

GLENBARD WASTEWATER AUTHORITY
Executive Oversight Committee
Minutes
September 15, 2024
8:00 a.m.

Members Present:

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

Others Present:

Matthew Streicher	Executive Director, GWA
Gayle Lendabarker	Executive Assistant, GWA
Tim Sexton	Finance Director, Village of Lombard
Patrick Brankin	Finance Director, Village of Glen Ellyn

1. Call to Order at 8:00 a.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call: President Giagnorio, President Senak, Trustee Christiansen, Trustee Bachner, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, Mr. Goldsmith and Mr. Buckley.
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 month of August of 2024 payroll in the amount of \$618,170.28 (Trustee Christiansen).

Mr. Franz motioned and President Giagnorio seconded the MOTION that the following items, on the Consent Agenda be approved. President Giagnorio, President Senak, Trustee Christiansen, Trustee Bachner, 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:
August 15, 2024 EOC Meeting

5.2 Vouchers Previously Reviewed:
Month of August 2024 and Payroll – Trustee Christiansen

5.3 Ratification of Email Poll Items

5.3.1 Authorization to Approve Amendment to the Agreement with GOVTEMPSUSA for the Employment of a Temporary Worker

As previously discussed with the EOC, due to having two key positions vacant, the Authority is utilizing GOVTEMPSUSEA (GovTemps) to bring in a temp worker. The specific position/assignment for this individual is “Management Consultant,” with the intent to help evaluate the structure of the Authority, undergo analysis and strategic development, as well as perform any administrative functions where assistance is needed. The EOC already approved to enter into a contract with GovTemps for a not to exceed amount of \$35,000. This amount was to cover through August 23, 2024. Since neither vacancy has been filled, the Authority would like to extend the agreement end date to October 4, 2024. The Authority will continue to be invoiced by GovTemps for \$113.60 per hour that Phil Modaff works, and it is expected that he will continue working 24 hours a week. Therefore, the Authority is seeking approval to amend the agreement for an additional amount not to exceed of \$16,500, for a total amount of \$51,500. Due to the vacant positions, there are sufficient funds in the approved CY2024 Budget’s personnel item.

The Authority is seeking a motion to authorize approval to amend the agreement with GOVTEMPSUSA for an additional amount not to exceed of \$16,500, for a total amount of \$51,500.

5.3.2 Authorization to Purchase a 2024 Ford F250 from Sutton Ford Commercial and Fleet

At the June 13, 2024 EOC meeting, the EOC gave authorization to purchase a 2024 Ford F250 from Haggerty Ford Commercial & Fleet in a not to exceed amount of \$47,581. This was due to the dealership that handled the Suburban Cooperative Purchasing contract being unresponsive. Since that time, Authority staff has been able to maintain communication with the cooperative purchasing dealership, and has received the attached quote that is \$119 lower than the original amount approved, however, since the EOC approved the purchase from Haggerty Ford Commercial & Fleet, the Authority will need to amend this request for approval.

The Authority is seeking a motion to authorize purchase a 2024 Ford F250 from Sutton Ford Commercial and Fleet in a not to exceed amount of \$47,462.

6. Approval to Engage in a Two-Year Agreement for Auditing Services

In 2015 the Village of Glen Ellyn Board selected Lauterbach & Amen in 2015 through a request for proposal process subject to annual approval by the Village Board. Due to the Village of Glen Ellyn's role as the Authority's lead agency, with Finance being one of their areas of responsibility, the Authority moved forward with using Lauterbach & Amen as well.

Therefore, staff requests the Executive Oversight Committee motion to approve a two-year renewal for audit services for a not to exceed amount of \$17,900 for the CY2024 Audit (to be invoiced in 2025) and a not to exceed amount of \$18,750 for the CY2025 Audit (to be invoiced in 2026), for a total not to exceed amount of \$36,650.

Mr. Brankin noted that both Villages currently use this company, and the Village of Glen Ellyn, also renewed a two-year agreement with Lauterbach. Mr. Brankin added that the rate of increase was slightly higher than CPI in the range of 4%-4-1/2% percent. Mr. Brankin explained that at times when CPI was 6% or more, the increases were in the ballpark of 3-1/2% - 4%; and in conversations with the auditors and other communities, audit firms are experiencing staffing issues and are turning away new clients, which is one of the driving forces behind the slightly higher than normal price increases.

