## **NEW YORK CITY WATER BOARD** 1:30PM Meeting of the Board October 14, 2021

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

## [START RECORDING]

MR. OMAR NAZEM: For any members of the public who are new to these meeting or either joining for the first time, this is a meeting of the New York City Water Board. It is a business meeting. So the point of the meeting is for the Board to the consider board business, discuss among themselves, but in a public format, and to receive informational updates from the Water Board staff, Department of Environmental Protection and from outside presenters we may invite from time to time. It is not a form for public input so I would ask everyone, put your phone in listen-only mode. Your questions or anything you want to share with us, this meeting is not the right format for that. You can send any questions, comments or anything you want outside of this meeting to the Board staff and I will give you the information right up front. The email, nycwaterboard@dep.nyc.gov or you can call us at 718-595-3594 anytime. We will take your questions and concerns there or report back to Board staff, but this is a business meeting not for public input. You need to call or email

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

real time.

It's streamtext.net URL. It's quite

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

1

Great. Thank you. Member Shaw?

MS. ARLENE SHAW: Here, present.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. Member Zarrilli?

MR. DANIEL ZARRILLI: I am here and happy to join my first Water Board meeting. Thank you.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. Welcome. We have a quorum Mr. Chairman.

MR. CARNEY: Mr. Secretary, thank you very much. First of all, welcome to everybody. This is a lovely-what is this-Thursday afternoon in New York City. We haven't been together in a long time, although, our last meeting was on the 14th of June, we are going to get to that in a minute. We were not together then. It will be great when we can figure out how to do that again safely and comfortably. I want to start out by introducing to all the members our newest member, Daniel Zarrilli. Dan is a special advisor on climate policy at Columbia and he advises the University on climate of course and on sustainability and is involved with something I only learnt about recently the New Columbia Climate School. Dan was a senior climate policy advisor to the city under Mayors de Blasio and

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Bloomberg and was with New York City Economic Development Corporation for many years. welcome, it's a pleasure to have you with us.

MR. ZARRILLI: Thank you so much for that introduction.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: We have a lot of important quests with us today. I quess all of our quests are important, but I am going to mention several of them. We are joined by representatives of the New York City Parks Department and they will be presenting a proposed real-estate transfer. I will introduce them shortly, but I had the pleasure of meeting Mitchel Loring recently very much enjoyed your company, Mitchel. Thank you for joining us on the phone. Collen Olgerson, and Nicholas Molinari also on the phone with us We are joined by representatives from, of course, DEP including two of the senior professionals who are involved directly with Department's new billing software project, which is-which is very exciting. I have met some of those folks recently and it was a pleasure to see the beginning of the implementation of that And I think you will enjoy that report. project.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Jeff Lynch is with us, Deputy Commissioner, and Albert Kramer, who is the project manager. the Water Board Staff we have Joe Murin and Omar Nazem and we have Albert Rodriguez. He is the secretary of the Board and a legal advisor. have a number of important agenda items including a review of that—the proposed real-estate transfer. It is a section of Hart island. It's in the Bronx and it's going to another city agency, of course, as well as vote on approving the audited financial statements for fiscal 2021. This meeting was preceded by meeting of the Joint Audit Committee of the Water Financial Authority and the Water Board and I want to thank Adam Freed and Jon Goldin for joining me at that meeting. It was a very productive meeting, great outcome. We will talk about that in a minute. And, of course, the Water Finance Authority had its three representatives present at that meeting. also going to hear presentations from DEP and the Board staff providing us with a financial update as well as an update on other activity at We will be voice voting today, I am -at DEP.

2.3

going to ask Mr. Rodriguez to call the votes after motion is moved—I'm sorry after a resolution is moved and seconded so that we can have a voice vote since we can't see each other and raising your hands won't help. The first agenda item then the approval of the minutes of the June 14th meeting—as I say we weren't together then. We are not together now. I hope we can do—we can get together sometime in the near future. We had a chance to—members had a chance to review the minutes. Are there any comments—proposed revisions?

MR. FREED: Yeah. This is Member Freed. I have a few comments that I would love to - - included. On Page 2, when we talked about—Members Freed and Goldin having some discussion around request of the rental payments in the City, in particular I think Jon - - I raised the fact that the discretionary waiver of the rental payments caused a lot of uncertainty and financial risk for the Water Board and for the Water System and urged the City to permanently eliminate the rental payment. And I would love to see the urgency particularly that

on record that members of the Board were urging
the City to permanently eliminate our rental
payments moving forward so that we could remove
that uncertainty and fiduciary risks on
financial risks that we face. And then on Page
8, at the end—and I appreciate the secretary for
noting my comments around the stormwater
management and the urgency needed to incentivize
stormwater management to rate settings. I also
had urged DEPs to move forward with a
sustainable stormwater rate setting that was not
happening to enable us on the Water Board and
DEP and others to explore a more progressive
rate structure as soon as possible and finding
ways to speed that up knowing that the billings
systems also being updated, which was something
that was preventing us from moving forwards so
that will be good to put on record. Now that we
noting the urgency but having DEP do
anything possible to accelerate that study and
resolution of that so that we are on the Water
Board can act on it.

MR. CARNEY: Adam, I remember both comments.

Al, what would you recommend? Shall we differ

2.3

the approval of the minutes pending those two additions in whatever form you would choose to do that or shall we approve the minutes subject to the Board's approval of the addition of Adam's two comments. I think both should be incorporated. I simply don't know how best to do that.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah. I think we can take the latter, but those actions, which is to approve the minutes, subject to those—the two amendments being made to the minutes. — — which if approved by the Board would be made and then will be distributed to the Board.

MR. CARNEY: Well then, we will make that the motion. Thank you very much, Al. Does everybody understand what we are doing? Do all the members—are the members clear on how we are going to do this?

MS. SHAW: Yes.

MR. GOLDIN: Yes.

