

GLENBARD WASTEWATER AUTHORITY  
Executive Oversight Committee  
Minutes  
September 14, 2023  
8:00 a.m.

Members Present:

Keith Giagnorio	President, Village of Lombard
Mark Senak	President, Village of Glen Ellyn
Robert Bachner	Trustee, Village of Lombard
Kelli Christiansen	Trustee, Village of Glen Ellyn
Scott Niehaus	Village Manager, Village of Lombard
Mark Franz	Village Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn
Carl Goldsmith	Public Works Director, Village of Lombard
Dave Buckley	Public Works Director, Village of Glen Ellyn

Others Present:

Matthew Streicher	Executive Director, GWA
Jeremy Henning	Assistant Director, GWA
Rick Freeman	Electric Superintendent, GWA
Jon Braga	Maintenance Superintendent, GWA
Andrew Pakosta	Operations Superintendent, GWA
Patrick Brankin	Interim Finance Director, Village of Glen Ellyn

1. Call to Order at 8:00am
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call: President Giagnorio, President Senak, Trustee Bachner, Trustee Christiansen, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, Mr. Goldsmith, and Mr. Buckley answered “Present”.
4. Public Comment
5. Consent Agenda – The following items are considered to be routine by the Executive Oversight Committee and will be approved with a single vote in the form listed below:

*Motion the EOC to approve the following items including Payroll and Vouchers for the months of June, July, and August of 2023 in the amount of \$2,237,099.17 (Trustee Christiansen).*

**President Senak motioned and Trustee Christiansen seconded the MOTION that the following items, on the Consent Agenda be approved. President Giagnorio, President Senak, Trustee Bachner, Trustee Christiansen, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, Mr. Goldsmith and Mr. Buckley responded “Aye” during a roll vote. The motion carried.**

- 5.1 Executive Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes:  
June 8, 2023 EOC Meeting
- 5.2 Vouchers Previously Reviewed:  
June, July, and August 2023 – Trustee Christiansen
- 5.3 Declaration of Surplus – Empty Polymer Totes (x22), Kyocera DuraXV E4610 Flip Phones (x2), Cisco 819-4G Wireless Routers (x10), Cisco 4G Antennas (x10)

The Authority regularly purchases a product called Clarifloc from Polydyne, Inc. Clarifloc is a polymer that is used in the dewatering phase of the treatment process and helps create a thicker biosolid and allows our belt filter presses to remove more water from the solids. The polymer is delivered to the authority in 2300 lb. totes that, once emptied, have historically been scheduled for pickup through the distributor for re-use/recycling. The Authority also occasionally uses a few totes for the storage of other liquid waste products such as used engine oil or used cooking oil. The use of the totes is built into the cost of the polymer and there is no additional charge if these totes are used for other purposes and not returned to the distributor.

Per a staff suggestion, the Authority recently inquired with Polydyne if the totes could safely be resold by the Authority. Polydyne agreed that the polymer product is non-hazardous and as long as all labeling has been removed from the totes, they can be reused or resold at our discretion. Based on this information and research by staff, the Authority believes some revenue can be generated by auctioning off the empty totes.

While preparing the resolution for declaration of surplus, it was decided to include other end-of-life electronics as well. Two Kyocera DuraXV flip phones were recently taken out of service and replaced with iPhones in an effort increase staff productivity and capabilities. These phones were well maintained and some revenue can be generated by auctioning off the wiped devices.

Earlier this year, the Authority also worked with an integrator to replace all of the end-of-life wireless 4G routers in use at all of the Authority's remote structures. The manufacturer no longer provided hardware support for the Cisco 819-4G wireless routers and, as such, created a higher risk for the Authority if a router were to fail. The old cellular routers were taken out of service and successfully replaced in April of this year. The end-of-life retired routers may still be of value to other organizations that have not undergone the same type of replacement project. Authority staff worked with our integrator to confirm that these units have been properly wiped and have no information related to the Authority saved on them. These routers were all in working condition when taken out of service and some revenue can be generated by auctioning off the wiped devices.

