

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS
Monday August 21, 2023

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Public Works held on August 21, 2023 at 7:30 a.m. in the City Council Chambers located at 405 Jefferson Street, Washington, Missouri. The following were present/absent:

MEMBERS:

Chairman	John Vietmeier	Present
Vice Chairman	Brad Mitchell	Present
Secretary	Mike Radetic	Present
Member	Steve Richardson	Present
Ex-officio Member	Steve Strubberg	Present
Ex-officio Member	Vacant	

OTHERS:

Council Representative	Mike Coulter	Present
Council Representative	Chad Briggs	Absent
Mayor	James Hagedorn	Present
City Administrator	Darren Lamb	Present
Public Works Superintendent	Kevin Quaethem	Present
Water/Wastewater Admin. Asst.	Sarah Skeen	Present
Interim City Engineer	Charles Stankovic	Present
Assistant City Engineer	Andrea Lueken	Absent
Waste Water Foreman	Kerry Duke	Absent
Water Foreman	Dylan Voss	Absent

Originals and/or copies of agenda items of the meeting, including recorded votes are available on record in the office of the Public Works Department for one year. Video/DVD and audio tapes are kept only until the minutes have been approved for the meeting. DVD copies of this meeting are distributed to Board Members if requested.

Minutes

A motion made by Mr. Mitchell and seconded by Mr. Richardson to approve the minutes from the regular meeting held July 25, 2023 meeting. The motion passed without dissent.

Priority Items

None

Wastewater

We have a rate increase discussion, but we are going to defer that until we finish the rest of the meeting.

We have been talking about this for a long time. It is a needed rate increase. Our last rate increase was in 2009. Since then, we have been operating a state-of-the-art treatment plant. Trying to keep all of our infrastructure strong and steady and operating the way it is supposed to. Costs have continued to increase and climb to the point where we can no longer sufficiently operate with the rates we are on. The question is, what rate do we pick and how do we get there. We did some scenarios, or proposals. We have two parts of a rate. We have a fixed base rate, and we have a user rate. The fixed base rate we cannot change without it going to the voters, which is not a problem. I don't have a problem going to the voters and explaining why we need to raise the rates but that is very time consuming. We all know that when we went through to try and get the treatment plant built. We can raise the user rates without going to the vote. That is for operational purposes and everything that we are talking about here is operational. Replacement of pumps, slip lining to stop infiltration which relieves the extra load on the treatment plant. Everything that we are talking about in this increase is all operational. That is what we have to look at that we can go and change at this point in time and try to bring some revenue in.

As we all know, Administration is wanting the Water and Wastewater Departments to be self-funded, meaning that there is no more money from the stormwater fund to do slip lining, nothing comes from the ½ cent sales tax to help offset any costs. We had in the plans to use for slip lining in the future to keep up our aggressive approach on slip lining. We can see a benefit of it, there is so much that needs to be done. We can go back to the way we use to do it and put \$250,000 in the budget and get a little bit done. The little bit helps us with DNR because we have to show that we are making an attempt to remove infiltration every year. We have to report that we did x amount of work on the infrastructure to DNR. We have to do some; we cannot eliminate it. This helps the residents out, it gets roots in the lines, it helps with back ups in the residential properties. It helps with the extra flow at the treatment plant on the slip lining side of it. Manhole lining is the same way. Lining the manholes gets all of our brick ones that has infiltration coming into them taken care of. We have new manholes that has roots growing in and around where they tied to the main into the manhole. You line them and the roots do not get into them. We have a resident right now that has roots coming into their service lateral and into the manhole. Spray lining that would stop that from happening.

At some point in time, we have to expand our treatment plant. Right now, we are running an average of 2.8 million gallons into the plant. When we hit 80% which would be 3.2 million gallons, DNR is going to expect us to have a plan in place to be expanding. I contacted Dave, with Cochran Engineering, who has experience and expertise of working and building treatment plants. I asked him if he could give us an engineered cost of what it would cost to expand the treatment plant. They then contacted Ressler Associates who is the company that has applied all the mechanical equipment for the original treatment plant, and they came up with a number of \$2.2 million to expand the treatment plant.

