

**WATER COMMITTEE**  
**OCTOBER 30, 2002**  
**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chuck Watkins, Chairman  
Dr. George Patton, Vice Chairman  
Chris Cofty  
Tony Parrott  
Chris Venice

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS:** Bill McNally-Absent  
Jim Mallett- Absent

**STAFF PRESENT:** Russell Ray  
David Jaegar - Mallett & Associates

**GUESTS:** John Munford - Fayette Citizen

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Chuck Watkins at 8:00 A.M.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MEETING ON OCTOBER 9, 2002.**

Tony Parrott made the motion and Vice Chairman Dr. George Patton seconded, to approve the minutes from the meeting on October 9, 2002. There was no opposition.

**II. REPORT ON LAKE MCINTOSH.**

Mr. Parrott reported that the public meeting was held last night. The meeting went well. There were no surprise questions. Chairman Watkins commented that Tommy Craig did a great job with his presentation. Vice Chairman Dr. Patton stated that he was well prepared.

Mr. Parrott went on to say that the other agencies want to look at the wetland sites again. They will do an evaluation. The committee further discussed the meeting. They agreed that Mr. Craig's presentation showed Lake McIntosh as the only viable site.

**III. WATERLINE EXTENSION POLICY.**

This item was tabled until the next meeting.

**IV. BROOKS CREEK WETLAND SITE.**

Mr. Parrott explained that we have a neighbor across the street from the Brooks Creek Wetland site that the rain water backed up on his property the other day. He

distributed pictures for the Committee to review. He is saying the water from our site is causing the water to back up on his property. Mr. Parrott asked the Committee to consider recommending Mallett & Associates do some surveys to see if we have made a difference in the design of the wetlands. This property is located on the north side of Grant Road. The water has gone over Grant Road before. When he built the house, the engineering department told him he had to build the house a foot higher than Grant Road. The water has flooded his driveways. Mr. Parrott commented that he feels the problem is the property owners site; there are two creeks that come together at the road. In 1994 the water flow went over the top of the road, and this was before our wetland site was built. He stated he feels it would be beneficial to check that this wetland site is not impacting this property.

Vice Chairman Dr. Patton made a motion to recommend this to the Board of Commissioners. Mr. Parrott seconded and there was no opposition.

**V. LAKE PEACHTREE DREDGING.**

Mr. Parrott reported that we are waiting on a letter from Peachtree City stating we can use Drake Field before we can put the bids out. Without the letter we don't have a place for them to mobilize. He agreed to send a letter at Chris Cofty's suggestion.

**VI. BID OPENING FOR MISCELLANEOUS WATER METER INSTALLATIONS.**

David Jaegar reported there were two bidders for installation of various size meters for County customers ranging from 3/4" meters up to 2" meters. The bid opening was held on October 15, 2002. Shockley Plumbing was the low bid on the base bid of \$71,400.00. The alternate bid was for additional 3/4" meters, which he is not recommending awarding at this time. He is only recommending award of the base bid. The second bidder was Crawford Grading at \$74,580.00 on the base bid. Shockley Plumbing has done lots of work for the County, so we know they are competent.

Mr. Parrott explained these are different from those United Meter is currently installing. United Meter is installing those that you just take out the meter and put in the replacement. All of these 5/8 X 3/4 inch meters require additional plumbing work. They have been tied in straight to the meter without meter connections, without backflows, and some of the plumbing lines have two 90's to get to the meter. It costs more because they will have to dig the box out, take out the meter, and then tie back into the customers plumbing in every case. The larger meters are the same way. The two inch meters have a box for the meter and a separate box for the backflow preventor. All this will have to be dug out in order to install the new meter. Each one is different. The Water System will provide the meters and backflows.

Tony Parrott made a motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to award the base

bid to Shockley Plumbing in the amount of \$71,400.00. Chris Venice seconded and there was no opposition.

**VII. BID OPENING FOR EXTERIOR PAINT REPAIR AT PEACHTREE CITY WATER TANKS.**

Mr. Jaegar reported the base bid on this project was to repaint the roof and overpaint the logos on the Crabapple tank, and then paint the test patches on the small tank located at 74 and 54. Alternate bid prices were offered. The base bid includes a brush blast which is a basic cleaning of the existing paint. It doesn't actually sand blast it down to metal. After they began discussions with the inspector that did the original report, they decided it would be best to get prices to do a commercial blast in the event that the existing paint is so poor that even the brush blast starts to lift it off. In doing so they also decided to get prices on painting the sides of the top of the tank (the white areas) that were not included in the bid. If you commercial blast that, you lose the existing logo so you need the price for the new stencil.

He went on to say, based on just the base bid, the low bidder was Utility Service Company at \$46,500.00. He recommended awarding the base bid, plus Alternate 2 and 3. A2 is the commercial blast and priming of the roof, which would be the additional work necessary to take the roof down to metal and then paint it back. A3 is the commercial blast and painting of the sidewalls and the stencil for the new logos. This is not including the base of the tank. Just the part that holds the water. If you award the job this way, you know you have a contract that will do it correctly. If you award just the base bid, and you get into a situation where the paint begins to flake off, then you have to have a change order to award the alternate.

