MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF WASHINGTON, FRANKLIN COUNTY, MISSOURI
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2023

INTRODUCTORY ITEMS:

The Special Meeting of the City of Washington, Missouri, City Council was held on Wednesday, September 27, 2023, at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber. Mayor Doug Hagedorn opened the meeting with roll call and Pledge of Allegiance.

Mayor:		Doug Hagedorn	Present
Council Members:	**Ward I**	Al Behr	Present
		Duane Reed	Present
	Ward II	Mark Hidritch	Present
		Mark Wessels	Present
	Ward III	Chad Briggs	Present
		Jeff Patke	Present
	Ward IV	Mike Coulter	Present
		Joe Holtmeier	Absent

Also Present:	City Attorney	Mark Piontek
	City Administrator	Darren Lamb
	City Clerk	Sherri Klekamp
	Police Chief	Jim Armstrong
	Public Works Superintendent	Kevin Quaethem
	Interim City Engineer	Charles Stankovic
	Finance Director	Mary Sprung

Originals and/or copies of agenda items of the meeting, including recorded votes are available on record in the office of the City Clerk. Each ordinance is read a minimum of twice by title, unless otherwise noted.

Approval and Adjustment of Agenda:

A motion to accept and approve the agenda accordingly made by Councilmember Patke, seconded by Councilmember Coulter, passed without dissent.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

* City of Washington Tax Levy

(Remaining of page intentionally left blank)

Residential	$	142,080.58
Commercial	$	62,202.03
Monthly Total	$	204,282.61
Annual Revenue	$	2,451,391.36

Current Rate

Base Rate $12.50 + $3.02 per 1000 gallons

Average Residential Cost: $ 23.17
Average Commercial Cost: $ 92.84

Expenditures over Revenue: **$ 1,648,608.64**

Residential	$	230,152.83
Commercial	$	133,156.11
Monthly Total	$	363,308.94
Annual Revenue	$	4,359,707.27

Board Proposal

Base Rate $12.50 + $7.00 per 1000 gallons

Average Residential Cost $ 37.51
Percent Increase: 62%
Average Commercial Cost: $ 199.04
Percent Increase: 114%

Revenue over Expenditures: **$ 259,707.27**

Residential	$	227,522.95
Commercial	$	131,016.79
Monthly Total	$	358,539.75
Annual Revenue	$	4,302,476.94

Minimum Rate Increase

Base Rate $12.50 + $6.88 per 1000 gallons

Average Residential Cost: $ 37.15
Percent Increase: 60%
Average Commercial Cost: $ 196.14
Percent Increase: 111%

Revenue over Expenditures: **$ 202,476.94**

THE CITY OF WASHINGTON, MISSOURI

Projected FY 23/24 Expenditures: $4,100,000.00

2023 SEWER RATE PROPOSALS

Lamb: So, what we like to do is go ahead. We've got a little presentation that was given to the Board of Public Works yesterday at their regular meeting yesterday morning. So, Kevin's going to walk through that will also will stop, take any questions that anybody has. But think it's pretty much self-explanatory of what why we're here and what we're proposing tonight. So go ahead, Kevin.

Quaethem: All right, well, Evening, Council. Thank you for being here tonight, everybody else. As we know, we're here for sewer rate increase. We've gotten to that point where we need to raise rates to maintain our operations at the levels we are right now. We are going to start struggling. We're going to actually be in the negative this year and moving forward. So, we need to raise rates.

So put a little thing here together, give you guys some more information. Now, I had it all set up and it's probably not going to work. Of course not.

Lamb: Is it on?

Quaethem: It was on. I ran through it. I guess I got started too soon.

Lamb: Froze up.

Quaethem: Yes.

Lamb: Hopefully it goes.

Quaethem: There it goes. Okay. So, this is our, make sure I'm in the right spot here.

Lamb: You want to go back.

Quaethem: Yeah, I'm going to go back to…

Lamb: There you go.

Quaethem: There we go, there we go.

Lamb: One more. There you go.

Quaethem: Okay, so here's our current what we're currently charging our current rates and our current operations. You can see our current annual revenue, and this is our projected expenditures for 2024's year at 4.1. So, that's going to put us in a deficit of 1.6, a little over $1.6 million.

To add to that, give you a little bit of information about this year. This year we're ending up at in a negative $1.2 million. Now, of course, it's all kind of fancy mumbo jumbo we can do to kind of make that move. But numbers for numbers, we're in the deficit right now of $1.2 million. So, that's why next year's projected of 1.6. We have a lot more expenditures going out. We have we're going to be taking on all of the sliplining cost and the just the general cost of operations alone.

So, now with that, that's going to raise our deficits. And that brings us to being self-sufficient, self-funded, which what we're enterprise funds, we should be at that. So, we're at a point where we now have to raise rates. We have no choice.

So, we have different options here. You guys have a sheet in front of you. So, the Board of Public Works recommended to raise the rates to $7.00 1,000 gallons and not mess with the base rate. So, we're just raising the rate to $7.00. So, to get that offset, that would give us $259,000 in expenditures.

Lamb: Revenue over expenditures.

Quaethem: Over expenditures, revenue over expenditures. So, staff got together and we thought, okay, what can we do? Can we get down to as low as we can go and still have expenditures over that, it would help operations stay in the black.

So, this is what we came up with. We could do a $6.88 per thousand gallons, which would drop the fee a little bit. If you see at the $7.00, the rate for the average customer would be 3758 and going with the 688, it would be 3715. So, there's not a big difference by dropping the rate that much.

Lamb: If I can interject, Kevin. So, the reason why the Board had seven at that time, we were not looking at increasing connection fees, that would keep connection fees as they were. So, we talked about this and actually after having a conversation with our Counselor, Mr. Piontek, I did, you know, his question was, well, if you are concerned about not only operations, I can understand wanting to go ahead and raise the fees to cover operations and as Kevin said, keep it as an enterprise fund. But if you also want to go ahead and have a reserve so that when you need to go ahead and expand the plant, you've got some money and you're not in a situation like the City was in 2009 where we had to go ahead and get a bond to approve and go into debt for 20 years because we had nothing in reserve at that time. As a matter of fact, DNR made us raise our rates at that moment...

Quaethem: DNR got involved at that point.

