

**SOUTH CENTRAL CONNECTICUT
REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY**

OCTOBER 27, 2022

MEETING TRANSCRIPTION

David:

I will call this Regional Water Authority meeting for October 27th, 2022 to order. And first item on our agenda, note that we have a hundred percent attendance. First item on our agenda is our safety moment. Larry, did you have somebody that you wanted to do this? I forgot if I said I would do it.

Larry:

We normally just touch on it very quickly, but October is promoting a safety culture in order to ensure that we can eliminate what causes accidents, like unsafe conditions or unsafe acts on the job. And then there's a-

David:

Did we all lose you, Larry? Well, looks like he disappeared and he's probably going to come back. All right, well safety moment is fine. We'll, move on to public comments. I can't see Tara or Jennifer if we have anybody from the public joining us for this new item.

Tara:

There's nobody from the public.

David:

Okay. This is something that we've talked about and is a new item that we're happy to have on our agenda. If anybody would like to come and update us, something that they feel they need to make public in a public meeting. We'll move on to the meet as a Pension and Benefit Committee, which means I will take a motion to recess as the Authority to meet as aforementioned committee.

Kevin:

So moved.

David:

So moved by Kevin.

Catherine:

Second.

David:

Second from Catherine. All those in favor signified by saying aye.

All:

Aye.

[PENSION & BENEFIT COMMITTEE MEETS FROM 12:32 P.M. TO 1:38 P.M.]

David:

Thank you. All right. Just trying to slide down. Item D, is acts on matters arising from committee meetings. We have none. So we'll go right to the consent calendar. What is your pleasure for the five items on the consent calendar?

Catherine:

I move approval of the consent agenda.

David:

Is there a second?

Kevin:

Second.

Suzanne:

I'll second that.

David:

All right. Well, we had two seconds, Kevin and then Suzanne. Is there any points of clarification or any items you request to remove? Seeing none. All right. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

All:

Aye.

David:

Five ayes. Good. We have a unanimous vote. All right. We'll move onto item F, Reports on RPB committee meetings. So we had in October, we had the Finance Committee. Tony, were you able to attend that?

Tony:

Yes, I did. Thank you. They went over the review of the audit with Rochelle present. There were no questions about the audit from the finance committee. We went over the quarterly financial report with Rochelle and they were wondering about the reporting of non-core income and probably will be looking for a detail report in the annual report. We may want to do that ahead of time for them. Let's see. Were there any policy changes in relationship to the revenue? As far as we know, we couldn't see any or knew any of any. They were concerned about the impact of inflation on purchases. We had little or no information to alter that and they wanted to look at the dashboard. They think they're getting too much information and they thought that it maybe be better just to have red flag alerts if and when they're necessary. And that was it.

David:

All right. Very good. Thank you. Land Use Committee, I attended that and it was the annual pizza dinner, so 11 of the 21 members of the RPB were there, so that was great. The main topic of discussion was the security update, and it was nice that so many members of the RPB were there, and they heard from Donna and from Chief Ruggiero regarding the security update, regarding the plan that was explained to us two meetings ago, and the increase in officers, increase in different aspects of security that were at that meeting and in our meeting in executive session, so I won't go into much more detail than that. It was received warmly by the committee. They were pleased with that. And non-committee members of the RPB were pleased as well with the outcome and the explanation of what management has decided to do with our support.

Suzanne:

Thank you, David, for attending that for me. And I have a question for you.

David:

Sure.

Suzanne:

Was the presentation on security any different than the one that was at the... Oh, you weren't at the last RPB meeting, so I was just wondering if there was anything new or different from that?

David:

Good question because I did watch the RPB meeting, but that was an executive session, so it wasn't filmed. Larry, I don't know if you want to handle that?

Larry:

Can you all hear me okay?

David:

Yes, we can hear you fine now.

Larry:

The presentation at the Land Use Committee was essentially a summary of the recommendations that was presented to the Authority and that was the same thing we did at the RPB meeting previous to that.

David:

Okay. So it was a repeat for all of them?

Larry:

Yes.

David:

I didn't realize that. Okay.

Larry:

And that gave them an opportunity to ask some questions though, which was good for clarification purposes.

David:

Yes, a smaller group setting.

Larry:

Smaller group. Paul was able to answer some questions too about the Authority of the Police Department. Can they arrest, can they confiscate materials? Things like that. And he went through their certification process, which is the same as any officer in the state.

David:

Good. All right. Thank you. Any other questions? All right. We'll move on to Consumer Affairs. Catherine, were you able to attend?

Catherine:

Yes, I did. Is an interesting meeting. After the safety moment, and approval of the minutes, there was an excellent update that was provided by Larry Marsik about an overview of the Whitney Dam project, the phase one of the design. I think the members really liked the presentation, but there were so many questions and some of those questions actually sort of led into areas of security and things that had to do with the selection process that probably were inappropriate in that particular meeting. Larry Bingaman stepped in and suggested that these were really not questions that were appropriate for that meeting, which wasn't. Thank you, Larry, for doing that. I was getting a little nervous about particularly the security related questions about the dam, but it was a good overview and I think the committee members appreciated that.

