

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**SANGAMON VALLEY PUBLIC WATER DISTRICT**  
**REGULAR BOARD MEETING**  
**MARCH 28TH, 2022**  
**3:30PM**

Held in person at the Water Treatment Plant

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Bob Buchanan, Monte Cherry, Michelle Grindley, Meghan Hennesy, Mike Larson, Colleen Schultz, Kerry Gifford, & Lindsey Wallen. A Quorum was present.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Michael Melton

**GUESTS PRESENT:** Sen. Chapin Rose

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Hennesy called the meeting to order at 3:29pm.

**2. APPROVE AGENDA:** Chairman Hennesy asked if everyone had a chance to review the agenda. Chairman Hennesy stated that she needs to add an item under New Business, so item B. will be discussion of a petition presented to the board.

**MOTION** by Schultz to approve the agenda, adding item 5. B. (Discussion of Petition) and removal of item 4.A.(Board Member Size Resolution), 2<sup>nd</sup> by Grindley.

All present members voting yes, motion passes.

**AMENDED MOTION** by Larson to add two additional items; Discussion of Remote Policy and Discussion of Request for the Board Packet to be made Available, 2<sup>nd</sup> Hennesy.

All present members voting yes, motion passes.

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT:** Chairman Hennesy noted they have one request for public comment and gave the floor to the requestor.

**Senator Chapin Rose:** Sen. Rose stated that a few weeks ago Gifford asked him a question about the difference between their member initiatives and how this grant is set up for, presumably, the phases up north. Sen. Rose stated he got some information for Gifford, but they have to go back in time. He stated that back in 2019, when Attorney General Raoul took over, this is People's Gas' to pay and they all agree on that, because frankly this shouldn't be on the taxpayers. He stated that he had an early spring briefing with him and bring him completely up to speed on that and ask him to make that part of his agreed order. To kind of hedge his bets, in the 2019 capital bill, which was negotiated in the month of May 2019, they passed the capital bill with a bucket for member initiatives and a separate bucket for water and transportation. The agreement at the governor's office was to fund the entire project, not part of it, out of that 2<sup>nd</sup>

bucket. Separate from the member initiatives, there is also 2 other transportation and 2 bridges on that. He added that, and stated the board would receive copies of all of this, there was an email immediately thereafter, and a meeting with Gifford, Chairman Hennesy, and Bud Parkhill. He showed the board copies of the documents briefing deputy governor Mitchell the Saturday afternoon before the meeting on June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2019. He stated that they'll notice Kirby bridge, raised bridge and Sangamon valley are the three things to be briefed on. Why are they brief Mitchell, because they are asking for that project to be released, and added that they were in that meeting. Moving forward, he thinks deputy governor Mitchel at the time, hoped that Attorney General Raoul would make People's Gas pay for this. In Sept. of 2019 it became clear that that was not going to happen because Attorney General Raoul, on Sept. 19<sup>th</sup>, 2019, filed his first agreed order with People's Gas that didn't do anything related to water lines, so the timing of this is critically important. HE told them to send bottle water for as long as it takes, and to put gas bleeder valves in their homes, and he stated you can read it online. Fast forward to Dec 19 into Jan of 2020, was the first opportunity for them to release their member initiative bucket, they release \$900,000, including \$400,00 for the Mahomet community for a project with the school district. Fast forward to May of 2020 it had become clear that Sangamon Valley and his constituents up north have been become clear that Gov. Pritzker had not funded any of those three agreements. He stated, in fact, raised bridge in Decatur is left stranded, Sangamon Valley is left stranded, and in Kirby, even though it was announced by the Gov. for 5 years down the line, which in his mind was basically walking away from the deal that they made. March of 2020 came in, all hell broke loose, everybody was budgeting conservatively because they assumed the worst with the state finances. He spoke about an article from April 15<sup>th</sup> where the Gov. himself notes that they are down almost \$7 billion, 2 articles in fact. Despite having announced the state revenue budget will be down \$7 billion, Gov. Pritzker negotiated the 2021 budget with the house and senate republicans and democrats, it passed, both houses on May 24<sup>th</sup>, was signed by Gov. Pritzker, he believes, on June 12<sup>th</sup>, well after he announced the \$7 billion shortfall. Within that budget, is \$3.8 million to SVPWD for first phase. He said to notice the original deal the Gov. Pritzker agreed upon was for the whole thing, this is now down to \$3.8 million. He signed that into law on June 12<sup>th</sup>. Three months after he announced a \$7 billion shortfall, two months after he negotiate a budget and 6 weeks after he signed it into law, he informed all four caucuses that he wasn't going to fund the capital bill projects. What he said is, if you want to do anything, you need to take it out of your member initiatives. Oops, by then there wasn't even enough money to do this phase 1, and that would assume he'd walked away from the other 10 counties worth of people he represents. That assumes he would walk away from the Clinton-Warner hospital emergency room equipment they needed to save people's lives, that's to assume he would walk away from Cisco's tornado, that assumes he would walk away from Weldon's flooding when the whole damn town flooded. He said that even if it wanted to do that, by that point in time there wasn't enough money to do it. He stated that this is the second time that the man has reneged. He said, now, let's keep going. He showed multiple conversations with Deputy Gov. Christian Mitchell over time, a call directly with the Gov. on Feb. 10<sup>th</sup> of 2021 where he