MR. CARNEY: Okay. Okay. Then may I ask for a motion to approve the minutes from the-from the last-the June 14th meeting subject to the revisions that the Board members will be

1	1:30pm Meeting of the Water Board 11
2	given an opportunity to read and approve before
3	they are incorporated in the minutes. Thank you.
4	MR. GOLDIN: May I motion.
5	MR. CARNEY: Thank you That was-I'm
6	sorry. Yes. John, that was you?
7	MR. GOLDIN: Yes.
8	MR. CARNEY: Thank you very much. Is there
9	a second?
10	MS. SHAW: Arlene Shaw seconds.
11	MR. CARNEY: Arlene, thank you very much for
12	the second. Mr. Secretary, will you do the roll
13	call?
14	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah. Yeah. Chairman
15	Carney, how do you vote?
16	MR. CARNEY: To approve, subject to of
17	course.
18	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. Member
19	Fernandez-Ketcham, how do you vote?
20	MS. FERNANDEZ-KETCHAM: Approved pending the
21	changesif any.
22	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. Member Freed,
23	how do you vote?
24	MR. FREED: Approved pending the changes and
25	I will just reassure you that we do read the
	T.11 •

2.3

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah. Okay.

MR. CARNEY: Mr. Rodriguez, thank you very much. See, our next agenda item is the Parks

Department presentation on a proposal to

transfer a section of Hart Island from DEP to

the Parks Department. The presentation will be made by Mitchel Loring, Colleen Anderson and

Nicholas Molinari.

MR. LORING: Hi, there. This is Mitchel Loring. I am a senior project planner in the New York City Department of Parks and Recreations in the Planning and Development division. Regretfully, Colleen Anderson and Nicholas Molinari are not able to join the call. - -

MR. CARNEY: Just so, you have got the duty, I guess. Thank you.

MR. LORING: I've got the duty and I will try to cover everybody's questions, but there may be a few things I will have to take back and if that is the case we will work through those. So thank you for your patience. Thank you for doing this request. I understand that the presentation and the memo that was prepared was

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

already distributed before and since we are doing this over the phone, I will try and be brief in my description of everything knowing the images. So I will just start with the overview of Hart Island. is been a municipal facility and has been used as a cemetery shortly after the civil war. The island had several uses throughout its history. It had various institutional facilities, hospital facilities, reformatories, substance abuse rehabilitation centers, different military uses as well as jail uses by the Department of Corrections and the Department of Corrections had been operating the island for most of its history up until July 1st, 2021, earlier this year where the Parks Department received the jurisdiction of the majority of the island, which is blocks 5649 lot 1; however, we paused on the center of block 5649 lot 100 once we realized the fact the portion of the island was not under DOC control, but possibly under DEP jurisdiction which have led us here today. So from that point, Parks did a little bit more research background information with why that portion of that island

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

was under DEP jurisdiction. I went through the North River Waste Water Treatment Facility with DEP staff with the old record. We did discover that there used to be a waste water treatment plant on the lot 100 area, very southern most portion of this island. It was demolished in the 1970s and the transfer from DEP to Department of Correction at that time never took So Department of Corrections continued operating their cemetery facilities across the island since the time of that facility's demolition in 1970 even though the portion of the island was still under DEP jurisdiction. local law that has passed in 2019 that outlined the center of jurisdiction from the Department of Correction to New York City Parks Department. So that's the main reason behind all the actions related to the transfer of Hart Island from DOC to Parks and the reason why we are here today. So - - hopefully you know request this approval of transfer of this remaining lot 100 from the Water Board and finalize the various actions that were requested of the City via the local laws of 2019 any other key points to highlight.

2.3

I think it is worthwhile to note that since the waste water treatment facility was demolished, burials has since take place on lot 100. There are some great tombstones located at that portion of the island and again, DOC had operated that portion of the island as they did the rest of the island throughout their history from southern point Parks jurisdiction on July 1, 2021, and Parks Management and Resources

Administration began through operational control of the island very recently on October 1st, 2021. I think that this is the key point I'll pause if there are any questions, I am happy to go through more details.

MR. CARNEY: Mitchel, before you take questions. Can you all hear me? I get this mute thing wrong every once in a while.

MR. MURIN: Yes.

MR. CARNEY: Thank you. Before you take questions, Mitchel, I would like to add a few things to your report—your presentation. First of all, thank you very much for hosting me and several other people on the luxurious ferry ride from City island to Hart island on Tuesday.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

The-it's a 10-minute ferry ride for anybody who is interested. I had a-I was curious about this transfer and I wanted to see it. I and Mitchel-Omar was kind enough through Mitchel to organize that trip and it was an eye opening and it was almost an adventure. I got to see the southern end of the island, which is on three sides surrounded by water, but has absolutely-probably has absolutely no commercial value whatsoever. It's the smaller end of the island. It is-there are now gravesites there. I suppose it's conceivable that some inspired developer could do something with it, but it would not be worth-I don't think it will be worthy of any effort. I am-I am not qualified to make such judgments. It was an eyeball decision I made. Hart Island had on it a number of structures and I was unaware of that. There was a facility there for wayward boys. There was, what is referred to now as an, asylum of some sort on the propertyon the island. There is now what was a beautiful church and these are all on the southern end of the island and not all inclusive of the-of the area that the water-that the DEP

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

holds. But near and or on that-that site plotlot 100, I guess it is called. It is an interesting island because all those buildings and, there must be 10 or 11 of them on the Southern end, had been allowed to deteriorate and will be razed at some point probably by the Parks Department. What impressed me most was that Hart Island actually has a historical significance that I had not known of before with-the tale is that there are million people buried out there. Our quide on the island was Captain Martin Thompson and Captain Thompson made it clear that that's got to be wrong but there may be thousands and thousands and thousands of-buried out there. A Civil War memorial which is impressive. A number of Nike missile sites make sense during the cold war the army decided that that was a good idea and so they, I mean, they're - - the area where these sites-areas, are still clear. It sounds to me like the Parks department has an opportunity, don't know that it will but, has an opportunity to actually explore the historical significance of Hart Island to the public and how they choose 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

2	to do that and where the money comes form is an
3	entirely different story, but just for the
4	members sake I would probably vote in favor of
5	this transfer, it makes sense, and now if
6	there's questions for Mitchel, please ask them.