Lamb: Because of that. So, the idea was how much what do you want to do when you have to go ahead and make the expansion? And Kevin, to give you those numbers in a slide a little bit later. But the reason why we've looked at this other approach was that we would raise the connection fees and Kevin's got a slide to go ahead and show that. So, as Mark asks the question to me, well, if you're concerned about expansion of the plant and you want to have a reserve for that, why wouldn't you look at the connection fees? Because that's putting it on the backs of new residents that move into your community that are causing the situation for you to expand the plant to begin with. So, that's why we took a look at also at the connection fees as well. And Kevin's going to do that.

Quaethem: Yeah, we'll get to them in just…

Lamb: First time that the Board of Public Works, in fairness to them, that they had it, they were just strictly looking at the user fees and that's the reason why the $7.00 came up. But then only yesterday morning did they see this slide show where we had chose to reduce it or show that we could reduce it a little bit and then also raise the connection fees. But we'll get to that at a future slide. Sorry.

Quaethem: That's alright. But I also want to let you know that the board yesterday chose to still stick with the $7.00 instead of 688 because there's not that much of a difference. And one of the board members commented, and I have to agree with them, is we're just going to continue to kick the can down the road. So, you know, at some point in time we've got to stop doing that. And that could help us if we stayed with the $7.00. So, anyway, so that's part of it too.

So, then so what we did to go on top of what we're trying to do, we're trying to take on the complete costs of the sliplining through the Wastewater Department. We annually was getting a $500,000 benefit from the Half Cent Sales Tax was going to start this year, plus we were getting $250,000 from the Stormwater Fund.

We're going to take that all in-house now, to do that we have to raise rates. So, this is just kind of a picture of showing this is two sections of lines that we slipline showing that this is what we're using the money for, so that people can see that.

So, we also added some other stuff in and we got a really nice video here that I, I think we would be good for people to see and I also put our big truck in there. That big old blue guy there, blue and white guy, and the lift station because we're talking about costs here. So, on the opera on the collection side, that truck right there, five years ago, we paid just a hair under $400,000 for that truck. And it's a workhorse it works for us every day. I mean we use it almost every day, we're using it. If I had to replace that truck today, it would be just a hair under $1,000,000 for that truck right now. So, that there is its cost. We have to be anticipating down the road because we will have to replace that truck at some time. You also we've got to be looking down the road for that. That's when we that's what our reserves are for, our building funds for.

Our Walnut Street Lift Station there. The little guy on the left there, that lift station pumps half of the sewage in Washington down to the Treatment Plant. That station right there, if, God forbid, we'd have to replace it. You're looking at about, engineers estimate about $1.2 million to replace that. That's just one station. If we had to do anything with it. The internal operations of that pump of that station, we've got three pumps in there, our storm pump, our biggest pump is about $160,000 to replace out of that would go out. So, the costs have just gone astronomical to operate sewer system now. It's just gone crazy and it's not going to go down.

So anyway, that's what that's what about. And here's the video. So we'll watch the video. This is this is what's happening to our lift stations. This is the things we don't talk about that we never bring up. This is one of the operators digging hand wipes, that is ground up hand wipes that jammed up that grinder pump and plugged it up and cause that lid that station to overflow.

So, that's the kind of stuff and it's about five minutes long. I could let you go through the whole thing. I have some other pictures in here to give you some give everybody the idea of what else is out there. So, I'll go ahead and stop this one. But it's just a good video to see. This is what it takes and it takes time, which is money to dig all of that stuff out of there and get it back and get back in operation. And also, what it does is it puts a wear on the pump and that pump now, that was like a year ago, I think we did all of this. And the pump now is probably due to be replaced because of that. And then of course, I have to talk about it because it's what it is. A pump like that right now is about $18,000. Two years ago, it was $5,000 now. That's what we're dealing with.

So anyway, so…

Wessels: You mentioned a little bit ago that sliplining. We've been doing that for a few years now. How many more years of that before we complete it?

Quaethem: Okay. We've been doing sliplining in Washington for over 20 years. We've been doing little bits, 125,000 here, 150,000 here. When John came on board, thank to John, he got very aggressive with it. He found out ways that we could borrow money from the Stormwater and other things. And we actually in the last two years, we put last year was over $500,000 in sliplining. This year we just did a hair under 500,000. And we're if we stay this aggressive, we think we can maybe get done somewhere in five to seven years to get, and the goal is to have the whole town done. So, we don't have backups, we don't have hand wipes catching on broken pieces of pipe and building. And I've got a picture of a backup that you guys see that's strictly hand wipes. So, that's we can't stop being that aggressive. You know, we need to stay that aggressive. We don't want to go backwards. We need to keep moving forward. So that's the importance of slip lining.

Also, we have to report to the Department of Natural Resources what we're doing to eliminate I&I and backups and that is what we used to show that we're doing, you know, 6,000 feet, 10,000 feet, whatever we can do. You know, when I when we reported at the end of the year.

So, that bucket that's on the side there, that one right there were only going point to there. But that's hand wipes that came out of the lift station in that pump before they got to that point. That's our nightmare is hand wipes, hand wipes are flushable. They are not biodegradable, and they do not grind up. They make a mess. So, anyway which is an operational cost.

So, this manhole right here on the left, my left your I guess left too, that all that you see in that and that right there, that is a slug of hand wipes. That is all hand wipes in that line. That manhole right there, I do believe is two blocks from here. So, that's what happens when and we don't know about them. We can't be their manhole. We wait for a backup that caused the backup. We had to show up and that's what caused the backup. So, that that's the stuff we deal with.

The life station on the other side, maintenance that we're actually added a tube to our vac truck to clean that out. That's buildup around the bottom of that, that the station we go and clean fairly regularly to keep it flowing and operating the way it needs to be. That's the stuff that these guys that showed up tonight have to go out and deal with on a daily basis. It's a daily basis. We deal with this stuff. So, that's something that's some of the reasons why we need to raise rates.

I just threw a few other numbers in here, just some of our repair costs that we've done previously. What we've got projected coming up from just a few things. We've got another influent pump replacement. That's the Treatment Plant, that's replacing or just rebuilding, not even replacing. That is just rebuilding two pumps, our influent pumps at the Treatment Plant, we have a total of four. It's $101,000 just to rebuild two of them to keep them operational. And again, next year, I've got the other two to do. And it's just going to be a constant rotation because of the wear and tear and the nature of the what they're moving.

So, and we've got a drying bed down there I have to replace that's failing. If I don't do some of that drying bed and that's on our on sludge processing side, if we don't do some of that drying bed, what a drying bed is, as you put the sludge out there and as a dry, the water runs out of it has to go back to the Treatment Plant. It's failing and it's good chance that it won't pass a DNR Inspection then becomes a whole another ball game we're dealing with. So, we've got to get that done.

