



Karen Alvord – City of Roseville
Anthony DeMattei – Placer County
Will Dickinson – SPMUD
Bonnie Gore – Placer County
Pauline Roccucci – City of Roseville

MINUTES OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING February 4, 2026

The regular meeting of the South Placer Wastewater Authority Board of Directors was called to order at 10:00 a.m. at 316 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA.

Directors Present:

Karen Alvord
Anthony DeMattei
Will Dickinson
Bonnie Gore
Pauline Roccucci

Staff Present:

Osman Mufti, JPA Counsel
Sean Bigley, Executive Director
Pam Walsh, Board Secretary

Call To Order

Director Roccucci called the South Placer Wastewater Authority Board meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Roll Call

Present: DeMattei, Dickinson, Gore, Roccucci
Absent: None

Director Alvord was not present at roll call, but arrived at the meeting at 10:10 a.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

Director Gore led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Comment

No public comments were received.

Election of Chair and Vice Chair

A vote was taken as follows:

MOTION by Director Gore, seconded by Director Dickinson, to elect Director DeMattei as Chair.

Vote: Ayes: DeMattei, Dickinson, Gore, Roccucci
 Nos: None
 Absent: Alvord

No public comments were received on this item.

MOTION by Director Gore, seconded by Director DeMattei, to elect Director Dickinson as Vice-Chair.

Vote: Ayes: DeMattei, Dickinson, Gore, Roccucci
 Nos: None
 Absent: Alvord

No public comments were received on this item.

Approval of November 13, 2025 SPWA Board Meeting Minutes

A vote was taken as follows:

MOTION by Director Dickinson, seconded by Director DeMattei, to approve the November 13, 2025, minutes. The motion passed.

Vote: Ayes: DeMattei, Dickinson, Gore, Roccucci
 Nos: None
 Absent: Alvord

Consent Calendar

BEGINNING OF RECEIVE AND FILE ITEMS
--

Item A. Information: Investment Review

Item B. Information: Debt Review

Item C: Information: SPWA Annual Financial Statements FY 24-25

Item D: Information: Connection Fee Program Report

Item E: Information: Projects Update and Financial Summary

Item F: Resolution: Modify the Authority's Service Area Boundary

Director Dickinson asked to pull Item B and Item D for discussion.

MOTION by Director Gore, seconded by Director DeMattei, to approve the Consent Calendar items. The Motion passed.

Vote: Ayes: Alvord, DeMattei, Dickinson, Gore, Roccucci
 Nos: None

No public comments were received on this item.

END OF RECEIVE AND FILE ITEMS

Presentations

1. Information: Facilitated Panel Discussion

This was an informational item for partner agencies to discuss the adequacy of the CASA Flows and Loads Study to inform future discussion by the SPWA Board. Panelists included Eric Nielson, General Manager with SPMUD, Robin Mahoney, Environmental Engineering Program Manager with Placer County, and Arashdeep Singh, Principal Engineer, with the City of Roseville.

SPWA Executive Director, Sean Bigley, facilitated the discussion. Panelists introduced themselves and provided their background information, including technical background and professional licensure. Mr. Bigley then proceeded to ask seven questions of the panelists.

When asked to explain what aspects of the CASA study was useful, the consensus was that the report was well-prepared and well thought-out with regard to data concerning single-family and multi-family homes. It was determined that the study covered 12 agencies throughout the state of California. Mr. Mahoney noted that the CASA Study showed MFR was lower than SFR for:

- a. Flows by approximately 14-15% based on Table 4.5 on Page 4-13, and
- b. TSS load by approximately 22-24% based on Table 4.17 on Page 4-35, and
- c. BOD load by approximately 6-7% based on Table 4.15 on Page 4-35.

When asked what was missing from the CASA study, the consensus was there was no age-restricted data. This information was missing completely. It was also noted that, even though the study covered 12 agencies, it did not cover the SPWA service area. It was noted that the data was also collected prior to COVID.

When asked what resources would be needed to conduct a local study on Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs) for age-restricted, single-family, and multi-family homes and what would be the industry best-practice, the consensus was that a targeted local study would need to be completed, one that would include the area that partner agencies within SPWA serve.