asked for this to be released. He stated that a follow up call after this with the Deputy Gov. where he told him to take it out of his member initiatives, and again by then, there was even more gone. He said, never mind the fact that they have had multiple conversations with the State EPA, State DNR, and the Attorney General's office and at every single one of them he has brought up this grant, or the previous grant for the whole amount. Most recently he's talked to the Lieutenant Gov. about it, he's talk to her deputy chief of staff and they said they couldn't do anything and when he and Gifford talked about it three weeks ago, he sent the letter that SVPWD has a copy of. He stated that Gifford told him all he had to do is submit a letter, so he submitted another letter, other than the received acknowledgment, they haven't heard anything. Two weeks ago, he ran into Christian Mitchell and brought it up again, sent it to him again, received, and that was two weeks ago. He said on top of that, there has been plenty of other things around this, like last year, when he passed the bill for SVPWD after their much-ballyhooed lobbyists completely screwed it up and it landed in his lap on the last month of session, he pulled it out and they got it passed, and that was a necessary predicate for this project, stating they couldn't do it without that, without that bill passing. They also, last year, passed the first ever Mahomet aquifer water counsel. So, the moral of this story is that next time they have a question, don't let it fester, don't be mad about it, just call him. He stated, are they perfectly clear on that. He then stated that he was going to be late to Springfield, passed out copies of the documents to all board members and left the meeting at 3:40pm.

#### **4. OLD BUSINESS:**

**A. Investment Policy Approval (ACTION ITEM)** – Chairman Hennesy asked if anyone had any questions with respect to the Investment Policy.

**MOTION** by Hennesy and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Cherry to approve the investment policy as presented.  
No discussion was held.

**All present members voting yes, motion carries.**

**B. Capital Assets Policy Approval (ACTION ITEM)** - Chairman Hennesy asked if anyone had any questions with respect to the Capital Assets Policy.

**MOTION** by Hennesy and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Larson to approve the capital assets policy as presented.

**Discussion:** Larson confirmed with Gifford that the auditors are good with both of these policies. Gifford confirmed that they were. Cherry asked about the water lines depreciation schedule being listed at 80 years. Gifford noted that they are using SDR thick walled for sewer and they are using the DR 1800 for water and they are outstanding, exceptional pipes and yes, he believes the life is 80 years. He said he could provide something from AWWA if needed. Larson asked if the accountants represent anybody else that would know, and stated there is kind of a two-fold to depreciation. Gifford agreed, it depends on how you are looking at it, and he is just looking at it from the quality of the material they use and how long they expect the water lines to last. The accountants wanted to go with 40 years and he believes for what they are putting in the ground, that is way to short. Larson stated that its okay to depreciate it over 40 years and continue to use it for another 40. Gifford stated that they values are depreciated faster. Larson said that if it turns out they need to depreciate faster, they can make changes then. Chairman Hennesy stated that is seems like she is hearing the

board is okay with approving this as is, but keeping it in their forebrains and if they need to make adjustments later on, they will do so. The board agreed.