There's an easement machine there. What the easement machine is, is that that's a machine that will hook to the front of that vac truck there with that hose, the blue hose that right there, where those guys are standing, and then it drags that hose a 1,000 feet and then we can clean lines that are in backyards or down through the creeks that I like on 100 and all that. Then we can clean another 600 feet with that. Right now, we can't get to the ones we've got because that's the only thing we have. So, that's what the easement machines for. It's very vital to cleaning and cleaning sewer lines and keeping the system running.

And SCADA upgrade, that's a yearly thing. We're always upgrading SCADA Systems. SCADA Systems is one of our most important things. We monitor system both Water and Wastewater. We can control it. We can turn pumps on. That's a vital part of the operation of the system too so…

Lamb: Before you move off the slide, Kevin. So, one of the notes that you see up there at the top for the Council that doesn't realize, so, in the Treatment Plant that that exists today, it that bond will be paid off in 2029 and you currently make a little over $1,000,000 payment annually to go ahead and make that to pay that off. So, it is important to go ahead and keep a note that,

that that will be paid off in 2029. We've projected kind of what we anticipate, what 2029 will look like. And even at the development rate that we've been going at for the last five years, you're anywhere between 2 ½ to 3%. You're at 2.2 million gallons a day, approximately…

Quaethem: 2.4, but yeah…*inaudible*

Lamb: Well, 2.2 is what we've discussed with them. But even at 2.2, 2029 you're at 2.62 million gallons a day. So, you're not going to be quite at the 75% of the 80% that that where DNR is going to make you, you know, start to look at how you're going to go ahead and add on to that. And we'll have that cost for what that's going to be here in the slide where. But it's just important that, it's not going to be we don't think you're going to be at 75 or 80% in 2029, but you're going to be at 2.62. But then for the next five years, if you keep up with the 3% growth, we don't know what that may be. But if you are at 3% growth, then you've got at least four or five years where you can go ahead, utilize that payment and keep putting that in reserve to help you pay for the expansion of the Treatment Plant. So, that's important to note. That's the reason why that I wanted you to take note of what that payment is that you make every year. So, go ahead.

Quaethem: All right. So, I guess where at that, let's see, did I go too far?

Lamb: No, you went, go back there. You're there.

Quaethem: Yes, I'm there. Okay. So, that is the discussion on the rate increase for the operational side. I mean, that's something that sitting here today, we're already working in the negative. We don't do something because it's just because it's going to keep multiplying. So, we have to raise rates. It's just deciding what we do. Is it the 6.88 or is it 7.0?

Now, like Darren said, Mark brought it up to Darren about connection fees. Great concept. We haven't visited connection fees, I think for about the same length of time that we haven't done the sewer rate increase.

Lamb: A little bit less.

Quaethem: A little bit less, but still it's pretty close. But anyway, we also need to raise our connection fees. Like Darren said, our connection fees will have helped offset that expansion down the road.

So, we kind of threw a little bit here from things that we had had already had in place. So, The Shoe Factory, the units over here on Second Street. If we would have charged any of these other rates that the Water District 1, 3 *inaudible* filing fees, that's what we would have gained on that, had we had a rate at that point. What we got from that connection for The Shoe Factory was $3,600. That's the maximum connection fee we charged for any development. Anything is maxed out at $3,000…*inaudible*

Lamb: If I could. So, your rate is based upon you have a base rate of $900. And then what they do is they look at a acreage at 900 per acre, and they prorate that based upon the acreage of the lot that you're connecting it to. That's what we've been doing for, I think it was way prior to 2014. That was the last time we looked at the rate is July 7, 2014. That's why that dates on there. But you have it, you have a maximum, as Kevin said, 3600. If you looked at these other, I asked Kevin and his staff to go ahead and look at what are the other fees that you get associated with. You can see Water District Number One is the district just to the south of us. Water District Number Three is just to the east of us. So, all around us that those fees are almost double what we charge. We liked O'Fallon. We looked at that because the fact that it's got a simpler formula that's based on bedrooms rather than acreage, you know, and so but and we've got a proposal of how we do it. But it is important. And then on the right-hand column, you see that's the difference in the fees which have for just a single-family home. And so, that's what you're looking at with the difference of what we could do. And in 20 or 2023, we received 81,000 and connection fees. Go ahead.

Quaethem: Okay. So, this is what we're proposing. This is O'Fallon structure, which is a very simple structure to follow it. It uses the meter size and then it does calculations off of when you go to multi-units, it does calculations off of the units, and then some calculations. As you can see on there, I'm not going to kind of walk them. You can read what they are. But this just to me, and I think to staff is a very, very comfortable rate structure to use. What we did do though, was you can see it there. We took O'Fallon's and we reduced their rate by 20%. What they charged, we reduced it by 20%. Just it was just a number we picked. Just because we're not O'Fallon, we're Washington. We're not as you know, we don't have the same conditions that they have over there, but yet we still have to do something to, you know, gain our revenue. So, you know, I like to look at as you know, we can look around, but we're still Washington. We have to do what Washington needed to do, not what everybody else is doing.

So, this is what we're kind of proposing is to go from using our old rate and how we do it to going just across the board. Most of your homes that are being built now are either 3/4" meters or 1" meters. So, there would be a $2,000 connection fee on that for a residential home. As you see your bigger meters go up, most of them you run into that becomes on the business side and the commercial side. When you start going up to an 1 ½ and 2 and larger, I think our biggest meter here in Washington is a 6". That's a big heavy user industrial, you know, company. So, but that's how our structure would go.

The multi-units, we would use the calculations that you see on the side like the apartment complexes. That is the same calculation as O'Fallon's just with our reduced 20% rate is what it is. So…

Lamb: Theres starts at 2,500.

Quaethem: Yes, theirs starts at 25 and then moves up from there. So, and then you can see the potential…

Lamb: Yes. The bottom number that you have down there is 190,000. That's what you could have had in connection fees last year if you would have had this rate in place. Yes.

Quaethem: Yes. So, here is kind of a in a nutshell. Right now, we're at 2.4. I know earlier I said 2.2, but after looking at everything, we're sitting at 2.4 right now. And it's been in the last three months, we've been at 2.4. So, we're kind of running steady at that.

