



Scott Alvord – Roseville (*Vice Chair*)
Bonnie Gore – Placer County (*Chair*)
Shanti Landon – Placer County
Pauline Roccucci - Roseville
James T. Williams – SPMUD

MINUTES OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING June 29, 2023

The regular meeting of the South Placer Wastewater Authority Board of Directors was called to order at 9:30 a.m. at the City of Roseville Corporation Yard, 2005 Hilltop Circle, Roseville, CA.

Directors Present:

Scott Alvord
Bonnie Gore
Pauline Roccucci
James Williams
Jim Holmes (Alternate)

Staff Present:

Osman Mufti, JPA Counsel
Richard Plecker, Acting Executive Director
Pam Walsh, Board Secretary

Directors Absent:

Shanti Landon

Roll Call

Present: Alvord, Gore, Holmes, Roccucci, Williams
Absent: Landon

At 10:38 a.m., Director Holmes had another obligation and excused himself from the meeting.

Pledge of Allegiance

Richard Plecker, SPWA Acting Executive Director, led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Introductions

The following were in attendance: Chad Roberts with Hefner Law, Jeff Short with North State Building Industry Association (BIA), Sean MacDiarmid with Lennar Homes, Bill Halldin with Rocklin City Council, Kevin Bell and Jared Deck from Placer County, Jerry Legg with Five Star Bank, Carie Huff, Emilie Costan, and Herb Niederberger from SPMUD, and Bryan Buchanan, Teri Quinlan, Dennis Kauffman, Kyle Horton, Devin Whittington, Scott Pettingell, Jason Marks, Joe Speaker, Archana Wagley, Trent Johnson, George Hanson, Jeremy Snyder, Sean Bigley, and Tracie Mueller with the City of Roseville.

Approval of Minutes, January 26, 2023

A vote was taken as follows:

MOTION by Director Roccucci, seconded by Director Alvord, to approve the January 26, 2023, minutes.

Vote: Ayes: Alvord, Gore, Holmes, Roccucci, Williams
 Nos: None
 Absent: Landon

Old Business Items

None

New Business Items

There was a request from Chair Gore to discuss item 2 on the agenda (Capacity Fee Analysis Update) as the first item at today's meeting.

1. Information: Capacity Fee Analysis Update

Bryan Buchanan, Wastewater Utility Manager for the City of Roseville, stated the Nexus Study is delayed (the Nexus study determines the regional connection fees that fund capacity at the two wastewater treatment plants).

Mr. Buchanan explained there are several efforts underway that are separate, yet interconnected, to one another. The combination of these efforts result in updated Capacity Fees (aka Nexus Study). A Capacity Analysis is being performed at each of the wastewater treatment plants during wet and dry weather, to identify needed improvements, if any, to meet anticipated service area growth over the planning horizon.

The Capacity Analysis looks at each treatment plant separately and then, in turn, at each individual treatment process or system within the plant to ascertain its condition and capacity. The Capacity Analysis identifies current limitations and bottlenecks within the treatment plant that reduce the plant's ability to meet its rated treatment capacity. From these Capacity Analyses, a Facility Plan, a schedule, and cost estimates are developed for each treatment plant to improve overall treatment plant capacity. These Facility Plans, schedules, and cost estimates are then used in the Capacity Fee Analysis to ensure the SPWA and its members are collecting sufficient capacity fees to fund needed capacity improvements into the future.

The Capacity Analysis of Dry Creek has been completed; however, the capacity of Pleasant Grove is forthcoming, as the recent expansion project nears completion.

Included in the Capacity Fee Analysis contract, is a task directing the consultant to evaluate the methodology for calculating residential Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs) for member agencies. The intent of this task is to determine whether the current computation methodology is appropriate and consistent, based on empirical flow/strength data. When the consultant reviewed this item, it was determined more data is needed for a complete and robust analysis. Mr. Buchanan explained that all EDU calculations, not just residential EDUs, need to be looked at for a more complete picture of funding recovery, since all EDUs fund capacity projects for

treatment plant capacity. The SPWA Capital Fund is an accumulation of funds collected through these capacity fees. If the calculation of residential EDUs is changed, it will affect the SPWA Capital Fund as a whole, which must be addressed. Because of the tremendous amount of data that will need to be evaluated, the consultant was not comfortable making a recommendation to the Board at this time. Accordingly, the City will prepare and propose another project scope of work, which will essentially be a deeper dive into this issue.