[Crosstalk]

Sorry, say again. The two of MR. CARNEY: your tried to talk at the same time.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Go ahead, please.

MR. FREED: Thanks, sorry, I don't have a question necessarily on the project. I did note that in the resolution it connected the transfer of the plan with the great point landing - - project and I was assuming that that was from the last line transfer we did last board meeting. I just wanted to clarify that? MR. RODRIGUEZ: I've made the same

MR. NAZEM: In the final document pack the circular of yesterday, you don't see that. resolution to vote on today does not have that included.

MR. FREED: Perfect. Thank you.

[Crosstalk]

assumption now.

MR. FREED: Perfect, thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. GOLDIN: question is whether there is currently, in connection with any of the structures or otherwise, water or sewers service on the island, and if so, how that's provided?

MR. LORING: I'll try to answer that question to the best of my ability. understanding is that all of the waste part treatment plant was demolished in the 70's, at that time it was dismissed because newer facilities were built throughout the - - and that service from the island was cutoff however, I am under the impression from DOC's - - on the island that there is some form of water service on the island. There are several hydrants spread throughout the island. Some of them are functional, some of them are not. So I'm sorry

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

that I don't know the exact technical details of how water is supplied to the island - -.

MR. JOSEPH MURIN: This is Joe Murin, if I may interject now? On that point Jonathan, member of Member Goldin. Whatever water supply or if there's any sewer service that is on the island would be connected in some way to the Hunt's point of waste water treatment plant which is in the South Bronx and as with other city-ownedfacilities, Parks-owned zone facilities, the - - department would be responsible for all future maintenance and taking care of those facilities-the sewer lines and the water lines on the island itself and we in DEP just like any other Parks facility we would be responsible for keeping any of those connections and that would just be part of our normal services that do with any of our other city agencies where they have a facility for servicing.

MR. GOLDIN: Thank you, and I just also wanted to thank the Water Board staff for its work on this and specifically determining whether there were any meaningful or

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

valuable - - including that there are - - in the area that we're considering and there are benefits to the system including not having to maintain the upkeep and the - - of liabilities so I think all of that counts as—in favor of submitting the transfer.

MR. CARNEY: Jon, it's Al. Thank you. Are there other questions or comments for Mitchel Loring?

MS. FERNANDEZ-KETCHAM: Yes. This is Evelyn Fernandez-Ketcham, and I just want to comment or share, so thank you Chair Carney for your remarks and introducing this matter. Omar, thank you so much for the update to the Board I'm not ignoring your responses on the matter at all but I just want to share some of my reactions as I was reading through the material. So as I was reviewing the questions from me revolved around the process of the information and just utility and value of the Law, again Omar, you e-mailed answers to some of the questions but I thinks it's important for me to share and for the record. You did mention that AECOM Consulting Engineers reviewed and confirm

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

to no impact to DEP's revenue operation. Still I wonder if you could have been presented these findings before voting. The firm also confirmed that there's no utility of loss for future projects but I still wonder to what extent are we thinking about the future? In the memo from the Parks department, dated 9/13/2021, there's mention of public and the public's interest is being considered. I did wonder who the public that we're referring to. Were there a survey, a town hall meeting, a form where the public's interest was recorded? Omar you did mention an explain this transfer is consistent with the requirements with board lease agreement, again, I still wonder as an agency we have considered the value of this lot as an asset. At this moment I still have sort of these questions in the best interest of DEP-I don't know if it's in the best interest for the DEP to let go of the lot or I think for me to make an inform decision I just need to better understand the value of lots for DEP physically as a whole, you know. Ι just wonder about what is the utility of lots for the water system and what is the value of

We

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

health.

our lots as a whole. I mean, we're here to move 2 3 forward and if we vote on the transfer of the lot I do hope that we consider ensuring that for 4 5 historical context and educational records. find a way to tell the DEP story in relation to 6 7 the lot and I join this board because I do not take for granted the supply of water and the 8 clean water that is provided for millions of New 9 10 Yorkers. I mean this commitment signals our

> MR. MURIN: So if I may interject again, thank you Member Ketcham, Fernandez-Ketcham - -. On the issue of the assessment AECOM is the engineer record that works for the system both for the Water Board and for the Water Finance Authority and the letter that is within the package, Bill Frank, who is the lead engineer that works for AECOM. He was also on that trip with Chairman Carney. You know they did the assessment and when we do any of these land transfers it is our responsibility to have the

city's way of participating and ensuring public

think we have worked through fully the ways that

our water system can best function in the future.

So our future in uncertain and I don't

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

engineer of record go through a necessity operational functionality as well as the revenue potential for any lot. So on the operational functionality as was , I believe it indicated in the package but I'll rearrange when Hunt's Point was constructed in 1951, the city began to transfer and slower down those smaller waste water treatment plans that were operating including the one on Hard Island which serviced a portion of the Eastern section of the Bronx at that time so that was when the waste water treatment plants was decommissioned and the demolished eventually in 1970, because Hunt's Point was then able to function to service whatever - - that would be performed by the Hart Island plant at that time. The assessment is that we-and by both the City Council, as well as by its concurrence of the mayor, that-and remember the city is the prime-is the owner of all the assets including the land, that the Board is leasing from the city. They have made the determination, that it is in the best interest of both the city and the system to turn this lot over to Department of Parks and have it

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

be part of the Harts Island-Parks ownership, and I believe there is a long term and maybe park - - to this, in terms of what the eventual visitation rights, people will have, because you said there I think a number of people who have had family members that have been buried on the island. I think there were some community input, particularly in the Bronx area to be able to have that. I don't know Parks I'll turn it over to Mitchell in terms of that whether-what their long-term plan is in terms of accessibility I also think it's a very interesting point to raise about-what, acknowledgement, and that's something we could take back with Parks in terms of Evelyn about what functionality and acknowledging that there was a value added at for many, many years where Harts Island was serving the community of the Bronx as part of the water and sewer system, in terms of being able to service their needs. I don't know if I answered all your questions. Definitely please follow up with me if you do have more on there, and also, Mitchel [phonetic], I don't know if you want to talk about the long-term plans for

2 the site as Parks facility.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MS. FERNANDEZ-KETCHAM: Thank you.

