

**EUGENE WATER & ELECTRIC BOARD
REGULAR SESSION**

July 6, 2021

6:00 P.M.

Commissioners may pose questions to staff prior to the scheduled board meeting. To view Commissioners' pre-meeting questions and staff responses, visit <http://www.eweb.org/about-us/board-of-commissioners/2021board-agendas-and-minutes>.

Commissioners Present: Mindy Schlossberg, President; John Brown, Vice President; John Barofsky, Sonya Carlson, Matt McRae, Commissioners

Others Present: Frank Lawson, General Manager; Deborah Hart, Chief Financial Officer; Anne Kah, Administrative Services Manager; Wally McCullough, Water Engineering Supervisor; Tyler Nice, Electric Operations Manager; Rod Price, Assistant General Manager; Sarah Gorsegner, Purchasing Manager and Warehouse Supervisor; Adam Rue, Fiscal Services Supervisor

President Schlossberg called the Regular Session to order at 6:00 p.m.

Agenda Check

President Schlossberg suggested the possibility of removing the Legislative Update from an already-packed agenda.

Vice President Brown suggested leaving the Legislative Update on the agenda and revisit its possible removal after the two-part Financial Planning (Capital Improvement Plans, Long-Term Financial Plans, 2022 Budget Assumptions) agenda item.

Items from Board Members and General Manager

Vice President Brown said he was glad to be a part of the salmon-sorting function at Leaburg Dam.

Commissioner Barofsky offered that he testified before the Eugene City Council on June 28, 2021, offering them an update on EWEB's E. 40th & Hilyard water storage project. He thanked EWEB staff for their assistance with the data he presented to the Council.

Commissioner McRae thanked EWEB staff for their work on the E. 40th & Hilyard water storage project.

Public Input via Telephone/Public Input Reading

Stephen Anderson of Eugene expressed disappointment and frustration at EWEB's decision to install both storage tanks simultaneously, as part of the E. 40th and Hilyard water storage project. He said EWEB had decided to change plans suddenly, deciding to install both tanks simultaneously, instead—as discussed originally—placing the tanks

one at a time over the span of a decade, and he asserted the utility changed those plans with zero input from the community. Mr. Anderson said community members had been told by an EWEB contractor that moving tank one to site two would not preclude blasting for another tank in a decade or so, as was the utility's original plan, and he wondered why EWEB was telling the public something different than what the contractor had told them. He implored EWEB Commissioners to come out and walk the land with area residents and hear their side of the story before making any final decisions about the project.

Ms. Kah read a piece of public testimony submitted by **Susan Barnhart** of Eugene. Ms. Barnhart wrote that she was opposed to the plan to destroy the forest at E 40th and Hilyard. She agreed it was important to have safe, earthquake-proof reservoirs, but they needed to be built in a way, and at a location, that would not endanger old-growth trees. Ms. Barnhart urged the utility to forestall the project, and to get much more public input before moving forward with the E. 40th and Hilyard water storage project.

Marilyn Block of Eugene spoke in opposition to the E. 40th and Hilyard water storage project. She believed it was reasonable and fair to request the utility to gather more public input before moving ahead with the project as planned.

Joanne Caravio of Eugene said that while she was not opposed to a new water storage project, she urged EWEB to move forward with a new reservoir in a way that would not destroy large, old trees. She pointed out trees should be considered pieces of infrastructure, because they: absorb solar radiation, filter pollution from the air and water, remove stormwater, store carbon, spread moisture, and nurture wildlife.

Steven Goldman of Eugene spoke in opposition to the E. 40th and Hilyard water storage project. He urged the utility to hold an in-person public hearing to allow everyone in the community who is interested, concerned, or has questions about this project to be heard and to have all their questions and concerns responded to thoroughly openly and honestly. Mr. Goldman added that while new water storage options were certainly necessary for a utility that relies solely on one water intake, he suggested fast-tracking the pursuit of a second water source, and not relying solely on water storage projects.