Mr. Buchanan stated, once the Capacity Fee Analysis is complete, a data-driven recommendation from staff to the SPWA Board will be presented, hopefully at the next SPWA meeting. If the SPWA Board approves the recommendation, then it will be each partner agency's responsibility to adopt the recommendation.

Director Gore asked if there was an indication whether the current capacity fees were in line, or if they would need to be increased, based on preliminary results of the study.

Mr. Buchanan stated, based on the current methodology on how EDUs are calculated, along with the projections from the City, SPMUD, and Placer County, the preliminary feedback is that the current fee is sufficient, given that it is adjusted annually for inflation.

Director Williams stated there was a study done on multi-family housing versus residential use approximately 8-10 years ago which showed overall flows were less; however, flows were more concentrated and the peak was higher compared to the residential use. This affects the collection systems because this money funds the capital improvement projects for the collection system. If the peak is higher, that means the sizing of the collection system has to be greater. He added, if there were a change to the EDU definition and partners are required to oblige, that might change the dynamics for either the County or the district and maybe for a portion of Roseville, and is he concerned how this could be understood clearly in any EDU adjustments.

Director Williams added that he prefers not to wait the full six months for the results of the report. If an interim report were available sooner, he would like to schedule a meeting or workshop prior to the January SPWA meeting to review the report and discuss it.

Director Alvord asked if, once the fees were established, if they would take place effective July 1, 2023. Acting Executive Director, Richard Plecker, responded that the fees would remain in place until they are changed. Director Alvord also asked if Roseville staff was working with technical teams from the partner agencies, and Mr. Buchanan responded that Roseville is receiving EDU projections from the partner agencies.

Mr. Plecker added that initially it was felt the financial aspects of the Capacity Fee Analysis were being examined but, in order to do that, the entirety of the system has to be evaluated. He stated this is not just a financial exercise, but also a technical exercise that involves collecting data and correlating it into something that is repeatable into the future. It is complicated and, by law, the SPWA has to establish a methodology based on actual data and industry standards. Staff is attempting to provide a consistent tool within the region that allows the partner agencies to determine EDU connection fees they can rely on. He stated that staff would produce the data and methodology once concluded, along with the recommendations by the consultant, and will bring it to the Board for review. Mr. Plecker emphasized that it is not a requirement that the member agencies adopt the recommendation - it is only a requirement that the member agencies provide enough funds to the SPWA Capital Fund to cover their share of cost for capacity. At the end of the day, each member agency is responsible for depositing its share of

expansion costs into the SPWA Capital Fund. SPWA is obligated to provide a defensible methodology for collecting Capacity Fees, but how and the manner in which fees are collected are ultimately left to the discretion of the member agency.

Public comments:

Chad Roberts from Hefner Law, on behalf of Lennar Homes, thanked staff for the update on the Nexus Study. He stated Lennar Homes is actively developing age-restricted residential projects in Placer County and, from a technical standpoint, age-restricted housing generates less sewer demand than conventional housing. He stated Lennar Homes is confident that when SPWA completes its analysis, it will support a similar conclusion. Lennar Homes is eager for the study to be completed since capacity fees are included in the building permits that Lennar is paying for. He requested the Board consider offering a credit for the amount overpaid for capacity fees on building permits for development projects while waiting for the study to be completed.

Director Alvord asked Mr. Roberts to clarify how far back he is expecting these credits to be offered, and Mr. Roberts replied from the time the Nexus Study was initiated. Mr. Roberts added, he does not have a specific request and would be happy to communicate this in writing, but that this issue has been an item they have been engaged in for quite some time and it is their position that age-restricted housing should not be charged equally to one dwelling unit, given the technical data.

Director Alvord asked if the credit would go to the residents or would it be profit for Lennar Homes and Mr. Roberts responded they would like the credit to be applied to future building permits.

Director Alvord stated that there is a set amount of money to run the utilities. He believes it is reasonable to adjust connection fees moving forward, but is concerned about the credit request for past fees paid.

