Representative Policy Board

Consumer Affairs Committee

October 17, 2022

Meeting Transcription

Stephen:

I will call the October Consumer Affairs meeting to order. First item of business is our safety moment. Today concerns cyber security. Always an issue. Please take a look at that, some good tips there. Next on the agenda is approval of our minutes. Do I have a motion?

Naomi:

So moved.

Stephen:

Thanks, Naomi. Second?

Rich:

Second.

Stephen:

Are there any additions, corrections or omissions to the minutes? Hearing none. All those in favor of approval? Aye.

Group:

Aye.

Stephen:

Any opposed? Any abstention? Thanks. Carries unanimously. Today we have Larry Marsik with us. Thanks Larry for being here to give us an update on the Whitney Dam project. This is a major capital project that's going to extend over several years. Larry, you were an engineer, correct?

Larry M.:

Yes, I'm a licensed engineer in the State of Connecticut, professional engineer.

Stephen:

And your responsibility is all of the dams that the RWA has?

Larry M.:

Well you've taken my first line. That's what I was going to say, your first line. Yes, I've been here for 20 years, just about 20 years, and most of my time is spent managing our dams.

Stephen:

Okay.

Larry M.:

Can I lead into it?

Stephen:

You're well familiar with this old dam then?

Larry M.:

Yeah. Lake Whitney Dam is our oldest dam out of all dams that we own. It was built around 1860 to 1861, and it was built between an agreement with Eli Whitney II, John McClellan and Son, the contractor, and the New Haven Water Company. And that was actually when the New Haven Water Company first went into existence somewhere in that timeframe there.

Stephen:

Wow.

Larry M.:

I'll just give you how old it is, is that our president, Abraham Lincoln, didn't become president until 1861, so this dam was built before he became president. So it's really old. And the other thing that we don't have, we don't have records of construction, there was never constructions, and it was set in one of our first meetings that there was never any contract documents for this. And that was probably something that was done back then. Things were done, I don't believe engineers would had to oversee dams construction until a failure that took place in the 1900s, and then it became mandatory that licensed engineers had to oversee dam design and dam construction.

But anyway, the dam was built in around 1860, 1861. Just after it was completed, they ran short of water and they raised it in 1864. And the reason for why they're short of water is because we were running some water to New Haven for fire and domestic, and also, Eli Whitney II was using it for his factories that were built right below the dam for hydro mechanical power for making guns.

Stephen:

Larry, was that the original reason for the dam?

Larry M.:

I believe there was a dam before Whitney Dam there that was used for mills. They used to crush wheat and stuff to make stuff, so there was a very small dam there. Not as high as one that's there, but yes, the reason for the dam is for both, for water and also for Eli Whitney for making guns.

Stephen:

But there was no treatment on that at that time, right?

Larry M.:

For water? No.

Stephen:

Yeah.

Larry M.:

No. I believe it was just-

Stephen:

Was it to fight fires or was it for household?

Larry M.:

I believe to fight fires and for both. It was for both.

Stephen:

Okay. And so, that was a meandering river before that?

Larry M.:

Yes.

Stephen:

So when they damned it, that had to expand on a lot of property. Who owned that?

Larry M.:

That's correct. And I believe Eli Whitney dealt with a lot of that stuff in terms of purchasing their property, because they were losing property by raising the water level, so if you read through some of the records you can see that.

Stephen:

Okay.

Larry M.:

And I don't know if everybody knows that Eli Whitney II's father was the inventor of the cotton gin. So it's well known at that time. So again, in 1864 it was raised, and then in 1917 the dam spillway, which originally was a 100, went from a 100 to 250 feet. So they two and a half times the spillway length because of the development going on upstream while water was running down there, and it was the right thing to do at that time. So it was done by an engineer named Albert Hill, which did a lot of our dams in the New Haven Water Company. So this dam is a Class C high hazard dam, and that's a definition by the state of Connecticut, Department Environmental Protection, Dam Safety.

And what Class C means, it's the highest hazard that they have for dams. If the dam was to fail, it would cause significant property damage downstream, and also probably loss of lives. So they really, Class C are very, how you say, robust, very strict in terms of making sure that it's built properly to the right

standards and stuff. So that's what we have in front of us, a Class C dam. The site itself is iconic only because of Eli Whitney. He had a contract with the government to make guns for the Civil War, and that's why he was under contract and he needed water to make them, because his whole factory used water for his machines to operate. So the site in itself is iconic, because it's a historic site.

