

**Town of Richmond  
Water and Sewer Commission Meeting  
Minutes of May 15, 2023**

**Members Present:** Bard Hill, David Sander, Erin Farr, Jay Furr, Morgan Wolaver

**Members Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Josh Arneson, Town Manager; Duncan Wardwell, Assistant to the Town Manager; Linda Parent, Town Clerk; Connie Bona, Finance Director; Allen Carpenter, Interim Water Resources Superintendent; Steve Cote, Water Resources

**Others Present:** The meeting was recorded for MMCTV, Cara LaBounty, Denise Barnard, Heidi Bormann

**Call to Order:** 5:00 pm

**Welcome:**

Sander: Welcome to the May 15 meeting of the Richmond Water and Sewer Commission on this very beautiful Monday afternoon.

**Public Comment:** None

**Additions or Deletions to the Agenda:** None

**Items for Presentation or Discussion with those present**

**Review of monthly water testing data for April**

Arneson: I'll share on the screen the water testing data for April ([https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Water\\_Sewer\\_Commission/Meetings/2023/05/3a1\\_Guide\\_to\\_Monthly\\_Water\\_Report\\_Data\\_\\_4-14-23\\_.pdf](https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Water_Sewer_Commission/Meetings/2023/05/3a1_Guide_to_Monthly_Water_Report_Data__4-14-23_.pdf)) All the numbers came back in the acceptable range with the exception of April 28, fluoride levels are at 0.3 when they put in a new batch it occasionally dips.

Sander: The day before was 0.7, the day after was 0.8

Cote: We have a mix a new batch. That's the number that is generated from just the water the next day. We're refining our technique a little bit. This last time we did it, we actually ended up with a 1.0 so we're getting better at figuring out how to do it.

Arneson: Everything's looking great. Thank you for your efforts for getting all the levels in the appropriate ranges.

Sander: These figures were derived using the new procedures the State has asked us to use. Yeah. Any questions or comments on the Water Quality Report?

Barnard: Could you explain how the State has requested that you present the data differently?

Cote: They've requested that we sample a little bit different. They would like us to sample post treatment, pre-distribution. There's a sample line that was installed years ago, we've started using that. All of the data is now obtained at the Waterhouse. We still are taking data from the Wastewater plant where it had typically been done. I believe that after a couple of months, the State's not going to request us to do that.

Arneson: That was a good overview. The far-right column, that number I you're still taking that at the water tap at the end of the line which is at the Wastewater station. They wanted us to look at free chlorine in the line. I know you are keeping separate data that you're still collecting for informational purposes of operation, but the State isn't requiring that to be reported.

Hill: Would it be worth modifying the guide document to describe where the sampling occurs for each value.

Arneson: That's a good idea and I had meant to.

Hill: Is it worth adding a sentence to each one to say where that value is derived or taken?

Arneson: We'll take care of that next month.

### **Review of list of water and wastewater items to be repaired or replaced**

Sander: This is a fluid document, which is fortunately being worked through. ([https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Water\\_Sewer\\_Commission/Meetings/2023/05/3b\\_Water\\_and\\_Wastewater\\_Items\\_to\\_be\\_Repaired\\_or\\_Replaced\\_5-4-23.pdf](https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Water_Sewer_Commission/Meetings/2023/05/3b_Water_and_Wastewater_Items_to_be_Repaired_or_Replaced_5-4-23.pdf)).

Arneson: We meet weekly to go over the process.

Cote: Dan Pratt did some of the electrical stuff, we've had another problem arise that we're going to have to have him back. Tom Allen is looking into whatever parts we need for our dialer and stuff. Next week, he will be up here for a day. We'll get a bunch of stuff addressed that we really need done. Phil is putting together a price for upgrading the check valves and pump station. The plant is in decent shape right now. The 20-year upgrade stuff looks like the 24<sup>th</sup>, so I re-did my vacation for the site visit. We need to get that going.

I contacted a couple of companies that deal in septage receiving units. One is in Canada, I'm fairly impressed with them. I'm really impressed with Franklin Miller out of New Jersey. They piece their systems out so we can you know add on as we go. It ends up being a card and a flow meter. Nobody can dump without a card. They get a printout, we can set it up on a computer system. The firm in New Jersey seems to think that they could put one together at a decent clip. He seemed to think that they could put one together as quick as we put in an order.

Dan Pratt thought that the grit motor was working when he left. It's a relay. It is not showing up working then he would have to change the plugin for the relay. He has all the information and I just have to call him back.