So if we don't raise our rates to show that we are putting money into reserves to help fund that expansion, it's going to make it harder for us to get bonds. We will still get the bonds to do the

expansion but at that point in time then there is going to be an enormous rate increase to pay for that because we will have to fund it ourselves. We will have to borrow money and then we will have to pay it back, just like we are doing at the treatment plant right now. That is why this rate increase, not only for operational. I've got a belt press at the treatment plant that is almost 40 years old that has to be rebuilt, that's \$220,000. A drying bed that's failing down at the treatment plant, that's \$250,000. Influent pumps that are \$60,000 apiece. There are four of them at the treatment plant that need to be replaced two at a time, that's \$120,000. \$50,000 a year for UV lighting to disinfect as soon as it goes out to the river. That is just a few of the little things that are there. With that being said, that's why this rate increase is so important. It is just how we get there. This increase is just a stop gap type of thing, we are going to have to re-address it. What I did, just so you guys know where some of these numbers came from. I went out to New Haven's website, and I looked at their rates. Their base rate is \$19.57 and their user rate is \$3.59 per thousand gallons. We are at \$12.50 and \$3.02. Nothing against New Haven, I use to work for New Haven, they have a lagoon system, and their users are paying more than what we pay for the state-of-the-art treatment plant. Owensville, a lot smaller community, I am not sure what they have, but their base rate is \$17.00 a month and their user fees are \$5.00 per thousand gallons. We have roughly 6,500 residential users and just under 400 commercial users. Union rates are \$19.10 base rate and user rates are \$2.35. The user rates are low, but their base rate is higher. We can't do anything with our base rate until we take it to the vote of the people. At some point in time, we are going to have to address that probably a couple of years down the road.

Why would we wait a couple of years? We sit here at this meeting, and you are talking about this needs to be fixed and that's worn out and this is worn out. I will not certainly recommend any type of approval unless we have a timeline that when we will take a base rate proposal to be increased, we just can't sit and wait for another 10 or 11 years. There needs to be some sort of, at a minimal, a cost-of-living adjustment. I agree, we are planning on putting a CPI on, that is the kind of stuff that has to be hashed out. How hard do we want to hit ourselves because we are all in this together. We ought to start in October with whatever user rate we go to and then turn around and try to get something on the next ballot for a vote.

Back to Brad's point, if you said that our base rate is going to be such and that's fixed and we go to whichever of these proposals that we approved and then we had a CPI rate included starting next year until you get this on the ballot, at least you don't get to a point where you are losing again. At least you would be keeping up with whatever we are doing right now.

We can add a CPI without a vote.

This is about the third or fourth time, since I have been on the board, that this has come up. I could live with a CPI added to it.

I agree with you guys, it's really a decision on which one do we want to address first, do we do proposal one where we just gain \$21,000 into revenue over expenditures, or do we go with proposal two and we are gaining \$498,000. Or do we do something in between. I know one person on the council, when we had the conversation last month, wanted to know if we could do it in increments like two years. Do half one year and half the next year, to help alleviate some of the cost. Talking with Mary Sprung, she said we could absorb that kind of decision to make it work. We would be dipping into reserves, but we have enough in there to offset that staged increase if we wanted to make it easier for everybody. This is the decision we will have to make.

What is the impact on the user? What will the average households bill go up? Right now the average is \$23.17 and it will go up by \$12.53 to take the average of \$35.70 in proposal one. In proposal two, it would add \$16.11 which would take the average user up to \$39.28.

How many gallons does the average user use? I can tell you by looking at all the reports we've drawn, it ranges from 685 gallons a month to 10,000 gallons a month.

With this user fee, if someone uses 1001 gallons, then they automatically would go to \$13 for user fee, right? If they use over 1000 gallons, it automatically kicks up, right? It's not prorated, ok? Like I said, these numbers can be manipulated. Is \$7.50 too high, do we do \$7.00 on proposal two?

If we increment it, and we need the money now, there is no sense in incrementing it.

I would go with the second proposal and then, like Brad said, as soon as people absorb the idea that their bill is going to go up, then go with the base rate increase.

When we do anything, include in the formula is going to be a CPI increase and that's like we did with water.

You stated earlier that there was money that we were getting earlier, that council is basically saying that is stopping. How much of our budget was that? We were getting an additional \$250,000 from stormwater which bumped our slip lining up to \$500,000 and then we were going to get an additional \$300,000 out of a half-cent sales tax. So we have a half million dollars that is going away. Everything else is just the increased cost of operation that is not going to go back down.