Jenna Hartman of Eugene asserted it would be a travesty for EWEB to cut down the old-growth forest in the E. 40th and Hilyard area to accommodate two water reservoirs. She spoke for all the animals who would lose their habitats if the trees were removed, and pointed out that, in an area becoming hotter and dryer each year, soon, every single tree would count. Miss Hartman urged EWEB to hold public meetings on this project, instead of making private decisions that would affect local residents, including the trees and the animals who call them home.

Joseph Hubble of Eugene expressed disappointment—as a resident of the E. 40th and Hilyard community—that he had just heard of the water storage project a few days before this meeting. He asserted that as a community member, he was a stakeholder in

any possible facilities planned in that community and was surprised the utility did not find a way to inform him of the project. Mr. Hubble suggested an in-person meeting (perhaps on the property in question itself) between the EWEB Board of Commissioners and the E. 40th and Hilyard community, at which discussions of alternatives to present plans could be explored together.

Victor Oddivak of Eugene, relaying the thoughts of Jason Simon from Nextdoor.com, offered that from an engineering standpoint, College Hill was a much better site to expand the water supply for the entire city of Eugene. Mr. Simon via Mr. Oddivak, added the College Hill site was much higher in elevation, already had the old-growth trees removed, and there was enough room to add more water capacity than the E. 40th and Hilyard site. Mr. Oddivak said that although EWEB calls itself a “publicly-owned utility”, the public has never been allowed to vote directly on anything the utility has ever done, and he suggested EWEB add a ballot to their next cycle of bills, so ratepayers could state whether they were for or against the project as planned, including the removal of the old-growth trees at the E. 40th and Hilyard site.

Jonathan Pincus of Eugene spoke in opposition to the E. 40th and Hilyard water storage project. He urged EWEB to explore the College Hill site, as suggested by the previous comment, instead of removing the old growth trees from the E. 40th and Hilyard site. He felt protecting old-growth forest was important to the region, and he urges the utility to rethink what they were planning at E. 40th and Hilyard.

Dr. Samuel Schmieding of Eugene was dismayed that he had not heard about this project—a project he referred to as the largest infrastructure project in decades for both EWEB and Eugene—until a day before this meeting. He said the project would create a major disturbance in the area for year, not to mention the old-growth trees that would be destroyed, and he urged EWEB to revisit their decision on the E. 40th and Hilyard water storage project, and asserted the project needed to be debated publicly.

Janelle South of Eugene read the Board EWEB’s Mission Statement from its 2017 Strategic Plan; it states: “Our mission is to enhance our community’s vitality by delivering drinking water and electric services consistent with the values of our customer-owners. We exist for the benefit of our local community.” She said EWEB’s decision about the E. 40th and Hilyard water storage project did not reflect their mission statement. Ms. South stressed the importance of the old-growth forest to be removed to children, who need a steady diet of Nature, instead of the screens of their various devices.

Hannah Thrift of Eugene spoke in opposition to the E. 40th and Hilyard water storage project. She found it impossible to believe there were no alternative sites for this project where trees had already been cut down. Ms. Thrift posited the region needed every single tree for carbon sequestration, and especially old trees such as those in question should not be removed for any reason. Finally, she urged EWEB to hold public debate on this project, and to actually listen to the public.

Sandra Bishop of Eugene spoke in opposition to the E. 40th and Hilyard water storage project. She felt the original decision to build the tanks one at a time, and in a way that would preserve the ancient forest, was discarded, and replaced virtually overnight with the current plan, which would include the razing of the old-growth forest in the area; and this was done with absolutely no input from the public. Ms. Bishop implored the EWEB Board—as the community’s elected officials—to help the community by forestalling the project, asserting this was an issue that needed to be debated publicly, instead of decided behind closed doors.