The expansion of the Treatment Plant, what we're talking about, that's why we're looking at rates and happening to fund it. The expansion would be on these two on the main Treatment Plant. Theres two VLR's that would go right here, which would take it from 4,000,000, which is four cells to 6,000,000, which is six cells. And then on the backside of the two clarifiers, in the whole back, probably hit the wrong button, sorry about that guys, in the whole back here on the back side that's where another clarifier would go. Just to do that expansion right now dollars it's $12.2 million if we were to build it today.

Now, of course, you know crystal ball would tell us of what it would cost us in '29 or '30 or whatever. But if we had to build it today, it would be $12.2 million. So, that's what we got to start looking at building reserves up for, is that expansion. We will hit that expansion. It's going to happen. We got it. We just need to be prepared for it. I don't want to go through the same thing that happened in 2009 when, you know, DNR had to step in. I don't think we're I don't think we want to go through that again and we don't need to go through that again.

So anyway, and then the other side is, I say we have two plants down there. We have our Main Plant, the Vertical Loop Reactor Plant, that takes in all sewage and then on the other side of the river was our old Treatment Plant that's converted over to a Sludge Processing Plant. All the sludge that we that generates and two clarifiers was at the bottom is pumped over to the other plant and it goes through its digestive purposes and then everything that's left over is pressed out of a belt press and then hauled out and we land apply that. They were running 1,500 pounds. I don't know the exact number, right around 15,000 pounds a year of sludge that we spread out in farm fields. That's great. I'm glad we've got that ability. But we also have to look at down the road on that. And it's just going to happen as farms get sold and they turn into subdivisions, we lose farms to spread our sludge because we have a 10 mile area that we can spread sludge from. We're starting to get smaller because farms are starting to be sold and being developed. And so, we've got to look at that down the road, too. So, when that happens and we can't spread that sludge anymore, we're going to have to do something else.

So, everybody I've got in this in the budget, in the 10 year budget, a drying system to dry that sludge and make it a Class A, right now it's a Class B. If we made it a Class A, you could bag it. It would become fertilizer that you could use at your house. But that's down, but something we got to always have in mind, that those are the things we've got to worry about too, we're going to start losing areas where we can spread sludge. So, but that's the other side of it.

So, that's kind of our expansion conversation we have. And it's all, it's all rate driven. That's how we have to fund our operations is rate driven.

Hidritch: Kevin, how much room to the to the east, how many more clarifiers can you, could you put in there? Could you put two more deep in there?

Quaethem: You could put two more on that end. The only problem is we don't have anywhere to put the Vertical Loop Reactors, the VLR's. So, that's why it's only it only needs three…

Hidritch: You can't go to the north with that?

Quaethem: No, because that is all floodplain. You can't build in that so you can't. That's the biggest footprint we have right there to build on is right there. So, that'll get us up to 6,000,000 We get up to 6,000,000, that's you're talking and that's going to be a long time because eventually Washington's going to get…

Lamb: And you'd be talking…*inaudible*

Quaethem: Can't you know, yeah. But that's years down the road.

Lamb: Right.

Quaethem: That's years down the road. So that's that. That's the discussion about the Treatment Plant and why we need to…*inaudible*

Lamb: And I apologize Kevin, I was running some numbers…

Quaethem: That's all right.

Lamb: Did you talk about the 3%? So, if we you know, if you're looking at 2029, if we had to and I was just looking at based on 2.4, if that's really the number that we got. You're at 2.86 in 2029 when you pay it off and if you do, like we said earlier, I, we talked with Cochran. They're the ones that gave us the number for the 12,200,000 to go ahead and do the expansion, whatever. But I asked them, what are you filling in for projects five years out, you know what's the inflation rate your using, they were going by 3% per year, etc. So, that's why you get to like

15,000,000 by 2029. I think even if you had your rate of 3% growth that talked about, starting in 2.4 is what Kevin's saying…
Quaethem: *Inaudible*
Lamb: You're at 2.86 by the time you get to year 2029. So, you're going to be starting to think about it then. So, you might not have until, you know, ‘34 before, you know, you start thinking about if you have that rate of that growth rate.
Quaethem: Because we also have to take into consideration the fact that anything developed to the south of us out in the district that can tie into our gravity line that we put in eight years ago, nine years ago, all goes all the way out to Country Club Lane, anything that out there that can go gravity that, must come gravity to Washington. So, any developments that are out there that are going now and in the future that can get gravity, that additional sewer flow that will come to the Treatment Plant that we don't really know even what's going to be happening out there. But we've got to keep that in mind, too, because that will add to the flow, which could shorten that life span that we're talking about. We don't know. But I mean, I'm sure we can I can do some tracking down and get a rough idea of what's being built out there now and come back with something. But we just need to keep that in our in the back of our minds that that is happening out there, too.
Lamb: It is more likely that the higher denser, higher density developments are going to come to you an annex into you because of the fact of just the regulations with the County has or whatever, but as Kevin said…
Quaethem: *Inaudible*
Lamb: We have a couple of them that we serve out in those areas.
Quaethem: And we'll be getting more so, something to think about. So, the next one is, here is just the rate change summary. So, if you look at the operations side of it, the projected annual expenditures over from ‘23 to ‘29 fiscal year ‘24, ‘29, we're estimating it being 26,000,000 growth in revenue, 27,000,000 we'd if we do this, if we do the rate, the rate increase, so we'll have a revenue over expenditures of about 1.3.

The Treatment Plant looking at the projected cost in ‘29 would be 15. It was a numbers growth 1.2. We're still going to be in a deficit of 13,000,000. So, the goal is to show that we're trying to gain revenue for the for the future growth of the plant. We don't have to have it all. It's just you're we're working towards at least funding some of that because you're still going to have to go out for a bond at that point in time. When that does have to happen, that is when we could look at our base rate because we're not messing with our base rate right now because we can do it with the user fees. That's when we would look at our base rate because at that point in time, we'd have to take a bond is you'd have to pay it off.

So, you use that as your rate change because that's a dedicated number that you have to accomplish. You use that rate for that base rate to change that and put the money for that. So, but anywhere that's down the road too, but things to think about and at that point in time I think we're done.

I guess the question is now is what do we want to set the rate at? Do we want 6.8? Now Board of Public Works, Brad Mitchell, very, very, I got to give my Board of Public Works is a great board. They're very, very conscious about what goes on. They manage the Water and Wastewater Departments really well. I'm very proud to be working with them. They, Brad Mitchell, brought up a good point and I have to agree with them.