MR. LORING: Yeah, I'm happy to speak to longer term vision for the island. So, the answer to original question, I brought up. is public and what is the public's interest I think that in the memo, the reference here? to the public was in regards to a group of advocates that have been pushing for several decades now to have the island, open to the public, which I think was not allowed until 2015, and then transferred out of Department of Corrections Control to Park Control, who make the island, be a bit more welcoming and plan for additional public access in the future. As it stands right now, the Parks Department is continuing the Department of Corrections visitation procedures, which allowed for two visits per month for families and loved ones of those buried on Hart Island, exhibit great sites, pay their respects like one would be able to do it at a private cemetery facility. So in the short term until additional funding be provided the transition progressed a bit further, that is

the kind of access to Parks will be allowing us	;
to site. But to your point about history	
of DEP's involvement at hundred, and	
just general history of the island. Overall, I	
think it is in Parks vision that has additional	
funding is supplied as more of a long-term	
master planning vision for that created.	
Public access would be increased to some extent	,
still in the parameters of this being a cemeter	. У
or technical by a contemplated place, but to	
that degree I think that some informational	
signage or different kinds of educational	
materials related to the various history of the	<u>.</u>
islands those that whole buildings, the	
wastewater treatment plant was demolished, all	
of this was on the table for potential	
information that would be available to public,	
in the future as the island goes from current	
date, this kind of thing , family grave site	
visit to a bit more public accessibility in the	<u>;</u>
future.	

MR. CARNEY: Mitchel thank you for that.

And I want to thank the members should have—I'm sorry. Are there other questions or comments?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. ZARRILLI: Yeah. Oh, this is Dan. Mitchel, I appreciate what you're trying to do here, I think this island itself is really a solemn and meaningful site in New York City and especially during the pandemic, I think we saw how this wasn't just an historic use site either and it continues to serve New York City and those in need. And so, I'm-where I'm going with this, I quess very interested in to the future of this island, then how it gets served and what Parks does with this. And one-I quess one quick question, is this lot specifically subject to the local law and the transfer? Or because it was in the DEP's jurisdiction - - it wasn't referenced in the local law?

MR. LORING: The local law did not break out the islands in terms of its various law. So our interpretation of the law was that the entire island was meant to be transferred to the Parks.

MR. ZARRILLI: And then I right in thinking that any potential uses or any discussion that we've just had here about the marketability or development of the site, this is city owned

2.3

waterfront property which I had always assumed means it's essentially inalienable. It can't be sold. There's no residual value to the Water Board on this, because it is city owned waterfront property. Is that correct?

MR. LORING: I think you're using the term inalienable there in terms of Parkland alienation, like state authority. Is that correct?

MR. ZARRILLI: Well, I think I had also,
I've heard that term use, in reference to the
city on waterfront as well. And maybe that's
incorrect or imprecise. But the city can't sell
waterfront property.

MR. LORING: I am not 100% certain whether that is correct or not. I do know that calling all those in Hart Island real estate on the phone, Colleen. Do you have any insights to that guestion?

MS. Colleen: Yes. I think - - wrong, I think this would be considered a - - be subject to that, that's usually something decaf than others. - - going on, but I don't - - be considered - - properly - -.

2.3

MR. ZARRILLI: That's true, then it seems
like there are no-there really are no ultimate
uses here that the Board can be considering.
And given the public policy needs to transfer
the property to Parks for the whole island. It
seems like that is the, that's the public policy
choices been made here and as consistent with
what the-what this board should be doing is
supporting that effort, knowing that this
doesn't have any value to the water system at
this point. Well just that point, I guess.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CARNEY: Sir .

MR. RODRIGUEZ: This is the secretary. Can I have your permission to add something to this discussion?

MR. CARNEY: Please, please.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. So, as everybody on the Board knows the water system is owned by the city. Pursuant to the lease agreement between the city and the Board. The Board has leased the property. But both the statute and the lease. Only leases the property, for water system purposes. Okay? It doesn't lease the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

property for development purposes. It doesn't lease the property for the Board to hold assets. The only use that the Board has right to the property is for operations of the system. So, if the property is not being used. As part of the operations of the system then technically under the lease. This property really doesn't fall under - -. But that's not what we're doing What we're doing here, is we're here. transferring control and jurisdiction of the property, I mean if it's approved, to from one city agency to another and those kinds of transfers are provided for also in the lease, and what the lease actually says is that there are two provisions, that would allow this type of thing, but the summary of both those provisions is that, if the property that's being transferred-the control of the property that's being transferred. If it doesn't affect the revenues of the system. And it's it doesn't have anything to do with the operations of the system. Then I think that puts the Board in a corner where it really has to approve these kinds of transfers, and with respect to any

2.3

other use of the property. The lease also state that the Board can transfer, sale, or use the property for any other purposes only for the purposes of the Board. and the authority without the consent of the city. So, I mean really, that puts the Board in the position where they really couldn't do anything with the property other than use it for water system purposes without the consent of the city. And if the property is not really being used for the operations of the system or it's producing any revenue, then the Board really wouldn't have a rational reason not to approve the transfer of the control of the property between city agency.

MR. CARNEY: And technically has, has not.

The property transfer should have occurred back to the city, at least.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Right.

MR. CARNEY: When there was no wastewater treatment facility in use there.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah.

MR. CARNEY: Okay. All right. Now thank you that's extremely helpful for me. I hope other members have found that those pieces of

61 Broadway – Suite 1400 – New York, NY 10006 Phone: 212-346-6666 \* Fax: 888-412-3655

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we have a unanimous approval of the resolution.