Stephen:

Larry, what area would be impacted if that dam failed?

Larry M.:

All the way down to Long Island Sound, just let you know that. These Class C dams have to have emergency action plans, and as part of that is that we model it by computer, and that computer models the water surface as it goes down to Long Island Sound. And in that, there's a map out there that shows the delineation of how far and how many houses the water would affect during the failure of the dam. And that's part of requirements from the state, it's actually a requirement that we had to meet. So we have done that work and it's on record right now.

Stephen:

Okay.

Larry M.:

Okay?

Stephen:

Yeah.

Larry M.:

Yeah, so regarding GZA, we had entered a contract with GZA, and GZA has done numerous analysis for us on the dam. Okay. A couple of these things are the terms of, they call it H&H analysis, which is hydraulics and hydrology. And that determines the capacity of the existing spillway and what we need to do to improve it, and what we need to do for the dam to improve the dam. So the requirement for a Class C dam is that this dam needs to address a probable maximum flood, which is 34 inches of rain in 72 hours.

Stephen:

Wow.

Larry M.:

Engineers like us, we call it the Noah flood, because the only place you really see that at this point is down in Gulf Coast and stuff when you get the hurricanes that come across there, you can see stuff like that, but we never had that rain up this way. The most we had was the 1982 flood where we got 12 inches of rain in three days, but that's only a third. But we have to design this thing, because of if a case it fails, we have to design it for this requirement from the Connecticut DEP, and that's 34 inches over 72

hours. So the current spillway is designed for a 100 to 150 year, we want to make it a 1,000 year. And then the dam itself has to resist the extra water that the 1,000 year can't resist.

Rich:

Larry. Aren't all those standards being shattered by climate change?

Larry M.:

Yeah, you're right. They haven't changed yet, but you're right, they are. Because of the climate change, what they're saying is, we're getting more droughts. The extremes are going to be higher in both aspects. More droughts and then more storms with higher intensity. But yet-

Rich:

I think storm Sandy was a 100 year flood. I think we've had a couple 100 year storms in the last five years.

Larry M.:

I know. I know. That's why we want to make sure that we're up to at least the standards of today. And then, I don't believe yet boards have changed them yet. They haven't been changed yet, but there have been considerations for these changes that haven't been implemented yet, because it takes a while before that happens. I'm sure Florida is going to change some of their standards down there, because of what took place.

Rich:

That's right.

Stephen:

Hey Larry, the 34 inches over 72 hours, that's a 100 year storm?

Larry M.:

No, that's a Probable Maximum Flood.

Stephen:

Okay.

Larry M.:

Okay, that's apples and oranges. So the Probable Maximum Flood is a special category that you figure out if things line up perfect. That's the most rain you can ever get out of a storm.

Stephen:

Okay.

Larry M.:

Whereas the 100 year, we know, like you just said, the 100 year can be, you can have two of them in two years. We've been hitting 100 year storms, a lot of storms that come by.

Stephen:

So what did you say about the 1,000 year, you're designing for a 1,000 year?

Larry M.:

The spillway.

Stephen:

Spillway. Okay.

Larry M.:

Right. But the dam itself has to resist the 34 inches over 72 hours.

Stephen:

Okay.

Larry M.:

So the other thing that we need to do is update the stability of the dam. So again, the dam was built in 1860, there was no standards back in 1860. They were just built whatever the contractor and whatever Eli Whitney felt that he wanted to pay to build this dam. We really didn't know. Engineers weren't around, they didn't really know how dams work. But the only thing I can tell you, the thing's still around and it's been over a 100 and something years. So whatever the dice they threw, it's still working right now, but we want to make sure that, that's going to work for another 150 years.

So stability needs to be improved on this thing. And that means, if you notice, I mentioned the height got higher, but I didn't mention it got wider at the bottom. And to make things stable, you have to make things wider if you go higher. So that's what we plan on doing in our stability, make things wider at the bottom. So, this is the analysis. We went through actually, and I mentioned it at the RPB meeting, is that we went over 30 different alternates at this point right now. We tried looking at all different things just to try to make it the best and the best design for our rate payers, but we're not there yet. We're not there. We look at 30, 31 might be the right one, so we still need to look into that more.