Barnard: How many people went to the conference in Lake Morey? Did you make any other contacts than when is listed?

Cote: All three of us went. There were not a lot of vendors in there for wastewater. I was able to reach out through a couple of companies and get names for the septage receiving unit and make those phone calls. If I hadn't heard from Tom Allen and our control specialists this week, I would have reached out to somebody else. I understand this is a narrow point, there's only a few people that do this. Nate gave me the name of another company, but they will be just as bad To now.

Barnard: I know you're also waiting for a piece of equipment. Were there any firms or companies at the conference that might get you the piece of equipment that we've been waiting for?

Cote: We were given a pump that's basically twice the size that we need. It's 25 years old, we installed it. That is just a to tide us over until we get the 20-year upgrade. The pump section is supposed to be done in July. Hopefully, everything works right by the end of early November.

Sander

Any questions or comments on the list? Are we ready to jump into the fiscal year 24 budget conversation?

### **Review of draft FY24 Water and Wastewater Budget and Rates**

Arneson: Maybe we start with what we've included in the packet.

([https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Water\\_Sewer\\_Commission/Meetings/2023/05/3c11\\_FY24\\_WATER\\_\\_\\_WASTEWATER\\_FY24\\_BUDGET\\_ALTERNATIVE\\_DRAFT.xlsx](https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Water_Sewer_Commission/Meetings/2023/05/3c11_FY24_WATER___WASTEWATER_FY24_BUDGET_ALTERNATIVE_DRAFT.xlsx))

([https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Water\\_Sewer\\_Commission/Meetings/2023/05/3c13\\_FY24\\_Water\\_and\\_Wastewater\\_Rates\\_FY24\\_BUDGET\\_ALTERNATIVE\\_DRAFT.xlsx](https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Water_Sewer_Commission/Meetings/2023/05/3c13_FY24_Water_and_Wastewater_Rates_FY24_BUDGET_ALTERNATIVE_DRAFT.xlsx))

The budget has largely remained unchanged since we initially started looking at this in April. We also have the rates as we looked at them last week. We also included an idea Connie had on another way to look at your budget. We included an alternative draft. The changes here remove contributions to Water & Wastewater from Unassigned funds, reduce the contribution to Reserves noting that we're going to need to spend a lot more money, updated the Unassigned numbers at the bottom and added FY23 Reserves to this budget. Even though we're removing the use of Unassigned Funds, we reduce the contribution Reserves so much that the overall amount to be raised by the rate for both Water and Wastewater is less than the original draft.

LaBounty: They went down because you're putting less in Reserves. And you're not using Unassigned to bring it down.

Bormann: Is that across the board?

Arneson: Yeah.

Bona: I was talking with Steve, and we were both in agreement that people are getting hung up on terminology. This alternative method drops it a couple \$1,000 but that's about it. We still have all these new things that we really haven't nailed down prices, or when it's going to happen. My recommendation would be then we look to the Unassigned funds and spend them down to 15%. Then go to the Reserves that we've had built up for this type of reason and spend them down as far as we want. I did talk to our auditor, we do have them set up for three sub-accounts on both the Water and Wastewater side, it was never really a formal process that we made that decision. We did it strictly as a way of monitoring how much are we raising from the users to support these reserves each year. We wanted to be able to keep track of it. Because that was never a real formal vote, the auditor said we can mix and match them and do whatever we want. We can look at it as one big pool of money. Now is the time to use that money.

Arneson: There's projected FY23 Year End balance of \$468,000 in the collection system Capital Fund. We may well need some of that to repair the sewer system. That's specific to the collection system Capital Fund, which is in Wastewater, so all the pipes that are leading into this system. The funds that we have here are the Wastewater Capital Reserve, the Short-Term Capital fund and the Collection System Capital fund. Based on a \$10,000 contribution of each the first two and nothing from the Collection System, the projected year-end balance is \$156,000 for Wastewater Capital and \$158,000 for Short Term Capital in Florida and \$468,000 for Collection System and these are all Wastewater. Water Capital Reserves would have \$115,000, Short Term Capital fund would have \$126,000, Distribution System would have \$21,000 for a total of \$263,742. The rates you're looking at are at about a 0.4% and 2.6% increase (Residential), 4.4% and 2.6% increase (Commercial & Government) and 3.6% and .5% increase (School). As we look at the new idea, you will see that the Water increases go down in some cases, but they're still in the 1-3% range. The Wastewater side is where the percentage difference drops quite a bit from the mid 20% down into the single digits and still at 12% here for the School.