MR. CARNEY: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. The resolution is approved the transfer either has been—or will be made shortly. Agenda item number five. I'm sorry. Was there a comment? Agenda item number five is an update on fiscal year 2021 financial—financials and investment results, and the year to date, revenue update.

MR. MURIN: Okay. This Chief Financial Officer Joe Murin of DEP. I'll start with the update.[Background Noise] overall fiscal year 2021 finished somewhat better than the financial plan for the year. In light of the pandemic the system adopted conservative budget-conservative budget assume lower revenues. We knew that fiscal year 2020 was like to you show lower revenues than our baseline prior to the start of the pandemic, as customers experience reductions, personal rental and business income and water use overall decline, due to diminished commuter and tourist traffic. We adopted expense budgets that could fit into the lower revenue profile that we still view as sufficient -yet with that

we still viewed as sufficient how to operate and
maintain the system to an adequate standard
while meeting obligations to the system's
bondholder. Operating revenues declined during
the year by 4.6%, reduction of \$175 million,
compared to the prior year, that is-that was
3.67-3.656 billion versus 3.831 billion in 2020.
As a reminder, the Board adopted operating
revenue budgets of the year of 3.315 billion,
with final audited numbers subject to accounting
adjustments coming in 344-\$341 million above the
operating plan. Lower revenues reflected a
reduction in water used by customers in the city
with total water use by metered customers
decreasing by negative-by 3.8%, compared to the
year before, which was the net effect of a plus
three-0.3% increase in residential water usage
compared to fiscal year 2020, and a negative
14.9% in non-residential uses. I'll pause there
before we move on to see if any of the members
have any questions on the revenue update?

MR. CARNEY: None here, Joe.

MR. MURIN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair [phonetic]. Hearing none, I'm going to turn it

over to Omar [phonetic], continue on other financial updates.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. OMAR NAZEM: I'm going to touch on a little more than we normally do some of the balance sheet items, as well as the wholesale side of our revenues. The combined systems liquidity was very strong at the year end, we had \$2.3 billion of cash and securities on hand, which \$1.6 billion was restricted. Looking at the Combined Authority Water Board balance sheet and liquidity profile. We don't talk so often but I do want to touch on this year. system's net investment in capital assets increased in fiscal year 2021 despite all the delays and disruptions, everywhere in the world basically, on here as well. They completed construction projects that the net carry value the six is the system's fixed income -this is fixed asset portfolio, increased to \$32.5 billion, an increase of \$766 million. Look at his original cost of assets, the fixed asset portfolio has a value of more than \$50 billion. I view that as a major achievement, as well as the outperformance of the revenue budget on

completing large construction projects in the
city, the complexity, the DEP undertakes is
challenging in the best of times and with the
backdrop of this pandemic, it was probably
triple challenging. And despite that
the was able to add \$766 million of fixed
asset value to the plant and equipment we use to
generate the revenue in the first place, that
was a highlighted-I want to draw attention to.
Revenues for the fiscal year 2021 were more than
sufficient to meet debt service coverage, and
we're consistent with the expectations of the
credit rating agencies, lower revenues did not
have an ability-did not have an impact on the
Board's ability to meet its financial
obligations to DEP or to bondholders, and the
Board was able to fund a larger DEP operating
budget in fiscal year 2021, than the year before.
Similarly, all bond holder payments of principal
and interest were made on time and in full
during the year. All three of the major credit
rating agencies reaffirmed their high investment
grade rating of the authorities senior and
junior debt securities in September 2021 as well.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

The wholesale water supply side was a little different. We saw wholesale water so increase by 5% during fiscal year 2021, due to higher consumption by communities north of the city. Not totally surprising given the change in commuting patterns. A lot of people who would be in city-weren't because they were staying at home working from home in the suburbs . further contextualize it, just to remind everyone at fiscal year 2019, there was a huge improvement in water efficiency on the wholesale side, we saw 17% reduction in the water sales that year. So this is probably a little bit of a reversal of that effect. They're probably mostly due toward the change the temporary, we hope, to change the commuting patterns from the suburbs into the city. Revenues from overdue interest charges, decreased by 19% during the year to \$31 million, \$39 million the year before. Due to a reduction in the rate of interest, we are allowed to charge overdue bills under City Council's legislation. On the council I - - view prudently reduced the late interest charge as part of the general COVID relief

effort, and there's when we charge a lower rate
of interest, of course, the amount of late
interest we collect on falls in tandem to that,
so. We still do collect a significant amount of
late interest but less than we did in the prior
year. In light of the increase in delinquencies,
the audited financial statements for fiscal year
2021, reflect an increase as well, of 1.3% and
the percentage amount used to calculate the
balance sheet reserve we carry for receivables
that may not be immediately collectible. This
is an accounting convention to kind of guide
analysts and rating agencies about the timing
and magnitude of what we think we'll be able to
collect on the receivable side. Generally, with
substantially most of the water charges we issue,
the charges are a senior governmental claim
secured by real property. They're collectible
when the property gets sold or refinanced, we
charge that late interest rate in the meantime,
the issue is that people especially New York
City, hold on a property for decades and decades
so, we do take that reserve as a prudent
accounting device to capture the economic value

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

1

of what for modeling purposes might not be immediately collectible. And I know that Jeff Lynch will talk about the current year Fiscal Update.