Charlie Rojas of Eugene asserted EWEB did a poor job of notifying their over 200,000 ratepayers of the largescale infrastructure project planned for E. 40th and Hilyard. He said he received an email from EWEB, justifying installing both water tanks at the same time and destroying the old-growth forest, which the utility dubbed an “adjustment in plans”, when in fact the changes constitute a complete overhaul of the project. Mr. Rojas admonished the utility for adding cost burdens to their customers in the middle of one of the worst economic downturns in Oregon history. He implored EWEB to reconsider this project, and to include the public in every step of it.

Vice President Brown said he wished there were an alternative to the updated plan for the E. 40th and Hilyard water storage project, but he did not think there was. He said reservoir siting is very technical, and even if EWEB were to stick to its original plan and only place one tank at present, they would still need to blast for both tanks (because, he said, they cannot install one tank, and then blast next to it after it is in the ground) and blasting for the second tank would involve cutting the old-growth down. Vice President Brown said the utility was under a time constraint from the Oregon Health Authority, who are mandating EWEB to decommission the College Hill reservoir, but they cannot decommission the old facility, until a new facility is in place.

Commissioner Barofsky stated that he has personally walked the property for the water storage project and attended community meetings at the property with neighbors and EWEB staff. He asserted EWEB’s public outreach for the E. 40th and Hilyard water storage project was robust, but it may have been hindered by the COVID pandemic. As a new Commissioner, he reviewed the background material and is comfortable moving forward with the decision. He acknowledged the trees that will be removed, as well as the oak habitat that will be maintained and enhanced. He also acknowledged there would be community impacts regardless of the location, but we need to move forward for the betterment of the community. On the topic of a more democratic process, he said the community elected him, and if any of them feel he is making the wrong decision(s), he recognizes they are free to not vote for him, or even to run against him in the next election.

Commissioner Carlson acknowledged the speakers’ sentiments that the public process was not what they would have liked it to be. She said she was pleased with EWEB’s efforts to minimize the number of trees destroyed, while maximizing the remaining oaks, which have the highest positive environmental impact. She agreed with Commissioner Barofsky that the public information campaign for this project was robust (she said she

was personally aware of no less than nine different emails which went out to the impacted communities) and encouraged the community to glean information from the utility's website. Additionally, at least two public meetings were held at the project site, as well as public board meetings with public testimony, and staff and commissioners have reached out to neighbors. Commissioner Carlson said when she learned the trees in question would have to be removed anyway—even if installing only one tank at a time, together with the more than one million cost savings, and less impacts to neighbors due to significantly reduced truck loads—the updated E. 40th and Hilyard water storage project plan seemed the right direction. Finally, Commissioner Carlson stated that other options were evaluated, she explained that the project requires a certain elevation and capacity which are not easy to find in that region.

Commissioner McRae thanked those who took the time out of their evenings to speak to the Board tonight. He said he puts a lot of trust in EWEB staff, and felt they were taking every precaution to minimize impacts and sincerely and thoroughly looking at all the trade-offs of this project. He pointed out that just two and a half of the ten acres of the property will be impacted, and staff are protecting the rare oak habitat. Lastly, he stated that the Board has asked staff to identify and take steps to minimize noise, dust, and truck traffic that will affect neighbors.

President Schlossberg echoed her fellow Board members' sentiments, and she put trust in staff to come up with and execute plans to mitigate: noise, costs, and ecological impacts of the E. 40th and Hilyard water storage project.

Mr. Lawson said the E. 40th and Hilyard water storage project was part of a larger, long-term water plan that increases water quality and water reliability. The plan includes two 7.5 million gallon water storage reservoirs at the E. 40th site, as well as two new 7.5 million gallon reservoirs at the Hawkins and College Hill sites. These sites were chosen many years ago because they are matched in elevation, specifically 607 feet above sea level. By having two tanks at these locations there will be more flexibility for operations and maintenance going forward. He explained another reason for constructing both tanks at one time is the 2100 reduced truck loads and associated carbon reduction. He added that he too had a great deal of trust in staff's decisions; and he appreciated the members of the public who are willing to testify before the Board even if they disagree with the Board's, and EWEB's decisions.