**All present members voting yes, motion carries.**

**C. Revenue Bond Ordinance Approval** – An Ordinance authorizing and providing for the issue of not to exceed \$1,490,000 Revenue Bonds of the District for the purposes of (i) paying the costs of improvements in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$1,000,000 and (ii) refunding certain outstanding obligations of the District in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$490,000, prescribing the details of said bonds and providing for collection, segregation, and application of the waterworks system revenues, and authorizing the sale of said bonds to the purchaser thereof (ACTION ITEM) – Gifford reviewed the highlights of the Revenue Bond packet. He stated that on the first page, after the preamble, he stated that it basically says, if they do not do the bond, they will be draining all of their cash because they have big projects going on, they have a half a million dollars of sludge to remove from the sewer plant alone, so that is why that is in there. He stated, the next page shows a refund for \$490,000, that is the two bonds we have to finish up, and he was going to see if they could keep the terms the same and get a lower rate on the coupons. He said, most likely, probably not, but he has it in there just in case. He said if they can save some money, they are going to save some money. He stated this is why the total bond is for \$1,490,000. The \$490,000 is current bonds, and the \$1,000,000 was for this year's budget and is for sewer projects. Gifford noted that in this bond, it also calls out a 1.25 spread in the reserve account, and if they get any future EPA loans, they have to keep one years' worth of payment in a reserve account. He said in the future, not looking at anything else but cash reserves, we would have about \$300,000 for an EPA Loan and about \$150,000 for a bond, which is not a whole lot of money to be restricted. He stated those are the main things to point out and at the end of the day, what they are authorizing here is for him and the Chairman, sometime between now and December 1<sup>st</sup>, to look at this and if they get a good rate to make that call and accept the offering of the sale of the bond and at that point, he said they could send some emails out letting the board know what rate they got. He stated that he doesn't really think they are going to be able to refund two bonds since the rate just went up, but he thought he'd throw it in there because you never know. Larson said that this bond is kind of like phase B of the wastewater plant improvements. Gifford said yes, they have to get the sludge out of the plant, they are paying for design, and a little bit of this will help pay for the Mahomet R & S lift station. Larson asked if this does a little bit with the aeration too. Gifford stated that he thinks they are going to be strapped once they get done with the sludge removal. Cherry noted that where he works, they are holding their breath on it because they have about 90,000 cubic yards to get rid of. Gifford said a couple guys he's talked to gave him about \$0.14 a gallon. Chairman Hennesy stated that it is not going to be inexpensive. Cherry noted they were given \$12 per cubic yard, but that was 3 years ago, and now they are looking closer to \$28. Chairman Hennesy said if they get a good deal, they should move on that.

**MOTION** by Hennesy and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Grindley to approve An Ordinance authorizing and providing for the issue of not to exceed \$1,490,000 Revenue Bonds of the District for the purposes of (i) paying the costs of improvements in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$1,000,000 and (ii) refunding certain

outstanding obligations of the District in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$490,000, prescribing the details of said bonds and providing for collection, segregation, and application of the waterworks system revenues, and authorizing the sale of said bonds to the purchaser thereof.

Discussion: No additional discussion was held.

Roll call vote as follows:

**Roll Call Vote:**

Hennesy: Yes	Melton: Absent	Schultz: Yes	Grindley: Yes
Buchanan: Yes	Larson: Yes	Cherry: Yes	

**All present members voting yes, motion carries.**

**D. Champaign County IGA – ARPA Funds Approval (ACTION ITEM) –**

**MOTION** by Hennesy and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Cherry to approve the Champaign County IGA-ARPA Funds as presented.