When half a million goes away, where does that get absorbed? Where is that going? Stormwater is going back to stormwater fund to use for whatever stormwater, and I have not heard or been told where the half-cent sales tax money would go.

Obviously, our rates need to come up, we are prioritizing how much we are putting on the backs of the residents to where the half-cent sales tax money can go somewhere else.

The half-cent sales tax was for capital improvements yeah, we have done it over the years but every time we do it we say that the Water and Wastewater has to be self-sufficient and then we say but gee whiz, as long as we can get the money, lets take it. We have got to get out of that mode of operation and be self-sufficient. That's going to be a hard sell to the public.

That is the only way that enterprise funds can get money because we can't have general revenue fund enterprise funds without it being a loan. Anything that we do, other than the capital half-cent sales tax and the stormwater because the storm water was manipulated into; we have excess flow at the treatment plant because we have infiltration, we only have infiltration when we have storms. That's how we got the stormwater fund. We have always got some money out of the half-cent sales tax ever since I have been here.

Do we have any idea the number of users that would be less than 1000 gallons? I can get that to you, it is in our spreadsheet. I just don't have that. I can get that number for you. I'll get you an average use. We can email that out to you this afternoon.

It would be interesting to see a breakdown, under a 1000, over 1500, over 2000 to see what the percentage of household users are.

The other thing is on a typical commercial person out there in the industrial, how much is it going to affect them? Commercial is a big change. Commercial is what gives us the heaviest loads. You have restaurants that send excess grease down to us. You have factories out there that we are already monitoring for whatever they discharge out of their factories, which is an additional cost. So when we look at commercial, I mean I am not saying I don't feel for them, but commercial are the ones that give us the additional sewage that causes the plant to work harder. I know Sal would be here saying that we can't affect the commercial users that much. This is operation of the sewer system. Proposal one, the sewer rates for commercial would go from an average of \$92.74 to \$185 and in proposal two, it would go from \$119 to \$212.

This would go into effect October 1st. Would you put the CPI in it at the same time? You would start this October 1st and the CPI would increase October of next year.

As far as the base rate goes, I think a year or two, when you compare it to other communities, would be an easy sell.

The operations of the sewer system, the cost is not going down and you know so we have got to get to that level where we can pay for the current operations and then continue to pay as we go along. Every supplier that I have talked to has told me the same thing, do not expect costs to go down.

When we built the treatment plant, what was the financial impact on the users. Did we have a rate increase? We are talking about the whole system, what was that 12, 14 years ago, and this is what it cost. We are approaching maximum usage of that plant as well as everything else that is going on and these are the things that you have got to consider.

Do we know a number of, based on normal usage, when we would get to the point that we have to expand the plant? We can get fairly close; we know what certain areas are going to grow. Right now, we have 300 units on High Street, 125 units on 5th Street. We've got Vic Hoerstkamp building all his units down there by Rabbit Trail. We should be able to get an average user amount of sewage from somewhere. I know we can on water.

We can use similar data; we can look at how much water you pump per day or how much water you sell to your customers. There should be data that is available to you. Divide that by the number of customers and real quick you can get what the average customer uses per day. Then look at the platted lot or planned development that you have, and you can look over the next five years we are going to have this many new customers and what that generates in new flows.

I guess what I am getting at, is let's say that was five years, we are going to have to do the plan and we could project in five years the expansion we need would cost, let's say \$4 million. How much of that \$4 million would we want to have in order to do the expansion and then I would think

that you need to gear your rates to get to that number. To look at these rates, this one gets us to break even and this one generates half a million dollars extra. Project where we need to get to, that probably fall somewhere in between these numbers, but you know at least that gives us a target of something to shoot for, not just randomly coming up with numbers and not knowing if we are going to have enough to pay for that something big in the future.

We have the numbers for what we need to do in the future, we have the treatment plant expansion number, and we know we have the operational costs. What I do know is that we do nothing, we see where we are going to be. If we do proposal one, we get to ground zero, where we need to be to operate next year. Then next year, we reconvene and start working on the base rate proposal which would then fall into the we've got the treatment plant to build. We have a questionnaire out of a user that wants to give up 30,000 a day in sewage. If that takes place, that is a big chunk coming to us. We need to make a decision to get us to ground zero. Proposal one, the lowest we can go, where we can operate 24's budget in the black, which is a requirement as enterprise funds, we have to have our rates to keep us in the black. We are not supposed to work in the red and then draw out of reserves.