Approval of Consent Calendar – A MINUTES AND ROUTINE CONTRACTS

MINUTES

- 1. a. May 18, 2021 Work Session**
- b. June 1, 2021 Regular Session**

CONTRACTS

2. Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. - for engineering design services. \$650,000 based on a Formal Request for Proposals using the Qualification Based Selection (QBS) process.

3. Dudek - for cultural research services. \$160,000 (over 5 years) based on a Formal Request for Proposals.

4. Jacobs dba CH2M Hill Engineers Inc. - Task Order (D2 Amendment 5) for Engineering Services for the Carmen-Smith Downstream Fish Passage. \$273,552 (original contract \$12,000,000, resulting cumulative Task Order total \$10,771,474) based on Request for Proposals using the Qualifications Based Selection (QBS) process.

5. Jacobs dba CH2M Hill Engineers Inc. - Task Order (FRS-1 Amendment 1) for Engineering Services for the CS Smith Spillway Expansion and Flow Release Structure. \$231,208 (original contract \$12,000,000, resulting cumulative Task Order total \$10,497,922) based on Request for Proposals using the Qualifications Based Selection (QBS) process.

Mr. Lawson announced that staff would like to remove Consent Calendar – A, number 2. He said there were some negotiating specifics that had come out, and staff would likely bring this item back next month.

Vice President Brown pulled Consent Calendar – A, number 3, for quick discussion

Commissioner Barofsky moved to approve Consent Calendar – A, less items 2 and 3. The motion passed unanimously 5:0.

On Consent Calendar A – Item 3, Vice President Brown noticed there were three proposers in total—two from Eugene, and one from Portland. He had trouble comprehending why EWEB decided to go with the Portland proposer, rather than one of the more local Eugene proposers. While Vice President Brown said he planned to vote for this item, but he wanted to make the point about hiring and spending money locally, thereby keeping more capital locally.

Mr. Lawson said he would work with EWEB Finance on the development of some type of local benefit or preference for contract work.

Ms. Gorsegrner offered there was an avenue in EWEB's rules which allow the utility to have a local preference, but it is very limiting in that it has to be an equal offer from any suppliers or vendors EWEB is working with.

Vice President Brown moved to approve Consent Calendar – A, Item 3. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Consent Calendar – B Non-Routine Contracts and Other Consent Items

CONTRACTS

- 6. Cornforth Consultants, Inc.** - for Leaburg-Waltermville dam safety engineering services. \$3,000,000 based on a Formal Request for Proposals using the Qualifications Based Selection (QBS) process.
- 7. Eaton's Cooper Power Systems LLC** - for the purchase of Network Protectors. \$550,000 (over 5 years - initial term is 2 years) based on Direct Negotiation.
- 8. Island Fence & Window Guard, Inc.**- for fencing services (on-call). \$150,000 (over 5 years) based on Formal Request for Proposals.
- 9. NAPA Auto Parts** - for an Integrated Supply Agreement. \$4,000,000 (over 5 years) based on a Cooperative Contract.
- 10. Oldham Crane Service, Inc.** - for crane services (on-call). \$150,000 (over 5 years) based on Formal Request for Proposals.
- 11. Wildish Building Co.** - for construction services to perform seismic transformer anchoring at several EWEB Substations. \$365,000 based on a Formal Invitation to Bid.
- 12. Wildish Building Co.** - Construction Task Order #23 for construction services for the reconstruction of the Trail Bridge Campground/Recreation Area. \$3,650,000 based on CM/GC Guaranteed Maximum Price.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS

Springfield Utility Board - additional funds for an extension to an existing Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) for the Indefeasible Right of Use (IRU) Agreement for Dark Fiber Service. \$300,000 (resulting cumulative total \$725,000 for April 1, 2006 - March 31, 2023) based on Direct Negotiation.