So as part of that, we're going into this thing called early contractor involvement, and Sonny talked a lot about at the RPB board. It's new for us, it's to bring in contractors to help us out in moving forward from where we are today. So we're in a process of doing that now, bringing in contractors to get their ideas to maybe they did something that can save us money, that it can build, it reduces. I will talk about it at the next page in terms of what's the reason why we're bringing the contractor in early for, and we'll go from there. SHIPO update, which is called State Historic Preservation Office.

Of course, because of historic nature of the site, they prefer us to work on the water side, not downstream, and there still needs to be discussions in terms of if in fact we build downstream, what mitigation that needs to be done, and we don't know what that is yet. And in terms of grants, I think

Rochelle will respond to that comment there regarding exploring the grants. I don't know if you want to do that now, Rochelle, or later, regarding the grants?

Rochelle:

I can respond to it later.

Larry M.:

Okay. And construction, again, we haven't done anything yet, because we're still in the phase one part of this thing. So next page, the next slide, Early Contractor Involvement. We're proceeding on that track as we said at the RPB board, what we were doing, and this what does is, to solicit contractors that have experience in doing the kind of work and building the dams and stuff. What our intent is to get a bunch of contractors look through their experience, and select probably three contractors and work with them to come up with the final design. And once a final design is selected, have the three contractors bid on it. And then we would select the best bid for the RWA out of the three contractors. Since all three of them are qualified, it would be what is the best option for the RWA and selecting the right contractor there. It's not going to be based on low price, it's going to be whatever the best decision for us to use. The advantages of using this early contractor involvement is, we can get design optimization, we can get construction risks reduction, cost optimization, and then risk mitigation. Basically if we look at all these three contractors and they give us ideas on how to do it and they know the drawings pretty well, we're probably going to have less chance of change orders during the construction, and that's the benefit of working with the early contractor involvement. So right now, we are proceeding on that road that was discussed. Our anticipated schedule that we discussed at the meeting for phase one, August, 2022 to September, 2023. Phase two application to the RPB board would be November, 2023 and construction would be '24 to '26. So that's the schedule we have at this point.

Rich:

Just a quick question. So you haven't selected the final consultant, but you have an RFP out, is that right?

Larry M.:

Yeah. We did have a consultant that's been working with us. We haven't selected the final set of contractors, that's correct.

Rich:

For design?

Larry M.:

For the ECI involvement.

Rich:

Okay.

Larry M.:

So the ECI involvement, we had to put together a set of specs and that's out on the street, but we haven't decided or even saw anything yet. That's just still been advertised. That's it.

Rich:

You mentioned that it won't be about price. Who will make the final decision?

Larry M.:

It's similar to selecting a engineer. When you design projects for the state and stuff, it's based upon a weighted selection process that engineers go through to get selected for designing schools or designing other stuff.

Rich:

So, there's no subjectivity, it's an algorithm. You plug their data in whatever their proposal is and it decides through some algorithm. It's not a group that gets together and chooses?

Larry M.:

Right. I believe they're going to have some weighted numbers, and then it's selected based upon the totals of them. But it's weighted, and I believe there's a selection committee to decide that.

Rochelle:

Rich... Oh, maybe just-

Stephen:

... the weighted requirements are decided by people within the RWA, or is it a standard?

Larry M.:

I believe they're decided by the RWA during the process of developing the procedure. That procedure hasn't been developed yet.

Stephen:

Okay.

Rochelle:

Larry, correct me if I'm wrong, you're talking about the early contractor involvement. So for them, they're each just going to get a stipend, correct?

Larry M.:

Yes, yes. I guess the clarification, is it during the selection of that one contractor who does the construction, or the selection process of the three contractors? So I guess the question to which one you're asking?

Rich:

Well, that's a good point. So both, we have the final contractor, is that right?

Larry M.:

Yeah. Three contractors are supposedly going to be selected, and then they're going to work with us to come up with the final design. And then the three contractors have to bid on the project, and then out of the three, one is selected, and it's not based on low bid.

Rich:

So in other words, the people that are going to design it, are the same ones that are going to bid on their own design?

Larry M.:

Yeah, but it's going to be a composite design, not just one design from one. One contractor may have an idea on this, one contractor may have an idea on that. And working with our design team, put together the best plan going forward.

Rich:

It strikes me as almost having a conflicting interest when you're doing the design and the bidding on the same project, but I don't understand it well enough to know better. From a 1,000 feet, it seems odd.