There was then the report from the OCA. There's one matter that had escalated to his level and he had a plan for addressing that matter. I don't recall the specific details, it was over a very small amount of money and an inability to determine why there was constant flow of water at a property, but he was working on resolving that. The committee approved the OCA's invoice of approximately \$1,800. There was one matter that came up, which actually we were discussing at the very beginning before this meeting had started, about a fire in Bethany where significant amounts of water were being drawn and hauled to try to put out that fire. And that's it.

David:

All right. Thank you very much. Any questions? All right. Very thorough. Thank you. Then we will move on to, we'll note certainly who has attendance at the November meetings, and then for your planning purposes, December and move on to the item of finance. Now there are two items under G, Lead and Copper Rule revision briefing, and then a 10 year model. With regard to both, they're both going to have items within executive session, but the Lead and Copper Rule, the response to that by the Authority is going to have to be an application to the RPB. And so I think that one, Mark, I know you were there and I can't see whether you still are or not, but that's going to have to be without your presence. But we can't have the discussion on the 10 year model without first talking about the Lead and Copper Rule because it affects it.

Mark:

All right. Well, if I can come back, I'll try to come back.

David:

We'll let you know. We'll call you when we're done with the Lead and Copper Rule because we'll be happy to invite you into the executive session with a 10 year model, because that's something that you're going to be seeing as RPB. Is that all right?

Mark:

Yes, it's fine with me. Just I don't know if I'll be around again.

David:

Right. Well, if you are great and if you're not, we'll see you tonight.

Mark:

Yes, thank you very much.

David:

All right. Thank you.

Mark:

You guys did very good reports from the people who attended the Land Use and the Consumer Affairs meeting. Very good reports.

David:

Thanks, Mark.

Mark:

Bye-bye.

David:

All right, with that, could we take a 13 minute break and come back at two o'clock and then we'll vote to discuss the Lead and Copper Rule and then go on from there. Okay.

[BREAK]

David:

All right, so let's call our meeting back to order at 2:00 p.m. sharp and we'll go into item G, finance. First item is Lead and Copper Rule revision briefing. Larry, I'll hand it over to you.

Larry:

All right, thank you. I'm going to have Sunny run through the Lead and Copper Rule update, and by way of that, we'll provide you with a background on the rule, what it requires utilities to do under this proposed rule. We will also get into the early estimates of the number of lead service lines in our service territory that may need to be addressed. And then we'll talk preliminarily about some of the cost

implications, and then we'll come out with some recommendations from that. So we'll go into executive session when we get to the preliminary estimates on funding and the number of units. So that'll be about halfway through the presentation that we'll need to do that because it's confidential and proprietary information. So with that, I'll turn it over to Sunny.

Sunny:

Oh, Larry, thanks. David, thanks. So I think we'll jump to the next slide there, Tara. All of you're able to hear me, right?

David:

Yes.

Sunny:

Great. So just, I would say, I'm pretty sure all of us here know the background, but just to revise, I would say, and touch base and refresh. The revisions to the Lead and Copper Rule was published by the EPA. The final action was done in 2021, January. So there was a lot of discussions, there was a lot of feedback from the utilities ever since Flint, Michigan came online, and I would say everybody knew about, I would say, the lead issues. So there has been plenty of discussions that was happening. So EPA finally, I would say, took a lot of input and published, I would say, the LCRR in 2021. So one of the major task that is outlined as per the LCRR for all, I would say, community water systems, public water systems, irrespective of the size of the water system, they're supposed to submit an inventory.

So the inventory will include both the utility side and the customer side, so both the public side of it and the private side of it. So the inventory will include the public side, what we have in terms of the connections to the homes. The private sides will have, how, I would say, the pipeline is in terms of material, size of the materials, and predominantly focusing on the nature of the material itself, whether it's going to be lead, copper, galvanized iron, so on and so forth. So for any utility that's greater than 50,000 customers, the rules and regulations indicate that they should also make it publicly available. So we would fall under, I would say, the utility, which is greater than 50,000 customers.

So we will have an online portal which public can actually access and should be able to see whether, what kind of, I would say, inventory is out there, whether, I would say, depending on the address, their neighbors have it or perhaps they themselves have it. So that's part of, I would say, the rules and regulations. And currently a lot of utilities are undergoing this and then updating the GIS and providing streetwise data. It doesn't clearly say, I would say, it's up to the utility to decide on how detailed they want to get into in terms of providing the home addresses and street addresses. EPA desks leave it open for the utilities to decide whether they just want to give you lat and longitudes based on GPS or provide addresses for each of these service lines.