When asked what resources would be needed to conduct a local study for EDUs for age-restricted, single-family, and multi-family homes and whether their agency would have the capacity to conduct its own study or if outside professional consultant support would be needed, Mr. Mahoney replied that Placer County could do a small study in-house, but a consultant would be necessary for a large study. Mr. Nielsen stated that SPMUD does not

have the capacity and would need a consultant. Mr. Singh added the City of Roseville has limited staff capacity, that this would take a significant amount of effort, and would also require a consultant.

When asked if the panelists were aware of any other existing local data regarding flow and loading from age-restricted, single-family, and multi-family homes, Mr. Mahoney stated he is not aware of a study, but he is aware of some data that is proxy for flow. The County is looking at preliminary significant differences per unit within the SPWA boundary. Mr. Nielsen stated that he is not aware of existing data, other than one conducted by SPMUD in 2013 on a much smaller scale. He stated the results were similar to CASA, with peak flows similar regarding single- and multi-family homes. Mr. Singh stated that data is limited.

When asked how their agency viewed capacity versus usage, the consensus was that capacity is the maximum amount of wastewater the treatment plant can handle during peak conditions and usage is the actual volume of wastewater processed by the plant. Mr. Mahoney stated that connection fees and operations and maintenance should be in alignment.

When asked what would be the next recommended steps, Mr. Mahoney stated he would like the partnering agencies to meet at staff level to first discuss what data is available, and then make recommendations whether to do additional studies, keeping in mind the alignment of connection fees and operations and maintenance, as well as any Prop 218 ramifications. Mr. Nielsen stated that collecting data will involve a significant amount of time and money, and that the results do not always reveal the outcomes that are expected. He noted that adding variability to EDUs is not an exact science, that many agencies use this similar EDU method, and changing connection fees and operation and maintenance would require a great deal of work. He sees value in the partners assessing EDUs in the same way, directly proportional to use, and recommends small changes over time. Mr. Singh stated any change to EDUs would not be an isolated thing. He wonders if the cost complexity and the implemented time involved would be a valued tradeoff versus the financial impacts.

Director Dickinson questioned what was the basis for the current single EDU rates applied to SFR, MFR, and Age-Restricted, and Mr. Nielsen replied he did not recall when or how the rate was determined, but believes it was established in the late 70s. Mr. Mahoney and Singh were not aware of the basis for the current rates. Mr. Bigley added that staff could conduct historical research with the partnering agencies to see if they could obtain this information and, if so, this information would be communicated to the Board.

Director DeMattei asked if peak flows go up in commercial buildings and Mr. Singh responded the diurnal peak is when most individuals are getting ready for work, and then in the evening hours after individuals return home.

Director Gore stated, if the data showed a group of people were using less flow in the system, as the CASA study indicated in multi-family homes, did it make sense that they should be charged more.

Chair Roccucci remarked that this was not SPWA's determination. She added that EDUs are critical to ensure capacity for future build-out costs. If a partnering agency wished to reduce their EDU fee, they could do that.

Director Alvord asked if the structure that goes into a multi-family home is any different, and the response from Mr. Singh was no, the infrastructure is the same.

Director Dickinson asked if there was anything to support advocating EDUs fees based on square footage. Mr. Singh replied there was no direct data differentiated by square footage. Mr. Nielsen added there was reference to this in the CASA report but there was no definitive data from residential use.

Director Dickinson asked legal counsel, Osman Mufti, what type of data would need to be done at the jurisdiction level for member agencies to adjust EDU fees, and Mr. Mufti responded, in his opinion, a robust study would be needed to support the changes.

Mr. Bigley recommended, as next steps, that the partner agencies meet to consolidate information, discuss remaining topics, and shore up information to determine what future key discussions will need to be made between the agencies and the Board.

The Directors agreed to this recommendation.

Public comment was received by Chad Roberts, with Hefner Law, and Kevin Bell with Placer County.

Reports/Comments – Board Members/Staff

None received.

Adjournment

The SPWA Board meeting was adjourned at 11:45 pm.



Pauline Roccucci
Chair



Pamela Walsh
Secretary to the Board

