

DEBERRY WATER SUPPLY CORPORATION DIRECTORS MEETING

Date: June 9, 2026 @ 6:00 pm

Place: De Berry Fire Station

Attendees:

Sara Edwards – President
Matt Tillman – Vice President
Mary Robinson – Secretary/Treasurer
Steve Werner – Board Member
Tiffany LeGrand – Board Member
Morgan Irvin – Bookkeeper
Donna Monroe – Member
Daniel Raney – Goff & Herrington, P.C. – Auditor

Mary Bohi
Sara Edwards
Matt Tillman
Steve Werner
Tiffany LeGrand

Call To Order

The DeBerry Water Supply Corporation (Corporation) Directors Meeting was called to order by President Sara Edwards. A quorum of the Directors was present.

Public Comment

Member, Donna Monroe had concerns about not meeting the monthly minimum, which Edwards explained to her that the monthly minimum was done away with in March 2025. Monroe then raised the question about what formula the Corporation uses to calculate bill amounts. Edwards explained that TRWA (Texas Rural Water Association) has conducted a rate study for the Corporation over the past two years and from this advice, the Board makes the decision on what tier rates the Corporation will use. Edwards showed Monroe on the DeBerry Water Supply website where she could find the rate sheet the Corporation is currently using this year.

Consent Agenda

- a. The bills were reviewed and payments approved by the board members.
- b. The minutes of the May 12th board meeting were reviewed. Werner moved to approve the minutes and Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. The approved minutes will be uploaded to the website.
- c. Morgan Irvin presented the financial report for May 2026. There were a few cancellations, and they probably weren't in use. Morgan also noted that sales were on the lower side for the month.

- d. Mr. Daniel Raney from Goff & Herrington, P.C. conducted the Corporation's 2025 Audit. He brought pamphlets and presented his findings from the 2025 Audit. He noted that the review would be quick, as he didn't have anything negative to say. Everything they looked at and tested was positive. He also noted that the audit was unmodified, which is the highest level of assurance that auditors can provide on financial statements. This means the auditor found no material misstatements and believes the statements were presented fairly, in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework.
- e. LeGrand has been working on getting the scanned documents on the website converted to be OCR (Optical Character Recognition) compliant, which she has completed. This makes all documents searchable on the website. She also provided the board members with instructions for doing this so they can be sure to use this format in the future.

System and Operations Updates

- f. Werner presented the Directors Report for the month of May 2026.
 - Water produced (pumped and treated) by the Corporation was 1,942,900 gallons, and water sold was 1,238,930 gallons, resulting in a Percent Sold figure of 63.8%, which is a little below average for the year. Another 11.6% was attributed to routine flushing operations, leaving 24.6% of the water produced being cited as lost.
 - Werner also took readings at the well house today for 60 minutes and presented his findings. Well #1 started at about 30gpm, and over 60min, tapered off to an average of 27gpm. Wells #2 & #4 started out at 65gpm and didn't taper off much with an average of 64.5gpm. Well #3 started off at 70gpm, but by minute two, was down to 62.5gpm, and tapered off gradually to an average of 58.8gpm over the span of 60 minutes.
- g. Edwards and Tillman presented an update on Wells #2 and #4 treatment, the results are attached.
 - Since they must have a swab rig out to do the treatment, it was cheaper to go ahead and do two wells at one time. That said, it was decided to do Well #2 and Well #4 together. Wells #2 & #4 were treated differently than Well #3. They were treated with a much, much more aggressive formula than Well #3, they sat for longer with the chemical in the casing and they were shocked after the acid treatment.
 - After treatment, Well #4's iron-related bacteria stayed the same, but the slime-forming bacteria went way down and is now non-aggressive.
 - After treatment, Well #2's iron-related bacteria actually got worse, and the slime-forming bacteria went from not aggressive to aggressive. The iron bacteria is causing the slime forming bacteria. It is not a health risk, but it is getting into the system and lines.
 - After treating Well #3 and the results coming back worse than before starting the treatment, the chemist felt like we didn't let the chemical treatment sit long enough in the casing.
 - Josh, from C Miller, stopped before doing the treatment on one of the wells because Hawkins didn't send enough products to complete the treatment. Even the solution that Hawkin's Chemist sent, Sean from C Miller wrote back and said the volume he figured was wrong according to the well information that C Miller sent Hawkins.
 - There are many questions regarding all three wells that have been treated. Edwards is going to call and request that Well #3 is tested again to see what the results are now three months later. After those results are received, Edwards and Tillman are going to work on setting up a

meeting with Hawkins to ask some clarifying questions about the process, formulas used and the results after the treatments.