Bormann: I'm just looking at the Commercial aspect of that. What does that calculate as for the Fixed?

Arneson: Commercial Fixed for Water is at \$615.03, and Fixed for Sewer is \$473.11 per year.

LaBounty: You're over a million, can we call that Reserves for right now even though it's not really Reserves? Is there any Unassigned in that?

Arneson: In Water, we would end the year FY23 with \$263,000, that's assigned to these three funds. Looking at Unassigned funds FY23 will be \$191,000 in Water. The Sewer. Unassigned are projected to end this year with \$541,000.

Bona: Water is called Fund 20 and Wastewater is Fund 21. Within each of those are three sub-funds. Those three sub-funds within each one can be commingled but not between Water and Wastewater.

LaBounty: Overall, added together it is almost \$1.75 million. We are going to have a 20-year shopping list, I got that.

Bona: I know the question has come up, what if we spend down those Unassigned funds and we spend down our Reserves. We do have to look at our cash flow. Rather than having to take a loan while we wait for reimbursement from the State, we can prepare ahead of time and take a line of credit. We would only pay on what we absolutely had to use while we were waiting for reimbursement.

Furr: This relates to the rate. Given how much money we've got Unassigned, contributing to it doesn't make a ton of sense. The other question had to do with the percentage of income from Commercial, Residential and School coming from Fixed rate versus how much was coming from the usage. What if we reduced the Fixed cost? If you're looking here for FY24, the Fixed rate is \$550.59.

Hill: The principles of this rate structure start with the idea that each user group pays its proportionate share of the cost. If you use 10% of the system, you pay for 10% of the budget.

Furr: Residential still has to come up with \$264,93 and Commercial has to come up with \$86,342. Right now, the Fixed rate brings in \$34,000 of that while the Metered rate brings in \$51,000. What if we changed the Fixed rate to 20% which would then raise Metered to 80%. Is there any reason we couldn't do that if we're going to still bring in the same money?

Hill: I don't think so. The School is a special case because of the vagaries of their use by season. The Fixed/Metered ratio or percentages match between Residential and Commercial/Government, that whatever it is 20-80%, 30-70%. That might be one approach.

Furr: I have no problem with that. From the standpoint of the small business owner who doesn't make very much, and usage might be small, changing, this would mean they have a lower Fixed rate. The costs will be more borne by the big users.

Arneson: That then changes the Sewer to \$236 per year for Fixed, increases the Metered rate to \$22.41 per 1000 gallons in the Sewer. It drops to \$307 for Fixed in Water and \$14.29 per 1000 gallons Metered.

Hill: What if we did the same thing for Residential, 20-80%. You don't want this sort of death spiral where you encourage low use and come up short.

Bormann: The Schools were actually paying more in 2017 than they are now in 2022. This is why I'm not saying Residential, I'm saying it's School that needs to be adjusted. The issue has been because of COVID, they got such a lower rate that it has continued since COVID.

Hill: The policy was to use the most recent pattern of use across the user groups. We might make an exception for the School. Aren't we looking at the most recent three quarters to get to the share usage?

Arneson: We're looking at April 1 of 2022 through the end of March 2023, so the most recent 12 months.

LaBounty: Since you haven't been metering your septage, that's going to be an increase of a minimum of 20%. First, increase their dollar amount before you start trying to shuffle the other numbers because it might be taking some good money off the top of what you need to bring in.

Hill: It'd be ideal to really get it ASAP to what are they actually dropping off? What do our rates look like relative to other towns? Didn't we just raise the rates modestly, and they were still apparently lined up at our door.

Sander: They didn't even blink.

Furr: We raised them twice.

LaBounty: I'm saying how much money have you projected to bring for increased septage? I'm asking for the total revenue. What's the total revenue that you've projected for the haulers compared to last year?

Bona: At least 80% of that septage number is coming from one hauler. It's a problem with all your eggs in one basket is if they decide to go, that's a big hit.

Hill: I'm going to suggest we increase the septage rates, based on our current use, to cover an additional \$70,000 expense.

LaBounty: I'm asking about the increase in revenue not the rates, there's a big difference. If your quantity is going to be measured at a 20% increase, there's instant revenue right there.

Wolaver: Based on \$460,000, that goes up to \$552,000.

