

**SOUTH CENTRAL CONNECTICUT REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY**

OCTOBER 26, 2023

MEETING TRANSCRIPTION

David:

I'll call the meeting of the South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority for October 26th, 2023 to order at 12:30. I will note we have 100% attendance, but one member is remote. Kevin is remote. The rest of us are here in the Welch room. And with that, I will note for your interest that we have a safety moment in here. Timely and good, interesting. So read that at your leisure. Move on to public comments. Jennifer, do we have anybody from the public here?

Jennifer:

No, we do not.

David:

Okay, very good. And we'll move right on to meeting as a Pension & Benefit Committee. So I will ask that we recess as the Authority to meet as the Pension & Benefit Committee. Who would like to move that?

Suzanne:

I'll move that one, sir.

David:

Great. Thank you, Suzanne. Who would like to second?

Mario:

Seconded.

David:

Mario. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Group:

Aye.

David:

Perfect. Heard from all of us. All right, then it is all yours, Catherine. Thank you.

[PENSION & BENEFIT COMMITTEE MEETS FROM 12:31 P.M. TO 1:43 P.M.]

David:

We thank you for that thorough report. It is something we don't do that often, so it was good to have that. There are no acts on matters arising from the committee meeting. So go right to the consent calendar. Fairly typical items this month.

Catherine:

I move to approve the consent agenda.

David:

Is there a second?

Mario:

Second.

David:

Any points of clarification? Anything you want to take off? Seeing none. Sensing you're ready to vote. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Group:

Aye.

David:

Good, passes unanimous. All right. Then we will onto reports of the RPB committees. We had October, right? Mario, we had you at Finance Committee a couple of weeks back with the audit.

Mario:

Thank you very much. Yes, the Finance Committee met with our auditors and they reviewed the audit. Very good presentation, similar to the one that we all saw a few days prior to that. There were no questions that the RPB Finance Committee came up with and asked, which kind of surprised me. They did not go into executive session to meet with the auditors, which I thought was a little surprising, but yes, it was their choice and they did talk about the possibility of doing that. They did not feel any need to.

David:

Well, they mentioned it, so that's [inaudible 01:16:31].

Mario:

Yes, and Rochelle did her usual financial report and did an excellent job. Then again, there were no questions because she covered every single topic in detail-

Larry:

Down to the detail, down to the decimal point.

Mario:

Yes, down to the dot. And the dashboard quarterly report, they also had no questions. So it was a Finance Committee meeting, we covered a lot of information in business-like fashion.

David:

Okay. Has not changed much. All right.

Mario:

No it has not.

David:

All right. Then the next one is Land Use Committee. Mario, I think you pitched in on that one.

Mario:

I did. I wanted to go for the pizza. And Mark was there, as his love is with the Land Use Committee. The pizza was late. That was the important part of the meeting, so the meeting started a little bit later.

Mark:

I was really surprised there weren't more people at the meeting. Our el presidente was not there. You missed the pizza.

Larry:

I did miss the pizza, yes.

Mario:

But it was good. I thought it was helpful that Captain Ruggiero and Sargent Putnam were there. I think that allowed for some interaction with Land Use Committee because they have been, obviously, concerned about how safety is going with our land and the land being worked on.

We did have a demonstration on one of the drones, what it is useful for and some of the activities they've been able to do, including inspecting roofs without having to go up on our building roofs, which is very good and it saves quite a bit of headaches of trying to get up there, inspecting them and also underneath bridges so we can inspect water mains that are hanging from bridges. Not able to go into tanks yet, but we are working on that. I think he is going to ask for a different kind of drone, but it was very interesting to watch that presentation.

And then, John Triana did his usual report. I had to leave because I had another meeting that evening, but John did cover all of his normal land use and where we are with forestry and recreation. So I do not believe there were any major questions of John. Were there, Mark? I will just ask you. There was not much.

Mark:

No, but that drone was incredible, what it can do for the Authority and our company. It is just incredible what they can do. But I did not hear any questions for John either. And you guys missed the beautiful foliage.