MR. JEFF LYNCH: Hello, this is Deputy Commissioner Jeff Lynch. Turning into the current fiscal year, a fiscal year 2022. We can provide you with an update on the revenue and water consumption through October 13th of this Revenues were 1.54 billion which is about 0.2% above the revenue plan for the year to date, and about 0.1% below revenue at this time last year. The variance on that is-the variance in the plan on that is about \$3 million. Just as a reminder DEP implemented a 2.76% rate increase as approved by the Board at this June meeting. For the first two months of the fiscal year, water consumption was 1.1% lower than the year before, reflecting a 3.4% reduction in residential use. And a 7.3% increase in non-residential use. We're still reviewing metered billing data for September and October, and the early reviews indicate that metered billing is beginning to follow, an upward trend,

beginning in September, will provide the Board
with a more detailed analysis of water
consumption trends with the next fiscal update
with the next financial update. Delinquencies,
continue to be at elevated levels resulting from
property owners deferring payments due to
reduction in their personal or business incomes,
and to non-payment of rent by tenants. We
believe the decision to not close on a lien sale
during the fiscal year 2020, and 2021. While
consistent with the policy goals of providing
the Board-the broad base customer least during
the peak of the of the pandemic contributed to
the higher delinquencies, as well as the recent
decision to exclude water charges from the
city's lien sale in process right now, during
the fiscal year 2022. In addition, reductions
to the interest rate charged on overdue bills.
3% has made the economic cost of non-payment
less severe, turn it back over to Omar.

MR. NAZEM: I'm not talk - - the about the Board's investment portfolio, wherever the Board is going to be asked to vote shortly on the fiscal year 2021 investment report, which

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

implicit guarantees, the explicit guarantee,
which is basically Ginnie Mae. We're also
allowed to buy—we haven't done this, I'd
probably ever been not shown—not the last decade
in particular category of loans which are short
term in nature, and that are completely
collateralized by those same types of securities,
so US Treasury securities, and those federally

explicitly backed Ginnie Mae securities. Those
three are-that's all we're allowed but we don't
do real estate or stocks or even corporate bonds,
we don't do any of that stuff. So the
guidelines, just what we're allowed to invest in
are very conservative. For the last five years
that we've been on even the most the
conservative side of conservative. The only
things you bought, going back to 2016 are
treasury bills notes, so the shorter-term
securities issued by the federal government.
And starting two years ago, when the pandemic
was, we brought in the duration of what
we're allowed to buy, even shortest. We only
buy the shortest-term treasuries securities you
can buy now. We do it that way because the
interest rates the market, the price of the
bonds there's a matter of response. And we have
always been concerned about losing the face
value of our bonds in sponsor saw an
interest rate movements in the market. And
that's been a prudent investment strategy in the
sense we've never lost money going back to 2016.
We can go back further than that too, we haven't

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

had a down or we had a sort of loss on the investment portfolio. It has a flip side which is when market rates become very low as they have been trending lower for years and years and years for like 20 years now they've been rates been falling. And the aftermath of the pandemic, the yield on short term treasury securities fell by about 90%. So they went from they went from 2% to about one fifth of 1% in pretty short order. So the, I offer all that as this kind of context of background to what we do here for Dan and then for the members of the public, all which is to say the investment income for the Board this year was \$376,000 which we are happy to have to make on the portfolio but it was the lowest investment return we've made on the Board side since 2014 and it was stunningly externally When you think about we had to small return. speak about a billion and six of treasury Just to recap you explain how that securities. could be, we take the billion six and you multiply by that one 20th and 1% and you take into account that we don't hold the stock for the full year. We start our savings portfolio

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

basically zero and then we accumulate bonds really starting the six-month mark. We pay the city first and the bondholders first then we start to accumulate savings at the midpoint and those very low rates on the stuff we buy times that fraction of a year leads you, you can have a very large investment portfolio but you're buying the low risk stuff and the lowest risk, low risk, you end up with a pretty modest investment portfolio or investment return for the year. So that that's you know, I view it actually as a success and it says we didn't lose money in a very, very crazy year with a lot going on in the capital markets but it was it was the smallest investment return we've had since 2014, not unprecedented low number for the lowest in several years. We don't plan to take any more risk in the portfolio next year, you'll see that with the investment guidelines rate I proposed to you, to readopt shortly or identical to what the Board saw first in 1997. And in terms of what we actually are doing in the portfolio, we don't plan to anything different other than buy those short-term treasury bills

2.3

for the foreseeable future. The reason that we just we we're really using these investments as a savings proxy. This is not a venture capital portfolio. We're trying to use this as a savings vehicle and add a little bit of return safely on top of it. So that's the update on that. A successfully year says we didn't lose money a lot going on, so at this point you understand it was the lowest return since 2014, explained by those low market yields and by the fact that you only buy the bonds for part of the year to start with. So that's—or else Michael O'Keefe is going to provide you with the next update on the DEP operating update.

MR. MICHAEL O'KEEFE: Good afternoon
everyone, I'm Michael O'Keefe, Deputy Chief
Financial Officer for DEP. Tropical Storm Ida
reached the city on September 1st, bringing with
it a series of unusually heavy rainfall that
resulted in sewer overflows flooding throughout
the city, including roadways and the closure of
the subway system. DEP's offices were
temporarily closed due to electrical power
issues although employees were able to pivot

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

remote work due to the personal technology put in place during the pandemic. Total rainfall in the city varied by neighborhood with some areas seeing in the most two inches of rainfall from the storm and others seeing much more at eight A particular challenge was the rate of rainfall with rainfall in certain areas at a rate of three inches per hour; a rate that exceeds the capacity of most sewers constructed. On September 27th in response to the impacts of storm Ida and in preparation for future extreme storms, the city announced plans to commit an additional \$2.1 billion in DEP's capital budget for flood mitigation and infrastructure. funding which is spread across fiscal years 2023 to 2031 focuses on increasing DEP's due replacement cycle, expansion of both the Bluebelt system and green infrastructure and other measures to make the city more resilient to intense rate event. The city also announced plans to accelerate over \$200 million in existing DEP capital projects in that funding for expense programs - - and producing quality. At this time DEP projects that these additional

2.3

capital funds and accelerations will have
minimal impact on annual rates increase. That
I'll turn it over to Deputy Commissioner Lynch
and Albert Kramer to discuss the new billing
system.

MR. MURIN: Well I think - - if we could just pause for a second to see if any of the members have questions but I [crosstalk] go ahead, Mr. Chair.

