Manager Durban read a comment from Vita Miller made available in the supporting documents for the Special Meeting on the LOCSD website.</p> <p>Linde Owen urged the District to protest all the District owned properties; commented that there has not been an efficiency analysis, and the residents should get a clear picture of what the County needs the additional money for.</p> <p>Julie Tacker thanked Director Fourcroy for recommending the district reach out through the media, website and newsletter to inform the residents; commented that the County has received 600 protest votes and that the residents need another 2032 to have a majority protest; that the District has two votes that belong to the public and the District should vote in protest; that a protest vote would delay the process until full public participation and community conversations could occur that includes new ideas, new formulas for the rates and charges; the community needs the same process other communities have had with multiple meetings, a question and answer period, bedding of ideas, and the different possibilities should be available to the public.</p> <p>Director Fourcroy commented that he does not support using the District votes as a protest; that having conversations about how to improve the operation and look for cost savings are worthwhile, but cutting funding off and having no ability to pay what is happening is not responsible.</p> <p>Director Milledge voiced agreement with Director Fourcroy comment.</p>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
<b>3. General Action Items (continued)</b>	<p>Director Ochylski commented on being undecided and wanting the District to work with the County rather than against.</p> <p>Director Fourcroy commented that the District needs to provide ample time for the community's voices to be heard, and to delay the financial impacts as long as possible, but does not support sending in a protest vote.</p> <p><b>A motion was made by Director Fourcroy that the Board does not submit a protest vote for the rate increase for the two District properties. The motion was seconded by Vice President Womack and carried with the following vote:</b></p> <p><b>Ayes: Directors Fourcroy, Milledge, Ochylski, Womack, Cesena</b> <b>Nays: None</b> <b>Abstain: None</b> <b>Absent: None</b></p>
<b>4. ADJOURNMENT</b>	The meeting adjourned at 6:28 p.m.