When you include the base bid, A2 and A3, it changes the low bidder. Mr. Jaegar explained Tank Pro becomes the low bid at a total of \$146,845.00. References on Tank Pro have been checked and they all came in fine. They are competent. Utility Services is competent also. In the event that we award the base bid it would be Utility Services. However, if we needed to use one of the alternate prices, we would end up spending more with Utility Services than Tank Pro.

Mr. Parrott explained that the existing paint job is sixteen years old. They are recommending going back to metal because you get a better job. Mr. Jaegar stated that Mallett & Associates recommend the base bid, plus Alternate 2 and 3, which would be a low bid for Tank Pro at \$146,845.00.

Tony Parrott made a motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners award of the base bid, plus Alternate 2 and Alternate 3 to the low bidder Tank Pro at a cost of \$146,845.00.

**Chairman Chuck Watkins seconded for discussion.**

**The committee discussed at length the award of the base bid with or without Alternate 2 and 3. Mr. Jaegar explained that Joel Maggert, a specialist who specializes in tank inspection will be the consultant. As they begin the work, he will be there and make the call when they begin the blasting.**

**Chairman Watkins called for the vote. There were none in opposition.**

**Mr. Parrott commented that we have not had a problem with a tank job since we began using a separate paint inspector. Mr. Jaegar added that Mr. Maggert is very strict about making sure the surface prep is done correctly.**

#### **VIII. BID OPENING FOR SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.**

**David Jaegar reported the bid opening was on October 15, 2002. There were three bidders, with the low bidder being Ultimate Security. Their base bid total was \$310,000.00. There was quite a spread in the numbers. They ranged from \$310,000 to \$620,000. He went on to say this is to provide access control to all of the buildings at each water plant. There would be card access at the doors, motion detectors at all the windows, and intercoms at the front doors. They would ring up to the operator if someone were at the front door. This would cover each building on the site.**

**Mr. Cofty asked if it includes fixing the doors that will not shut at the Crosstown Plant. Mr. Jaegar said yes, repair of hinges and hardware is included in the contract. Ultimate has done a lot of work for the County. They are qualified to do this work. Mallett & Associates is comfortable awarding the contract to them.**

**Chris Venice made a motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners award of the project to the low bidder, Ultimate Security at \$310,000.00. Vice Chairman Dr. Patton seconded. Chuck Watkins abstained from the vote. All others were in favor.**

#### **ADDENDUM**

##### **IX. SEPTIC BROCHURE.**

**Mrs. Venice explained she is bringing the Water Committee up to date on the septic brochure. She recalled about six months ago she came before the committee with the idea of providing home owners with a brochure describing care and maintenance of septic tanks. About half the county is on septic tanks. Many people do not even know they are on a septic tank, and if they do know, they don't know what to do about it.**

She went on to say they have done a lot of research to find out what other people do about brochures. She presented a copy of a brochure that staff liked. It is friendly, has great graphics, and is laid out very well. This particular brochure is in a folder format, so people might be inclined to stick it in their file drawer with other important papers and use it. The original price was close to \$14,000.00 for 20,000 brochures. The Water Committee had some concerns with some of the items, such as the advertising. It would also have to be amended for Georgia law, rather than California law.

She explained that they asked the gentleman what he could do to help us accomplish what we want. He came down to \$9800.00. This includes making any changes we want, and he would provide us a photo ready copy which we would have printed locally. They got bids from local printers. The cost of \$9800.00 includes the printing.

Mrs Venice remarked that the suggestion was made to print this in house. The copy machine that does commercial type printing did not make a good copy. The folder format is too thick for the copy machine and it comes out crooked and smeared. If we were to pursue other options, our other choices would be the brochure that the Environmental Health Department currently puts out. Or, the brochure the County Extension Service provides. These could be copied in house cheap, but she stated she thinks the Committee will agree that there is a difference in quality of graphics and approachability of subject matter. She went on to say that the suggestion had been made for staff to make up their own brochure. Do something from scratch. They would have to use the graphics in one of the local brochures because they are not copyrighted. We could not use any graphics from the folder brochure. In fact, legal advice says we probably could not even use the folder format. If staff put one together, the cost would be just over \$9,000.00, because the majority of the cost is in the printing.

Mrs. Venice stated that if the Water Committee is interested she would put the money for this in next years budget. We could apply for a DCA grant. This might be eligible. Also, the Board of Health expressed an interest in assisting in getting a brochure like this out. They understand the need for public education on this subject. She asked for comments and feedback from the Committee members.

Mr. Cofty asked for clarification of the cost. Mrs. Venice explained the \$9800.00 covers 20,000 copies. After that, it would be 15 cents per copy for a copyright fee. We would continue to have it printed locally. The original printing would be mailed to home owners. After that copies would be given to the Building Department to leave when they do the final inspection. They could leave it on the kitchen counter for the new home owner. A bulk mailing would be an additional cost.

**The committee discussed failed septic tanks and other issues that public education could help.**

**Mrs. Venice agreed to have the Environmental Health Department review and make any necessary changes. She will then bring it back for the Water Committee to review.**

**There being no further business, Chairman Chuck Watkins adjourned the meeting at 8:55 A.M.**

---

**Chuck Watkins**

**The foregoing minutes were approved at the regular Water Committee meeting on the 13th day of November, 2002.**

---

**Lisa Gillis**