President Senak asked for confirmation that the same firm has been used since 2015 after an RFP process at that time; and asked if there was a plan to go out for RFP again after the new two-year agreement. Mr. Franz indicated he was correct and that he has had discussion with Mr. Brankin, noting that the Village did request a partner rotation to as well as the audit team staff being rotated, as a way of keeping fresh eyes on the work being performed; and due to the number of turnovers in the Finance Department in the last three (3) years, for the sake of continuity, the decision was reached to keep the existing firm for a two-year period. Mr. Franz noted that the RFP process will be utilized after the new two-year agreement is done.

Mr. Niehaus stated that in piggy-backing off comments made by Mr. Brankin about getting new accountants, is that accounting firms are having such a hard time getting new accountants; and, that towns that have recently gone out to bid are finding that their prices are going up even higher, because a firm like Lauterbach & Amen is saying, "we are strapped so hard, that in order for us to take on a new client, the price is super high"; so in this case, it is an oddity of not going out to competitive bidding to maintain the price. Mr. Niehaus added that in discussions with Mr. Sexton, Village of Lombard's Finance Director, that those entities who are going out to bid and severing relationships are probably paying double-digit increases, or there are only one (1) or two (2) firms coming in and proposing. Mr. Sexton added that in conversations he is hearing that in many cases, the current firm is the only firm submitting proposals. Mr. Sexton stated that

in the last month or so, he read a statistic that 75% of current CPAs are at or above retirement age. Mr. Niehaus noted that in the State of Illinois, there are over 6,000 units of local government, auditors are pushed even harder, because every unit of government has to have an auditor; and there is legislation in ILMA, to actually change the audit requirements for municipalities under 1,000 residents, because, quite frankly, when you are dealing the amount of income they have, what is the point of auditing every year.

Mr. Senak noted that it will interesting to see where things in two (2) years.

Mr. Streicher added that he had received a poll from Illinois Association of Wastewater Agencies (IAWA), inquiring about audit fees as several wastewater facilities have seen significant increases in their audit fees.

Mr. Niehaus asked Mr. Brankin and Mr. Sexton what accountants are doing to draw younger people into the exciting world of Municipal Auditing. Trustee Christiansen stated that she knows several friends who are accountants, so it is interesting to hear about the shortage. Mr. Sexton noted that one factor was sometime back, the requirement that one must have a Masters Degree was added to the list of requirements to get a CPA; and a lot of states are starting to peel that requirement back. Mr. Brankin added there was also the requirement to have 150 credit hours, which also starting to be re-evaluated, as well as some changes to the CPA examine to make it a little easier.

Mr. Goldsmith motioned and Trustee Christiansen seconded the MOTION to approve a two-year renewal for audit services with Lauterbach & Amen for a not to exceed amount of \$17,900 for the CY2024 Audit (to be invoiced in 2025) and a not to exceed amount of \$18,750 for the CY2025 Audit (to be invoiced in 2026), for a total not to exceed amount of \$36,650. President Giagnorio, President Senak, Trustee Christiansen, Trustee Bachner, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, Mr. Goldsmith and Mr. Buckley responded “Aye” during a roll vote. The motion carried.

7. Discussion

7.1 Draft Budget Discussion

Enclosed in the agenda packet is the draft CY2025 Budget for discussion. The enclosed memo details changes in the draft CY2025 budget over the approved CY2024 budget.

To summarize, at this time the budget has an O&M increase of 4.82% (\$252,453). About 60% (\$150,000) of the O&M increase is a result of personnel increases, while nearly 18% (\$45,400) of the increase is a result of health insurance costs, and about 9% (\$22,000) as a result of the increase in the liquid oxygen costs. This is a lower increase from CY2024’s budget, which saw a 6.71% increase.

The budgets overall increase including capital is 3.8% or \$347,645 over the CY2024 approved budget. Comparatively, the Consumer Price Increase for the Chicagoland area was 3.4%

This draft budget has been reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee as well as the Finance Directors, who have provided comments that have been addressed. It is requested that the Executive Oversight Committee provide any feedback or thoughts on the draft budget. After the mid-September sludge hauling bid opening, the budget will be updated to reflect the new rates, and a request will be made to motion the EOC to authorize approval to the Full Boards of Glen Ellyn and Lombard.