Jeff Short from the BIA requested the Board look at EDUs at an even deeper level, such as on a fixture-basis. He requested EDUs be based on the amount of kitchens or bathrooms in a home. This would allow builders to supply homes catered to market demand and to potentially help incentivize bringing in more attainable housing without penalizing people who are still building suburban communities. It also allows for a more accurate calculation of what the builder is being charged for. He stated it does not make sense to charge the same fee for a one-bedroom apartment versus a house with five bathrooms, as one would expect more flow to occur in a larger home.

Bill Halldin from Rocklin City Council encouraged the Board to look into charging fees by fixtures, square footage, and size. He stated, for Rocklin, the impact of fees on a small house or apartment is much bigger than the impact of fees on a large house. He states, if one buys a million dollar home and is paying a \$15,000 fee that is one thing, but if trying to build a \$350,000 home and it is the same \$15,000 fee, it takes the affordability challenge to a much higher level. He asked the Board to please consider this moving forward.

Director Williams commented that housing is not the only user of the utility systems, so this needs to be looked at comprehensively. This has to be looked at in total and his greatest concern is an obligation to control costs. The next issue, however, is how those costs are allocated across the spectrum of users.

Director Rocucci stated it is important to have all of the information in order to make an informed decision. She also stated she would like to be briefed sooner if the report is available.

The Directors agreed that they desired to have time to review and discuss the results and recommendations of the Nexus Study prior to the January 2024 meeting if possible.

Mr. Plecker stated a board meeting could be arranged at any time, or even a workshop or study session if that was the Board's preference. He mentioned it would also be a good opportunity to discuss and clarify the roles of SPWA, as well as the roles of the member agencies.

Chair Gore stated it would be great to have the Nexus study presented sometime in the fall so that the Board had an opportunity for discussion prior to the January 2024 meeting.

2. Resolution: Capital Improvement Project Update and Approval of Capital Improvement Projects Budget for FY23-24

Capital Improvement Project Updates:

Bryan Buchanan, Wastewater Utility Manager, provided the following updates on current projects:

- The first project discussed was the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant UV Addition Project. The design is at 100%. Procurement has been initiated for the purchase of the equipment. The Request for Proposals for a construction contractor will be initiated in approximately two weeks, with expectation that Council will approve the contract in approximately two months. There will be a request for a budget adjustment for additional money for this project.
- The next project was the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion Project. Mr. Buchanan stated this is now substantially complete. The primaries and digesters are operating and a contract to start land-applying biosolids will be initiated soon. The odor issues related to past solids handling have been eliminated.
- The Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Energy Recovery Project, which was done concurrently with the Expansion Project, is scheduled to be completed next month. The digesters are producing RNG (renewable natural gas) and this is currently being used for the refuse fleet. Power is also being produced from the micro-turbines, which was included in this project as well. There are still a few items being worked out, but the project is essentially fully operational.
- The Regional Pump Station 26 and Force Main Capacity Improvement Project was advertised for bids and the results came in approximately \$900,000 higher than the engineer's estimate. There was a decision to split the project into two separate projects: a pump station project and a pipe-bursting project. There will be a contract awarded for the pump station project shortly, at just under \$1 million. The pipe-bursting project will be grouped with other pipe-bursting projects in the future in order to attain better pricing.

- The Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Treatment Plant Capacity Evaluation looked at both plants independently. The Dry Creek analysis is complete. The consultant will start the formal project of looking at the capacity of the Pleasant Grove plant early in 2024. A wet weather evaluation will be conducted in early 2024 and a dry weather evaluation in late summer. Because the Pleasant Grove plant is newer, they do not expect the projected facility plan to be substantially different from what was expected. The project model for the expansion modeled about 12 mgd for dry weather capacity. The permit allows 15 mgd, if the capacity analysis supports that, which would allow years of buffer before the need to initiate another expansion project.
- The 10% conceptual design and cost estimate has been completed for the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Maintenance Building Project. It was quite high, at \$23 million. This project is being placed on hold in order to assess cost saving alternatives and to determine how to best move forward.

New Capital Improvement Projects Requiring Board Approval

Mr. Buchanan provided the following requests for new projects:

- The Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant UV Disinfections System Addition Project is getting ready to go out to bid. Equipment has been procured and is ready for installation. The engineer's estimate has gone up and there is an additional \$1.2 million needed. Mr. Buchanan is asking for a budget adjustment to cover the projected costs.

MOTION by Director Williams, seconded by Director Roccucci, to approve a budget adjustment for the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant UV Disinfection Addition Project (Resolution 2023-04).