Tony:

So are we planning to issue a public report in anticipation of all that?

Sunny:

Right. We're supposed to file as we go down to October, 2024, Tony. We are supposed to file the entire, I would say, document with the states, and that'll be accessible for all the public. As well as, I think, we're supposed to provide an online portal where people can go and check pretty much on a regular

basis on which streets we have found, I would say, lead lines. So it's both, I would say, available to the state, as well as, I would say, each utility has to maintain it for public to access it.

Tony:

Okay.

Sunny:

So the four major class... Go ahead.

Suzanne:

I have another question. Sunny, you mentioned just a second ago, there's public versus customer, and the customer is the lines from our pipes to their house. The public is the size of the line. I'm not following what that means.

Sunny:

Right. Let me just say, I would say, if I can share my screen a quick second here, maybe this... That's why I've pulled this a little bit. Are you able to see this one, all the folks? Suzanne, are you able to see what I'm sharing?

Suzanne:

Yeah.

David:

Yeah, that's good.

Sunny:

Okay. So technically, I would say, this is from the EPA document. Ours looks a little different, but if you look at, I would say, the water main underneath the street, and the water meter is going to be more towards the customer owned service line side. But typically, this is how it looks, right? So you have the water main, and then you have the connector pipe that goes in, and there is a property boundary as you can see, and then there is a curb stop, and then from the curb stop, it becomes the customer service own line. So this is EPA's standard detail that is across, I would say, all utilities, but if I'm going to share what regional water has, regional water would have something similar to this.

So most of the lines that we have, this is the latest and the greatest, but we don't have copper tubings for most service lines. So if you see this one RWA maintained, this portion from the water main to the curb stop, or the curb valve would be ours. This is the utility portion or the public portion of it. So from the curb stop-

Suzanne:

And that's what you're calling public. Okay.

Sunny:

... from the curb stop all the way into the meter basement, or sometimes if you look at the meter, can be placed outside the meter walls. This should be part of private or customer. So you can either call it

private or customer. So just, I would say, I get the drawings both for the EPAs as well as ours. But this is more a generic drawing that's generated by EPA for people to kind of, I would say, go and read it. But ours varies a little bit based on how we place the meters and how, I would say, our meter boxes are positioned.

Suzanne:

Thank you. And you're calling us public and them customer?

Sunny:

Correct. Right. That's the way that the rule, final rule says, you can either define it as private and public or utility and customers. So the nomenclature is something that's left open for the utilities to decide on how they want to call the private site and the public site. But it's left open to our own interpretations. And each utility has, I would say, their own versions of definitions. So EPA doesn't clearly, I would say, categorically say you should refer to it this way or that way. So it's left to us. So in the inventory classifications, as per the LCRR, they want to define, I would say, these service lines, the ones that run in from, I would say, the water main in the street to the homes.

So they can define it in four ways. One is lead, if it's clearly identified as lead. Then the other one, they call it galvanized requiring replacement. So the galvanized requiring replacements, they have a few definitions outlined in the final rule, which says that if you have, I would say, some kind of a lead gooseneck that is upstream of the galvanized line, it'll still be considered as a lead service line for practical purposes and should be replaced. Right. So the third one is clearly we have a copper line as the recent, after 1980s, when lead was considered, I would say, not to be the optimal material of choice. Copper was being substituted and PVC and polyethylene pipes was substituted in terms of, I would say, replacing lead service lines. So they are non-lead.

And the fourth category is the utilities. If they can't really identify if it's lead, if they don't know if it's galvanized requiring replacement, and if they can't really identify whether it's copper or polyethylene, we can still define it as a status unknown. And in the later years, as we update them annually, the EPA says, you can come back to us and tell us, okay, 2024, you submit this inventory, but 2024 you can come back and tell us, okay, this address, whatever it is, 1 Main street, we did not know in October, 2024. The status was unknown-

Sunny:

We did not know in October 2024, the status was unknown. Now, June 2025, we have now know it's polyethylene, so we can update those as each year goes on. So they have given that window of opportunity to utilities to say that, "If you do not know, just explicitly say you don't know for certain addresses, but we will give you the opportunity to come and update as each year goes on." So these are the four categories under which we have to classify and pretty much all utilities across the United States have to do it. And the deadline for submission is October 2024, for doing the inventory for both the public side and the private side. Any questions? Okay.

So let me move on to the next one. I think Tara has already advanced it. Thanks Tara.

So, what we have, that's the background to it. So what we have done so far, we have completed the phase one investigations using CDM Smith. And they went through the tap cards, they went through the service records, they went through the field operations notes, they went through all the documentation that we had in house. And based on that, they had come up with a certain set of inventory. And out of that they have identified about 30,000 plus unknowns. So what does that really mean? So hundred

thousand plus connections, we have pretty much identified 30,000 of them are really unknowns. Where we can classify them as lead, copper, polyethylene, or any other material of galvanized requiring replacements. So we can put into any of those buckets.