Discussion: Gifford noted that he thinks they should run through the Finance Committee for internal rules and reporting. Wallen stated that they ask for internal procedures that you use to validate that their past due balance is covid related. Gifford stated that we need to think through how we’re going to do that. Chairman Hennesy confirmed that Wallen and Gifford would schedule a finance committee meeting.

**All present members voting yes, motion carries.**

**E. Briarcliff Sewer Lining Project – Pay Request #3 - \$4,432.18 (ACTION ITEM) –**

**MOTION** by Hennesy and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Schultz to approve pay request #3 in the amount of \$4,432.18.

Discussion: Cherry stated that it seemed like there was a significant slowdown in work, and that is probably why this pay estimate is so low. Cherry asked if they were keeping up pace. Gifford said all we have left to do now is inject a chemical that hardens the gap between the liner and seals all the laterals up so you don’t get rain water through. He stated there are 52 laterals to do that do and they are going to be there April 4<sup>th</sup> to finish that up. At that point, other than getting all the yards cleaned up out there, they will be done.

**All present members voting yes, motion carries.**

**F. COVID Updates** – Gifford noted that wastewater analysis in Illinois is showing a trend way up in the amount of virus being detected. He said the University of Illinois – Chicago is monitoring that program, and the Urbana-Champaign Sanitary District is involved in that. Gifford noted that he watches that and he is seeing a spike. He stated that means they may see something in about 7-10 days.

**5. NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. Billing System Software – Equipment Budget Adjustment Approval - \$8,360.00 (ACTION ITEM) –**

**MOTION** by Hennesy and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Cherry to approve the Equipment Budget Adjustment of \$8,360.00.

Discussion: Chairman Hennesy asked for a brief overview. Wallen stated that they are wanting to upgrade the billing software that they use and that they are on a really old platform, actually the original platform from 2012, so this original budget was approved for \$22,000 but they found they need a new server to host the new software, so that is what the increase is for. Gifford noted that it is just outside his cap of \$7,500.00. Chairman Hennesy stated that the software will do them no good without a server.

**All present members voting yes, motion carries.**

**B. Discussion of Petition** – Chairman Hennesy stated that the District has been served with a petition. She said some board members know more about this than others, so she wanted to take this opportunity to bring people up to speed. She said this petition has been presented to the District. She said they first learned about this petition as they were getting calls from some of their customers, who were telling them that they were being asked to sign petitions. She said a few of the things that they were being told is because our board members are run out of Chicago, they needed more local control and this petition would provide that. They were also informing them that they were being told that their rates were going to move from about \$40 to \$90 per month if they didn't sign this petition. They were also informed by customer's that they were told that the University of Illinois is going to buy them, which was interesting, and also that American Water was going to buy them. These were all of the reasons that they were being asked to sign these petitions. She stated, to dig into this a little bit, Bob Buchanan was the one who brought the petition to the District, and also circulated it, and when she asked him what had come about, he told her that he and Mike Larson and Mike Melton were all behind this idea of moving to an elected role and then Bob actually circulated the petition as well. She stated that they did meet with the attorney of the District and this board does not have any oversight with respect to this, but procedurally, this petition needs to be presented to the board, so it is her recommendation as Chairman that they tell Lindsey that the Board has been presented with this petition. (Chairman Hennesy distributed copies of the petition). She stated the next steps is that Lindsey will sign off on the petition being presented to the board, it will then go to the County, and could ultimately end up on the ballot, as is described on the top of the petition.