MR. CARNEY: Thank you Joe. Forgive me, my mute button isn't doing what it should be doing. Are there any questions for any of the four presenters so far?

MR. ZARRILLI: This is Dan, just-I want to make sure I heard correctly what I think I heard, is that in the investment guidelines are not changing. The resolution is a continuation of the same investment guidelines that we've had since 1997?

MR. NAZEM: Correct. You're going to be asked to vote to adopt the investment guidelines and they are exactly the same, not a word changed from what was in place last year and it's what's been in place every year since 1997.

3

1

So yes, you have to vote to readopt, it's the same thing.

4

5

6

7

8

MR. ZARRILLI: Great, thank you. And the second question is that you mentioned additional capital dollars after Hurricane Ida. Can you just clarify, is that city geo debt or is that Water Board debt that's associated with those

9

MR. NAZEM: That's water utilities funding.

Thank you. Are there-sorry,

11

10

MR. ZARRILLI: Thank you.

new capital dollars?

MR. CARNEY:

quidelines?

12

are there other questions for the presenters?

14

13

Omar, is staff giving any thought given this

15

year's-well it is abysmal performance, we made

16

nearly \$400,000, but is there any thought being

17

given to revising in any way the investment

18

19

20

MR. NAZEM: No, if there's an interest to kind of explore—to taking somewhat more interest rate risk in the hope of a higher investment

2122

return there are a number of options for doing

23

that under the existing guidelines. I mean

24

starting with resuming the practice we had in 2016 to 17 and buying a mix of bills and notes

25

Ubiqus
61 Broadway - Suite 1400 - New York, NY 10006
Phone: 212-346-6666 \* Fax: 888-412-3655

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

it isn't right that if we buy everything right now with a duration of less than one year to maturity. You could take it out to one to two years to maturity and there would be a higher return associate with that as well as investment But on the sums of bonds we have in the risk. portfolio, small change of interest rate where an interest rate can have a large dollar effect. I mean the Board would recall this used to be a \$5 to \$10 million a year investment performance on the Board side. So 376 is again it's extremely low compared to where we were given a couple of years ago but not unprecedented. I would say that if the Board wants to have a discussion around enhancing the investment returns, over and above just waiting for the yield on bills to hopefully pop back upward more than where they are, I would just say the first steps to look at would be, let's look at taking more interest rate risks within the treasury world or even the kind of the secure agency world before undertaking the revision of the investment guidelines, because there are a number of options for trying to enhance

2.3

investment returns within the guidelines we already have versus a wholesale - - of the guidelines.

MR. CARNEY: Might we have a conversation about that? At what other upcoming board meetings, Might you present some options to the Board for investing differently without revising the guidelines.

MR. NAZEM: Absolutely. We'll take that into consideration and we'll come back to you.

MR. CARNEY: Okay, thank you. Other questions or comments for the presenters? I'm sorry, there is one remaining presentation?

MR. LYNCH: Yeah. So this is Jeff, Deputy
Commissioner Jeff Lynch on the billing system.
So we're five weeks in past our new billing
system launch. We implemented DEP's new UMAX
billing system on September 7th. And it's been
an early success despite the ongoing pandemic,
the historic flooding that happened the week
before we launched and the normal kind of
growing pins on the operational side when you
launch a system like this. First I just want to
thank all of our partners in this effort, BCS,

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

BIT, other bureaus throughout DEP, our vendor, Itineris, our trusted advisor, EMA. We wouldn't have been able to launch the system to better serve the city of New York without the full team on this very complex project. Um our staff were in the office early this summer following all the safety guidelines to complete over 25,000 hours of UMAX training and thousands more hours of practice in the new system above and beyond the training so that they were as prepared as possible for the launch in early September. project is now in our six-month operations phase where we are focused on stabilizing the new system and that includes triaging technical and process challenges as well as continuing to build our staff's expertise in our new system. Our extensive testing phases that we did for the project resulted in-as of right now again five weeks in, no serious bugs being detected in the new system since our launch. Also, after our planned pause of billing for the first week of launch, billing commenced to UMAX and we've sent out bills to hundreds of thousands of customers who are receiving our new bill from the new

system, and now here in October we're returned
to kind of our normal billing pace. This is
sort of the-this is the standard way of
launching a new billing system just as an
example of one of the teams that had been doing
really well in the new system, our billing
exceptions unit, which is responsible for
monitoring possible issues with bills before
they go out to new customers, has done an
excellent job in our bill quality going out to
customers the bills that have been generated in
UMAX has been excellent, which we're very happy
to report. Additionally, a couple of the key
pieces to the new launch were we included a new
online customer portal for folks; my DEP account,
and it's been very well received, we've had it
visited over 130,000 times since the launch.
We've also been using our new, easy to
understand color bill that it's a big
improvement over our old bill for our customers.
And that's we've even gotten some proactive
compliments from the public and our customers on
the new bill. DEP and the Water Board staff has
reacted mostly positively to the new system,

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

despite some challenges including readjusting to being back in the office and the expected learning curve of a very complicated new billing system in UMAX. As part of the launch-the phased in launch, our key business processes gradually started up over the last month. That includes a couple examples; our field inspections, our denial of access unit, our borough office, taking appointments from customers. And that's been going very well and continuing to ramp up as we continue to get further into the stabilization efforts. vendor Itineris, our DEP's trusted advisor EMA and our project team members that were on the project team for many months or quite frankly, some for more than a year, have continued to support our operations with flow walking and technical issues. But I also want to just highlight the team is continuing to work through some expected challenges, there are I'll highlight two or three of them. There's complicated billing adjustments that involve migrating data from our old system and those continue to-we continue to work through. Wе

have a slower call center response times due to
staffing shortages, as well as a bump in call
volume from customers with questions as they
reregister their bill-their online billing and
other questions about the new system. But we've
augmented that by shifting some of our
operational staff that is less critical in the
early phases to taking calls on a short-term
basis. And then last, we've had some delays in
cash flow related to the plan shift of billing
phases as well as the auto pay schedule for the
new system. And this is all connected to the
kind of transition from the old to the new
system to give us all a little bit of a window
for making sure there are no major bugs right
after launch and allow the staff to adjust to
the new system. That was kind of the major
update on our side here with the new billing
system.