It is our intent, once declared surplus by the EOC, to post these items to govdeals.com, an online government auction website, with the expectation that some financial benefit would be recovered.

Therefore, enclosed with this memo is the formal resolution auctioning off Empty Polymer Totes (x22), Kyocera DuraXV E4610 Flip Phones (x2), Cisco 819-4G Wireless Routers (x10), Cisco 4G Antennas (x10) for approval. The Authority respectfully requests that the EOC motion to approve Resolution No. 2022-001, a resolution authorizing the sale of equipment - Empty Polymer Totes (x22), Kyocera DuraXV E4610 Flip Phones (x2), Cisco 819-4G Wireless Routers (x10), Cisco 4G Antennas (x10)

#### 5.4 Approval of 3-Year Natural Gas Contract

After being approved to seek procurement of a new natural gas supply contract at the March 9, 2023 EOC meeting, on May 17, 2023, the Authority locked in a new fixed rate of \$0.46711/therm for three years beginning in April 2024 with Constellation. The new rate is a significant increase over the previous historic low rate of \$0.281/therm rate that has been in place since April 2021.

Therefore, it is recommended the EOC authorize the Authority to formally enter into a 3-year agreement with Constellation for natural gas supply at a rate of \$0.46711/therm. This amount has been taken into account in the draft CY2024 budget, and will be reflected in future years budgets.

#### 5.5 Ratification of Email Poll Items

##### 5.5.1 2023 NRI Rehabilitation Project Award

At the June 8, 2023 EOC meeting, the EOC approved the Authority to waive the competitive bidding process for the upcoming NRI Rehabilitation Project to award a contract based on price negotiations with the three previous bidders for the project. Working with the consultant, RJN Group, the Authority moved forward with those negotiations and received negotiated bids from two out of the three previous bidders. The low bid was from Hoerr Construction at \$381,075 and the bid price came in at 3% below the engineer's most recent cost estimate. After two previous public bid openings with unexpectedly high bid prices, this was the hoped for result of negotiating directly with the three previous bidders. As was the case in the previous two public bids, the bypass pumping was the biggest variable in the project plan from each bidder. Having worked closely with the two bidders on the negotiations, RJN is confident in Hoerr's bypass approach and has written the attached award recommendation letter for Hoerr Construction.

Because of price escalations and unforeseen unit costs for certain line items, the engineer's original estimate from last year increased in the

original RFP in March, and up through the most price negotiations performed in July. The original engineer's estimate in 2022 was \$310,730, which increased to \$359,450 for the March and May RFP's and is now \$393,600 for the recent price negotiations. Glenbard budgeted for \$310,730 based on the original engineer estimated amount. Even though the low bid comes in over budget by approximately \$70,000, this is by far, the closest any bid has been to the engineer's estimate and the budgeted amount. The Authority and RJN Group agree that delaying the project any further could potentially lead to failures of infrastructure that are in need of rehabilitation and/or lead to greater costs for repair in the future. The Authority will be actively assessing the current year budget to find ways to offset the additional funds needed from the capital fund.

The Authority is requesting the Executive Oversight Committee give authorization to award Hoerr Construction with a notice to proceed for the 2023 NRI Rehabilitation Project in the amount of \$381,075. This project was budgeted for in the CY2023 Approved Equipment Rehabilitation Budget, Fund 40-580150.

#### 5.5.2 2023 Asphalt Resurfacing & Patching Program Pricing Revision

Since the approval of the 2023 Asphalt Resurfacing & Patching Program at the June EOC meeting, staff has been working to move forward with the low bidder, Brothers Asphalt, on verifying the project scope and the contract documentation. After site visits and discussions with the contractor, it was brought to the Authority's attention that the tonnage calculations for the new surface course and leveling binder to be applied were incorrect. Staff first verified the square yardage calculations were correct, but did find that the tonnage was calculated incorrectly on the RFP. This error was due to GWA staff's unfamiliarity with paving contracts, and the correct conversion from square yards of pavement to tons of asphalt.