If we need money from the enterprise funds to stay afloat from general revenue, is considered borrowed and we have to return it? We wouldn't be borrowing money, but we would be using money out of our Wastewater reserves that we currently have today to fund ourselves to keep running in the black because we didn't raise our rates to get to where we needed. So, either way, we need more money.

I would rip the Band-Aid off and I would at least go in between one and two. I mean, it is a big increase no matter which way you look at it, I don't know that I would want to say "lets go all the way to two" but you know whatever you increase now, if you go above one we will make that next increase maybe a little less. It is already a big rip of the band aid now. With the thought process that the council certainly look at getting that base rate up because if our base rate was anywhere near the \$19 that's over a half million dollars a year just in base rate income. I am not saying go to \$19 but I say we need to look at taking that base rate up and then certainly anything we do now, adding that CPI into it.

CPI will be added to it for starting next year, we will raise it this year, like we said and then next year the CPI will take place. It's all of us getting to a number that I guess we are comfortable with moving forward and I agree with Brad, we should probably play in between proposal one and proposal two. If we have to do one to get us in the black for 24's budget. If we continue to do this, now I could cut stuff, I could cut the budget but then we cut services, and we do not want to go down that path either.

We can't cut the budget, there is no fluff in the budget the way it is.

It's all stuff we have been putting off because we did not have the money, like the drying bed. I have been putting the drying bed off for three years.

The council has not discussed this a whole lot yet. The only thing I've heard was just the kind of a little now and a little again, but I don't disagree with what you are saying. Go somewhere between one and two and then try to get the base rate up soon after.

I think, in my mind, all that would be predicated then on where we think we need to be at a certain point of time for that next big expenditure which obviously is expansion of that treatment plant, whether that is a four-year number or a six-year number and it's 3 million, 4 million. If Council says you need to have all that money or you need to have 60% of that money, whatever that number is, our rates need to tell us we will be there at that number at that time.

Let's say we got a difference between \$6.50 and \$7.50, and we went to \$7.00 and then throw the CPI in there as a starting point and then try to get the base rate up. That is at least going to generate you more funds.

We have got to build the information to take it to the voters so that's where we projected at this date, we are going to have to expand a treatment plant. One thing that I haven't brought up that we don't talk much about the collection side but one important piece of equipment we have that we use almost on a daily basis is our vac truck. When I bought that, five years ago, it was \$300,000. If I bought it today it would be \$850,000 for that same truck. That kind of stuff has gone up too, that would also be tied into that operational side of needing the revenue to replace that because that truck, it's paid for itself already with how much we use it. We use it for cleaning sewer lines and cleaning out manholes with the backside but we hydro excavate with it any time we are around gas or anytime we have a situation. It saves dollar amounts in damages and safety problems. That is just one little thing on the collection side that we don't talk about. We have lift stations that we are maintaining all the time, we take in hand wipes, we are pulling pumps everyday to get the hand wipes out of them which wears the pumps out. Our smallest pump costs \$5,000 to replace, our biggest pump, if it was the storm pump at Walnut Street Lift Station, you are looking at over \$100,000 for that. We are not bringing in the funds to operate so I think we are all on the same page. We know we need to raise the rates just where do we get to. I keep on just giving you the doom and gloom, I hate to, but that's my job. I am comfortable taking the \$7.00 increase at my house. I mean we have to, there is no choice. I'm also comfortable with putting information together with everybody working together to take the base rate to the voters to get that raised. The user rate in New Haven is \$3.59 and the base rate is \$19.57. Owensville is the one that has \$17.00 and \$5.00. Union is \$19.10 base rate and \$2.35 for user rate.

What is the biggest difference between next year's projection of being in the hole and this year and last year? One of the major changes that has happened in the last two years that I have tried to absorb is the cost to operate. Two years ago, if I needed to buy one of the pumps at the Walnut Street Lift Station, the small one, that pump would have cost me \$25,000 today to replace. That same pump is \$60,000 and that is just one thing. Everything across the board has gone up. Pipe, rock has gone up, everything we do has immensely jumped in the last two years and we see it when we go out to buy our stuff at the stores. It is just a lot more expensive in the industrial side, than it is the residential side, to see what is going on.