- h. There have been several instances of the current operators not completing tasks that they are asked to do and of poor communication from the operators. Also, since a previous employee has left the company, the Colemans have not been able to keep up with the tasks that they are asked to complete. The board is also seeing issues where the operators are possibly not flushing the lines like they should be. The wrong meter was turned off the other day because they don't use Diamond Maps to locate meters. The board doesn't want to take away from what the Coleman's have done for the Corporation, because they made huge strides within their first year. They helped us correct all the violations from TCEQ and get back into compliance, along with many much-needed upgrades. But things have changed in the past 6 months and the board feels it is time to move on.
 - There are two operators who are interested in taking over operations for DWSC; Prothro Utilities and Excavation LLC (Colton Prothro) who currently operates EF Blocker Crossroads water system and 4-A Utility Services LLC (Cody Allums) who currently operates Beckville water system. Both are somewhat familiar with the system and its challenges. They are both relatively close on their price sheets for services.
 - The board discussed a little more about each of the candidates but wanted to take some time before making a decision. After some discussion, there will be a special meeting on June 15 at 5:30 to vote on which candidate will take over operations for the Corporation and replace the Colemans.
- i. Edwards has the compliance log, and it is a Google sheet, which is available upon request.

Action/Discussion Items

- j. Chase Palmer has been working on the Option Agreements for the land purchases for the USDA grant. He sent those to Edwards just before the meeting. She will send them to the landowners for them to review and approve. We are planning on drilling three test wells, but the USDA will not reimburse the Corporation for a dry hole.
- k. Corporate Credit Card: There were two credit cards sent, Edwards is going to check into why two were sent. It was discussed and decided, the items that will be put on the credit card will be the Corporation phone, postage, FedEx fees, Norton, Microsoft Teams, Diamond Maps, lab fees, etc. LeGrand mentioned that she is the treasurer for the booster club and FFA and she just has a detailed Excel spreadsheet that shows in detail what the charges are for. Edwards made a motion that Morgan Irvin (bookkeeper) is allowed to put reoccurring charges on the credit card and provide the statement each month, Robinson seconded the motion, which passed with all in favor.

Adjourn

With no other business to discuss, Edwards made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Robinson seconded, and the motion carried with all in favor.

IRB / SRB / Slime bacteria — before & after treatment comparison

Sample ID
7767 — DeBerry WSC Well #3

Pre-treatment
Jan 22, 2026

Post-treatment
Apr 14, 2026

	PRE-TREATMENT (JAN 22)	POST-TREATMENT (APR 14)
Iron Related Bacteria (IRB)	Moderate growth 2,200 cfu/mL	Aggressive growth 35,000 cfu/mL ▲ +1,491% increase
Sulfate Reducing Bacteria (SRB)	Negative No growth detected	No growth No growth detected — No change
Slime Forming Bacteria (SFB)	Aggressive growth 440,000 cfu/mL	Aggressive growth 67,000 cfu/mL ▼ -84.8% reduction

Colony-forming units per mL (log scale, proportional to max)

IRB — pre (2,200)

2,200

IRB — post (35,000)

35,000

SFB — pre (440,000)

440,000

SFB — post (67,000)

67,000

- **SRB:** Remained negative both before and after treatment — a positive finding with no change needed.
- **SFB:** Significant reduction — dropped from 440,000 to 67,000 cfu/mL, an ~85% decrease. Still at Aggressive Growth level, indicating continued treatment or monitoring is warranted.
- **IRB:** Worsened after treatment — escalated from Moderate Growth (2,200 cfu/mL) to Aggressive Growth (35,000 cfu/mL), nearly a 15× increase. This is a significant concern requiring attention.

Here's a breakdown of what the data tells us:

SRB (Sulfate Reducing Bacteria) — The only clear win. Negative both before and after, meaning treatment had no negative effect here and the well remains free of this corrosion-causing bacteria.