After recalculating the tonnage and verifying all other quantities shown in the RFP, GWA requested revised pricing from Brother's Asphalt to account for the quantity change. Brother's Asphalt retained all unit prices from the original bid and adjusted their total price based solely on the additional tonnage quantity provided by the Authority. No other scope line items were changed in the revised pricing. Therefore, the corrected pricing that authorization is being requested for is the true value of the project. The total tonnage listed on the RFP was shown as 2,275 tons, when in fact the correct tonnage is 4,006 tons. Because of this adjustment, the total price of the paving contract will increase from \$333,510.63 to \$479,377.38. This amount comes in at less than 50% of the total budgeted amount for repaving and would still be within 2% of the engineers estimate for the project, which leaves enough funds to complete the

remainder of the paving project for Bemis Road and the administrative parking lot in 2024.

The Authority is requesting the Executive Oversight Committee approve the change in pricing for an additional \$145,866.75 and authorize the Authority to award Brothers Asphalt Paving with a notice to proceed for the 2023 Asphalt Resurfacing Program for the total amount of \$479,377.38. This amount will be taken out of the CY2023 Approved Budget, Fund 40 Capital Plan.

6. Approval of 3-Year Contract for Landscaping Services

The CY2024-CY2026 Landscape Maintenance Services Contract is a Lump-Sum contract billed on a monthly basis during the eight (8) month contract season each year. Below is the bid tabulation sheet for the September 1, 2023 Landscape Maintenance Services bid opening. Sixteen agencies had the RFP in hand at the time of bidding. Of these, five responded with proposals ranging from a high of \$258,060.00 to a low of \$80,248 for services. Below is a table summarizing all the bids received:

<b>Company</b>	<b>Bid Amount - Total 3 Year</b>
Sebert Landscaping	\$80,248.00
NAV Group	\$81,367.96
Beary Landscaping	\$132,720.00
Apex Landscaping	\$166,326.89
Mark 1 Landscape	\$258,060.00

The Authority’s previous landscape contractor for CY2021-CY2023 was Sebert Landscaping. They provided poor services during their contract duration, they appeared to perform the bare minimum, and often it took time from Authority staff to reinforce contract terms. Therefore, the Authority desired to dismiss Sebert’s bid, and began to check references for the second low bidder, NAV Group. It was found that the second low bidder had no similar experience to the scope the Authority is requesting. Due to lack of any credible references, as well as not having performed the type of work being requested, the Authority began looking at the next low bidder.

The next low bidder, Beary Landscaping, was substantially higher than the low bid at \$52,472 higher than Sebert. The options of which contractor to award the contract to were discussed with the TAC, and although Beary Landscaping has credible references, rather than incur an additional ~\$17.5k/year in costs to the Authority’s O&M budget, the Authority will recommend to award Sebert the contract. Despite their services being poor, they did perform the minimum basic services, and would respond to corrective

action at times. It should be noted that the contract does allow for the Owner to terminate services at any time during its term, and is not required to provide any reason for termination.

The Authority is requesting authorization to Award a Three-Year (3) contract to Sebert Landscaping in the total amount of \$80,248.00 to supply Landscape Maintenance Services as proposed for the Glenbard Plant, Stormwater Plant, the acquired parcel across from the Glenbard Plant (940 Bemis) and acquired parcel directly north of the main plant (1S 641 Sunnybrook Rd) during this three-year contract term.