Cherry stated that he read the act and the act has provisions in it about how boards are formed and it also has a provision in there how the public can also chose to elect board members. He stated that when he thinks about how Districts are formed, because he has lived this life for a long time, and on some of the bigger Districts, they don't have the ability to just recommend a change in the board, it has to be done through legislation, so he was kind of surprised to see that in this act, that they actually had that provision. He added that what people need to consider is that having the board appointed by the county board gives you a certain kind of level and it avoid certain problems that can come out of elections, especially in smaller districts, where most people don't come out to vote anyway. He added that, unfortunately, when he heard about this, the first thing that came to his mind were special interest. He stated that this is Mahomet and there is a special interest behind a move like this. General, he said, whatever comes out of it, if it does go through and people are elected, then most likely, in his opinion, those people elected would be there to serve special interests, whatever that is, he doesn't know. He said by having people appointed by a county board, again, he said you don't have that problem. So, you have board members from

every background, all of them have different backgrounds and bring different things to the table. As he has seen in numerous elected boards in Mahomet, there is no question that there are special interests behind them and they work very hard to make sure they keep control of the board. He said if this moves that direction, and there is probably a good chance that the same thing would happen here. He said it will take a little while to figure out what the special interest is, but it will all come to the surface at some point in time. He said that in his time on this board he's never felt that the people sitting around this table serve a special interest. He said everybody was there, appointed, doing the job, and that's great. He said that's what they need to continue to do through this process, and he said he thinks they will have to get to the point where they decide what's best and head that direction and figure out how to make sure that the public understands what they are voting for. He added, they have all the rights in the world to vote anyway they want. If they really feel like that is going to serve them better, then they need to institute that means of governance over this board. He said they have done a lot of things and they have to put their efforts and their energies toward, in his opinion right now, succession planning because if you haven't planned out the succession game for this industry, there is a huge risk of failure if they don't get their succession plan in place. He said that he's talking just for the experience that he has from Danville, they can't find anybody and they certainly can't find qualified people and their salaries and everything else are definitely competitive with the market. He stated they have a lot of work to do and this is one distraction that he wishes he hadn't seen but again they will address their problems and keep moving forward and kind of see where this heads.

Buchanan stated that he personally felt like the Champaign County Board hasn't always been diligent in searching for who they should appoint to the board. Buchanan said that he isn't being critical of the ones that they have appointed but he just feels like the people of the District, the employees, the people, the customers should have a voice in who sits on this board and that is his opinion and the proper way to do that is to get petitions, a certain amount of them, present it to the board, then it would be if they decide to approve it, to do it, there would be a discussion before a judge or somebody that would make a decision if its warranted to put the people of the District in charge of electing the trustees, rather than the board county supervisors. That's his opinion and that is where it started from and that's the reason for the petitions, and that's what we wanted to send it to the county board to decide if they thought it was okay and would like to put it on a ballot, then if they do decide that then it would be put on the ballot, to be elected probably in Nov. if it gets through, but it would be an election, as he understands it, if it gets on, in June, it would be a ballot of some sort to decide if that's what the people of the district want and that would be on the ballot for them to choose. They want to have some of the input as to who sits on the county board vs. the county board. Buchanan stated, as he understands it, if you have petitions, it is the duty of the secretary to present it to the county board and that's all he knows, from there he doesn't know what happens, they take it from there and they decide if its plausible to put it on the ballot.

Chairman Hennesy stated that because Buchanan presented it to them, she has some concerns about some of the stories that they were told by their customers about what they were being told when they signed these petitions, but having not been involved she can't really speak to that.

Buchanan stated that he wasn't either, only on 2 pages, or about 20 people that he contacted and he didn't tell them any of that kind of stuff, he said that he did not present those.

Chairman Hennesy stated that Buchanan is the one who brought the packet to the board so she is trying to understand if he has insight.

Buchanan stated that it was brought to him and it was decided that he was the one that would be carrying it and to bring it to the District, that's the reason. He stated that he doesn't even know who all got the petitions to sign, as far as he knows they were honestly searched out and they were presented and notarized that they were sworn to be true.

Chairman Hennesy asked Buchanan who handed him the rest of the packet. Buchanan stated that he didn't know. He said he doesn't know all of those people that presented the packets. He said he has no idea, he doesn't know what they said, all he knows is what it says on the top, that it says "people would like to have the trustees selected rather than appointed" and there were other people that wanted to get the survey to get the names.