Commissioner Brown moved to approve Consent Calendar – B. The motion passed unanimously 5:0.

Financial Planning (Capital Improvement Plans, Long-Term Financial Plans, 2022 Budget Assumptions): Part 1 - Strategic and Operational Guidance, Business & Economic Assumptions

Mr. Lawson, Mr. Price, Ms. Hart, Mr. Rue, Mr. McCullough, and Mr. Nice offered the Board a report and PowerPoint presentation on Financial Planning (Capital Improvement Plans, Long-Term Financial Plans, 2022 Budget Assumptions): Part 1 - Strategic and Operational Guidance, Business & Economic Assumptions.

Vice President Brown asked if staff was comfortable with an inflation rate anywhere from 3-9%

Mr. Rue admitted the 2% inflation pointed to in the presentation was at the low end of that range. He said the decision was partly based on state forecasts which showed inflation in the 2-2.5% range for the next few years.

Vice President Brown cautioned that setting a lower percentage for inflation might necessitate raising rates.

Mr. Lawson offered adjustments could be made over the space of several years on EWEB's risk-based investments, to prevent an increase in rates.

Ms. Hart clarified the 2% projection was not for construction costs, considering construction costs are currently up about 30%.

Mr. Lawson assured the Board the Finance Department would look more closely at some scenarios in which the sensitivity to the 2% inflation number could be tested.

Mr. Rue pointed out that the price of purchase power was outside of the aforementioned 2% inflation calculations; he added those cost projections were consistent with long-term contracting prices.

Commissioner Carlson asked if the labor costs estimation, instead of being forecasted with a 2% inflation rate, had its own rate, which included healthcare costs.

Mr. Lawson said that was correct

Commissioner Barofsky said he would like to see more about the Willamette River project. He said he had not had enough information about that project, to be either in support or in opposition to it. Commissioner Barofsky also posited the Rate Stabilization Fund could be dipped into in the future—provided it is feasible to do so—to help prevent rate increases.

Mr. Lawson assured Commissioner Barofsky that staff would give the Board a full report on the Willamette River project in an upcoming Board meeting.

Commissioner Carlson asked about the \$44 per megawatt hour wholesale forward market presented in the Electric section in the presentation.

Mr. Lawson said the wholesale market has a favorable impact on EWEB's revenue. He said there were times when the utility was both buying and selling power, but on a yearly average, EWEB is a net energy seller.

Commissioner Carlson said she looked forward to an explanation for the increase from \$70 million to \$90 million on the possible future EWEB Willamette River water treatment facility.

Commissioner McRae echoed Vice President Brown's sentiment about inflation rates and thought it best the utility be very conservative when it came to those rates. He asked if more or less water use drove costs up and/or influenced rates.

Mr. Lawson replied water consumption in the region was mostly driven by weather, and higher consumption financially benefits EWEB

Commissioner McRae asked if the bump in water usage due to hot temperatures this year is significant?

Mr. Lawson said he believed both water and electric consumption were up due to the recent heatwave.

Commissioner McRae asked if annual peak electricity use affected rates.

Mr. Lawson said not significantly at present.

Commissioner McRae asked about assumptions in terms of carbon intensity of EWEB's electricity.

Mr. Lawson said questions and assumptions concerning carbon were still largely unanswered, but the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) the utility was working on throughout the year would shed some light on the carbon issue.

President Schlossberg said she was interested in seeing how changing weather patterns affected the utility financially.

Mr. Lawson said the trends EWEB was seeing now look to continue, but more, and more in-depth modeling could be done by staff.

Commissioner Barofsky asked—mentioning what Commissioner McRae said earlier about EWEB being conservative in its assumptions—if rates would have to go up to compensate.

Mr. Lawson said yes, if budget assumptions were conservative in nature, it could drive up rates.