*Mr. Streicher explained that normally this item would have remained on the consent agenda, however, it was pulled out because of unique circumstances. GWA's existing landscaping services contract is with Sebert, and that contract expires at the end of this season. The Authority has not been entirely satisfied with Sebert's performance through the life of the existing contract, they have been performing the bare minimum, and it has taken quite a bit of time and effort on the Authority's behalf to keep them doing that bare minimum. They were not specifically invited to bid; however, they were not excluded from the bidding process either. They submitted the low bid at the September 1st bid opening, so the Authority considered dismissing their bid and moving onto the next low bidder, the NAV group. After looking into the NAV group, they had no comparable references to the scope that GWA was seeking, so there was not a large amount of confidence that they could have performed better, and could have possibly been worse than Sebert's. Due to the next low bidder being approximately \$52,000 higher, this was brought to the TAC, where it was determined there was not enough justification to dismiss Sebert's – and the contract will allow us to terminate for any reason at any time moving forward. Therefore, if Sebert's does not perform, their contract will be terminated. This was pulled from the consent agenda because it's possible the EOC may see this item on the agenda again next year. GWA will meet with them prior to the contract beginning to explain to them the circumstances.*

*Mr. Niehaus asked whether or not Sebert will have a short leash. Mr. Niehaus pointed out that with a \$17k/year price difference, if it ends up taking too much staff time, it's not worth it. Mr. Streicher explained that GWA did propose to the TAC that we not award them, but due to the price difference, it could not be ignored.*

*Trustee Bachner asked which areas they were lacking in. Mr. Streicher explained that essentially all they were doing was mowing, with occasional bush trimming. We have never seen them apply fertilizer/weed killer, and it has taken frequent reminders for them to simply to mow grass at times. In addition, brush clearing had been neglected significantly, so much so that it ended up being out of their scope. GWA had to expend extra effort to get the brush cleared due to their negligence. Trustee Bachner asked if we brought this to their attention previously, to which Mr. Streicher replied that we had and explained that the intentions of staff are to create a written checklist prior to the start of the next contract*

*Trustee Bachner asked if there were any other tactics to compel compliance other than termination. Mr. Streicher stated that GWA may decide to withhold payments as another tactic.*

*Mr. Buckley informed the TAC that landscaping contractors are a very difficult industry to keep to task. They do not typically perform everything in contracts, typically since they have such a variety of work between jobs, there is not much oversight. Mr. Streicher explained that initially GWA was happy to have had Sebert, as they perform for other large clients, who all have beautiful grounds.*

*Mr. Streicher also explained there was some concern that their bid was less than a 1% increase over the previous 3-year bid price, which leads to speculation that they do not intend to expend many resources on our contract.*

***Trustee Christiansen motioned and Trustee Bachner seconded the motion to authorize the Authority to Award a Three-Year (3) contract to Sebert Landscaping in the total amount of \$80,248.00 to supply Landscape Maintenance Services as proposed for the Glenbard Plant, Stormwater Plant, the acquired parcel across from the Glenbard Plant (940 Bemis) and acquired parcel directly north of the main plant (1S 641 Sunnybrook Rd) during this three-year contract term.***

7. Draft Budget Discussion

Enclosed is a memo summarizing the highlights of the draft CY2024 budget, along with the draft budget itself. At this point in time, the budget has an overall increase of 4.3% or \$376,256 over the CY2023 budget. The majority of the increases are in the O&M budget, which had a number of expenses increase due to new regulations, increased material prices, and general personnel costs.

*Mr. Streicher led the discussion by thanking GWA staff for their input and assistance in putting together the CY2024 budget, as well as the TAC, and the Finance Directors. The agenda packet contains a lengthy memo that details all of the changes from CY23 to CY24, however, rather than go through each item in detail several slides were put together to summarize items. Mr. Streicher did state that if there were any questions on items in the detailed memo to please feel free to ask.*

*4.3% overall increase from CY23 to CY24, with the majority of that increase being due to the O&M increase, which is seeing a 6.71% increase. There are several individual reasons for that higher increase that will be explained in further detail. The overall budget number that will be sought from the Full Board is just under \$18M. The draft capital number that is being presented may see a slight change as cost estimates are updated; however, it will not affect the capital contributions from each Village. Mr. Streicher explained that last year the EOC agreed on indefinitely setting the capital contribution increase to 1.25%, so the target is to budget according to that increase. Mr. Franz voiced that the 1.25% may not be indefinite, but instead in the near-term future.*