Now, the second phase of investigation is to make the 30,000 or 35,000, or 40,000 to a more narrower band. Where we can identify and put them into different buckets. So we can submit for October 2024, we can submit the inventory list to the State as well as to the EPA. So what we have done so far, we have done the phase one. It got complete some time in mid of 2022. After that, the phase two investigations is more a cumbersome, elaborate process. Where we have to really go and get participation from the homeowners as well as do a little bit of invasive testing. Where we can go and identify whether the service lines belong to any of these four categories. So for that, we had to get another consultant. And for that we floated an RFQ/RFP process sometime in August.

So the RFQ was qualifying the consultant who would come in. So we had three responses Tighe & Bond, Jacobs, and CDM Smith. And then after that we asked all three to provide cost proposals. And based on all the three technical proposals as well as the price proposals, CDM Smith ended up having both on the technical side of it as well as on the price side of it, they clearly beat the competition. Both Jacobs and Tighe & Bond were clearly not up to par when it came to CDM Smith's proposals, both on the technical side as well as on the price side. So we have awarded CDM Smith the contract to do the phase two as of October, and they should start working on that. The kickoff should be sometime during the first week of November, and their schedule is to finish this inventory by December 2023. That's the anticipated schedule.

Just to give a background in terms of the question that most of you will have in mind is, are we really in terms of the levels, the action levels as well as trigger levels? So EPA has said, which is basically Connecticut DPA's action level, "There's 15 parts per billion," which is a very low number. And where we are right now based on testing we have done, or the period of whenever it is, our numbers have never exceeded two parts per billion. So we are significantly lower than the action level of 15 parts per billion. The trigger levels according to the EPA are 10 parts per billion. But just to put things in perspective, if you look at one part per billion, you take a Olympic size swimming pool, one drop is one part per billion. So it's such a insignificant number in terms of the volume itself. So one parts per billion would translate to one drop in a Olympic size swimming pool. So that's how small this number is. But even still we are not even close to 15 parts per billion.

So even with that said, we want to be more proactive in eliminating a lot of lip service lines as well as anything that we find on the goosenecks, anything that we find on the utility sign. So we are being proactive, and I think Regional Water has been proactive ever since 1970s. Where any time we found lead goosenecks and all that on our side of it, we've been replacing them on a consistent basis. So I think that goes back, not just because of the EPA rules, I think RWA has enacted this as part of a procedure policy from 1970s onwards. Not that we have replaced all of it, but as we come across during meter replacements, as we come across during service lines and all that, we've been consistently making an effort to do this. If you have any questions, I will stop. If not, let me move on to the next one. Any questions?

Suzanne:

Yeah. I have a question, Sunny.

Sunny:

Sure.

Suzanne:

I want to make sure I understand this whole parts per billion and what that means for us. So I'm assuming what you're saying is parts per billion lead contamination inside the water, yes?

Sunny:

Correct, correct.

Suzanne:

Okay. So is the EPA saying that, "If you have 15 parts per billion that's where you have to replace the lead pipe, but if it's not at that level, you don't?"

Sunny:

The EPA doesn't actually, even at 15 parts per billion, the EPA would pretty much give you a consent order. You're correct. So for example, there were two or three cities, the Newark is an example. Trenton I believe also had a consent order. So those cities where they had exceedances of over 15 parts per billion, you need to take action actually. So as part of the utility, you are required to take action at 15 parts per billion any time if you fall below that, 15 parts per billion, between 10 parts per billion and 15 parts per billion, there is something called a trigger level. So the trigger level is for you to get aware of that there is going to be a problem. And then you have to start planning for replacements at 10 parts per billion. So at 15 parts per billion, most likely, you will get a consent order from the State saying that, "You have to start replacing the deadlines," which is exactly what happened with Newark and Trenton and a few other cities.

Chicago is another one, which I think they believe they have a consent order to replace as well. So some of these cities which have exceedances, Flint is another example, and many cities in Michigan also had consent orders where they were exceeding the action levels. And at that point it's considered a health risk and a hazard. So the State comes in and says, "The EPA will come in and say, 'You guys have to replace it.'" For us, we are very low, we are actually almost 10% of where we should be for action levels. So in a way it's great. They can't really come and give you a consent order. But in terms of for higher purpose, giving good quality water, eliminating less from every levels of supply of water, it'll be good for us to do this as more serving towards the higher purpose.

Suzanne:

But my question is how much of what you're about to share in terms of what we need to replace is in the category of higher purpose? And what is in the category of an early warning system? 10 to 15 and we should be proactive and 15 is we got to do it now. How much are we in each category?