Break

President Schlossberg called for a break at 7:50. She reconvened the meeting at 7:55

Financial Planning (Capital Improvement Plans, Long-Term Financial Plans, 2022 Budget Assumptions): Part 2 - Investment Plans and Financial Results

Mr. Lawson, Mr. Price, Ms. Hart, Mr. Rue, Mr. McCullough, and Mr. Nice offered the Board a report and Power Point presentation on Financial Planning (Capital Improvement Plans, Long-Term Financial Plans, 2022 Budget Assumptions): Part 2 - Investment Plans and Financial Results

Commissioner Carlson referenced a graph in the PowerPoint presentation which displays base level reservoir capacity in comparison to need, she inquired if EWEB could build the storage required at the College Hill site.

Mr. McCullough said the graph depicts the minimum demand, and the Utility needs to consider how close to that threshold it should be, while also considering the future trajectory. According to the graph, capacity is expected to drop below demand in the future, he explained this is due to a future decision point around the decommissioning of the Santa Clara reservoir which is not reflected in the graph. EWEB will need to decide whether to decommission Santa Clara or build replacement storage ahead of time.

Commissioner Carlson posited that it would be helpful to know what the variance is associated with any graph or figure.

Mr. McCullough pointed out the graph in question was based on a 2015 Master Plan EWEB had done, and the next scheduled update to the utility's Master Plan, was scheduled for 2025.

With regard to rebuilding at College Hill, Mr. Price explained that building smaller tanks will improve water quality and maintenance flexibility. Additionally, distributed storage will improve resiliency in the event of an earthquake when pipes may be impacted more in some areas of the city than others.

Vice President Brown wondered why there were four substations slated for replacement in the Thurston and upriver areas, when EWEB had only 2,300 customers there.

Mr. Nice described the four substations as follows: Waltherville, which was more of a conversion-decommissioning – putting the generator onto the distribution system instead of a transformer; International Paper (IP) plant; Thurston, which was not slated for replacement, rather a conversion, which would take advantage of Bonneville Power Administration's existing powerlines; and Hayden Bridge.

Vice President Brown wondered if there were any plans to increase the budget for undergrounding electric transmission lines.

Mr. Price said currently about half of EWEB's lines were underground, and to up that percentage significantly, would cost \$50-\$70 million.

Finally, Vice President Brown asked what possible seismic upgrades could be done on the Roosevelt Operations Center (ROC) building, which was just built a few years ago.

Mr. McCullough said currently, the seismic on the ROC building was such that you could get out, but not back in; he added the upgrade would be on par with police stations and hospitals.

Mr. Nice said EWEB had just recently been approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for an undergrounding project in South Eugene, and details would be included in the next quarterly report.

Commissioner McRae expressed surprise and dismay that the ROC building—the most essential building to the utility—had not been built to higher seismic standards, and he was glad the building was being seismically retrofitted. He wondered if it were possible to create a Board policy which would guarantee all new EWEB buildings were built to a higher seismic standard

Vice President Brown offered the ROC building was built to a lower standard because there is no “essential” function in the building, but rather administration and engineering.

Mr. Lawson said it was the utility’s strategy to become more resilient and part of that should be to apply the appropriate seismic standards to not only its buildings, but to other structures as well, such as transformer foundations and pump stations. He added EWEB did not actually have a resiliency policy, and such a policy would be something worth exploring.

Commissioner Carlson asserted the utility should start looking at any of its equipment that may be vulnerable to extreme temperatures

Commissioner Barofsky asked for specifics about EWEB’s contract with International Paper (IP).

Mr. Lawson said IP was a large consumer of EWEB’s electricity, and the utility felt IP was a strong and healthy business, that warranted a continued investment on EWEB’s part.

Commissioner Barofsky asked if future EWEB water storage projects would involve the simultaneous installation of two water storage tanks.

Mr. McCullough said that was correct, although the two tanks were being installed at the Hawkins site in a slightly staggered fashion.