*Mr. Streicher presented an additional slide showing the differences between CY23 and CY24 in categories within the O&M budget. The largest increases were in O&M (out of the O&M) and personnel. The next slide gave a closer view on the breakdown of O&M costs. There is a net increase in the O&M budget of around \$330,000, with all of the increases being close to \$400,000, while also seeing decreases of \$80,000. The biggest contributor to the increase was due to Biosolids Hauling as the result of a new state law that will be explained. Personnel did not see any turnover. Natural gas will have a new rate coming into effect in February 2024 coming off a historic low rate. Combined heat and power engines will be seeing a significant service interval. While “uncontrollable” may not be the best description, but these are necessary costs that the Authority attempted to minimize as best as possible. Mr. Streicher explained that GWA could not really take credit for any of the decreases, as the decrease in Pretreatment was due to not having to perform the local limits study that was required this year due to the new NPDES permit, GWA benefited from the Village of Glen Ellyn’s sale of surplus equipment/vehicles and investment incomes, and the Finance directors recalculated the Overhead fees, which came out lower than previous years.*

*Mr. Streicher explained that the biggest increase in O&M was due to biosolids increase due to a house bill that became a law, which regards prevailing wages. Although GWA’s contracts require prevailing wages, previously, biosolids haulers had a loophole that exempted them from that because part of the work was related to agricultural work. A recent case was brought forward that proved that land application was essential to wastewater treatment works, and therefore, should require prevailing wages. This is true for GWA, because if we cannot land apply, we have to pay significantly more to landfill our biosolids – which may not even be accepted at landfills. GWA has already received a letter from our existing hauler stating that as the new law takes effect, they will claim force majeure on the contract, and require a rate increase. This increase has been reflected in the draft budget, resulting in the significant \$155,000 O&M increase. GWA’s existing contract does expire early next year, so discussion will be had with the TAC as to whether or not to break contract if force majeure is being claimed, or just continue on until the contract expires and rebid at that time.*

*Capital budget, out of the \$12M that was slated, the majority of the costs consist of 6 different large projects – mainly the Primary Clarifier Improvements project, at \$6.6M, which has been pushed back several years. Manager Franz asked if the \$6.6M cost included financing costs, to which Mr. Streicher replied, no, it only included construction and engineering. Mr. Franz suggested increasing the potential bond amount to reflect.*

*Mr. Streicher offered to answer any other questions that arise, and confirmed that no vote is required on this item at the moment, but due to other business – an October EOC meeting will be held where we’ll request a formal vote on the budget so it can move forward to a full board meeting.*

*Manager Franz asked Mr. Streicher to highlight the “big project” coming up. Mr. Streicher referred to the capital plan, where it’s broken down with engineering starting in 2029, spanning for two years, and construction beginning in 2031 spanning 3 years. GWA is anticipating Phosphorus to be implemented into it’s permit by 2038, however,*



*due to aging infrastructure, improvements will have to be implemented prior to the regulation taking effect.*

*Mr. Goldsmith inquired as to the use of the properties GWA acquired in relation to the “big project” and if this was enough space for the design. Mr. Streicher highlighted that GWA is preparing to send out a Request for Proposals for a Facility Plan, and since GWA does a Facility Plan every 5 years, the request will be to update the most recent facility plan, but really focus on preliminary engineering for the upcoming large project in 2029. Mr. Goldsmith confirmed that the preliminary engineering will evaluate land use potential. Trustee Bachner asked if there was consideration in taking over the roadway and vacating the right of way to create dead ends. Mr. Streicher replied that this was discussed, but due to “second point of ingress and egress” that it would not be feasible. Manager Franz stated that reconfiguring the roadway may be a more likely possibility. Mr. Streicher highlighted additional properties that could be acquired to give more options, but that this will be evaluated in more detail during the Facility Planning study, as this project is now on the 5-year horizon. Mr. Franz asked if the ponds were a viable option, but Mr. Streicher explained that hydraulically it would not be as feasible, but also that DuPage County may not allow process lines to be installed under the DuPage River. Mr. Streicher also stated that area could potentially be used for solar fields.*