Sunny:

At this point of time... Till the inventory is fully done, Suzanne. We won't really have a good idea as to where these buckets go. But as you see based on the phase one inventory, when we go into the executive session, you will see that Rochelle is going to share a few slides. Where we have taken some educated guesses and based on the private side as well as the utility side, and we have applied whatever knowledge we have at this time. And we have done some financial modeling based on it. So you will see some numbers pertaining to what we have to replace and what things we have to do for higher purpose. So I mean once you go into slide number eight and nine, you will see those numbers actually.

Suzanne:

Okay, thank you.

Sunny:

Sure. Tara, you want to go to the next one?

So what have we done? The phase one, we have taken all the paper records that was there, the tap cards, the service records, and we have gone through, made them into electronic formats, which was the phase one work. And then we have now categorized the lead lines and unknowns, but still the unknowns are still running into tens of thousands of numbers. And so far what we have done also is the GIS mapping of what we have done in phase one, mapped it onto a GIS, which will come in handy as we keep updating these inventories. The GIS mapping will be available for public at some point of time when we start rolling it out and all the addresses and things of that sort will be mapped and people can click on it and find out if their line is lead or if there is any lead presence near the neighborhood. So it'll be a very extensive GIS based application that'll be available online, but that's going to be in the future. But for the time being, we have in-house mapping done based on the information we have gathered.

The next big thing we have done is we are continuously working, Rochelle and myself are working along with the team with the SRF folks plus the green banks and plus other institutions. Where we are knocking on the doors to see how much of grants we can get, how much of low interest loans we can get. So that portion is a parallel activity that is ongoing.

Then the third big step would be the communications plan. Where the communications is a significant activity because the customers have to be informed, both the stakeholders, internal stakeholders as well as the external stakeholders, will have to be informed. But there is a slide which goes into much more details. I'll elaborate more on it, on what we are planning to do, what we have done and what we are planning to do.

Tara, you want to go to the next one?

So the current activities, which ties into the phase two of the work, the inventory of service lines will continue more detailed. The communications, we are developing the plan and the roadmap to communicate with the customers, both internal, external. The field investigations will follow sometime after the initial set of phase two investigations. We will perhaps go into more conventional and newer technologies to see whether we need to be very invasive in terms of finding out the service lines, or can we actually do more newer technologies using certain electrical resistivity technologies and other activities which can give us a better idea than being very invasive and opening up people's yards and all that. So the other activity that needs to happen is the corrosion controlled treatment. So we have Jacobs who has done a preliminary study for us on the corrosion control.

We already use poly phosphates for corrosion control, but there could be more studies to be done to design a mix that's going to reduce the level of lead in the service lines and all that. So that's one of the reasons why our lead levels are low because the polys phosphates which we have been using for a long time has helped in lining the pipes. So the lead corrosion doesn't happen, which doesn't lead into the tap water having lead contaminated water. So that's an ongoing study we have, by September we have the initial corrosion control studies done. There are a few recommendations that have come out of it. We will start doing some more pipe loop studies based on it to see what the optimal mix, because the research is developing on it. So there could be orthophosphates which we could add into the mix to the polyphosphates.

So there is a lot more studies to be done in the next year or so. We will complete those bench scale testing and pipe loop studies to understand better methodology and better chemicals and maybe a

hybrid of chemicals to mitigate the effects of corrosion and carrying lead on any other corrosive activities that could make the water less... In terms of color, in terms of discoloration, in terms of odor, in terms of more chemical contaminants, to prevent all those, we will do more, bench scale testing to optimize corrosion control measures. So that's another panel activity. Along with this, we have to gear ourselves up for filter distribution and management because the EPA does say, "Once you find a service line, that's lead service line, we have to intimate the customer of the lead service that's there in their house."

Even though we are not obligated to replace them, we are to intimate, communicate and say, "Hey, you know what? You guys have a lead service line, but we are going to provide you a filter for six months with cartridges, then we will do some sampling. And once the sampling comes clean, and then I think the responsibility for the utility ends there." If the customer so decides to replace, he can inform us, then there is a continuous engagement of doing our side of it, their side of it. So along with it comes the filter, distribution and management. So we are getting geared for it. We already have, the director of procurement, Peter, is working with filter companies, Brita and so on to get contracts done. So we are getting ready because of supply chain issues, we want to make sure that we have enough ordered. So when the time comes, we are ready to distribute that. So that's part of the current activities that's ongoing.

Tara, you want to go to the next slide?

On the communications plan. So I think this is a very major exercise, and one of the major activities that we will have to do is... We hired a WaterPIO, a communications consultant, who has done this work for the last decade or so. Working with many municipalities across the United States. And they have a very specialty in addressing the lead service lines, lead copper rules and regulations. And they have been working with many communities across the US. And I had a conversation with them last week, and we have brought them on board for the last month or so. And we had a kickoff last week. And they are very much geared. They have done the templates. And so, we could actually use that expertise in terms of lessons learned, in terms of existing templates where we can actually tweak.