Right now, today we have one sewer line that's in the creek at Brookfield, it collapsed. It's a crossing, it collapsed. To repair, that's $100,000. So, if we do 6.88 instead of 7, we're going to have $200,000 of over expenditures anticipated. If we have two of those, there's what we just tried to gain over expenditures gone. And those can't be budgeted. I can't budget and know they just happen. Those are the things that that you have that reserve for to look at to do. Right now, we don't have that. So, their point is, he uses the I love his analogy, we got to quit kicking the can down the road.

Patke: Right.

Quaethem: So, you know we got to make a decision. I'm backing the board. The board wants 7, I think we need 7. But really, it's up to everybody. Do we do 6.8? I'm paying that difference to, I'm like everybody else. I've got to pay it too. You know, I don't like it, but it has to be done. So, it's just what we do. It's a decision we've got to make.

Patke: My fear is that $7.00 is still kicking the can down the road.

Quaethem: We're all in that, but there's a point where we got to stop and say…

Patke: I understand.

Quaethem: You know, we can only do…

Patke: *Inaudible*

Quaethem: We can only charge so much at one time now. But we are going to review this. I'm looking at reviewing this every three years.

Patke: Okay.

Quaethem: We're going to do a CPI just like we did water on it. So, we'll have that escalator on it and you know, once it starts, but we need to review it to see what are we doing. Are we actually, you know, coming out of this? Are we still kicking the can down the road? And then at that point, we'll have to make another decision, a very hard one, but we'll have to make it. This is not done lightly. The Board of Public Works has been, we've been discussing this for a long time. It's been in discussion a long time. It was needed to be done a long time ago. It's just now thankfully, we have leaders that are willing to do it. Previously, we didn't have so many that was willing to do it and that's we, and it got us into this position so, that that's where we're at.

Hidritch: So, is there any way and I know you're going to say no so, is there any way that we could, instead of and I know this should have been done six, seven years ago, start out it like at 550 per thousand the next year, go to go to seven, then do a three year, then the next year, do eight?

Quaethem: Well…

Hidritch: People aren't so hit…

Quaethem: I don't want to say no but…

Lamb: You can do…*inaudible*

Quaethem: *Inaudible*…but you've got to remember…*inaudible*

Hidritch: I'm just saying, that'll ease people into it.

Quaethem: We're running a business here and the enterprise funds are a business…*inaudible*

Lamb: If I can Kevin, if I can.

Quaethem: Yes.

Lamb: The you know, the purpose of like I said, of trying to go ahead and make the sanitary self-sufficient is the fact of when you come back to the voters when you go to Capital Improvement Sales Tax in 2026, what we're trying to do away with is trying to set for these enterprise funds that they have to go ahead and be reliant upon that tax to pass so that they know. So, for example, 500,000 I think you said, it was out of that for your sliplining. That should be paid for out of your Sewer Fund. That shouldn't be, you shouldn't be basing your maintenance of your day to day. What are you going to do if that tax wouldn't pass, turn off the water? I mean, you know, I mean, I'm being drastic, but I mean, that's not a way to go ahead and run it. You need to go ahead and have it as a fund that self-supporting itself.

The other on the flip side of this that you do, is you keep that those additional funds that you have put in the pass towards the water tanks, the, you know, the sewer. You've got that much more money towards your emergency operations, primarily your Fire Department for buying them equipment, your parks and those other entities.

So, we're trying to get them off of, get Kevin's Water and his Wastewater self-sufficient to where they're taking care of themselves. I know what you're saying. It's a big hit. I understand that. So, that's how soon we bite that is really up to you guys. We don't have an ordinance in front of you tonight. We wanted you to go ahead, we wanted to have the hearing, get the input, and then, like I said, see how you wanted us to go ahead and move forward.

What we had hoped to do would be is to have an ordinance in front of you at your second meeting in October. And we would probably just so you know too, propose that wouldn't those fees wouldn't start until after January 1st, especially the connection fees because those developments that are out there that have been approved have got time then to go ahead and adjust permits and do accordingly.

But how much you do at one time, which I think we've shown you the need or what you have to do, it's up to you how soon you want to go ahead and achieve that.

Hidritch: It just seemed like years ago, shortly after I got on the Council, we had trash rates that had to increase because we were way behind. So, I said like we do and in my in my trade, we try to do three- or five-year contracts so the contractor can know what's happening next year. If he's bidding the job next year, he knows those rates are going to be. That's the only reason, that seemed like it worked very well at that time. A lot of people were happy with it. They weren't so, Oh My God, like you're hearing all these rates are going to double. I mean, you're hearing it everywhere, you know. But so is everything else.

Quaethem: I agree. My rates are jumping big time.

Hidritch: Right.

Quaethem: So, I mean, you know, but…

Hidritch: That's the only reason why I brought it up. I just threw a number of 550…

Lamb: I understand,.

Hidritch: Maybe next year 675, maybe the next year, $8.00 and then you're actually higher than what you were, but it eases somebody into it because I'm kind of afraid about $7.00 myself, you know. You know, but because I do this stuff every day. I know, I know the cost is tough for me, but I, I'm just trying to ease for people that are on fixed incomes.

Lamb: Your base for and correct me if I'm wrong, Mark, but basically your base rate is, is that if you wanted to increase that, you would have to go to the vote to the voters?

Piontek: That's correct.

Lamb: For approval of that. Your user rate, though, you can go ahead. That's the one that you guys can go ahead and adjust. And so, Mark had a question for me today because people are looking at and saying, well, wait a second, you're going from 302 to 7 or 302 to 688. You're more than doubling it, and I think that was also you gave me that, shot me that tax or whatever. But you have to figure if the base rate's going to be there regardless.

Hidritch: I mean is there anybody's thoughts on that or does everybody want to go…

Patke: I understand your point, Mark, I do. And I think that it's a good idea, but I think that's another version of kick the can down the road. I don't think we're going to, going from $3.00 to $7.00 is a big jump, there's no doubt. But as a household, that means $13.00 a month.

Quaethem: For the average, the average user. So, some use less. I've got a number here on what users we have in categories just to maybe help out a little bit.

So, under our 1,000 gallon users, we've got 470 users that use less than a 1,000 gallons. Usually that is your fixed income people, the ones that so that the number on that. 1,000 to 3,000, we've got 2,386 customers that are in that range. 3,000 to 5,000, we've got 1,778 customers. Over 5,000, we've got 1,451 customers. So that's our range of users.