The Authority is not seeking approval of the budget at this time due to an upcoming bid opening for Biosolids Hauling that may impact the operations and maintenance budget.

7.2 Solar Discussion

Mr. Franz asked for clarification of the area to be converted. Mr. Streicher advised that the wooded area north of the lagoons is in a floodway, and was removed from the scope, as it would increase the land development costs from \$500,000 to \$2 Million; however, that area could potentially be used for a phase 2, in the future.

Mr. Franz asked for confirmation that the north lagoon has been filled in. Mr. Streicher advised that it has been filled.

Mr. Franz asked if the fill from a Lombard project was going into the south lagoon. Mr. Goldsmith advised the Village is done with that project and no dumping occurred. Mr. Streicher advised that the Village of Glen Ellyn is the only one dumping into the north lagoon just to fill in all areas. Mr. Franz asked if the south lagoon was being filled. Mr. Streicher advised that the south lagoon is not being filled at this time; and as part of the project, GWA was going to pump the south lagoon down since we have that capability, leaving the developer with the responsibility of filling it and preparing it for solar development. Mr. Franz asked if it would be possible to finish filling in the north lagoon and at a later date. Mr. Streicher advised that the development would all be done at the same time, in order to reap the incentives.

Mr. Franz asked what are some of the development costs associated with the project. Mr. Streicher stated that the land development is approximately \$600,000, which was incorporated into the ROI calculation; the solar field itself is between \$5 million dollars to \$5.5 million dollars.

Mr. Goldsmith asked if there was potential for fill to be brought in from either municipality at this point in time to offset the land development costs. Mr.

Streicher replied GWA would be interested. Mr. Goldsmith stated that he has approximately 6,000 cubic yards that he needs to be disposed of from a project. Mr. Streicher stated that GWA would still need to pump out the south lagoon, and the contractor would still need to dredge it, and then it would be ready for fill. Mr. Streicher noted that if it is decided to move forward with the project, the first step would be to have the EOC Committee authorize GWA staff to negotiate the contract with the solar developer, firm up the price for land development, making it a not to exceed price, and if GWA can find ways to realize any cost savings it will.

Mr. Goldsmith asked what the timeframe would be for pumping and dewatering the south lagoon. Mr. Streicher advised that it would take GWA less than a week to pump it out, but he cannot speak on behalf of the developer as to how long it would take them to dredge the area and prepare it for fill.

Mr. Niehaus stated that he had spoken with Mr. Streicher on his way to the meeting to show general support; but has some questions that are specific to Lombard; 1) in the vein of measure twice, cut once and he shared with Mr. Sexton; in terms of an internal fund borrowing from the Village's reserves, he wants the Village of Lombard, to contact its financial advisor, just to check a box and say if we are going to loan money from our other reserves, how is that going to be viewed by outside parties, such as rating agencies. Mr. Niehaus noted that everyone knows that the Village of Lombard needs to work on its ratings position; and the amount Lombard has in its reserves, the amount to be borrowed is not a lot, he still wants to ask that question; 2) asked if there are any existing policies on internal borrowing. Mr. Niehaus added that any time a project came to Lombard's Public Works Committee that had an ROI over ten (10) years, the Committee typically passed on it, however, with an ROI of seven (7) years, with a large portion of it being made up early, this one is enticing; and his hunch is that when programming the out year electrical savings, those numbers are probably conservative estimates and most likely, the electrical costs are going to be more. Mr. Streicher stated the calculations included a two percent (2%) inflation rate. Mr. Niehaus added that when looking at \$220,000 annual savings, it will, most likely, be more than that as electrical costs will out-pace it. Mr. Niehaus noted, that while there is a strong desire to do this project, he wants to sharpen the pencil on Lombard's end and answer some internal questions; and, 3) relative to the \$6.3 Million dollar loan, would it be split based on flow similar to the budget. Mr. Streicher, stated that he assumed so, but would need to have further discussions with the Finance Directors. Mr. Niehaus noted that if there is an acceptable methodology in place, it does not make sense to create a new one for this situation. Mr. Goldsmith agreed stating that Capital component would be the same.