Schultz asked Buchanan how he got the pieces of paper, though. Buchanan stated they were printed up. Schultz stated that if he doesn't know these people and he hasn't talked to them, how did he get these his possession (holding the petition papers).

Buchanan said they were given to them to pass out to different people to petition the areas of their ability, friends or whoever they might get to that were customers of the district. Schultz asked Buchanan if he knows those people, like Constance Musik.

Buchanan said that he does not. Schultz asked how did that paper get from Constance into his possession. Buchanan stated they were printed, they were printed up and given out to pass out, to people that would be willing to go and get the petitions to see if people were interested in that proposition. Schultz stated that she understands, she is just asking, how people he doesn't know circulated something and then he came into possession of it. Buchanan said, well that happened, they were passed out to people that would be willing to do that, that they thought that would be a good idea. Schultz asked him who passed that out. Buchanan stated that they were in the area to be selected, they were passed out to areas.

Cherry stated that most likely this is going to follow the path that every Mahomet election has followed, in all the time he has been there. He stated that social media will come alive and email stings will come to life with nothing but misinformation, innuendo, and all out lies. He said it will become very apparent what is being spread. He said, the problem is, it's really difficult to fight that when it starts down that path. He said he is not a social media guy, he never looks at it, he never posts anything, he never does anything, but he does know what that can do and having run for board once, or twice, you are subject to all of it, dealing with it first hand, it's a pretty painful process. He said, unfortunately, this time around, it will probably be directed at this board and the people on this board, so like it or not they probably are going to be subjected to it and again, he thinks all they can do is try to make sure that they are putting out consistent, actual information so that the rate payers can decide how they want to go. Buchanan said that he's sure the people that would like to run to be a trustee, he's sure that is the information that they would put out, that they would say, "I'd like to be on that board", and have a say in what is happening, and that is his idea that they should have that. Cherry said with an election you know what kind of qualified people you get, or can get, very, very high quality.

Gifford stated that he would like to speak but he's probably going to get himself in trouble. Chairman Hennesy said, well then maybe don't get yourself in trouble. Cherry said that is probably best. Cherry said that they know what they need to do.

Chairman Hennesy stated that she does have concerns though that current trustees seem to have information, but not any real answers. It's curious to her that Buchanan

can't tell them who put those pieces of paper in his hand, in order to put them together. Buchanan said the attorney that they went to, Michael. Chairman Hennesy asked Buchanan, who is "they". Buchanan said Michael McCormick. Chairman Hennesy Hennesy said, who is "we". Buchanan said Michael McCormick. Chairman Hennesy said, who went to the attorney. Buchanan asked, who went to the attorney? Chairman Hennesy said yes. Buchanan stated, Mr. Parkhill, "Bud" Parkhill and him. Chairman Hennesy asked if anyone else went. Buchanan said no.

Chairman Hennesy stated to Mike Larson, that Buchanan did say that Larson is in approval of this. She would just like to know if that is true. Larson stated, in the course of conversation about restructuring the board, and he said he would make pretty clear his perspective on that, he evaluated what options they had and as he looked at the public water act, he saw this was an option and he thinks having an elected board is something the voters should have an opportunity to vote on. So yes, when the questions were asked, yes, he looked at the public water act and said this is an option available if the voters agree that it should become an elected position that would be a mechanism to go through. Chairman Hennesy said okay.

Chairman Hennesy asked the board if there was anything else. No further discussion was held.