MR. CARNEY: Jeff, can you hear me at all?

MR. LYNCH: Yeah, yeah. I hear you.

MR. CARNEY: First of all, thank you very much for helping me to see how the implementation of the system is working, hosting

2.3

me at your offices and introducing me to a lot of the members of your staff. It's an incredibly high hurdle that you all are dealing with. I'm sure you've got your bumps and potholes but the fact of the matter is that your staff is extremely enthusiastic about the successful implementation. The launch has gone exceedingly well, I don't want to jinx that by having something take a left turn now, but thank you for taking the time to help me understand the complexity of putting this new system into operation. It seems to be going extremely well.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Chair. And the staff was very happy to see you as you walk through the floors. It was good for them to talk to you a little bit when you were here.

MR. CARNEY: Well you kind of say that they probably wondered, what is he looking for?

[laughter] I'm looking for anything [laughter].

It was very encouraging to talk to people, your team leaders who were just really up, I mean, feeling good about the success of the implementation. Thank you very much for what you're doing for all of us, it is very special

to see. Are there questions for now any of the,
I guess five presenters? Then I think we can
move on to the next agenda item. And thank you
all very much. We're going to vote on the
acceptance of the 21 and 20 financial statements.
Before we do that, the Board should be aware
that the joint audit committee of the Water
Finance Authority and the Water Board met
immediately preceding this meeting to hear a
presentation from our external auditors, Grant
Thornton. And that meeting was terrific, it was
brief and it was really—it was a testament to
what the two organizations were able to do
together to put these combined financial
statements together. The short story is that we
received an unmodified opinion, the so-called
clean opinion. We also heard that our Internal
Control Environment in every separate area of
inquiry that, Internal Control Environment were
very good. It was a very encouraging report
from the external auditors. Bob Balducci
[phonetic], who may be on the phone now, in my
view is doing a terrific job along with Omar
Nazem, of putting together those financial

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

question?

MR. ZARRILLI: So at the back of the package-and maybe I didn't realize this was in

2.3

the financial statement too. There's a number of KPIs, the key performance measures for the system. And I want to just familiarize myself with these because I think they're important.

And the it's the last one in particular that I'm looking at that, how we've set a performance goal of establishing rates that provide for sustainable high-quality delivery of water and sewer services.

MR. CARNEY: Sure.

MR. ZARRILLI: And what I'm curious about is that the answer to that is largely driven by our bond ratings. And I'm curious that it—I think that's right, it could be very subjective to figure out how we're providing for sustainable high quality delivery of water services, especially given —

MR. CARNEY: You and I both know about the rating agencies?

MR. ZARRILLI: Right, and I'm just curious if that's the right way to answer this kind of question or if over time we can think about that KPI in a different way, especially in this post Ida moment, when there's a lot of focus on the

sustainability of the sewer network in particular.

2.3

MR. CARNEY: Well certainly we can talk about it, Dan. It's an interesting question and may well be a better way to think about that specific topic, that is the performance measures topic generally, happy to sit down with you and do that.

MR. FREED: Sure, this is Adam Freed. I assume there's nothing that would prevent us from having multiple networks because I think the complexity of the system and the fiduciary responsibility brought in to the Dan's point is often focused on drinking water but the sewer system and the - - provide-would be - - about a number of retrospective come together for that.

MR. CARNEY: I agree. There's no reason we could not have different approaches to determining the performance measures. Sure.

MR. NAZEM: So this Is - - -

MR. FREED: All right. Go ahead.

MR. NAZEM: — for follow up with the Board. We'll take that as to do, make it a follow file with the Board for a future meeting. We can

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

to have a voice vote and I'll ask Mr. Rodriquez to read the roll.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes, I will. Chairman Carney, how do you vote?

61 Broadway – Suite 1400 – New York, NY 10006 Phone: 212-346-6666 \* Fax: 888-412-3655

MR. GOLDIN: That was the reason for my

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

question - - thank you. Then, is there any other business to come before this board? Hearing no comments at all, may I have a motion

1	1:30pm Meeting of the Water Board 68
2	please to adjourn?
3	[Crosstalk]
4	MR. CARNEY: Thank you. Again, voice vote,
5	Mr. Secretary?
6	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. Chairman Carney, how
7	do you vote?
8	MR. CARNEY: To adjourn.
9	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Member Fernandez-Ketcham,
10	how do you vote?
11	MS. FERNANDEZ-KETCHAM: Adjourn.
12	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Uh-huh, thank you. Member
13	Freed, how do you vote?
14	MR. FREED: Adjourn.
15	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Member Goldin, how do you
16	vote?
17	MR. GOLDIN: Adjourn.
18	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Member Hsu, how do you vote?
19	MR. HSU: Adjourn.
20	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Member Shaw, how do you
21	vote?
22	MS. SHAW: Adjourn.
23	MR. FREED: And member Zarrilli, how do you
24	vote?
25	MR. ZARRILLI: Adjourn.
	Ubiqus

61 Broadway – Suite 1400 – New York, NY 10006 Phone: 212-346-6666 \* Fax: 888-412-3655

1	1:30pm Meeting of the Water Board 69
2	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. Unanimous
3	approval to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Chairman.
4	MR. CARNEY: Thank you very much, Mr.
5	Secretary. It's a good meeting. We covered a
6	lot of ground today. I'll look forward to our
7	next gathering, maybe it'll be in person. We'll
8	see. Thank you all for coming.
9	[END RECORDING]

[END RECORDING]

## C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Chibueze Madukwe, certify that the foregoing transcript of New York City Water Board was prepared using standard electronic transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not connected by blood, marriage or employment with any of the parties herein nor interested directly or indirectly in the matter transcribed.

Signature

Smodikul

Date October 18, 2021