President Schlossberg wondered about the timeline of the second water source project.

Mr. Mccullough said EWEB was working with SUB on property acquisition, and rights and easements for the installation of a water transmission pipeline.

Mr. Lawson said the utility was also working closely with the City of Springfield on the land use issues.

Commissioner Barofsky wondered if the federal money EWEB expected to receive from the Federal Government to help offset the costs of the second source project, could also be used to offset in increases in water prices.

Ms. Hart said the funds could be used to offset those increases.

Commissioner Barofsky asked, if EWEB used \$20 million in rate stabilization funds, how much less the utility would have to raise its rates.

Ms. Hart said her team would send a memo to the Board which would answer that question.

Vice President Brown said he wanted to be very sure EWEB could get land-use approval in Springfield for its second water source project, citing the possible 9% rate increase associated with the project.

Mr. Lawson assured the Board that the utility had a lot of boxes it needed to check before considering any rate increase, and the Board would be involved every step of the way.

Commissioner Carlson wondered if the yellow on the graph depicting electric long-term financial plans was indicative of EWEB possibly having issues borrowing capital in the future.

Mr. Lawson said that was not correct; he pointed out the yellow on the graph that Commissioner Carlson mentioned showed EWEB was coming close to the bottom end of its financial metric, and not dropping below it.

Commissioner Carlson wondered if inflationary price increases were due to COVID, or if they were indicative.

Mr. McCullough replied the \$20 million in inflationary cost for second source was based on actual construction cost indexes from 2014-15 to 2020, and then a 3% assumption on increase in inflation.

Commissioner McRae said he appreciated the gradual rate increases smoothed over a longer timeframe, and he wondered why EWEB could not do the same on the water side of the utility.

Mr. Lawson clarified the utility had gone several years with no rate increases on the water side, and the current projection—when taking into consideration the second water source project—has rates rising parallel to inflation.

President Schlossberg asked, since the utility was raising its rates, if the budget for low-income financial assistance would be raised also.

Mr. Lawson said the budget for financial assistance was very flexible and would increase if necessary.

Commissioner Barofsky did not agree that EWEB had “checked all the boxes” here, namely, because there was no mention whatsoever of Walterville.

Mr. Lawson asserted EWEB had achieved the tactical response to Leaburg and Walterville through this decade. He said that if there were any long-term investments associated with Leaburg or Walterville canals, it would most likely be because of decommissioning or relicensing.

Commissioner McRae asked if the utility expected any unexpected costs in the future, and what kind of capacity EWEB had to deal with such unexpected costs.

Mr. Lawson said there were mechanisms built into each project that would provide a bit of a financial cushion.

Commissioner Carlson offered that she agreed with the trajectory the utility was on as far as Leaburg, Walterville, and the potential second water source facility; she added that, to her, Leaburg was the project which needed the most, and the quickest, attention.

President Schlossberg advocated for Work Sessions, to give the Board more time, and more chance to discuss these large decisions they are to make.

The Board decided to move the Legislative Update item to a future agenda.

Correspondence & Board Agendas

Mr. Lawson offered the Board a report on this month's Correspondence and Board Agendas.

He announced the EWEB Board was planning on meeting in person at the Headquarters building for the August Board meeting.

Board Wrap Up

Commissioner McRae asked if there was anything else to do with wildfire mitigation that would come back to the Board in the future.

Mr. Price said there would be a couple more wildfire mitigation agenda items put before the Board in the near future.

Commissioner Carlson announced that at last month's Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) meeting, she and others received a report on the underground infrastructure/dark fiber sharing, and she wondered if any of the other Commissioners would be interested in receiving a report on this information from LCOG.

Commissioner Barofsky said he would like to be kept in the loop as far as any information on the hydrogen project.

President Schlossberg adjourned the meeting at 9:28 p.m.

Recorded by Rodney Cimburke

Assistant Secretary

President