Vote: Ayes: Alvord, Gore, Roccucci, Williams
 Nos: None
 Absent: Landon

No public comments were received on this item.

- The next project is the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Electrical Capacity Expansion Project. When the treatment plant was built, it was not built with full electrical infrastructure to support the plant. When the plant expands to a certain point, it triggers the need for other projects, including this electrical expansion. There is currently not sufficient backup generation capacity to support the plant if there is a power outage. The total project is estimated at \$31 million. Currently, this request is asking for \$6 million for the design phase of the Project, including the design consultant fees, staff labor, and associated fees.

MOTION by Director Williams, seconded by Director Alvord, to approve the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Electrical Capacity Expansion Project and Budget (Resolution 2023-05).

Vote: Ayes: Alvord, Gore, Roccucci, Williams
 Nos: None
 Absent: Landon

No public comments were received on this item.

- The need for the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity Expansion Project was identified in the facility plan as part of the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity Capital Analysis. This project includes design and construction of the identified near-term capacity improvements, which are estimated to be required in the next two years due to the plant approaching 80% of the current oxidation system capacity. This request is asking for \$16,725.00.

MOTION by Director Roccucci, seconded by Director Alvord, to approve Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity Expansion Project and Budget (Resolution 2023-06).

Vote: Ayes: Alvord, Gore, Roccucci, Williams
Nos: None
Absent: Landon

No public comments were received on this item.

- Previously, a task item was added to the recent Capacity Fee Analysis to evaluate projected flows between different residential uses such as age-restricted and multi-family developments. The purpose of this task was to determine if a different EDU calculation for these different residential uses was warranted regarding sewer connection fee calculations. Unfortunately, the task, as described in the contract with IB Consultants, did not provide sufficient detail to study the overall sewer discharge characteristics from different residential uses. Mr. Buchanan is requesting a new project, the Equivalent Dwelling Unit Evaluation, to enlist the services of an appropriate consultant to perform this task. This project is asking for \$250,000.

Chair Gore asked, since this item was a line item on the previous contract and was not addressed, can the Authority expect a discount, and Mr. Buchanan said he would assume the Authority would receive credit for that analysis being incomplete.

Chair Gore stated that she feels it is worth looking into all methodologies regarding the EDUs and determine the best practices. She feels the Board needs to understand what all of the options are and what other jurisdictions are doing, in order to make an informed decision.

Director Williams indicated there are jurisdictions with combined water and wastewater utilities that are able to use water as a surrogate, and that is probably the most equitable way to do it; however, SPMUD does not have that opportunity.

Mr. Buchanan stated he would expect to develop a scope working with the member agency managers and the scope could include a workshop and a presentation of options.

Chair Gore indicated that she would prefer to have staff work on the methodologies before presenting this to the Board, since they are familiar with this information. Once that has been completed, she requested this be brought to the Board for review and discussion in the fall.

Director Roccucci said the bottom line is to ensure the treatment plant is sustainable and paid for. Each member of SPWA is its own entity and has the right to choose the methodology for charging their EDU fees, as long as it meets the end product of paying for the treatment plant.

MOTION by Director Alvord, seconded by Director Roccucci, to approve Residential Equivalent Swelling Unit (EDU) Evaluation Project and Budget (Resolution 2023-07).

Vote: Ayes: Alvord, Gore, Roccucci, Williams
Nos: None
Absent: Landon

No Public Comments were received on this item.

3. Information: Regional Connection Fees Report

Archana Wagley, City of Roseville Environmental Utilities Senior Business Analyst, provided an overview of the regional connection fees collected by the City of Roseville, County of Placer, and the South Placer Municipal Utility District and the allocation of these fees for year ended June 30, 2022.

No Public Comments were received on this item.

4. Resolution: Approval of Annual Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2023-2024

Mrs. Wagley also presented the Annual Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2023-2024 and requested Board approval. Mrs. Wagley explained the fiscal year 2023-2024 budget was unofficially modified to reflect the actual State Revolving Fund reimbursements received. The original budget anticipated receiving \$63.4 million in reimbursements; however, only \$45.2 million was received.

Director Gore questioned if the Authority could expect to receive the unpaid reimbursement amount, and Mrs. Wagley confirmed the carryover of \$16.4 million has been budgeted to be received in FY2024.