Trustee Bachner asked, if it would come into play as the Village has their bond rating re-accessed, and it comes back favorable, how soon would the money need to be moved to start the project. Mr. Niehaus stated that the next bond rating would probably be about the time the Village is ready to break ground on its

Public Safety building, thus the loan would probably be paid out before then and by that point, there will probably be a track record of some of the money flowing back. Mr. Niehaus asked, with regards to the credit situation, if the window on committing to the project was through April of next year. Mr. Streicher explained that the Inflation Reduction Act, is changed every year, in July of this year is when credits when up to 30% base and then the 10% bonus; and that bonus could be completely removed come next spring, they could modify the base, could be lowered to 28% and there is a plan to slowly dwindle the credit amount down. Mr. Niehaus stated that there is some time to decide this before April.

Mr. Franz asked what GWA has in terms of reserves. Mr. Streicher stated he did not have that number off the top of his head. Mr. Franz asked if GWA had a Capital Reserve. Mr. Streicher stated that GWA only has the cash on hand in the capital and based on the Capital plan spreadsheet in the proposed budget, GWA is forecasting the cash on hand balance at the end of CY2024 to be about \$7.5 million dollars. Mr. Franz asked if we have looked at possibly having GWA use those dollars, especially if we get 50% back. Mr. Streicher stated that an option that crossed his mind, but he has not yet had a chance to analyze yet, is GWA only borrowing from the Villages that first three (3) years of that payback; meaning it will be a quicker payback to the Villages, and then GWA cover the rest. Mr. Streicher noted that in looking at the Capital Plan spreadsheet, GWA is not project any deficit until 2031, which would be impacted if this approach is taken.

President Senak asked what the number would be to borrow from the Villages. Mr. Streicher stated that he did not have the exact figure. Mr. Franz asked if the \$7 Million dollars is the operating reserve for GWA. Mr. Streicher stated that GWA's capital does not have a reserve, it is cash on hand, which, could theoretically go down to zero. Mr. Franz stated that because of what we just went through, realizing that GWA is not in a position to take borrow money because of the governing structure, and what we just learned; it might be better to try and have GWA take as much of that burden on because the two (2) Villages will have to always worry about their bond rating whereas GWA does not, although GWA will have to open their books as well when the Villages issue bonds, and the timing of the big project in the future. Mr. Franz noted there are a lot of timing issues that need to be looked at.

Mr. Franz asked if it makes sense to send this back to the TAC to evaluate alternative ways of achieving this without burdening the two (2) Villages as much as we are proposing here; are there other ways, maybe taking a portion out of GWA's Capital fund and the Villages contribute to the amount that is going to be paid back by the grant very quickly, so it is more of short-term impact on the Village's budgets. Mr. Franz noted that maybe sending it back to the TAC and work with the Finance Directors to come up with alternatives. Mr. Niehaus stated that the EOC Committee will definitely be meeting again in October, and feels that having several options to look at is a good idea; however, in the meantime, he would like for Mr. Sexton to nail down answers to the other questions he posed.

Mr. Franz stated that from what he can remember, Glen Ellyn has not done anything like this either.

Trustee Christiansen asked if the figures include any operations, maintenance or replacement costs. Mr. Streicher advised that it does include contracted operation and maintenance service fees that will be contracted through a third party with an estimated first year cost of \$30,000 and a two percent (2%) escalation thereafter as well. Trustee Christiansen asked if that was factored in to the cumulative cash flow. Mr. Streicher confirmed it was and that the column was hidden on the spreadsheet as it became a little too much information.

Mr. Franz asked if the Villages were to increase the Capital Fund contribution from 2.5% to 3.5% what amount of revenues would be generated. Mr. Streicher stated he could not provide an answer off the top of his head, without having the budget file in front of him and being able to adjust the numbers. Mr. Franz continued by stating that if this is something that the EOC Committee will have continued long-term benefits, maybe a one (1) year or two (2) year contribution increase would be viable. Mr. Streicher stated that he did not think it would have a tremendous impact as raising the rate from 1.25% to 2.5%, for example only increased Glen Ellyn's contribution by \$20,000. Mr. Sexton added that on a \$4 million dollar budget the extra 1% would only be \$40,000 increase.