Larry M.:

There's certain rules you have to follow and stuff, in terms of say one contractor has a unique, how you say it, preparatory say designed method or something like that.

Rich:

Right, right.

Larry M.:

And then there's certain rules that we have to file to make sure that, how do we give it out to the three if he has a certain way of doing something compared to the other guys. So there are rules set up for that. We have not been through it yet. So right now, we're just in the process of putting it out the bid for contractors that are interested, and then we have to go from there to the probably three contractors.

Rich:

Yeah, Larry, just one last question, that is, these three design folks that we're bringing in are expected to work together to come up with a common agreed upon design.

Larry M.:

Yes, that's correct.

Rich:

Even if they have their own, as you said, proprietary methodology, et cetera, how do you reconcile differences in that group if they don't agree? I mean, there's some assumption that they're all going to see the light and they're all going to agree on the design.

Rochelle:

Rich, I think we're getting into detail that's going to be covered at the... We have yet to submit the application for construction. The purpose of this was just to give a update on where the project stands, not to get into the details of the design or the construction.

Rich:

Yeah, I know. I don't need to get into details, I'm just trying to understand the concepts, that's all. They're very high level.

Larry:

Excuse me. I'd also like to make a point. Excuse me. Since we've not submitted an application for the design and have had a hearing, this whole meeting's transcript is going to have to become part of the public record, because we're going into far more detail than we anticipated. And the rules require that if a subject that is going to be before the RPB or a hearing, is held by a committee or a subgroup of the RPB, then either a transcript of the meeting or very detailed notes has to become part of a public record. So Jennifer, that's something that you'll have to do, and we need to be careful that we're not getting into public security matters, which we have touched on earlier about the dam construct. So, I'd like to suggest we keep this at a higher level.

Rich:

But Larry, with all respect, then maybe you should forward us some participation rules so that if we're going to do a presentation and we're going to engage and try to understand what's being presented. Sometimes it requires some Q&A in order to even understand what's being presented. So A, maybe we shouldn't get the presentation, or be guided to say, don't ask any questions, because it's really our job and our instincts to say, let us understand what's attempting to be communicated to us.

Larry:

Well, Rick, I'm not suggesting you don't ask questions, I'm just suggesting that this committee meeting is not the forum for those kind of questions. And we understood that this was just a quick update on the dam, because we are going to be submitting an application for the construction, and you'll have all the time in the world to ask those kind of questions that you're asking tonight.

Rich:

Okay. So that then it would probably be good to, as part of the agenda to say, not a lot of questions, we're just doing an information share. So then we know.

Larry:

Yeah. Because we understood that this was just an update meeting, which we anticipated, A, no new information would be offered to the RPB that the Authority has not heard yet, number one. And number

two, that this was just a general update status meeting as opposed to detailed questions about the design of the dam.

Rich:

Oh, I hope I wasn't asking about the design.

Larry:

Well, no, you were asking questions around the design and how we pick a contractor and those sort of things. And those are topics that would be appropriate for the public hearing on the application itself.

Rich:

Okay.

Stephen:

Larry, this is Steve. I mean, I had the same question. I think we could note that we just have a question about, it appears there's a conflict of interest or at least procedure, in terms of the way that, that method was presented to us. I think, we're just asking that question. You don't have to answer it tonight, but just note that we might not even know that, that comes up in a public hearing.

Rochelle:

Yeah. I think, Steve, there's probably, I know the concept of the early contractor involvement was discussed at the hearing that we had on phase one, so I'm sure we could provide that information, it's probably on the record.

Stephen:

No, it makes sense. Just, I had the same kind of questions about how can that work out and be fruitful and be non-conflicting, that's all.

Mark:

I have to agree with Larry. Some of these questions are really something that you go after the five member Authority approves it, and then we can go to the public hearing. And I think now you have to put this into the minutes. So I think that we should really curtail this.

Rich:

But it sounds like, as Rochelle has pointed out that it's already in the public record, because these questions may have been asked and answered in a hearing already.

Rochelle:

Regarding the early contractor involvement, I recall that there was some discussion about that.

Jeff:

That's in my memo.

Larry M.:

Yeah. So Sunny discussed a lot during the RPB presentation about early contractor involvement. There was a lot of questions from different members regarding that. So again, the only thing I have left is our design alternate that was presented at the last meeting was the option for an upstream mass concrete that's on the existing dam that's there, upstream new concrete dam, that means a separate dam. Upstream, when we mean upstream, we mean waterside of the dam, and then the downstream concrete buttress option that's also out there, and it would cover the existing face of the dam that's out there today. So those are the three that are still up there and still being discussed as part of this design phase one.