How in the world did we get into this fix that we need to make up the difference of almost two million dollars a year? We never raised the rates for 14 years. That is why I am asking, because that is the kind of thing we need when we not only take it to the council members but rolled out for public education. What have you guys been doing? Sleeping at the wheel?

I wouldn't say we have been sleeping at the wheel, we have been talking about it, it is just getting to that point to get to that decision. We had some years when there was no rate raises, we fought through that. Look how long it took us to get water, it's the same thing. So we are at that point

now where we can't keep operating the wastewater system to keep it at the level that I feel we should be providing to all the residents of the City of Washington, ourselves included if we stay on the same path.

Where would you need to take the base rate to, if let's say that went to the voters? We have got to do some forecasting on that to see where we can comfortably go because I don't just like waiting to get the numbers for the expansion. I could have thrown numbers out there for the treatment plant expansion, but I wanted to wait until we had some good, trusted engineering numbers that could support that. Same thing with the base rate. We have got to do some forecasting to get to that point of saying this is what we know we need to go to get to where we need to be.

If we went to \$7.00, how much would that generate? About two and half thousand dollars. That would at least be a decent stop gap until we got this into a regular base rate, wouldn't it?

I think what it boils down to is how much you want to borrow when you have to go a head and do your expansion. One year is going to get you \$500,000 if you go on the high side, you are going to need \$12.2 million in the expansion. All you are trying to do is cut into it so you don't have to borrow as much.

Is the City still paying off the original treatment plant? We got until '26 to pay that off, so in '26 we will get an extra million dollars back in the coffers. Hopefully we can make it until '26.

When is the earliest to put the base rate on the ballot? I would advise that you wait until April and keep it at municipal elections. I wouldn't want to get it mixed in with all that other stuff. Keep it local. It's a local decision. We did that with the treatment plant too, when we built the treatment plant.

I would make the motion to go to \$7.00 per 1000 gallons and leave the base rate at \$12.50 but make sure that the CPI is the following year just like the water verbiage.

We also need to have some numbers of where we need to take the base rate to be able to have it on the next municipal election. We will start working on that. We will start doing some forecasting on future growth. I will also take in some of the county stuff because as developments develop on the south side of town, they're coming into our plant, so that gets added into it and DNR pushes pretty hard on having less small plants if there is a big plant in the area to go to. There is a couple of subdivisions being developed out on that side. I would utilize Cochran on some assistance on this to help with some of the outskirt stuff if need be. We get some good forecasting numbers together for the base rate proposal side of it.

I seconded Brad's proposal, \$7.00 per 1000 gallons with CPI added on with recommendation to go to the municipal as soon as possible to increase the base rate.

Right now, this is to get us operational to '24 but also to get us to the wastewater department into a self – funded Enterprise fund and the only way to get there is to go down this path.

A motion made by Mr. Mitchell and seconded by Mr. Richardson to approve the sewer usage rate of \$7.00 per 1000 gallons. All in favor aye, those oppose, none.

How are we paying for the new water tank? You have in your water fund, for over two years, and we were successful at getting a million dollars from the County's ARPA funds. We had our own ARPA funds that the city could use, but it's about \$1.4 million unallocated in ARPA funds. I urged the council to go ahead and tuck that money away because basically as I've said before it pays for the inflation that it created itself. Now when we go out for road projects and we go out for bid, the prices are coming in. We recently bid East 3rd street, that's going to be done Spring of '24, we anticipate a little over a million. We made sure that the water fund had enough to absorb that. The total was 2.2 million, 1.8 for the tank. \$600,000 this year and next year from the water fund and \$1 million from the ARPA funds. The goal is that when you are going to the voters for the capital improvement sales tax renewal, we are not going to them for funds to slip line the sewer system. That should be self-funded through your user fees. Same with the water tower. There was some allocated from the capital sales tax to go ahead to pay for a portion of the water tank but we were successful in getting the county funds, so we are grateful for that. If we didn't get that million, we would probably be using our own ARPA funds.

What has the CPI been? I have checked it for our budget purposes, we look at it for wages for employees. It was 3.1, I think, it was 4.2 the month before that and it dropped another point so it's on a downward trend. That's good news. Last year when we were adopting the budget and we had that escalator in there for the water, it was 8%. I think what put you behind is not having that CPI escalator in there all these years. You need to have that in there, you can't just have flat rates and not revisit it.