So the audience for this is going to be, as I said, "Both internal and external." The internal audience, just to give an example, it'll be the board, the authority, the RPB, then the leadership team, the employees, and the vendors work with us. The external would be the customers, the municipalities, the boards of health, elected officials. We are interacting with the municipal elected officials, the New Haven Task Force, Chambers of Commerce. There could be one of the things that Newark did, I think they had religious leaders and organizations that participated in conveying the message to the residents, the news media, the social media platforms. So there is many different activities that's being planned on the external side as well, both on how to communicate with whom to communicate, and then the formation of lead advisory groups with the health officials of different municipalities working along with Regional Waters.

So there's many aspects to the communications plan which we are trying to attack. Then again, we come into the timing of the communication efforts. So right now, there could just be a message that's going out saying that, "We are going to do the inventory, we might come and knock on your doors and find out if there is leads service lines that's part of the home." So based on when we want to communicate, there's going to be a timing based communication plan that's going to be developed. It could be door hangers, it could be, postcards. It could just be finding out, what kind of service lines they have. So that could be a postcard with scratch test and all that. So the timing is going to be different and based on the timing and the content of the communication, what needs to be done.

So there is a whole area of, the plan that is being developed right now. Taking all of these, metrics into consideration and WaterPIO will be an outside consultant who will help us out working alongside, our

communications team as well as with CDM Smith, who has done this for other cities. They're working in Chicago, they work with Newark, so they also have a very good solid base on communications. So these three, the internal communications team with WaterPIO as well as CDM Smith, they will pretty much devise the base upon which we will build based on input from both internal and external folks, and how we want to communicate and what to communicate and the nature and the content.

Suzanne:

Is anybody out there doing this yet, communicating?

Sunny:

With regard to-

Suzanne:

[inaudible 01:57:15] utilities?

Sunny:

Many utilities are doing it at this time, Suzanne. Especially, some of the utilities have successfully done this. And they have already replaced because they came under a consent order, and some of them have done it. WaterPIO was one who has helped them out. CDM Smith is another consultant who has helped out many utilities in that regards. So I think with both of them coming on board, we'll be able to get their lessons learned as well as their expertise in providing us the right platform to approach and develop both the content and the way we want to approach and knock on the doors action.

Larry:

Suzanne, in Connecticut, I know that the city of New London has been very active in replacing all of their known lead service lines within their system on the utility side as well as on the customer side.

Suzanne:

And do you know, Larry, if they are in the parts per billion high end, early warning low end?

Larry:

I'm sorry, Suzanne, I don't have that number at hand, but we could certainly find that out and let you know. But they're doing it as a precautionary action.

Suzanne:

Right. Thank you, Larry. Going back to the communication piece, I guess, I only have one concern about this is that I don't want our communication to alarm people unnecessarily, but I think it needs to educate and inform. So I think we need to do a good job giving a larger context and talking about how RWA has very good systems, but as part of this whole national effort, we'll be doing this kind of thing. So I just don't want [inaudible 01:59:12].

Sunny:

That's a very good point, Suzanne. I think that-

Larry:

[inaudible 01:59:14].

Sunny:

Go ahead, Larry.

Larry:

No, no. Go ahead, Sunny.

Sunny:

No, I think that's a very good point because that's one of the reasons why I think we are talking to different municipalities, we are talking to the elected officials to make sure that the messaging is right. So it has to be a positive message, as you said, "It need not be alarming." And that's where the lead advisory groups too are going to work. Because even recently, I think last week, New Haven came out with this, and we want to be part of it. Making sure that the messaging is consistent between the municipalities. As well as we are requesting the State to also message in the right fashion. So all the utilities across Connecticut, we are all reaching out to the DPH because we feel that DPH would be the primary source to disseminate this message across the State. So they are the department of public health.

So we are as part of the Connecticut American Water Works Association, we are all knocking on the doors. So that the communications happens right from top-down and then they get that information from the DPH and then we all piggyback on it. As well as work in tandem with the municipal officials. As well as both on the political end of it as well as the administrative end of it. And working with these advisory groups to make sure that the communication goes in terms of what we need to communicate so that we don't alarm people. At the same time, we also inform that this is what we are going to do, and we're going to help you do all these things. And this is a requirement based on the EPAs. Mandatory requirement that we have to do as part of the inventory. So as you said, "The message has to be good," but we are working to develop those. And that's where I think having these two people will help us because they have worked in delivering similar messages for other cities as well. So we will use their expertise to fine tune our messaging too.

Catherine:

I agree with Suzanne that we don't want to alarm people, and I also think this is an opportunity to... I don't know how to say. Well, frankly, to promote the RWA brand that we've been taking these steps, appropriate steps for decades, which is beneficial to customers. The one thing I'm a little bit concerned about, so I think that there needs to be a balance message, this is going to be very expensive. And we don't want customers to think that we're spending money that's going to increase costs and possibly rates for something that may not be necessary. But the one thing and I think part of that messaging has to take into consideration that decades ago, the thought process...