Stephen:

Larry, what is upstream mass concrete?

Larry M.:

That's just adding concrete to the existing size, the masonry dam that's exist out there today, just adding additional concrete that weighs it down so it doesn't overturn or slide. So the new dam is strictly all new, it's totally separate. And the downstream would be right up against the existing dam that's there today.

Mark:

And I understand we haven't decided which way to go yet, or have we?

Larry M.:

Yeah, we have not decided which way to go yet. That's still as part of the contractor's involvement. There's a lot of pieces to that puzzle before that decision is being made. And we have not got there as of yet.

Mark:

I guess we got you at our meeting a little early.

Stephen:

Well, that's great information. Thank you.

Larry M.:

Okay. Thank you.

Stephen:

Yeah. So Larry, that's your update to that point?

Larry M.:

Yes, it is.

Stephen:

Appreciate you coming, and we don't mean to give you a tough time, we're just trying to understand it, that's all.

Larry M.:

Yes.

Stephen:

We appreciate your input. Thank you.

Larry M.:

Yes, thank you very much.

Stephen:

Are there any other questions on this topic for Larry? Okay, thanks Larry.

Larry M.:

Thank you.

Stephen:

We can move on to item four on the agenda, which is the report of the OCA, Jeff?

Jeff:

Thanks. Good evening, everyone. We have one active consumer matter that was just escalated to us about 10 days ago. It's a very small matter monetarily, it involves roughly $36, so I probably just spent that talking about it. But it's a New Haven consumer who was contacted by the authority back in August, because of a 72-hour continuous use. It's a vacant property, and the customer went to the property and claimed that the meter was running despite the fact that no water was being used. So the authority asked the typical questions, looking for leaks and really wasn't able to get to the bottom of it. And so, it was escalated to my office on October 6th. We've reached out to the customer and asked the customer to set up a call with us so we can better understand what's going on at the property. But like I said, it's a $36 dispute, so we're going to try not to spend too much time on it and see if we can get some resolution based on one phone call.

Stephen:

Hey Jeff, does that fall under the water company for giving a one-time thing?

Jeff:

A waste adjustment?

Stephen:

Yes.

Jeff:

Yes. I mean, I don't know that I would recommend to the customer that they look for a $36 waste adjustment. I think, the question really is if there was anything going on at that. I mean, somebody could have used their outdoor hose or something in August, who knows? It was a vacant property.

Mark:

But Jeff, he said that the meter was running but there was no water going through it.

Jeff:

Yes.

Stephen:

Is there any way to check that or do we know that that's true?

Jeff:

I think a FlexNet was installed in 2018 when water's being used. If it wasn't using water, no water was passing through the meter, the dial would remain still. So with a vacant property, it's very difficult to figure out what's going on. I mean, the water authority recommended that they test the toilets, they explained how they would go about doing that. They recommended that they go to the property once a week and find the meter and see if the meter was running, and the customer went to the property in the middle of September and said that the outside water spigots off and nobody could use it.

And the only other person, according to the customer, that has access to the property is a neighbor who has a key. So there's time intervals, there's graphs that were provided to me by the water authority showing when the water was used. The customer was not at the property at those times. Customer was told by the authority to enroll in Water Watch so they can access the same information that the water authority accesses. So like I said, I want to have one conversation with the customer, find out a little bit more about what might have been going on, on those days that water usage occurred, and make a recommendation to resolve it.

Stephen:

Okay.

Jeff:

And that's it.

Stephen:

Really, any other projects you're reviewing at this point?

Jeff:

No, I just want to say with regard to ECI, when I wrote my memo and gave my testimony at the phase one hearing to the RPB, I did, if you go back and look at the memo, talk a little bit about ECI and my experience with it and the procurement process that's typically used for ECI, because it's not a design

bid build project delivery method, it's QBS. So it's a quantitative-based selection process that's used by state and federal government agencies, and it's a weighted criteria scoring process to procure the ECI contractors. So that is something that we touched on in connection with the phase one application, and I gave my testimony about why I think it's an appropriate project delivery method for this type of project.

Stephen:

Okay, thanks.

Jeff:

Sure.

Stephen:

Any questions for Jeff? Okay, hearing none. We'll move on to item five, which is approval of Jeff's invoice for September.