LaBounty: What was the increase that you did in this proposed budget? I strongly recommend increasing to 25% because you're going 24% on your users.

Wolaver: We can't depend on that until we get it installed. I see what you're saying.

Arneson: Our historical budget on septage, in FY22 we put in \$430,00, in FY23 we did \$460,000, and so far in FY24, we've budgeted for \$460,000. The conversation we've had in the past has been let's under budget a little bit in case those numbers fall. Now we're getting new meters so we could change this \$460,000. Looking at actuals, we went from \$238,000 in FY19 to \$426,000 in FY20 to \$494,000 in FY21 to \$484,000 in FY22. We are at \$406,000 so I think we could probably go to \$480,000 or more on septage. I think we'd be safe.

LaBounty: I think you should go to \$500,000 on it. Is it a calculation because you're increasing the rate or putting the meter on? Or is it the calculation of the combination of the two?

Arneson: Combination of the two.

Barnard: I thought that even with the new increase, we are still the absolute lowest in Chittenden County.

Furr: In Chittenden County, yes. We were tied with Montpelier, right?

Sander: They just raised theirs. Heidi has the figures.

Bona: In May we just went up to \$0.080.

Furr: If we raise our rates and if we get accurate metering, we will be swimming in a big pot of money, right?

Sander: Possibly.

Cote: You may lose some haulers.

LaBounty: Or just the ones who weren't being honest.

Arneson: We did go up to \$0.07 on January 2 and \$0.08 in April which started in May. There's probably still some room for increases and better metering.

Barnard: We could always increase again.

Hill: These haulers are not connected to us by pipe, they're connected to us by truck. What's the cost of moving one of those trucks a mile between maintenance operations, the driver, the gas, the wear, and tear? I'm going to guess going another 20 miles or more makes up the difference in overhead costs than the drop off cost.

Barnard: The next cheapest town was South Burlington, you know what the traffic's like in South Burlington, the haulers are not going to want to go there.

LaBounty: To go up 20% would be \$552,000 so go to \$550,000 is a more realistic number.

Arneson: That gets us a 45% drop, the Fixed is going to go way down, the Metered goes down by 5%. The Metered for Commercial goes up because we are shifting the burden. It's a smaller amount with a smaller number of users.

Hill: If you reduce the Fixed cost, you sort of prefer the low users, the classic single older person not using very much, a Commercial user that's got like one office and bathroom that they don't use very much. Who gets charged more are the high users

because it shifts cost to the usage. I'm not saying it's a bad thing. It's just a mathematical observation. High users would pay more, and low users pay less.

Wolaver: How much septage do we need to bring in to dry out our loads?

Cote: Around 15,000 gallons or three trucks a day, five days a week.

Carpenter: You're better off if you do 20 to 25,000 gallons a day.

LaBounty: Savings on your Wastewater is a huge saving. Getting a 20% savings on your Wastewater is a good savings even if you're going up 3% on your Water.

Hill: I think it still calls the question for the smallest users. Do we want to mitigate or reduce the Fixed fee? I'm coming around to maybe there's a logic for consistency across those two groups.

Bormann: It's the Fixed rates, the Commercial shouldn't be five times the Residential.

Hill: On average, Commercial uses more so that's why it ends up being higher, you could put as a 30%-70% and see what it looks like.

Arneson: There are 75 users in Commercial & Government and 421 in Residential.

Farr: I just divided the 70%-30% and it made the Fixed rate for Water \$115 per quarter, and it makes the Fixed rate for Sewer \$67 per quarter. How do the Commercial people in the audience feel about that? It would take the fixed rate down substantially from what it is now for your Sewer, and it would help with the Water.

Wolaver: Commercial is not even twice what Residential is.

Hill: It's not a function of the rates. It's a function of how many users and what's the volume.

Farr: Right now, the Fixed costs for Water is \$150 a quarter and it's \$114 a quarter for the Sewer. It's going to half your Sewer per quarter, and it won't half your Water but it'll bring it down. A conversation for next year is there are other towns that do their budget that have tiers based on usage: 20,000 to 50,000 gallons, you're in a different tier than others. That might be something for us to look at. Not before tomorrow. Once we have a better idea of what we're using in Town and how much everything's costing us, it might be worth looking at some other ways to split up the rates.

Bormann: Once we get the plant situated and the meters going, even Residential and Commercial, I think that's definitely an excellent discussion.