Mario:

Yes, it was [inaudible 01:19:42].

David:

Thank you. Just a question, because the drone thing, when you are talking about our tanks and things like that it raises a question. Do we still go in with the divers to do the checking?

Sunny:

We do engage the outside firm to do it.

David:

Right.

Sunny:

Right. But I think Mario did bring up the question whether we can use the drones for interior tank [inaudible 01:20:04]. So the way the drone is set up right now is, there is a very specific software for entering, I would say, the tank. So we do the exterior of the tanks using drones, but to enter into the tank itself, we can go inside, but it doesn't allow you to navigate that great unless we buy that monthly, I would say, upgrade to the software, which makes it a little bit more intelligent for the drones to go in.

The other aspect, when I touched base, based on, I would say, Mario's question is, how effective it's going to be. Typically, if we find it effective for people to go in there, in case if there is any kind of a crack or paint peels off, the drone isn't that, I would say, good to pick those up, as effective as a human. So there are challenges with this, but eventually, we will send the drones in, based on the business case, on how it works out, costs of the software upgrade versus the cost of just sending people in.

David:

Would you not need almost a mini submarine of some type in order to get underneath the water as well and the stirs and things like that to check all that?

Sunny:

Right. Typically, we do have those remote operating vehicles, which do get submerged. In the tunnels, we use it. In the last year, we did use, one of the tunnels, we did use an ROV to get inside. They do have a much more sophisticated range of, I would say, picking those cracks and things [inaudible 01:21:29], but for the tanks, we are still finding that we could use people to go in.

David:

Thank you.

Sunny:

Eventually, we will do it as long as the technology keeps on [inaudible 01:21:40].

David:

Right. Getting better.

Mario:

That was part of the discussion. The technology has gotten so much better in a very short period of time. Currently, we have two licensed drone pilots.

South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority  
October 26, 2023

David:

Good. Thank you.

Catherine:

You can still use people but then we [inaudible 01:21:56].

Mario:

[inaudible 01:21:57]

David:

Do you really? That makes sense. They are not in just a protective suit? All right. Consumer Affairs Committee. Catherine?

Catherine:

Yes. Well, I caught the foliage, but I caught it in Pennsylvania driving back. But yes, I did attend the Consumer Affairs Committee meeting. Obviously, there was a safety moment and approval of the minutes. Then the committee voted to go into executive session, pursuant to, I guess, 200(6)(E) to discuss matters related to confidential financial data, specifically, this I can say, it was about the accounts receivable update.

David:

Okay.

Catherine:

That's pretty much all I can say about that because it was an executive session. Then the OCA, Jeffrey Donofrio, gave a report. There was only one matter that was still under his purview and it was dealing with, you probably recall from a report from a prior meeting, that there was a property in New Haven where there was a tampered meter and that is on its way to resolution. The homeowner or the property owner is cooperating. The OCA then reported that he provided testimony and joined with the RWA in seeking a more generous understanding-

David:

Or fair.

Catherine:

I read it as reasonable and accurate.

David:

Yes.

Catherine:

But interpretation of our structure would assist us in obtaining resources or accessing resources for the [inaudible 01:23:56] role. Let's see. Then he reported also, that he attended the public hearings in North Branford concerning the land dispositions. The OCA's invoice was approved under new business. Steve

South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority  
October 26, 2023

Mongillo raised questions about a tree down and some debris blocking Connelly parkway and there was some brief discussion of that and a recommendation that he referred to John Triana. That was all that happened in that meeting. Next meeting is November 20th.

David:

Thank You. Any questions? All right. And we see what our assignments are for next month or this? All right, business updates. Let us do this and then the plan would be to take a break because finance will be a little while.

Larry:

Okay. So Dana Bochan is pinch hitting for Prem. So Dana is on the line.

Dana:

Nice to see everyone. How are you?

Catherine:

Good, Dana.

Dana:

Great. So did you want me just to start, Larry? I'm sorry, I missed part of that.

Larry:

Sure. Go ahead.

Dana:

Thank you.