**C. Remote Policy Discussion** – Chairman Hennesy stated that Larson asked for this discussion so she gave him the floor. Larson stated that when he asked for there to be a remote option, and was told that wasn't possible, it was illegal, when he went back and looked, they passed a remote policy option that specifically says that you can do that if somebody is away, so he is just wondering if that policy is not valid, and if it is, how is it administered. Chairman Hennesy stated that policy was put together under the covid mitigation rules, so that was because of the emergency executive order, so when covid first hit, the executive order came out granting the ability to have remote meetings as a result of the emergency status. At that point in time, they put that policy together so they had some rules to govern underneath that remote policy. Now that they have pulled back that emergency status, that is what they did in the last meeting, and that is what she heard the board wanted to do, that emergency status was the provision that gave them the ability to have remote meetings. Now that that is gone, OMA is back in charge and there are very specific rules under OMA about remote access and it's not available because its not legal under OMA. Larson stated that we need to eliminate that policy then. Chairman Hennesy said correct, she thinks they did pull it. She said, again, it was after the last meeting when the board said they didn't want to exercise that emergency anymore, so she believes it is down and if it's not down then they will pull that. Larson stated that he doesn't know that the board stated that they didn't want to exercise the emergency policy. His request was the ability to meet, and he understood that there may be others that needed to meet remotely. He did specifically say would like to meeting in person with remote option. He doesn't recall ever saying to pull the emergency provision. He said if that's happening and that's what everyone's doing and were going to go back to meeting in person, he's just trying to be clear. Chairman Hennesy said that is what's happening. Larson asked if that policy is defuncted. Chairman Hennesy said correct. Buchanan asked if that was enacted by the board that they do that. Schultz stated that the law in the executive order gave the Chairman sole discretion whether its going to be a covid meeting or non-covid meeting, under those covid rules and the board had a discussion last time and said they wanted to come back to being in person and so if she doesn't declare the

meetings are imprudent or unsafe then they go back to regular OMA rules which preclude remote attendance. Gifford noted that policy could come back though if they have surges. Chairman Hennesy said yes, if it becomes dangerous, but what she heard last meeting, loud and clear, was that the board felt like it was not dangerous. She's been watching the infection rates, and they were going down. Most of the other boards were moving towards this and so she decided that they would just take the steps to do that. She stated that she thought that is what they asked for. It was her judgement that it was time to do that. Larson said he just wanted to clarify, that was all. Chairman Hennesy said okay. She asked the board for any additional questions. There were none.

**D. Request to Provide Board Packet Discussion** – Larson stated that Kelli Pfeifer specifically asked for in a letter, and he had some other folks ask, if there was a reason for them not to just put the board packet on with the agenda. He is just asking since other folks have asked. Chairman Hennesy said because the board packet is designed to have sensitive material, budgets, preliminary discussion documents, in it that are really for the purposes of the board members. They don't really have the staff available to have two different packets put together and she just doesn't think they should be asking their staff to have to go through and pull information and have two sets of packets. She stated that they are certainly following the law. The law requires that they publish an agenda and other districts their size, usually what they do is just publish an agenda because its pretty difficult for a staff to have create both of those sets of documents. Larson stated that after the fact, the packets are available through the meeting minutes, so he just wasn't sure what in there they are worried about sharing. He said, again, maybe there stuff is. He said, what in this board packet is there to be concerned about. Gifford stated that it would have to be exempt and he's declared it exempt already, their financials, their banks accounts listing the money in it, he wouldn't want anyone to see that and know where their accounts are and how much money they have in them. Chairman Hennesy stated it would require having to have Gifford go through each packet every month and find out what those exemptions are and to pull it and to make two separate packets. She stated that she doesn't know if that is something that they should be asking. She stated that they (the customers) can want to see it, but they (the board) are following the law and she thinks what they are putting out is sufficient. Larson said that he knows they are following the law, he's just asking the question because folks said they would be interested in this. He said that other folks post agendas, but other folks post pretty comprehensive packages too so he sees it both ways. Schultz stated with the employees stretched pretty thin, she would not be in favor of having to pay more to have someone go through, because that would raise rates. She said as long as they are in compliance with the law, she would like to keep their costs down. Larson said alright, he just wanted to understand. Chairman Hennesy asked for addition questions. There were none.