Farr: The Unassigned funds that we're adding, can we add it to just offset the Water rates?

Arneson: We're not adding Unassigned funds in this model. You could add Unassigned funds in just the Water side of the budget.

LaBounty: What if you do a 35% so it's halfway, it's a 5% dip versus a 10%, unless you want to zing the big users.

Bormann: I'm still looking at Richmond Elementary and Camels Hump to increase theirs.

Barnard: We also have kids from Huntington, Bolton, Jericho that are now using those schools.

LaBounty: If the whole system is based on gallons used by group, you have to change up how many gallons each group is using. If you want to quote more for the cost onto the School, you have got to increase the school's rate periodically.

Barnard: We've got a bill from 2017 and we've got a bill from 2023. The rates have gone down. I know enrollment has gone down slightly. But how can the bills be so different if all of ours have skyrocketed.

Hill: Can we look at gallons used by the School? They're using 5% of the total system so you're looking to bill them for 5% of total system, not 10% or 20% even though that can be tempting. That's what drives their cost versus other users.

Arneson: The 2017-2018 School that we're looking at, they used a million gallons, which was 6.5%.

Sander: It's up but they were still at 15% or below.

Arneson: Their usage went from 854,000 with 4.92% from two years ago to 881,000 with 5.13%

Barnard: Their bills have gone down.

Arneson: It's all based on percentage of use. If we're using actual usage in the last 12 months for Residential and Commercial, why would we do a different logic for the School?

Hill: That opens us up to not only complaints and grievances, but legal challenge. They're using less than they once did. If at some point in the future, they go back up again, then they will pay more, and that will offset other people or other user groups.

LaBounty: You need true measurements before you add in tiers like Erin talked about.

Hill: We've tweaked this a little bit. We've updated septage revenues, we've tweaked the percentage for Commercial and Government. Let's see what happens is probably a prudent thing to do for this kind of a system with this number of users.

LaBounty: Not using your Unassigned funds until you get your grocery list complete and your 20-year list prepared is realistic.

Bormann: After it's metered, can we have this discussion in six months and not have to wait until the annual meeting?

Sander: Definitely, we've been adjusting septage rates going on assumptions. It would be awesome if we did get a 20% increase in metered septage receipts. We don't know if the overall cost increase will drive people away. Probably not. The other unknown as we don't know what the cost of cleaning the septic receiving tanks will be. We've got the cost of metering, the cost of cleaning, and the anticipated 20% increase in revenue. There's a lot of unknowns there.

Cote: In the grand scheme of things, we take in as much septage as Montpelier. It is revenue, and we need to get a handle on it.

Bona: I would suggest that we tweak, before going to tomorrow's meeting, the Capital section, we put in a line that has a number but with no budgeted amount, and we call that unbudgeted Capital Improvements. Then you all can decide if we are going to pay for this with Reserves. Or do we want it to go to this unbudgeted Capital Improvement line? That's how the Unassigned funds will tick down.

Farr: A customer shared their water bill with me. They used about 20,000 gallons per quarter. Their current bill was \$789.20. With the new rate structure, it would be \$722.22. I'd be interested to run the calculations with someone like Denise's business, or a high user. It's good to see what it does to someone's physical bill in 2023 versus 2024.

Barnard: It will be great for the meeting tomorrow night to give people examples.

Hill: Everybody has the same Fixed rate, low users would go down, high uses would go up in this scenario.

Arneson: The average Commercial user would have been paying \$1490.17 for Water and Sewer combined last year. Combined, it goes from \$2631 down to \$2436. If everybody was the actual average user of all 75 users spread across and everybody used exactly the same amount of water and sewer.

LaBounty: All the savings in Residential is going to be Metered.

Arneson: And on the Sewer side with the increased amount of septage revenue anticipated for 2004.

Hill: If the School has gone down, then somebody else has to go up. That percentage has to come out, or somebody covers that percent, whether it's Commercial & Government or Residential.

Arneson: If Schools don't use as much water, then they will get a savings. If we don't Meter the water, the water is free. Are we on a budget that we want to look at tomorrow? And the rate structure that we're going to look at tomorrow? It seems to me that we're at a good spot and we can go further with that for tomorrow.

## **Update on Gateway Expansion Project**

Furr: Two things need to be done. We need to do a pressure test. We want to make sure that no really obvious problems exist, so we need to scope it.

Arneson: Vermont Rural Water has a program where we can get it scoped for no charge. Tyler's looking into scheduling that.