Larry:

... review the highlights of the CIS project.

Dana:

Yes, appreciate it. Thank you. So the presentation that you're looking at is our traditional four square project update where we're focused on the accomplishments, decisions, risks, current activities, and next steps. Trying to give you a picture of the project on a page.

As you can see, I will start in the top left box with the recent accomplishments of the project, focusing on the blue highlights here. The integration and infrastructure design and how all of those things are going to fit together within our architecture and integrations with other parties has been completed.

The other week, we actually completed a week-long training with the core team where we were able to see and have in-depth discussion about how the project and the solution was going to work, how some of the new modules and things that we'll be getting as part of that will have function and feature. It was well-received by the entire group. It was engaging and we were really excited about the foundation it can bring as we start to bring in the training for our front end users later on in the project.

Additionally, the OCM plan has finished its initial deliverables for the design phase, which are setting us up for more of those outbound, outreach and communication components over the remainder of the project.

Moving to the top right box for decisions, risk, and issues. Currently, we are working on some key areas, including an interest charge after 28 days, rather than our current 30 day interest charge. This is something that we are going to be escalating and are working closely with Rochelle and the team in terms of how we bring this to the proper channels for review and approval. The key risks that we are focused on include the design phase being extended by a couple of weeks due to delays with data migration and some of the complications around our reporting requirements and notices. Mitigations are in place and the team has been working to make sure that we are doing our best to bring all of that back in line. And you may recall that we had previously reported a scheduled delay of four weeks, where I'm happy to report that through the focus on ADI closures and working on the mitigation plans for these items. We have reduced it to three weeks. The team is continuing to look at opportunities to work in parallel to bring that schedule back online and we will continue to update you as we make progress there.

In the bottom left-hand corner, with regard to current activities, one of the biggest completions we have had most recently is data mapping and conversion activities as we lead into ETL two, which is scheduled for this week. That was quite an exercise by the team and we have seen some changes both in how that team is functioning and some of the processes that have helped to bring some of that data migration components. As I mentioned earlier, some of the mitigation activities back in line.

Additionally, for some next steps, we are working on the UMAX training guides. We have both the project trainer that was hired specifically as a consultant to assist us with this as well as the new customer service trainer that we on boarded into our organization a couple of months ago, working to develop those closely with the itineraries team. Any questions or additional information that you guys want to talk about?

David:

Yes, Suzanne.

Suzanne:

Dana, where it says on the top "schedule explanation point, yellow, completion Q2", I assume that's off from the original. And can you remind me what the original completion timeframe was?

Dana:

Yes. So the original completion was expected to be over essentially Labor Day weekend or September of 2024. As I mentioned, when we had last reported out to you, we were looking at about a four-week delay putting us into October of 2024. We believe that through the mitigation, like I said, we've kind of pushed that back into three weeks. So we're still hoping for, I should say planning and targeting a September 2024 go live.

Suzanne:

So why does it say completion Q2 25?

David:

Fiscal year.

Suzanne:  
Fiscal.

Dana:  
It is fiscal year. Sorry. Thank you Suzanne.

Suzanne:  
Sorry.

David:  
Any other questions? Thank you Dana, for the report.

Dana:  
Of course. Thank you.

David:  
Thanks Dana. And then anything else you have? The report and others, anything?

Larry:  
Yes, just one item I wanted to bring to the board. You recall that at the beginning of the fiscal year we set our global metrics and for coverage this year, because we've done so well in the past, we set the coverage at 118 or required by the general bond resolution to achieve 114. However, we had an extremely wet summer and our production is off close to a little over 9%. And in order for us to make the 118, we're going to have to take what you might call some extraordinary actions such as, we could not fund the pension over the arc. We could take money out of the growth fund or the general fund and use that to make up the difference between what we achieve, which would be a minimum of 114 and what we need to achieve 118.