Mr. Streicher stated that he felt obligated to bring this project forward to the EOC Committee and the TAC; obviously it was not something GWA had planned, as there a good number of capital projects going forward. Mr. Streicher added he is not looking to apply any pressure to the EOC Committee to move forward or not, and felt it would have been a missed opportunity if he had not brought it forward.

Trustee Christiansen asked if this project was taken on, what project or projects would not be able to be done in the future because of the expense. Mr. Streicher stated that if GWA had to defer another project, it would not be possible as it would be deferring necessary rehabilitation to essential equipment or processes. Trustee Christiansen stated that there is an opportunity cost; and, if this project were to proceed, consideration as to where the funding was coming from and what it would mean for future GWA projects. Trustee Christiansen added that she is hesitant to draw down the cash on hand with major future projects to think about.

Mr. Goldsmith asked if this project was only feasible in event of borrowing from the Villages, short of having an influx of cash from those sources, unless GWA defers other projects, which have a more pressing need for maintenance of existing critical equipment. Mr. Streicher stated he was correct, stating that a borrowing or partial borrowing. Mr. Goldsmith asked, in terms of timeframe, in order to take advantage of the credits, there is a need to act quickly, for example, by November.

President Senak asked if the contribution by GWA will come from GWA's reserve fund. Trustee Christiansen stated that is one option. Mr. Goldsmith added that by

doing so, it would possibly delay other projects. Mr. Streicher stated that GWA does not have a Capital reserve fund and the Capital Fund is a cash on hand fund. Mr. Senak asked if the other projects are budgeted were to have any surplus would be used to cover the cost of this project. Mr. Streicher stated that GWA would still budget the regular O&M amount and any surplus realized at the end of the fiscal year would be rolled into the Capital Fund has been the practice for past years. President Senak stated he is interested in whether deferring projects for this one would be something we would have to consider; and, he is interested in the project and would like GWA contribute if the Villages are, but he is not keen on deferring other projects that relate to the operation of the facility. Mr. Streicher agreed that this project is an extra-curricular project. President Senak stated he is in agreement with Mr. Niehaus' comments of having further analysis on different options to aid in the decision making.

Mr. Buckley asked for confirmation that the budget plan for CY2025 does not currently include the solar project. Mr. Streicher confirmed that it is not currently in the CY2025. Mr. Buckley asked if the current budget plan has the Capital fund going negative in 2031, without the solar project and if the project were to proceed, costs could not be recouped until after 2031. Mr. Streicher confirmed that is the case.

Mr. Brankin ask Mr. Streicher if he had changed the number from their small group meeting the previous week when a few discrepancies were noted. Mr. Streicher stated that he had not included the repayment. Mr. Buckley asked if the project and repayment were in the alternate budget plan that included. Mr. Streicher confirmed. Mr. Buckley noted that the budget Capital Budget page in the packet and being displayed on the screen, did not reflect the solar project.

President Senak stated he gets the sense that the view is that we should go forward, the EOC Committee needs some more detail, and Lombard would like to do some due diligence on their side. Mr. Streicher stated that was the direction GWA was seeking from the EOC Committee, should we just drop this or pursue further. President Senak stated that from his point of view, it is at least worth going to the next step and seeing what alternatives are available and the costs with respect to each municipality. Trustee Bachner agreed.

Trustee Christiansen agreed, but asked if this was an all or nothing type project, i.e. do we have to have the sized solar field being proposed or is there a benefit to downscaling, maybe doing a solar field of half or two-thirds the size and see how the numbers shake out. Mr. Streicher stated that the ROI would only grow longer if the field was down-sized, as the idea is the greater the field, the greater the generation, the greater the savings and the incentives. Trustee Christiansen stated that it makes more sense to do it all at once rather than testing it and seeing how well it works. Mr. Streicher stated that this was actually part of the scoring process when reviewing the proposals. Mr. Streicher added that the cheapest field

may not garner the best ROI because they are not generating the most and getting the return.