Tony:

I move we accept?

Mark:

Second.

Stephen:

Second, Mark. Thank you. Any questions for Jeff on the bill? All those in favor.

Group:

Aye.

Stephen:

Aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you. Our next meeting-

Mark:

Could I bring something up that's happening now? It's under new business I guess, but it's not really business. I really wanted to talk to Larry about it or inform him about it. I guess, everybody should be informed about it. I don't know how many people know, right now there's a huge fire going on in Bethany underground, and it's right on the water shed property over there, it's Capasso's Lawn Service. And they've been coming down and getting huge amounts of water from the hydrant and Woodbridge and dumping all this water. This started, I think Thursday or Friday. They have brought in, they're 30 feet down and they can't put the fire out. It just keeps going. And they've been putting thousands and thousands of gallons of water.

So really, I wanted Larry to know about it. I did call John Triana and I did call Jim Hill to find out about the amount of water, because what's happening now is, they need so much outside services to move all

the debris that's there, that they're paying a lot of money to outside services to do this and dump water and keep continuing dumping water. So I just wanted to make sure that you're aware of it, and Larry, you can ask whoever you want, and Rochelle and anybody else who's in there, but I think we should, as a company, know about it.

Larry:

Okay, well thank you, Mark.

Stephen:

Mark, I was up at Lake Chamberlain on, when was it, Sunday, Saturday. And there were fire trucks on Amity Road there. Is that what they were doing, hauling water?

Mark:

Taking water from our hydrants to put this fire out. I mean, God's amount of water. Not only that, if you know the area, Steve, they emptied a pond on Peck Road and they started almost emptied the pond on Route 42. And so, they've been using water from our hydrants in Woodbridge. And I don't know, I talked to Jim Hill and said, you should have a meter in there, Jim. It's fire. They just connected a thing, it's all part of fire service. I had to explain that to him, Larry. But anyways, it's something that I thought we should know about, especially since I'm more concerned that it's so close to our watershed, this burnt wood and fire, and it's a mess up there. It's a mess. And they're having a special meeting tonight the water selection in the inland wetlands to find out what they're going to do about this. They can't put this fire out.

Stephen:

What's burning, Mark?

Mark:

Well, listen, I'm a layman to this kind of stuff. So what's happening is that apparently, not only did he bury tons and tons of chips, but he buried stumps and he buried logs, big huge logs. And what happens is, and I didn't know this, when you bury that, that way, there's gaping holes. When you got the gaping holes, air's allowed to get in there, and if air gets in there, it becomes a spontaneous combustion-type thing, as I understood it, and I could be wrong, but I just thought that we should be aware of it and we should check out what's going on and find out if they should pay for the water taken from our water thing over there, because Bethany really doesn't have any hydrants or anything, and should Woodbridge be penalized for that. And I asked Jim Hill, he said he didn't see any real upswinging water, but I'm telling you, they're running the tankers back and forth, and each one of those tankers holds seven, 8,000 gallons of water. Right, Steve?

Stephen:

I don't know.

Mark:

Well, really, I just wanted to tell Larry, but now everybody should know about it too.

Rochelle:

And Mark, we are looking into the applicable charges, because there are charges associated with private use of public hydrants.

Mark:

That's what I'm saying.

Rochelle:

There are charges.

Mark:

This is a private use, and I think that we should get some money on that. Do I get a percentage if you get to do this for turning them in? Anyways, I'm glad it's got to your desk, I guess, Rochelle?

Larry:

Yeah.

Rochelle:

Yes.

Larry:

Both of us know about it.

Mark:

Okay. I called John Triana this morning. Did you?

Larry:

Yeah, Jim Hill, let us know about it tonight.

Mark:

Okay, good. So I've done my job.

Larry:

Thank you.

Stephen:

I just want to know, I was at Lake Chamberlain during the height of the drought, and I've never seen it that low. It was probably eight feet below the spillway, but with all the rain we've had, I thought this time it would be going over, but it's still three feet below the spillway. So that's a lot of water that still could be stored in that reservoir. All right, anyway.

Mark:

I make a motion we adjourn.

Stephen:

I just want to make note that our next meeting will be November 21st at 5:30. Motion to adjourn?

Stephen:

Mark, a second?

Naomi:

Second.

Stephen:

All those in favor?

Group:

Aye.

Stephen:

Thanks everyone.