Now, we have to remember that this rate is charged off of our winter sewer rates. So, from November to April, we set our sewer rate for the year so the user can adjust their sewer charges by adjusting their water consumption because that's how we charge sewer. So, they have the ability to relieve some of that pressure on themselves.

Now, that's not a good thing for the operational side because that's less revenue. However, it is an option for the users, myself included. Anybody to adjust that from November to April. Use less water that sets that sewer rate for the year. So, you know, there is a way for them to adjust some of that cost themselves down by adjusting the consumption that they that they go through at their house. I mean that's it's the only way that it can happen. It is adjustable by the user.

Patke: So, by the numbers you just said, the majority of people use 5,000 gallons or less than a month?

Quaethem: Yes. Well, the majority of people use 1,000 to 3,000, that's 2,386. And then the next one in line is the 3,000 to 5,000. So, that two range of groups use the most water, yes.

Patke: Right.

Quaethem: So, starting from 1,000 to 5,000, yes.

Patke: So, that even at 5,000 gallons a month you're at $35.00 if it's set so, you're staying below that?

Quaethem: Yes. You want to my users, mines 10,000 gallons. I'm a big user, yeah…*inaudible.* So, there we are.

Patke: Many times before, Darren, Mark, we've been through this a couple of times before and it just seems like every time we do this, we're so far behind it never makes any sense. It's like, why didn't we do this five years ago?

Lamb: Right. I think one of the things, though, just if I can, Jeff, is like just like what we did with the water rates. We are proposing a CPI Escalator in this to be every year. What we haven't done in the past, I will tell you, we'll set the rate, but what we didn't do was put anything. Obviously, these guys that are work for us in our Water and Wastewater Departments or whatever, they're not still working at the same wages that they were back in 2009.

Quaethem: No, they're not.

Lamb: And so that's the thing that you haven't kept up with regards to that, or at least had that escalator in there to go ahead and keep up.

Patke: Well, we've done this with trash, we've done this with water, we've done this, you know…

Quaethem: *Inaudible*
Behr: Not just these guys sitting here. You just saw the cost of a pump. I mean…
Lamb: Yeah.
Behr: Everything you buy…
Quaethem: And I had these guys come tonight because I'm very proud of my crew. I got one of the best crews that I can ever, ever ask for. So, I want these guys to be here just so that you could see them. Some of you guys may not have seen most of them. This is most of my crew. Believe it or not. We take care of everything with, what, two more, three more people or something like that? So, that's both Water and Wastewater. So that's over…
Wessels: This isn't really getting into the rates thing. But John made a believer out of me too on the slipling. So, my hopes too were when we complete that, that will also cut down because that's what was happening…
Quaethem: That's…
Lamb: Cut down on infiltration water…*inaudible*
Quaethem: Which…
Wessels: Don't belong there.
Quaethem: Which helps operational. So, which then helps gain revenue at the end of the time for that expansion that we're going to have to because we are going to have to expand. It is going to happen. So, everything that we're doing is a path to improve operations and gain what we need at the end so we're not sitting here again when we build the plant and said, okay, well now we're taking to the base rate from 1250 to $30.00 a month. You know, I mean, that's just a number, but that will have to be adjusted. So, we're trying to get to that point at least alleviate some of that down the road. We have to start looking down the road. We've always been looking right in front of us. We need to look down the road.
Wessels: I would say too, there seems to be mentioned that the your board that they lean towards the seven.
Quaethem: Yes.
Wessels: And I see, and you know to me, the $0.12, the 688 to the 7, I'm afraid we're going to be asking ourselves five years from now when you $0.12 we should done it.
Quaethem: We should of, yeah exactly. So, I like I said I'm behind my board was saying $7.00 and that's what we go with.
Patke: Well, I also think that as hard as it is to say, today's money is cheaper than it will be in three or five years. So, the more you can generate now, the better you are going to be at Treatment Plant update time.
Quaethem: Yes.
Patke: No doubt about that.
Quaethem: Yes.
Patke: Again, to Mark's point, to ease the blow to jump up there wouldn't does make sense. But the sooner you can collect more now at the rates we are today, the better we are. When we got to make it's inevitable it's going happen.
Quaethem: It's going to happen. It's going to happen.
Patke: Today's world inflation is tough. We all, we all feel it. But there's no doubt it's better today than it will be in three or five years from now.

Quaethem: Yes.
Hagedorn: You know, if somebody wants to save money, you know, turn the shower off after you get wet and then turn it back on, it's a little you know, I fixed my toilet. I'm proud of myself.
Quaethem: Because toilets are water monsters. They will eat water like nobody.
Patke: Teenagers and toilets.
Quaethem: Trust me, I know.
Reed: Mayor, you're telling me you stack *inaudible*…
Lamb: We don't have to go there. We don't have to go there.
Wessels: TMI.
Hagedorn: You know, but if guys, if we do $7.000 per 1,000 gallons and somebody wants to save money, they can do that even though it's a pain in the butt. You know, I like keeping the shower warm just like everybody else does. But it gives our citizens the opportunity to knock their water bill down, even if as we're increasing.
Hidritch: Well, if we're looking for something, I and I'll put it on the table, I'll make a recommendation…
Piontek: Hold on, it's a Public Hearing.
Hidritch: Oh, it is, that's right.
Quaethem: Yes, so you got to wait.
Hagedorn: Thank you.
Quaethem: Guys, thank you for coming tonight. I appreciate it.
Behr: Thanks, Kevin.
Reed: Yes, thank you.
Hagedorn: Public comments, is that…
Lamb: Yes, we need to open up the floor.
Hagedorn: Yes, please. Anyone would like to speak on this that's here this evening? Please feel free. Michael, you don't want to come?
Michael Radetic: Kevin said it all. As a board member, I'm fine with the $7.00, and I agree with Mr. Patke. I mean, we're kicking the can down the road, and we just got to bite the bullet now.
Hagedorn: Okay, any more comments, guys? Okay. All right.
Patke: *Inaudible*, but do you want a recommendation?
Lamb: It would be helpful if you would so that way we know what the ordinance needs to be when we bring it to on the 16th.
Hidritch: I make a recommendation six, seven and eight over the next three years.
Unknown: Do we have a motion?
Quaethem: If I could.
Lamb: That's a motion.
Quaethem: If I could say something to that. I'm not saying no to it, but how about if we, staff looks at what it's going to take to get us out of the negative? That's what we, we can't keep working in the negative, that's the problem. If we work in the negative, which we are right now, and we will be next year, we're going to be pulling out of reserves to sustain and we can't operate our business that way. So, we got to remember that when we say we want to adjust things right now, we're working in 1,200,000 is what the end of the numbers are this year. So, that's what we're in a negative right now. So, things have to come out of reserve for that. So, we got to look

at that. I don't, I don't disagree with trying to make it work, but we got to get to where we're not in so that's just I just want to put that out there. We can't keep doing it.