In fact, actually Connecticut State law says that, "A child under six that has a blood lead level with 15 micrograms per deciliter that that's not blood poisoning." The federal government has lowered that blood lead level to five micrograms per deciliter for any federally subsidized housing. And I have heard from physicians that say, "Any level of lead in a child's blood under the age of six is potentially damaging to their long-term development." So as the medical profession learns more, and we learn more about the negative effects of lead in the blood of a child. These things becoming more and more concerning

which is, obviously, why we're going through this regulatory process to address this issue. So I think that the any efforts that the RWA makes to make sure that our delivery systems are free of lead is actually benefiting all of our customers. And I think that needs to be the message, or someone can say it more eloquently than I can.

Larry:

And certainly, our corrosion control techniques and the chemicals that we add in there significantly reduce the leaching of lead into customer's homes, not only in the distribution system, but as it sits in the customer's plumbing within their home or building. And there may be lead in the in-home plumbing or solder or things like that, but our corrosion control prevents the water from being aggressive and getting that lead to leach out. So we do have a very strong message there in terms of the safety. But on the other hand, as you well know, lead is becoming a very hot and topical issue and concern for lots of people.

Catherine:

Yeah. I agree. But it is a good message for the RWA. I've been dealing with lead poisoning issues as long as I've been with the city, and I have never seen an epidemiological study come back with a positive... For any lead in the water in any of the homes where we've had lead poisoned children. So that's a good message.

Sunny:

Absolutely.

Catherine:

Anyway, sorry.

Sunny:

Oh no.

Larry:

No. That's good.

Sunny:

I think as you said, Catherine, "It's zero lead is better." That's why I showed you we are very low in terms of two parts per billion, but I would agree with the message that you said with the medical professionals that, "Zero is better than anything else," actually. So I think that's the way we want to go. Taylor, you want to go to the next one? Unless anybody has questions. So I think this just gives you a snapshot of the schedule that we are looking at. The EPA deadline, as I mentioned, is going to be October 2024 for submissions of the inventory. Our schedule at this point of time, as I said, "We are doing the phase two of the inventory," which should end around December 2023. So if CDM is able to complete that by December 2023, we should be able to refine those numbers and have it substantially before October 2024.

So that's our tentative schedule. Then these scheduled for some of the construction, the actual construction based on the lead service lines which we're going to replace might actually begin in 2025, sometime in calendar year 2025. It's not fiscal year, it's calendar year 2025. EPA doesn't really mandate

unless it's got some consent order. But even still based on the reading of the final rules as well as what they had put out, they pretty much say, "If you exceed the action levels of 15 parts per billion." I'm just going to put a caveat here based on two documents that I read from EPA, one says 3%, the other one says 7%. So EPA has to clarify, but it is a dynamic moving document. So I'm sure EPA will issue a clarification, but I think the original rule has 3%. So I've used 3% here, but there was another document that was put out by EPA for guidance for developing an inventory. But I would go to the federal register, which says 3%, so I put in 3%.

So if there is a utility that exceeds 15 parts per billion which exceeds the action levels then they said, "You should at least replace every year 3%," which means they give a utility almost 30 years to replace the entire a hundred percent. So it's a long drawn process. They're not expecting utilities to replace in two years or three years or five years. So they're giving you a long rope for you to replace a hundred percent. So 3% times 33 years, you're somewhere close to a hundred percent. Recently, I think Rochelle will delve more into the financing based on our conversations with DPH. They're also working to see whether they can give some grants during 2023 and 2024, and we want to try out some pilot projects based on a small neighborhood where it's manageable, 10 houses, whatever it is.

And we might try out not so invasive service line replacements, like pipe pulling or something like that. We want to see whether those would be much more efficient in terms of construction itself, reduces the risk for the homeowner, reduces the risk in terms of other liabilities that we might face working on people's yards and pavements and driveways. So we want to try a few pilot projects in 2023, sometime during the calendar year, but that's going to be, again, based on the funding and grants available. So that's a tentative schedule. We have not ironed out the schedules yet, but certainly the big schedule that we have right now is the December 2023. We want to finish the inventory of phase two associated with the unknowns. So that's a big schedule which we are looking at.

The construction itself will start in 2025 and the 10 year plan, once you see Rochelle's plan, you will see that the actual replacement of lead service lines and the capital dollars associated with it will be flowing in from 2025, all the way up to 12, 13 years. But the EPA itself doesn't come out and say, especially for utilities, which are less than the action levels, they don't even say you have to replace it. But for public water systems, which exceed action levels, they pretty much say 3%. There's one document, as I said, say 7%, but I would go with the federal register for the time being and take 3% instead of relying on the guidelines for inventory itself. So if you take both, even at the 7% replacements, you're still talking 15, 16 years. If you take the 3%, you're still talking 30 years plus.