That's an internal benchmark that we set that is part of a global metrics payout at year-end. So we will have to achieve that. But because that is an internal set standard metric, it's not required for the general bond resolution. Credit rating agencies do not look at that or not unless you achieve it obviously. So we would like to suggest that we reduce that metric from 118 to, and I'm going to suggest 114 back down to what is required of the global metric, so we do not have to take extraordinary actions in order to achieve whatever that global metric might be in excess of 114. Comments?

Suzanne:  
I have a question. But the global metric is, just the global metric, right?

Larry:  
But it is used for the payout of the extra 1% to the 401K plan. So it is an important metric in the context of all of the metrics together.

Suzanne:  
So to pay out the extra 1% we need to meet the coverage that is in the metric.



Larry:

One of the metrics. We would have to meet seven of the eight I think it is, including that coverage metric.

Suzanne:

Okay. And so if we don't meet it, we don't pay out the additional 1% to the employees.

Larry:

That is a possibility, yes.

Suzanne:

Okay. But other than that, as long as we make the 114...

Larry:

We are in compliance with the resolution. Yes. David and I chatted about this, we did not think it made a lot of sense to start pulling a bunch of levers to artificially make one that is set at 118. I think given how wet the summer has been and unless interest rates stay current, stay high and some other things, I think I would like to suggest we set it at 114.

Suzanne:

Why did we set it at 118?

Larry:

We were cocky.

Suzanne:

Okay. And was the biggest basis that usage had been higher than normal knock down trend and that is why we were achieving that amount.

Larry:

We set it at that because for the past two years we have well exceeded the 114. And of course we did not anticipate the wet summer. Cash collections have been good, demand had been strong in prior years. That did not continue this time.

Suzanne:

So that is what I am asking is, did demand drive it up and demand is driving it down? Or is it a confluence of factors?

Larry:

It is a confluencing of factors. And last summer, the summer of fiscal 23, so calendar 2022, was unusually hot and dry. So what happened in the summer of 2023, fiscal 24, was the opposite.

Suzanne:

Okay, thank you.

Larry:

So there was about a million gallons per day average increase in consumption because of that wet summer.

Rochelle:

There were other factors also financially, were there not, over the last couple of years that drove us up to like 128?

Larry:

Yes 140 last year.

Rochelle:

A 140, a 122 maybe a year before or somewhere in there where they have been very high. And they have been high for a variety of reasons. But this year and from Larry and my conversation, we are obviously going to try to do what we can do to keep that coverage high. But the summer weather is definitely having an impact. So we are forecasting what our revenues to be less than budget. Right now we are forecasting interest income as Larry said, to be high, depends on what the interest rates do.

Larry:

And we have asked the organization to cut all discretionary expenses. So we have taken actions to mitigate that dip, but we just want to make sure we don't penalize the entire employee population because of management being too aggressive with the metric.

Suzanne:

And how much is a dollar amount of difference from 114 to one... What is it set up 118? 117?

Rochelle:

I calculated this before and it has got to be at least a couple million dollars.

Suzanne:

Okay, thank you.

Rochelle:

So 1%? What is the contribution?

Larry:

Roughly 250. 250,000.

David:

I wanted Larry to talk about it sooner rather than later. He brought it up to me soon because I did not want them taking out of the growth fund. We are still looking at acquisitions, that is our plan to have acquisitions. But I also thought that with what we are hearing with the pension, it's apropos for today,

but I did not feel that would be a right place to take it, because that is an expenditure. That is in the \$55 million or \$60 million in the O & M, but I did not think that was right. I would rather change the metric than not make the extra contribution to the pension plan. I think that is very important to the financial stability of the organization.

So I would rather they not have to do some of the extraordinary matters that are there. So I thought this one... I think I am in favor of doing it this way. I think it still allows our team, our staff to work hard towards getting that. But I will also say one thing with the change in head of HR, we do not have the low or the high vacancy rate anymore. They have done a much better job of keeping up with the hiring. And as you see every month in your board report, we used to have 20, 30 vacancies. What was it? Nine this month? It was very little. It is good for the organization. I am sorry?

Rochelle:

Eight and a half versus budget. I think Liz, you're talking about the actual recruitment basis.

Liz:

Yes.