Stankovic: It's like 6 ½.

Quaethem: Do what?

Stankovic: It's like 6 ½.

Quaethem: *Inaudible*…but if we do 650 and then bump it up. If we do 650…*inaudible*…if we do 650 and we take it to revenues over with 21,000, which is what that calculation we did because Charles, thank you for reminding me of that, if we have anything happen, we're right back in the same spot again. So, there's we're not building a cushion for ourselves if we don't go to where we're at right now, the $7.00. $7.00 starts building a cushion for us. Anything else below that's going to put us into if we have one thing happen, I can't tell when a pump at one of those three lift stations is going to go down. I can't tell if that main pump is going to go out and we're in the middle of a storm and it frys itself or lightning strikes the building and something happens, you know, I mean, that's what we got to, that's what I think we got to look at. I mean, I'm all for doing as easy as we can. I really am. I don't like this no more than anybody else does. But we got to face reality. And reality is we're already working in a negative. We can't keep doing that.

Hagedorn: Working in the negative with aging infrastructure.

Quaethem: Yes.

Wessels: You know, if you go to eight in two years, that fixed income person you're talking they're going to get hit a whole lot harder with…*inaudible*

Lamb: Talk into the mic Mark if you don't mind, talk into the mic so they…

Wessels: You would continue that eight then after that, they would get a lot of years of eight, which is going to hit them a lot harder than the seven, obviously.

Hidritch: But maybe that eight will carry us three more years too.

Wessels: It should.

Reed: So, when would we raise…

Patke: The CPI would be your step grade after that too, it wouldn't go immediately to eight, it would step up after seven. It would a bigger burden at the beginning, but it would be a step up after that.

Reed: What would be your prediction on when we would raise the base rate?

Lamb: Well, I think we're talking I just I mean…

Patke: *Inaudible*

Lamb: I would say yeah, I would say when you, I mean, one of the times you could go ahead and take a look at is when you pay off the plant 2029 and then you can go ahead and take a look at it at that point, see where you're at, how soon you're going to need to do the expansion, what's been your growth. You'll be able to know that at least by that time. I mean 3% is, I mean, we've grown quite a bit in the last five years, but we've also approved a lot of multi-family type developments. And so I don't know that we're going to continue at that pace. But like I said, you can see where you're at in 2029, and that would be when I would suggest unless something comes up that changes all of this in the next couple of years, I would say that that would be when you look at your base rate again.

Wessels: And probably a bond.

Lamb: And if you had to do the expansion at that time or you could wait until you approached it, maybe you're sitting at 2,600,000 gallons in 2029 and you're not at the point yet where you really have to talk that expansion. And again, you're going to have $1,000,000 extra dollars a year that you can go ahead and put in reserves because you're not paying on that bond anymore.
Hagedorn: There is a motion on the floor you guys and Mark, correct me if I'm wrong, 6, 7 and 8% for the next three years in that order? Do I hear a second?
Reed: Are you saying percentage or are you saying dollars?
Lamb: He's saying dollars from what I understand.
Reed: Yes.
Wessels: And what happens after the three years, is that the *inaudible*…thing?
Hidritch: Yes, until…
Lamb: Until you revisit it?
Hidritch: Until Kevin comes back and says…
Lamb: We need more money?
Hidritch: We need to go to 10, what have you.
Reed: Well, and what about just going with the vote, the board proposal?
Hagedorn: Well, we've got to address Mark's motion first.
Reed: Yes.
Behr: I'm looking at the average user here. I'm just using what we've got in front of us. And if we do six instead of seven, it's a difference of $3.57 basically in the user's pocket every month. You're going from $23.00 to 37 with the proposal for the average user, again, instead of going from 2317, you'd be going to, I haven't done the math here, but basically you're taking a buck off per month for the average user and you're taking $0.30 off for the guys under a 1,000 gallons. It's, you know, to do that math and figure that out over the next three years, I think it might be simpler for everybody involved and to give a little bit of as we say, it's been out there for a while and we haven't done anything with it. And all we're doing is going in the negative.

In the last three years, it was negative times two or three. I almost feel like we've got to bite the bullet and do it because nothing's getting cheaper, just like we talked about. I don't think there's enough of a relief there, I guess, is what I'm saying. You know, three to six is still double in for the amount that you have to pay per thousand gallons.
Hagedorn: Okay. So, do we have a second? Evidently not. Any other motions?
Patke: I'll make a motion to go with board approval with the CPI added to it.
Hagedorn: Motion by Patke to approve board proposal.
Lamb: Which is $7.00 per 1,000 gallons plus the base rate of 1250.
Briggs: I'll second that.
Behr: And this doesn't…
Wessels: And he's throwing in a CPI?
Lamb: Yes, and the CPI Escalator that we discussed.
Hagedorn: Okay.
Behr: This doesn't include anything to do with connection fees?
Lamb: No, we can address that next.
Behr: Okay.
Lamb: I haven't had a chance to ask Mark, do we need to address that in two separate ordinances?