That would be a number that if we look at going to the voters for something, we show them, hey we tried to help out and didn't raise the rates each year, had done that, this is where we would have been and we wouldn't be trying to fix that because we would be in a much better spot. We were in this spot now when we built that treatment plant because we hadn't raised fees in forever.

DNR got involved in that because we were not prepared for it. We knew we had problems but at the time, the board didn't prepare for it.

Obviously, we've had no increases in the last 14 years. We had an increase when we built the plant but how many years did we go prior to that without an increase? We have ordinance records; I can look that up.

We need to be prepared, if you look at the entire rate, how much will our residents be paying compared to Union or New Haven, on a regular basis. I know that the base rates are different but what it really comes down to what's the real dollar out of their pocket bottom line? We got a spreadsheet that we can put the numbers in and it will tell us, starting from the lowest one all the way to the highest one so you know we can manipulate that anyway we need to to get some information to you. I looked at a couple, I looked at my own, and what I did notice is that a lot of fixed income people are our low user residents and their usage is low, which tells me that they are probably a single person or two elderly people that don't use a lot of water. I can't give you a total amount of numbers. Looking at the spreadsheet and then looking at our software that we use to gather the information, our census software, looking at the usages that they use, you know it is 10 gallons every three hours. You know it's a toilet flush. It is not like you see at my house, with 3 ½ people. We can get those numbers for you. The average low user. It is all off of flow.

Thank you for your recommendation, we will have a workshop with the Council tonight at 6pm. Feel free to come to the meeting and have a discussion. That will be the primary thing we are going to talk about with the Council.

Water

We have a couple of pay requests starting with Caldwell Tanks. They are requesting a payment of \$452,304.50. They are on site; they have the second ring completed. They are about a third of the way done on the tank. It is about 8 rings. It is going to be the same height as the Enduro water tank. If you drive out west, you see the Enduro tank out there that is basically what that one is going to look like. It will be smaller than Clay Street but it will almost be a snapshot of Enduro. It is coming along. A motion made by Mr. Mitchell and seconded by Mr. Radetic to approve the payment to Caldwell Tanks in the amount of \$452,304.50. Just so you know, we will have another request from Caldwell next month and then probably another request in September (October). At some point in time they will have to stop working due to weather. You can't paint the tank in the wintertime so they'll get it all built by November and then it will sit until April and then they will come back out, sandblast it, coat it, and be online by the end of June next year. We already have the water line ran to the site. That has all been taken care of. We just have to wait for the tank to be built. One of their subcontractors will do the painting. It is all encompassed under Caldwell, they have a painting crew, wrecking crew, foundation crew. It will all be through Caldwell.

Moving on to KJU, he's done some more work out there. We have pay request number three for some grading, some cutting, and some other stuff for the crew before they came out to start building the tanks. A motion made by Mr. Richardson and seconded by Mr. Mitchell to approve the payment to KJ Unnerstall in the amount of \$16,237.01.

Other

None

Old Business

The sewer pipe in the creek on the East end is still being designed and it is still hanging on. I have Dave here with Cochran, the engineering firm that is designing that because technically it should be designed and sent to DNR. The design is essentially done, and we are getting pricing from contractors right now. Of the contractors we have worked with, there is one who is going to give us pricing on the job. I hope in the very near future we will be able to present that pricing to the city and we can decide to move forward with the project. Ok, I was just curious because we haven't mentioned it for a while, we knew it was being designed. We have been very lucky it is still holding together. The soils out there are pretty unique for the area, Franklin County in general. Obviously, we got in the situation we are in because of the soil stability on the creek bank. We actually had a driller come out and they drilled down to 50 feet and didn't encounter solid rock. That is pretty deep in the area to go down without hitting rock. The reason we did that is we were trying to develop a pure foundation system to support the bridge that wouldn't wash out again. That did prolong the design process a little bit having that geotechnical work being done but it allowed us to put a better design together that is going to be more of a long-term fix.

Next Scheduled Meeting Date

The next scheduled meeting date is Tuesday September 26, 2023.

Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting adjourned on a motion by Mr. Richardson and seconded by Mr. Mitchell. All in favor aye, those oppose, none. We are adjourned.

Prepared by: Sarah Skeen
Sarah Skeen
Water/Wastewater
Administrative Assistant

Adopted and Approved by the Board of Public Works:

Date: Sept 26, 2023 Signature: MFLY DAS
Secretary