Cote: He's got some questions about the size and diameter of the pipe, the length of the pipe. Rural Water can scope about 900 feet max. We'll also have to do it at a time when we can drain the check valves back into the schools' wet well as you can't scope underwater.

Arneson: Once we have that scope, the results of that will lead us to if we can pressure test it or not.

Furr: Did we get in writing or verbally that if the line explodes, and we have to repair it, we have to bear the cost.

Arneson: We outlined ideas to put into that agreement.

Furr: It did occur to us that if we blow up the line, somebody's going to have to pay for it.

Sander: I'd like that ironed out before we proceed.

Farr: Did the Land Trust agree to let them continue?

Furr: The Land Trust board discussed it and that they were amenable to moving forward with allowing us to tie on and extend the line beyond the Reaps. They are not interested in allowing us to jump to the other side of Rt 2, but we don't have that in writing yet. We got enough of a thumbs up that the Reaps would start getting ducks in a row because I believe they'd like to build this construction season.

Hill: They already have an easement for the benefit of the Reaps.

Farr: All this stuff should probably be in writing before we do that pressure test and who's responsible for if the line blows up. If it continued on to the Mobile, would people be forced to hook on to that? Or would that be an option?

Furr: Technically, they would be forced to hook on it. But in the past, we have been willing to cut people some slack and not require them to do it instantly.

## **Discussion of "10% in Vermont" program**

Furr: The Vermont Treasurer sent out a mailing that essentially says he has permission to loan out up to 10% total of what's in the Vermont cash account. That would be another place where we potentially could get money. The initial deadline for applying for one of these 10 % percent in Vermont things is June 1<sup>st</sup>, that's not to say these are the only

opportunities. We won't be meeting again before then. The overview of the program shows the priority is for housing, environmental, and social equity. The proposals must contain a narrative outlining the proposed investment, a description of how the proposal meets priorities, a brief summary of the organization and a business plan list of criteria. If we want to go in the first round of loans, we will need some direction tonight.

Barnard: Why don't we just do that pump that we need? I know it's a lot of work by June 1st.

Arneson: I don't know how much information they need on each individual project. We don't have hard numbers on these unfortunately. We don't have quotes in hand.

Furr: I know we're all busy people, but we could sit down and knock this out. It's a hell of a deal. I think you can easily make a case that keeping the Town of Richmond Water and Sewer treatment functioning for the help of our users is not a casual thing. We are going to have to repair it eventually because it's not free money. We might find out that we're one of 5 towns or we're one of 50 towns. It takes a couple of hours to put this together.

LaBounty: We've done a lot of Water and Sewer grants through the years.

Arneson: I don't have a spare moment.

Furr: I could put together a draft to serve as a skeleton. I might have to do it this weekend.

Farr: It would be worth contacting whoever it is that the proposal is due to because they are generally very helpful.

Furr: I am going to write a draft.

## **Approval of Minutes, Warrants and Purchase Orders**

### **Minutes:**

*Wolaver moved to approve the Minutes of 5/1/23 as presented. Furr seconded.  
Roll Call Vote follows discussion.*

Farr: There were a couple of times that I said something last time to clarify with Denise about the 20-year study and those didn't make the minutes. I assume they edit things that they don't think pertain to the conversation.

Sander: Are you comfortable approving the draft as submitted?

Farr: This time, yes.

Wardwell: Keep me posted whenever you see something. I'm trying to keep it so it's either with the agenda or if it hasn't been said before. Sometimes when people repeat things, I'll try to cut it down so it's less than 20 pages.

Farr: It is helpful to know everything if you haven't been following the meetings.

Barnard: I really liked Erin's comments about the tiered metered usage.

*Roll Call Vote: Farr, Furr, Sander, Wolaver in favor. Hill abstains. Motion approved.*

**Warrants:**

*Furr moved to approve the warrants of 5/1/23 as presented. Wolaver seconded.*

*Roll Call Vote: Farr, Furr, Hill, Sander, Wolaver in favor. Motion approved.*

**Purchase Orders:** None

**Discuss Items for Next Agenda**

\*Annual Meeting on May 16<sup>th</sup>, 6 pm

**Adjournment**

*Furr moved to adjourn. Wolaver seconded.*

*Roll Call Vote: Farr, Furr, Hill, Sander, Wolaver in favor. Motion approved.*

Meeting adjourned at: 6:48 pm

**Chat file from Zoom:** None