David:

So I think that is one of the reasons we are not building up surpluses too.

Catherine:

Okay. So that is one of the factors. I will say I would rather change the metric than do all this financial engineering. I think that is actually a bad idea. And I do think that contributing above the arc is actually, it is viewed well by the rating agencies and if we stop doing that, I think that could negatively affect our rating or at least the view of the organization by the rating agencies. So I do not think we should do that and maybe we should think carefully about how we set these metrics in the future. Stretch goals are interesting, but I think that they create unrealistic expectations. I think we should try to avoid doing that in future, which is not to say that we set the bench but the bar even lower. So make it realistic and make sure that people can meet those expectations.

Suzanne:

Are there any other benefits tied to meeting the 114, or any other bonuses tied to it?

Larry:

No, that is only for the global metric payout, which is the one that is set apart.

Suzanne:

Okay, so I have a slightly different twist. I do not think we should do any engineering. I do not think we should take the contribution out of pension and I do not think we should change the metric. I think changing the metric mid-year on something that has a payout impact, I do not feel good about that. Why have the goals? Why have the connection? So I am not crazy about penalizing all employees because we did not meet it, at all. I do not like that, but I do not like as much to rearrange things so that we can make sure people get paid. So that is my two cents.

David:

And that is a fair point and I weighed that in, I have had little more time to think about this, but I have to feel that it's been an extraordinary wet year and that's a major factor to us and we had no control over that. Should we have not approved that metric? Should Larry not have proposed it? We not approve it possibly. I do like the idea of the stretch goal. I know they have issues and whatnot and this was a stretch goal.

Suzanne:

And so maybe in the future as Catherine is saying, if 114 becomes something that is maybe half a percent? So if we meet our legislative bar they get half a percent. If we meet the stretch goal, they get another half percent or something. But I just think this is monkey business.

David:

Other comments Kevin?

Kevin:

No, I do not have any comments. Thanks.

David:

Okay. Well, do you need a vote because we approve the-

Larry:

Well because you approved it at the beginning of the fiscal year, I think a change in the metrics should be voted on.

David:

Okay.

Catherine:

Do we have to do that today?

Larry:

Yes, we tend to want to see how we keep doing. I definitely understand the issues with the rain over the summer. No one can predict it. A bonus is the bonus. I like that it is going to the 401k. I think being set up that way, I think that is good. I would be curious how everything else is going then. A whole laundry list. 118 I thought was high, as a target. I do not want to penalize everybody because it rained over the summer. By the same token, if we set a series of metrics, why are we changing it in the middle of the year? We couldn't have predicted the amount of rain.

Suzanne:

No, I understand that.

Larry:

And it is not because management has been sloppy or have been tightened their belts. So I hear what you are saying about engineering in the middle of the year and all, but it is not because management has not been paying attention to what's going on. So [inaudible 01:42:13].

Suzanne:

No, that is exactly right. We are introducing... It is just a philosophy about tying goals to compensation that if you wanted to mitigate it, I think I would feel better, but to just wholesale move it back so we can pay people feels as engineered as doing some of the other stuff to make it. And so they both feel equally uncomfortable.

Larry:

Well, we could move it to 116 if I understood you correctly.

Suzanne:

No, actually I am not saying mitigated to 116 if 116 is still not realistic. Right? I am saying if you want to move the metric to 114, whatever makes you feel better about that metric. But I am saying given the fact that we changed the metric, we are not going to pay everybody 1%, but we're going to pay everybody 5%. We could not control this. That was our stretch goal. That is what we set. We do not want to penalize everybody. Just something to mitigate the fact that it is just not a free, it's not a fair and free world all the time. You know what I am saying? It is just compensation tied to a culture of achievement and accomplishing it. And I get it. I get it that this time it did not work out.

Catherine:

Could we not entertain at a later date, making a contribution without making any of the changes to the goals or the metrics, and then a proposal could be put before the board to make a contribution to the 401K.

Suzanne:

Anyway.

Catherine:

Right? Right.

David:

We could do that. But Larry has the levers to make it at 118. What I am saying is I do not like those levers.