## **6. SECRETARY'S REPORT:**

**A. Approval of Open Minutes from Regular Meeting held February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2022 -**  
Chairman Hennesy noted a few typos to correct.

**MOTION** by Hennesy to approve the minutes with the typos corrected, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Grindley.  
**All present members voting yes, motion carries.**

## 7. TREASURER'S REPORT:

**Approval of Accounts Payable listing for February, March & April 2022** – Gifford reviewed the Income and Expense Report and all A/P listings over \$1,000.

**AP Summary as of March 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2022** - \$83,638.92 (Over \$1,000 below)

- A&R Mechanical - \$3,429.23
- Altorfer - \$13,296.36
- Ameren - \$9,110.65
- Bobcat of Bloomington - \$1,100.00
- CMS - \$6,414.00
- CNA Surety - \$1,362.67
- Donohue & Associates - \$29,595.38
- Illinois EPA - \$7,463.36
- Roto-Rooter - \$1,993.61
- Text-Em-All - \$1,350.00
- The Cincinnati Insurance Co - \$2,434.00
- Water Solution Unlimited - \$1,633.64

**MOTION** by Hennesy to approve the Treasure's Report as presented, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Grindley.  
**All present members voting yes, motion carries.**

## 8. GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT: Gifford's GM/Treasurer's Report is below. **General Manager/Treasurer Report February 2022.**

**District Covid-19 Operation Level:** The Water District is at normal level of operation.

### **Treasurer report:**

**Income:** February water sales were typical at \$157,425.01. Total operating revenue for the month was in line with budget expectations at \$164,042.86. Non-operating revenue continues to be strong through February at \$50,470.23. The Water District issued 14 new housing permits through February.

**Expenses:** Operating expenses for February were a below average at \$135,242.23. One unplanned expense item in February was the water main leak in Cobble Creek subdivision for \$3,914.44.

**Billing:** Total of 1,970 customer accounts were billed in February with 11 meters estimated. The average water usage per customer were as follows: homeowners 5,015 gallons, candlewood 3,369 gallons.

**Water Accountability:** The unaccounted-for water loss for the year is at 4.2%. The Water District typical unaccounted for water loss range is between 3% - 6%. The district discovered a water main leak in Cobble Creek subdivision in the month of February. We believe this leak is the reason for higher than normal unaccounted for water loss in the previous month.

### **GM report:**

**Water Distribution System:** Aqua Store (Cady Tanks) will be on site in the spring to reseal exterior of the above ground storage tanks. Spring time dead end water main hydrant flushing will be done in April.

**Water Treatment plant:** Iron Filter were taken out of service in February cleaned and filter depth measured for media loss. In addition, staff currently is touch-up painting the iron filters for corrosion control.

**Wastewater Treatment Plant and Collection System:**

**Wastewater Plant:** We plan to install a new washer/compactor at the headworks of the plant in order to make the Bar Screen waste product more acceptable for the landfill. The Water District first meeting with Donohue and Associates to discuss and start the design of the wastewater plant CIP improvements occurred on March 10,2022.

**Subdivision Updates:**

**6<sup>th</sup> addition to Thornwood Phase 1:** The subdivision is now in the 2-year maintenance bond period several new housing permits have already been issued.

**20 Year Capital Projects Plan:** I submitted my proposed 20 plan via e-mail to the board members in January. I expect future meetings to discuss in depth planning.

Chairman Hennesy asked if there was any other business to come before the board. Larson asked about the ARPA funds from the County and asked if Gifford or Wallen put in any requests for Engineering. Gifford stated that he did and on April 7<sup>th</sup> is the ELOC meeting at the county and he and the District Engineer will be talking to the committee then. Larson asked if there was a chance, they would get something. Gifford said yes, he thinks so. He said if anyone is interested in coming to the meeting, they can.

**9. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MOTION** by Cherry, and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Grindley to adjourn at 4:28pm.  
All present members voting yes, motion carries.

Respectfully submitted,

Lindsey Wallen  
Secretary, Board of Trustees