*Mr. Goldsmith stated he was being pre-emptive, but based on land use, parcels may need to be consolidated. Mr. Franz suggested this be investigated during the Facility Plan as well.*

*Manager Niehaus stated the Village of Lombard is onboard for a November 13<sup>th</sup> Full Board meeting to be held at the Village of Glen Ellyn*

## 8. Discussion

### 8.1 Solar Power Proposals

At the March, 2023 EOC meeting, the Authority approved to enter into a no cost agreement that would provide consulting services to conduct an investigation/study into the feasibility of a solar power “power purchase agreement” (PPA) or an outright ownership of a solar installation for the Authority. The results of the study were favorable, and therefore, a request for proposals was distributed to solar developers authorized to work in the state of Illinois. Proposals were due June 30<sup>th</sup>, and although the Authority only receive one response, the option of outright ownership yielded a favorable return on investment. However, since there was only one proposal, the Authority decided it did not demonstrate a competitive process, and re-released the request for proposals with attempts to make the request more attractive to bidders.

The second round of proposals were due August 31<sup>st</sup>, and are being evaluated with the Technical Advisory Committee and Finance directors to determine if any options are feasible within the Authority’s O&M and/or Capital budgets, and if

so, how to best move forward. Any formal award to a solar developer will be brought forward to the Executive Oversight Committee for approval.

*Mr. Henning discussed how GWA has been looking at the old lagoons for a potential solar field. He summarized that in March 2023, the EOC approved for GWA to enter into an agreement with a consulting agency for no cost to determine if solar is a possibility. After determining it was a feasible option, GWA went out to bid twice to date, unfortunately, only one bid was received each time. However, the return on investment for the one bid as attractive to the Authority for a self-ownership model and a power purchase agreement model where the Authority would purchase the electricity generated by the field from a third party. The PPA model was less attractive, but would still reduce the amount of electricity drawn off the grid. Unfortunately, receiving only one bid is not demonstrating much competitiveness. Despite making changes for the second bid opening, it still appeared developers were reluctant to bid. Mr. Henning suspected that there were a couple of reasons developers may have been hesitant to bid, with one reason being the required land development that would need to go into preparing the site where the field would be located, and the other reason being the low electric supply rate GWA pays on their existing supply contract. Developers did not think that GWA would be interested because the PPA rate could not get close to the supply rate; therefore, in the second request for proposals GWA highlighted that we would still like to see potential PPA rates because our electric rate will not stay this low when our contract is up in 2026.*

*GWA still intends to have further discussions with the consultants to see how we could move forward. If any proposals were to move forward, EOC approval would be needed.*

*Manager Niehaus inquired as to what the desired return on investment was for GWA, as Village of Lombard typically seeks an 8–10-year ROI on these types of projects. Mr. Henning stated the less favorable option, the PPA, was closer to a 10-year return on investment. He also mentioned how the self-ownership model was not included in the budget, adding another complication, but if it were purchased outright the payback with incentives was very quick; with 50-70% of the incentives coming back in the first two years. Manager Niehaus inquired as to what kind of incentives they were, to which Mr. Henning replied they were state and federal based off certain criteria. Trustee Christiansen asked if there was a minimum square footage requirement. Mr. Henning said not necessarily, but the larger the array, the better the return on investment. Mr. Henning said that with the self-ownership model the savings was in the millions of dollars over 25 years. Mr. Streicher stated the first ROI we calculated on the outright purchase was just 4.5 years. Due to the very attractive ROI, Mr. Streicher stated that during a TAC meeting, Mr. Sexton suggested an idea of the Villages financing the project, and GWA would reimburse the Villages' as incentives were received. Trustee Bachner asked if the solar developers would have to apply for the incentives, or if GWA would. Mr. Streicher believes it would on the contractor. Mr. Goldsmith*