Director Williams asked if the Board could be kept informed of reallocated budgeted amounts made by the Executive Director in the approved Operating Budget and Mr. Plecker stated the City has a formal process in place and he would be happy to forward the process to the partner agencies to review and ensure it meets the Board's needs.

MOTION by Director Roccucci, seconded by Director Alvord, to approve the Operating Budget for FY 2023-24 (Resolution 2023-08).

Vote: Ayes: Alvord, Gore, Roccucci, Williams
Nos: None
Absent: Landon

No Public Comments were received on this item.

5. Resolution: Approval of Investment Policy for FY2023-2024

Kyle Horton, City of Roseville Accounting Supervisor, reported on the Authority’s Investment Policy for FY2023-24 and asked the Board to adopt the Investment Policy, which would be effective July 1, 2023. Mr. Horton identified two changes in the Policy. One is to incorporate Senate Bill 1489, which states the investment terms are from the settlement date to final maturity instead of trade date to maturity. In addition, the SPWA Treasurer title was replaced with the title of Chief Financial Officer throughout the policy to be more in line with the SPWA Agreement.

MOTION by Director Williams, seconded by Director Roccucci, to adopt the South Placer Wastewater Authority Investment Policy for FY2023-2024 (Resolution 2023-09).

Vote: Ayes: Alvord, Gore, Roccucci, Williams
 Nos: None
 Absent: Landon

No Public Comments were received on this item.

6. Resolution: Delegation of Authority to Invest in Local Banks

Dennis Kauffman, SPWA Chief Financial Officer, presented an item responding to the Board’s request to place a portion of SPWA deposits with local banks, similar to a program the City of Roseville created a few years ago called the Roseville Advantage Financing Program. This is asking the Board to approve a resolution delegating the authority to invest bank deposits (not to exceed a total of \$1.5 million) with three local banks. The banks, in exchange, would commit to lend at least 75% of the money to businesses in Placer County. Mr. Kauffman explained higher investment returns were negotiated with the banks. He added, local government bank deposits are required in California to either be insured or collateralized by the banks under state law to protect local government deposits.

Director Williams requested that the contracts state that the businesses must be within the SPWA boundary region and Mr. Kauffman responded that he did not think his request would be an issue.

Director Alvord questioned if the \$1.5 million was the amount in total or per bank, and Mr. Kauffman responded it was the total amount.

Chair Gore asked for clarification concerning the number of banks – the staff report indicated four banks, but Mr. Kauffman mentioned three banks. Mr. Kauffman clarified that there were four banks initially, but that American River Bank declined.

Director Roccucci asked if there was a cost for SPWA to enter into these contracts and Mr. Kauffman replied that it depends on the interest rate environment.

Public Comment:

Jerry Legg, Government Banking Manager with Five-Star Bank, stated that they are the only bank included in this program that is headquartered in Roseville and provided information about the bank, such as different options aside from the interest rate, the liquidity of the money,

no fees, security when banking with them, and confirmed the money could be directed within SPWA's service area.

MOTION by Director Williams, seconded by Director Alvord, to delegate authority to invest funds in local banks, with the noted change that the money will be directed within SPWA's service area boundaries (Resolution 2023-10).

Vote: Ayes: Alvord, Gore, Roccucci, Williams
 Nos: None
 Absent: Landon

7. Resolution: Approve Execution of Conditional Letter of Intent Regarding Castle City Mobile Home Park

Mr. Buchanan stated that SPMUD is proposing to add Castle City Mobile Home Park to its, and in turn the SPWA's, service area. A letter of intent is required by state regulators that states the SPWA supports annexing this area into the SPWA service area.

Castle City Mobile Home Park contains 200 units. They own and operate their own private collection and system treatment. The system lacks capacity and has historically overflowed in wet years. They would like to consolidate their wastewater system with SPMUD to provide a long-term solution for their wastewater needs. Funding for the consolidation will be provided through a Wastewater Consolidation Grant. The Grant provides for 100% of the cost for planning and up to \$25 million for construction costs.

Mr. Buchanan confirmed that the connection, projected flows, and impacts were assessed and found to be less than significant from a system-wide treatment standpoint.

Chair Gore asked where this mobile home park was located. Carie Huff, with SPMUD, responded that it was on the east side of Hwy 80, south of Indian Hill Road, in Newcastle, CA.