SFB (Slime Forming Bacteria) — Partially successful. Treatment knocked the count down by about 85%, from 440,000 to 67,000 cfu/mL. That's meaningful progress, but it remains in the Aggressive Growth category. Additional treatment rounds or a different chemical approach may be needed to push it below the aggressive threshold.

IRB (Iron Related Bacteria) — This is the red flag. Rather than declining, IRB went the wrong direction — from Moderate Growth at 2,200 cfu/mL up to Aggressive Growth at 35,000 cfu/mL, roughly a 15× increase. A few possible explanations worth investigating:

- The treatment may have disrupted the biofilm community in a way that allowed IRB to proliferate once competing organisms were reduced.
- The chemistry used may not have been effective against IRB specifically.
- The increased IRB could reflect mobilization of bacteria from deeper in the formation or casing.

The overall picture is a mixed result — treatment helped with SFB but did not address IRB, and may have made it worse. A follow-up treatment targeting IRB specifically (such as chlorination with a longer contact time or a biocide targeted at iron bacteria) would be advisable, along with a re-test in 60–90 days.

DeBerry Water Supply BARTS comparison: pre-treatment (Jan 2026) vs post-treatment (Jun 2026)

Pre-treatment baseline Jan 22, 2026 — All 4 Wells		Post-treatment results Jun 5, 2026 — Wells 2 & 4		
WELL	BACTERIA TYPE	BEFORE TREATMENT	AFTER TREATMENT	CHANGE
WELL 4 — 298 2 FM 31	Iron Related Bacteria (IRB)	Aggressive / 9,000 cfu/mL	Aggressive / 9,000 cfu/mL	—
	Sulfate Reducing Bacteria (SRB)	Negative	No growth	—
	Slime Forming Bacteria	Aggressive / 440,000 cfu/mL	Not aggressive / <20 cfu/mL	↓ 99.9%
WELL 2 — 346 4 FM 31	Iron Related Bacteria (IRB)	Moderate / 500 cfu/mL	Aggressive / 35,000 cfu/mL	↑ 70×
	Sulfate Reducing Bacteria (SRB)	Negative	No growth	—
	Slime Forming Bacteria	Not aggressive / 100 cfu/mL	Aggressive / 440,000 cfu/mL	↑ 4,400×

Key: Aggressive / elevated Moderate Negative / not aggressive

WATER QUALITY TRENDS — KEY PARAMETERS (EARLIEST VS 2026)

PARAMETER	TCEQ LIMIT	WELL 1 (1965→2026)	WELL 2 (1971→2026)	WELL 3 (1979→2026)	WELL 4 (1988→2026)
Sodium (mg/L)	Report >20	96.9 → 91.3 — flat	80.6 → 87.7 — flat	171.3 → 156 — flat	130 → 199 — +53% since 2006
Chloride (mg/L)	SCL 300	39 → 35.5 — flat	38 → 32.9 — flat	116 → 133 — slight rise	53 → 120 — +126% since 2006
Sulfate (mg/L)	SCL 300	7 → <3 — flat	3.2 → 8.1 — slight rise	20 → 86.3 — +332%	54 → 269 — +398% since 2006
Iron (mg/L)	SCL 0.3	0.10 → <0.025 — flat	0.020 → 0.269 — gradual rise	0.16 → 3.84 — +2,300%	0.29 → 5.51 — +1,793% since 2006
Manganese (mg/L)	SCL 0.05	— → 0.022 — flat	0 → 0.033 — slight rise	0.01 → 0.291 — +2,810%	0.031 → 0.437 — +1,310%
TDS (mg/L)	SCL 1,000	381 → 286 — flat	244 → 262 — flat	569 → 470 — slight decline	388 → 780 — +101% since 2006

Well 3 finding: Sodium and chloride are naturally elevated and stable (suggesting a deeper, more mineralized zone rather than contamination), but iron (+2,300%) and manganese (+2,810%) have risen dramatically since 1979. The 46-year-old steel casing cemented only to 95 ft is a likely contributor — at this age, casing corrosion would mobilize iron/manganese into the water column. A downhole camera inspection is recommended for both Wells 3 and 4.

Well 4 finding: All parameters accelerated sharply after 2006 — sodium, chloride, sulfate, iron, and TDS all rising together. This multi-parameter post-2006 pattern is not consistent with natural aquifer aging and points to an external contamination source and/or casing failure. Steel casing is 37 years old, cemented only to 135 ft.