Piontek: Yes.
Lamb: Okay, so this would just address that.
Hagedorn: Okay.
Briggs: I'll second Jeff's proposal. Mark, I like your idea. My only thing is if we don't do it now, we don't know what the future is going to hold. I mean, inflation's still running 3, 4, 5%. no matter what numbers you use. I just, I worry that we might be in the same boat. When we do 8% in three years. We might have to be have more by then if that makes sense. So, I think if we just bite the bullet now, I think is the best thing to do.
Hagedorn: Okay, other discussion, you guys? We got a motion and a second on the floor. Okay, let's vote.
Klekamp: Do you want a roll call vote or you just want to do...
Piontek: Yes.
Klekamp: You want a roll call, okay. Behr-yes, Briggs-yes, Coulter-yes, Hidritch-nay, Patke-yes, Reed-yes, Wessels-yes. It passed.
Hagedorn: Okay, by your vote, motion passes.
Lamb: So, the next item, I guess, that we need to go ahead so we can prepare the ordinance for the October the 16th would be for the connection fees. Kevin, you want to go back to that slide, if you don't mind. We would like after discussing this, we would like to go with O'Fallon's model and with at 20% less than what they were charging. But and again, this would potentially double your connection fees per year based upon going from your current formula, which is based on acreage to now the meter size basically, plus you got that factor in there for multi-unit buildings with no maximum on it.
Hidritch: So, those numbers are already at a reduction of 20%?
Lamb: Of, based on a reduction of 20% of from O'Fallon's rates.
Hidritch: Right, so that's the 2,000?
Lamb: Correct, that's what we're proposing.
Quaethem: Yes.
Patke: O'Fallon is 2,500?
Lamb: Correct.
Patke: And we're proposing 2,000?
Lamb: Correct.
Wessels: And what is the fee right now for a 1" or smaller?
Patke: 900.
Quaethem: That would be, let me go back to, that would be 1,065 is kind of the average…
Lamb: Well, that's if you're looking at a, that's a ¾" water meter, Mark, and then that plus that's all based upon square footage of how…
Quaethem: Yes, *inaudible*…
Lamb: *Inaudible*… square footage of the lot. I mean…
Quaethem: Yes, square footage of the lot.
Lamb: It's an acre cap calculation and it's prorated, which I don't know why we got into that. Maybe Mark can shed some light on why it was based on acreage. Do you remember or why or?
Piontek: There was, way back when there was some residential development going on and the connection fees at that time did not have a cap. It was so much per unit and there was a development that was coming in with I don't know, 60, 70, 80 residential lots and they were

complaining that their connection fees were going to be extraordinarily high. So, it was just artificially somebody made the decision, we're going to cap it at three acres.
Lamb: So, there you go.
Piontek: There was no other rhyme or reason…*inaudible*
Hidritch: *Inaudible*…that, you would really be shocked. Remember that Jeff?
Patke: The what rate?
Hidritch: The rate before this one.
Patke: Oh, the connection rate, yes.
Hidritch: It was like 300 bucks or something, something silly.
Wessels: So, it's around 1,000?
Lamb: Correct.
Quaethem: Currently, currently…*inaudible*
Lamb: *Inaudible*…for a typical home.
Quaethem: Yes.
Lamb: Yes, so you'd be looking at 2,000 for 1" or ¾"…
Reed: Are we going to do it a different night or are we going to do this now?
Lamb: Well, we'd like a recommendation from you tonight so we can prepare the ordinance and then we can put that in into the packet.
Reed: *Inaudible*
Patke: Is this one a Public Hearing also?
Lamb: It's all…
Patke: Connection fees?
Lamb: It's all part of it.
Patke: Okay. Is that a motion Duane?
Reed: Yes.
Patke: Second.
Hagedorn: Okay. Duane, pardon me but can you explain your motion?
Lamb: *Inaudible*
Reed: *Inaudible*
Hagedorn: Follow staff approval.
Quaethem: Yes.
Hagedorn: Okay.
Lamb: Mark, is there, I mean we didn't, we haven't discussed this with Kevin, but is there a CPI Escalator that we should consider with this or not?
Piontek: You can, but you don't have to, but you can.
Reed: Well, they're at 2,500.
Hagedorn: Okay.
Lamb: It's going to get in some goofy math…
Quaethem: Later on down the road.
Lamb: *Inaudible*…look at Mary over there, her eyes are like…
Quaethem: And who calculates them for me in my office when they do that, they're going to be, what am I doing?
Lamb: I just asked, I just asked, just so in case they I ask before they one of these guys did, that's all. But you can set this and go back and revisit it if you want to at a later date.

Wessels: A CPI or an eighth of an acre unless it's with…
Hidritch: Make sure we revisit this way before we did the last time.
Patke: Well…
Quaethem: We're revisiting everything. Like I said, I'm setting a three-year minimum revisit on everything. Water too. We're going to be doing some water stuff too, yet we're still working on that too.
Patke: So, to this point, when will this be enacted? January 1?
Lamb: Well, that was the other thing. If you, if you wanted to I was going to ask the question and get a consensus from you later, if you wanted us to go ahead and have the ordinance, we can have both of these proposed. But as far as I know, you just got a motion and a second. We haven't voted on this, but if you approve this and you guys vote in favor of this, we would propose both of these fee changes to take place after January 1st. The ordinance would reflect that on October 16th.
Wessels: Does that give you time to get to the people who've already submitted?
Quaethem: Yes.
Lamb: Yes.
Quaethem: That's the goal…*inaudible*
Lamb: That's the goal…
Quaethem: To give them some time.
Lamb: Those guys know, say hey you don't have your you know, your permit in and you get you come in and apply for your connection or whatever. If you don't do it before January 1st, you're going to pay the new fee structure. That gives them 2 ½ months at least at that point.
Quaethem: Yes.
Wessels: So, you sound like you're hesitant about a CPI on…
Lamb: Well, I just threw it up there just in case you guys, I just didn't know. But like I said, it's probably a nightmare. Probably…
Quaethem: I can only imagine.
Coulter: *Inaudible…*CPI.
Lamb: Right. It gets a little…
Patke: *Inaudible*
Lamb: It gets a little…
Quaethem: Yes, and when we are revisiting.
Patke: Are we going to wait 10 years?
Quaethem: No, like I said, I'm looking at a max of three. You can take me to the board. I'm looking at a three year revisit on both. It'll be both Water and Wastewater.
Coulter: We don't need a CPI on a connection fee.
Lamb: There you go.
Hagedorn: All right. So, motion by Reed seconded by Patke to follow staff recommendation.
Lamb: You want to take a roll call vote?
Klekamp: Behr-yes, Briggs-yes, Coulter-yes, Hidritch-aye, Patke-yes, Reed-aye, Wessels-aye.
Hagedorn: By your vote, the motion passes. Okay.
Lamb: If I understand, everybody's fine with the January 1st.
Unknown: Yes.
Unknown: Yes.

Lamb: Okay, we will have the ordinances prepared as such and we will have that one at your second meeting in October.
Hagedorn: Great.

With no further discussion, a motion to accept this item into the minutes made by Councilmember Patke, seconded by Councilmember Hidritch, passed without dissent.

* City Administrator Darren Lamb will not be attending the Monday, October 2, 2023, Council Meeting due to a conference.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, a motion to adjourn made at 6:59 p.m. by Councilmember Patke, seconded by Councilmember Hidritch passed without dissent.

____

Adopted: ______________________________

Attest: ______________________________ ______________________________
City Clerk President of City Council

Passed: ______________________________

Attest: ______________________________ ______________________________
City Clerk Mayor of Washington, Missouri