Larry:

When we go into the next slide, slide eight, I'd like to suggest Mr. Chairman that we go into executive session due to that being financial information pertaining to commercial and financial information.

David:

All right. Is there a motion to that effect, so we can discuss it?

Tony:

So moved.

David:

Is there a second?

Kevin:
Second.

David:
Catherine, was that a second or a question? Catherine, you're on mute. Sorry.

Kevin:
Second.

David:
Thank you, Kevin. Thank you, Kevin. I got your second. Catherine, was that a question before we vote?

Catherine:
It's a recommendation that the record reflect the statutory section that we're using for this discussion which would be 1-210 (b) (5) (B).

David:
Correct.

Catherine:
It's scary that I know that.

David:
Yeah. Well, that's all right. Jennifer and Tara will make sure that that's part of it, as well as inviting the senior executive team that is present and of course us.
So we have a motion on the floor in a second. All those in favor signified by saying, "Aye."

All:
Aye.

David:
Passes unanimous. All right. So we are in executive session for this purpose.

[2:40 p.m. to 3:55 p.m., executive session pursuant to G.S. Section 1-200(6)(E) to discuss matters covered by Section 1-210 subsection b #'s 5 B, pertaining to commercial and financial information].

David:
We can reach out to Mark to let him know we are on the Ten Year Model. The item is Item 2, the review of the Ten Year Model. I would like to have a motion to go into executive session to discuss this because of the reasons stated in the agenda, which Catherine reminded us of and inviting all of us and inviting Mark from the RPB, if he does show.

Kevin:

So moved pursuant to the statute and the reasons stated on the agenda.

David:

Second. Alright. Tony. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

All:

Aye.

David:

Passes unanimously.

[3:55 p.m. to 4:42 p.m., executive session pursuant to G.S. Section 1-200(6)(E) to discuss matters covered by Section 1-210 subsection b #'s 5 B, pertaining to commercial and financial information]

David:

We'll go into Item H, business updates. To quickly move things along, any significant changes in COVID?

Larry:

Yes, I was going to introduce, just so you could meet her, Elizabeth Calo, she goes by Liz and she is the Sr. Director of Employee Relations and HR Operations, and she is serving as the interim head while we are going through the recruiting process for the VP and CHRO. So here's Liz in my lower left corner.

Liz:

Hi everyone, nice to meet everyone. As of October 26th we have 120 confirmed cases, so it's an increase from the last report on 10/3, there has been no identified trends in departments or internal work groups. So our vaccination rate is at 85%, cleaning is status quo. We are still doing everything we have been doing with electrostatic spraying, treatment plants are being cleaned once a week, remote work is still being conducted and we are monitoring everyone's performance metrics.

We are following the current CDC's guidelines and that's it for the update on COVID.

Larry:

I'll do some high level discussion and then Sunny and I have another item that we wanted to update you on in executive session, because it pertains to real estate matters under Section 1-206(D) of the CT General Statutes. So, just to quickly summarize this past month I personally communicated with the owners of three businesses, two of which were a lab, one that was a plumbing company and we were also finalizing our economic adjustment for PipeSafe moving forward to implement that in November.

I have reinstated my next round of one-on-one meetings with employees, so that is going well. Also, to get their view of the business and things they think we can do better.

I also spent time in the field this past year. This past month with Dan Peschell, who is our Director of Operations and our Aquatic Resource scientist, who is Will Henley. So touring the area to see how the crews were doing with Dan and I went out and did water quality sampling at Lake Watrous and the Dawson Reservoir in Woodbridge. I saw how they analyzed the samples and looked at the algae in the water and actually learned how to drive a boat – so that was interesting.

This past month David and I co-authored a Op-ed on Imagine a Day Without Water, which is part of the American Water Works Association National Campaign to get people to appreciate the value of their local water system. We also ran an ad in the New Haven Register and the Connecticut Post on October 20.

David:

If that is written, we can see that. Is there anything not written, just because obviously it's 5:00 and we've got to get going.

Larry,

Yes, I can forgo the rest of it, that's fine.

David:

What's written we have, I appreciate that. But if you have more verbal, you often have verbal updates.

Larry,

That's fine. I think this month is confined to what's written, so I can move on.

David:

Ok, thank you.

Larry:

We need to go into executive session for the next part.

David:

Ok. So the next part is to discuss potential real estate transaction. Is there a motion consistent with what's in the agenda for the purpose and inviting those present?

Catherine:

So moved.

David:

Is there a second?

Suzanne:

I'll second it.

David:

All those in favor of going into executive session for real estate purposes, say aye.

All:

Aye.

David:

Passes unanimously. All right we are in executive session.

South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority
October 27, 2022

[4:47 p.m. to 4:55 p.m., executive session pursuant to C.G.S. Section 1-200(6)(D) to discuss matters concerning strategy pertinent to real estate matters]

4:55 p.m., Authority comes out of executive session and meeting adjourns.