*asked if the proposal included a breakdown of what the site preparation would be. Mr. Henning replied that they did not.*

*Mr. Niehaus stated he supports the effort, and would normally say “measure twice, cut once,”; however, for this instance, he would suggest “measuring 3 or 4 times.” Trustee Christiansen stated she was concerned about a solar project that would require the removal of trees.*

*Mr. Streicher also stated that another concern was that existing residential parcels overlook the wooded property, so there may be objections to GWA installing solar panels at that location, and there could be zoning issues that need to be looked into.*

*Mr. Franz asked how high the panels sit off the ground. Mr. Streicher responded that they are about 5-6 feet in height. Mr. Henning added that we also stated in the request that the ground underneath the panels would be turned into a native habitat area.*

*Mr. Giagnorio advised to be slow, careful, and vet everybody out because of the high number of solar companies that have gone bankrupt.*

*Mr. Franz inquired as to what type of infrastructure would need to be built, and if the bridge to the lagoon area would need to be replaced. Mr. Streicher replied that it would not, and the biggest infrastructure would be power lines.*

*Mr. Streicher concluded that the only reason this was on the discussion agenda was due to the prior week’s bid opening, and that we had hoped to discuss steps moving forward with the EOC, but knew we would not have an item ready to vote on. However, with having only received one bid, we need to go back to the drawing board.*

*Trustee Bachner inquired as to whether or not we’d continue to use the CHP’s if we ended up moving forward with solar. Mr. Streicher replied that we would re-evaluate that when the life of the engines was up.*

*Trustee Bachner also inquired as to why the CHP’s did not appear to be used over the summer. Mr. Streicher explained that due to a digester upset, immediately followed by the digester cleaning, did not allow us to generate enough gas to use the CHP’s.*

9. Other Business  
9.1 Technical Advisory Committee Updates

*Mr. Franz asked Mr. Streicher to explain the IEPA loan process and why GWA will need to seek a bond for a financing option. Mr. Streicher described the process and what GWA had experienced with the Primary Clarifier Rehabilitation Project.*

*Mr. Franz explained that there had been meetings with bond council and financial advisors, as well as some follow up internal meetings. After further vetting, Mr. Franz will be recommending GWA issue its own revenue bonds. It would be similar to debt payments from IEPA loans; however, a debt resolution would need to be passed by the full board. No action would be needed from the EOC; however, it would be advised to run the resolution and process by the EOC at the October meeting.*

*Mr. Streicher stated that the capital budget does reflect the bond repayments within it, incorporating the higher interest rate.*

*Mr. Franz stated we need to vet things further and get the GWA attorney involved eventually as well.*

*Mr. Bachner asked if there was a bond rating for GWA. Mr. Franz replied, no, we do not. Mr. Bachner also asked if a more favorable bond rating would affect the projected interest rate on the bond. Mr. Bachner also asked if the suggested strategy of negotiated sale for the bonds if that could drive the projected interest rate as well. Mr. Franz replied yes.*

*Mr. Franz informed the group that he believes in the future the bond interest rates will start to become more competitive with the IEPA loan interest rates. Mr. Niehaus feels that the state will eventually raise interest rates as well.*

*Mr. Streicher informed the group that GWA will still apply for IEPA loans on future projects in the event the funds become available for its projects.*

*Mr. Niehaus feels there will be value to this process to establish GWA's credit history to give future flexibility for financing options.*

10. ***Next EOC Meeting*** – The next regularly scheduled EOC Meeting is set for ***Thursday, October 12, 2023 at 8:00 a.m.***

***Mr. Franz made the motion to adjourn the September 14, 2023 EOC Committee meeting and Trustee Bachner seconded the MOTION. President Giagnorio, President Senak, Trustee Bachner, Trustee Christiansen, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, Mr. Goldsmith and Mr. Buckley, responded “Aye” during a roll call. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:50 a.m.***