President Senak asked if there were any other grants available for a project of this nature. Mr. Streicher stated that this was discussed at the TAC meeting and currently, there is not much available in the way of solar grants per se; however, if a local legislator wanted to set aside money. President Senak stated that he asks as there was a private group that we had spoken with at some point in time, who was interested in making a contribution, but only for solar. Mr. Streicher stated that the group was only offering \$25,000. President Senak suggested reaching out to them and see if the offer is still available, knowing that it will not do much, but feels that any offset is better than none.

Mr. Franz stated he felt it was a worthy project to consider, but he is hard pressed to think there will be a decision by November and if that is a hard deadline, as there is a lot to look through and decide. Mr. Franz asked if there were any other projects coming that would require the issuance of bonds that funding for this project might be able to be combined with. Mr. Streicher noted that the final clarifier rehabilitation project will go into design next year, with construction the following year. Mr. Franz suggested maybe combining the two projects as this project is a perfect project for shorter term bonds potentially. Mr. Streicher expressed his hesitation to wait, as by the time the clarifier project is ready for funding, the Inflation Reduction Act credits could either be reduced or discontinued.

Mr. Goldsmith asked for confirmation that the extra 10% is what is driving the April deadline. Mr. Streicher stated it was. Mr. Goldsmith asked if the EOC Committee holds off on making the April deadline, knowing that the loss of the 10% is going to result in a slight uptick in ROI; is there any value with GWA proceeding with the filling in the lagoons, and eliminating those development costs from the developer. Mr. Niehaus asked if that would offset the loss of the bonus 10%. Mr. Streicher stated that GWA had looked at that and with including the land development, it became part of the 40%; and if we do not do that as part of the solar field, then GWA does not get the incentive on roughly \$600,000, and the other concern was that GWA could develop the land, and then end up with no one being interested in it or get worse proposals.

Trustee Bachner asked if GWA got the solar project up and running, would use of the CHP engines be discontinued. Mr. Streicher stated that they would remain in operation, unless an RNG, renewable natural gas, program were to come out. Mr. Streicher noted that the solar field will only reduce GWA's grid usage by 40%-50%; however, when combined with the CHP should be able to reach 100% off grid. Mr. Streicher added that if the wooded area to the north had been included, then that would have the plant close to 100% off grid.

President Senak stated that the consensus is to move forward, but there is a need to address the timing issue, can we meet the deadline. Mr. Goldsmith asked if GWA needs to be under contract by April. Mr. Streicher advised he believed so. Mr. Niehaus stated that the money would not be needed for spending until that time; and believes it is totally worth the effort of rolling up the sleeves and getting to work on developing options. Mr. Goldsmith suggested going back to the TAC and meeting with the Finance Directors to develop options, i.e. meeting the 10% threshold versus not meeting, borrowing, deferring projects, etc. Mr. Niehaus stated that it needs to come back to the EOC Committee with options and not just a yes or no; but let the EOC Committee own and recommend.

Mr. Franz stated that it was a lot of work and being short-staffed he appreciates the work that Mr. Streicher put into this evaluation. Mr. Streicher stated that once the Inflation Reduction Act was changed to allow for tax exempt agencies to take advantage, it made the project hard to pass up looking at. Mr. Streicher added that during his eight (8) years at GWA there had been multiple feasibility studies done and none of them ever came back as favorable until now.

President Senak asked when Mr. Streicher thought he could present options to the EOC Committee. Mr. Streicher stated he could have something for the October meeting if he reinstates the October TAC meeting.

7.3 Pending EOC Action Items

- 7.3.1 3-Year Biosolids Hauling Contract
- 7.3.2 Solar Procurement
- 7.3.3 Primary Sludge Direct Feed Line
- 7.3.4 CY2025 Budget
- 7.3.5 Vehicle Purchase

8. Other Business

- 8.1 Technical Advisory Committee Updates
- 8.2 Other items

9. ***Next EOC Meeting*** – The next regularly scheduled EOC Meeting is set for ***Thursday, October 10, 2024 at 8:00 a.m.***

President Senak called for a motion to adjourn the September 12, 2024 EOC Committee meeting, and President Giagnorio seconded the MOTION. The members responded unanimously to a verbal call of “Aye”. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:41 a.m.

Submitted by:

Gayle A. Lendabarker
GWA Executive Assistant