MOTION by Director Williams, seconded by Director Roccucci, to authorize a conditional letter of intent regarding the Castle City Mobile Home Park (Resolution 2023-11).

Vote: Ayes: Alvord, Gore, Roccucci, Williams
 Nos: None
 Absent: Landon

No public comments were received for this item.

8. Information: Discussion Regarding Allocated and Direct Charges to Member Agencies

Richard Plecker, Dennis Kauffman, and Bryan Buchanan clarified allocated and direct charges to member agencies.

Mr. Plecker explained allocated charges:

The City of Roseville Wastewater Fund expenses are split proportionally among the SPWA partners, per the various SPWA agreements. The Wastewater Fund accounts for operating costs and revenues attributable to the utility, including labor, materials, supplies, power, chemicals and the like, in addition to ongoing rehabilitation and repair, not related to capacity. As a City enterprise fund, the Wastewater Fund pays a portion of the City's general overhead,

which would be explained later by Mr. Kauffman. Mr. Plecker stated that he doubted the City would consider a method for direct payment methodology, as the current system is well defined and understood.

Mr. Buchanan explained direct charges:

He stated the flows that come in from the member agencies are metered and each year the percentages of flow for each partner agency is determined. At the beginning of the year, the estimated cost of treatment is divided among the partnering agencies (this consists of *budgeted* costs for operations going forward and *actual* costs for rehabilitation projects in arrears). The partners receive a quarterly billing based on these projections. At year-end, a "True-Up" is conducted, which is the difference between projected costs for the year versus what was actually spent, resulting in either a cost or a credit to SPWA member agencies. Mr. Buchanan added this is described in detail in the SPWA Operations Agreement.

Mr. Kauffman provided an explanation of indirect charges:

Mr. Kauffman explained these include costs that are allocated for support services that are provided to the Wastewater Utility. The City of Roseville hires a third-party consultant, who is used by a number of cities throughout the state, to provide a cost allocation plan that is a detailed analysis of all of the support service costs and how they should be allocated among all of the City's services and funds (clerk office, council, manager, human resources, finance) and also internal service funds (IT, Facilities, and fleet are examples of internal allocated funds).

Director Williams stated the inconsistency in the quarterly billings can cause difficulty with the member agency budget process. It is part of the partner's expenses, which in turn will affect their rate analysis, and he asks if it could be a little more refined. Mr. Buchanan replied that he has spoken with the member agency managers. He provided an explanation of the quarterly billing to them and he feels there is an opportunity to look at how the quarterly billings are projected. He will discuss this with the Finance Department to see what options are available.

There were no public comments on this item.

9. Information: SPWA Organizational Charts

Mr. Plecker provided the City of Roseville's organizational charts and outlined staff who directly support SPWA, as well as staff that supports SPWA on an as-needed basis, in response to a prior request from Director Williams.

Director Williams remarked that the organizational charts are helpful; however, it still feels opaque how individuals are actually working and the direct attribution it gives to staff members. He would like to have a better idea of where the checks and balances are with the positions, the responsibilities of staff, and how they relate to SPWA, given the recent incident regarding fraud.

Chair Gore mentioned that she understands Director Williams' concern, but believes the City has implemented stronger checks and balances because of the fraud incident.

Mr. Plecker stated there are active controls in place. He added, there are additional items that can be done to assist with transparency. In preparation for the City's budget, Environmental Utilities (Wastewater is included in this department) is required to submit a staffing plan and new position allocations. The City can report on new positions to the SPWA Board if they would

like. Mr. Plecker added that visibility and the transparency of staff are key to safeguarding against these types of events in the future.

Director Williams also questioned how long Mr. Plecker would continue in the Acting role of Executive Director. Legal Counsel, Osman Mufti, stated he would bring this item to the next Board meeting to make the appointment official.

No public comment was received for this item.

10. Information: Receive and File Items

The following items were on the agenda as Receive and File items:

- Investment Review
- Rate Stabilization Fund Balances as of April 30, 2023
- SPWA Annual Financial Statements FY 2021-22

There were no questions or comments from the Directors.

No Public Comment was received on these items.

Reports/Comments – Board Members/Staff


None.

Public Comment

None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:36 a.m.



Bonnie Gore
Chair



Pamela Walsh
Secretary to the Board