Suzanne:

I think we all agree on that.

David:

He has the leverage to make it happen. It is within his purview to not spend money on things that he decides not to spend money on. As the Chief Executive Officer. I give him credit for bringing this here

rather than say, okay, we are going to hold off the pension and doing that because he does not want to hold off the extra pension payment either. And the pressure is going to be on to do that then. Which is his right to do.

Suzanne:

I think Catherine has made an excellent suggestion that rather than changing anything, leave it to the end of the year or whatever timeframe makes sense. Put it before the board, this is what we did. Do not do any monkey business to achieve it. And if the board would like to still make the payment despite the lack of achieving the goal, make the payment and not do this, let's reduce it so the payment can be made.

Catherine:

That might also be, if you can do what, seven out of eight?

Larry:

I think. I believe it is seven out of eight that we have to make a lot [inaudible 01:45:04] of multitude. Others metrics. We have already missed one of them, which is having zero recordable injuries for the year. So we have already missed one. So we automatically now are down to six, which is probably three quarters of a point rather than one point.

Suzanne:

Is it all or nothing, 1% or not?

Larry:

No, no. It is graduated. I think if you make six, I think it is three quarters of a point. If you make four, I think it's a half a percent and then anything below that is zero.

Suzanne:

Okay. And is this supplement [inaudible 01:45:35]

Rochelle:

Can just add, I think the coverage is the key one we need to make.

Larry:

But we have to achieve the coverage.

Rochelle:

It is like a self-funding payout.

Suzanne:

And is there any other payout that they get for four... Do we contribute, is this a supplemental 401K? Okay, so this is on top of our contributing to the 401K.

Larry:  
Correct.

Suzanne:

I really like Catherine's suggestion. I really do. That feels far more integrity driven to me. Not to say that you are operating from lack of integrity. I am just saying adjusting in the middle of the year feels...

Larry:

Well. That is why we wanted to bring that is that we can either adjust it, make it a different number, adjust it down, make it a different number or leave it alone. And I think that's an equitable suggestion. I just felt bad that the whole organization would suffer because of a wet summer and management was overly aggressive. So with that understanding that is fine.

Suzanne:

Yes, but they still may get half a percent it sounds like. Right? And it is supplemental.

Rochelle:

No, not if this is not met.

David:

Right because it's graduated, but this is one [inaudible 01:46:50]

Suzanne:

I see. That is interesting.

Larry:

Because of the self-funding nature of the 401K contribution from this.

Suzanne:

Okay.

David:

Yes, this is how extra revenue comes in. 10 times the extra revenue of the cost. But nonetheless, the extra revenue comes in.

Suzanne:

And I would say minimally you got to make it over to fund it. So it is cost [inaudible 01:47:12] think, that is for sure.

David:

And that is a good point. So if you get to 115 or 116 and that is more than the cost of the program, the board would be very amenable to that, is what I am hearing.

South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority  
October 26, 2023

Suzanne:

Would be more amenable to [inaudible 01:47:26]

Catherine:

No, but it is making a case that-

Suzanne:

A basis.

Catherine:

Yes, I would be much more comfortable.

Rochelle:

Sales were down because of the rain, still were able to be part way up to the 118.

Catherine:

Exactly.

Suzanne:

And fund what would be the 1% bonus.

Rochelle:

Right, yes.

Suzanne:

I am comfortable with that.

David:

Kevin, your thoughts?

Suzanne:

Thank you, Catherine.

Kevin:

I mean, I agree with Suzanne's comments earlier about not adjusting it just in order to give the bonus. I mean, I remember years ago that we were talking about even trying to be able to make 114 and I think that was a stretch if you go back eight to nine years. So I mean, I like the idea. I think it was Catherine's idea of let us see what happens at the end of the year and then make the call at that point in time. Thanks.

David:

Okay. All right. So then that is what we will do. All right.



South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority  
October 26, 2023

Suzanne:

Are you comfortable with that?

Larry:

Yes, that's fine. Thank you. I appreciate that.

Rochelle:

I appreciate you bringing it up early.

David:

Yes, well that [inaudible 01:48:46].

Rochelle:

As opposed to the last day. [inaudible 01:48:46]

David:

That is important, is that we got ahead. Okay. All right. Was that the end of, you have one more.

Larry:

One other, and if you want to defer this to the end, but a question had been raised about email?

Suzanne:

Our emails?

Larry:

Your email?

David:

Yes.

Larry:

Right now you are all getting email on your personal email. David has been advised by a lawyer that that would make your personal email subject to an FOI.

David:

That is correct.

Larry:

In order to avoid that, we need to provide a dedicated RWA email. So the choices are, you can achieve that dedicated RWA email by giving you a separate cell phone. So you get to carry around two of these or...

Catherine:

I already have two.

Larry:

Or the other option is, I am glad to see you all have the iPads, that you just put the RWA email on your iPad and you just have to remember to log into your iPad.

Suzanne:

It is your iPad that you're talking about. [inaudible 01:49:56]

Larry:

And that way it is secure. They do not want to put the RWA email on your personal phone. That would open you up to the same issue as we have now.

Suzanne:

So we would have to check it on this iPad in order to get our email.

Larry:

In order to get your email periodically. So it is not really a great set of options. I mean, you basically got two and one of them is not convenient, the other one seems to work.

David:

I would be in favor of that if we could somehow get an alert some other way on something that we normally do check.

Rochelle:

Without it being liable.

David:

Well, just an alert check your email.

Catherine:

Well the alert is not going to be a big deal. Right?

David:

Yeah, like a text or an email saying, check your email today. Then we know to check it. Honestly, I do not open this thing up. It was out of battery. I told you the other day I had not looked at it because it was out and I could not open it until Sunday night because...

Rochelle:

Had to charge it.

David:

Yes.

Larry:

I do not know if that can be done automatically, but let me talk to the IT department since Prem is not here, but let me talk to the IT department, let you know whether a text.

David:

Almost like an out of office notice.

Catherine:

I am perfectly comfortable with checking my email once a day. I have five email accounts.

David:

But I have four that I get on my phone, including one secure from work. It is a secure site that is in our business it has to be secure as well. And I am able to get on there. I can understand though their fear of not wanting to put that app that you have to go to. I did not think that is how they were going to cut down on it, but see if we can get it with an alert.

Larry:

Okay.

David:

Somehow. Thank you.

Rochelle:

Thank you.u

David:

Yes. All right, if you are done with that, why don't we take a break because a 10-year model is going to take some time and so let us take a break for 15 minutes

[BREAK FROM 2:20 P.M. TO 2:35 P.M.]

David:

All right, we will get started. So we are into the item of finance, which is the 10-year model. We are going to be discussing commercial and financial information. So I will ask for a motion to go into executive session, and invite the senior executive team and members who are here from staff.

Catherine:

So moved for items pursuant to C.G.S. Section 1-200(6)(E) to discuss matters covered by Section 1-210(b)(5)(B), pertaining to commercial and financial information and matters covered by Section 1-200(6)(E) for matters covered by Section 1-210(b)(19)(i)(ii) pertaining to security risk.

Suzanne:

Second.

South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority  
October 26, 2023

David:

All right. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Group:

Aye.

David:

All right. Larry, I will give it to you.

Larry:

Yes, thank you very much.

[EXECUTIVE SESSION FROM 2:34 P.M.4:51 P.M.]

David:

We will now recess as the Authority and reconvene as the Pension & Benefit Committee.

Mario:

Yes, I will move.

David:

Thank you. Second to that?

Suzanne:

I will second.

David:

Thank you. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Aye.

Group:

Aye.

[AUTHORITY MEETING RECONVENES AT 5:15 P.M.]

David

All right, now that we are back as the Authority, I will accept the motion to adjourn the meeting.

Suzanne:

I move we adjourn.

David:

Okay, second?

South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority  
October 26, 2023

Catherine:  
Second.

David:  
All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Group:  
Aye.

David:  
Thank you.