

**WATER COMMITTEE**  
**JULY 22, 2009**  
**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Pete Frisina, Chairman  
James K “Chip” Conner, Vice Chairman  
Tony Parrott  
Jack Krakeel  
Brian Cardoza

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS:**

David Jaeger

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Russell Ray

**GUEST:**

Commissioner Jack Smith

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Pete Frisina at 8:00 A.M.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MEETING ON JUNE 24, 2009.**

Chip Conner made the motion and Jack Krakeel seconded, to approve the minutes from the meeting on June 24, 2009. There was no opposition.

**II. MR. BUDDY WELCH, CITY OF STOCKBRIDGE DISCUSSION ABOUT REEVES CREEK MITIGATION SITE.**

This item was tabled.

**III. DISCUSSION ABOUT PEACHTREE CITY AND FAYETTE COUNTY DIVE AND RESCUE TRAINING AT LAKE HORTON.**

Mr. Parrott asked the committee if the draft Memorandum of Understanding covered everything that was discussed at the last meeting. He commented that it is one time a year, the first part of the week, and is coordinated through all the groups that are involved. It is limited to the Antioch Creek side of the lake so we can just close off one boat ramp and the other boat ramp can be left open. He included Lake Kedron so the agreement would have it in case they wanted to use it, we would post it, but we would have to have some kind of coordination at Lake Kedron. It would be a little more involved because we could not completely close the park off. Other people would have to be able to get in and out. The first part of the week at Lake Kedron, usage is real low, usage is mostly weekends. Most people think that it is just Peachtree City and it doesn't get as much traffic.

Mr. Krakeel asked that a change be made to Item E; rather than say or Municipality, be specific to Peachtree City Dive Team so we don't end up getting requests from other dive teams around the area to use the facility for that purpose. It should say Fayette County Public Safety and Peachtree City Dive Team. The County attorney should review this document also.

**Mr. Parrott made a motion to recommend this Memorandum of Understanding to the Board of Commissioners with attorney review. Chip Conner seconded and there was no opposition.**

#### **IV. LAKE MCINTOSH**

**Mr. Jaeger stated that we have had some significant activity since our last Water Committee meeting. The mitigation credits for Magnolia Swamp have been authorized by the Corp of Engineers for release. It is his understanding that the county has completed the financial transaction and now has those mitigation credits secured. This puts us in the position, according to our 404 permit, that we can begin construction, and that is excellent news. We have a re-submittal meeting scheduled for next Wednesday with Tom Woosley at Safe Dams Program. They will be meeting at the geotechnical consultant's office in Alpharetta for the bulk of the day. They will be going over the re-submittal comments. He said at that meeting he intends to inform them that the County has now acquired the mitigation credits and the only thing holding us back is authorization from Safe Dams.**

**Mr. Jaeger reported that we have pre-qualification packages that have been submitted by contractors that they are reviewing. They intend to issue an invitation to bid to those who are pre-approved.**

**Mr. Jaeger stated that our submittal to the FEMA mapping requirements resulted in a letter being sent to Coweta County since their FEMA maps are also impacted by the reservoir. We submitted the conditional letter of map revision, meaning this project is not here, but if it is here, we think it will require a true letter of map revision for a revision of the FEMA maps. FEMA, then sent a form called Overview and Concurrence Form to the officials at Coweta County, asking them for their concurrence that this is a conditional map revision project. The response that Mr. Jaeger got back after some back and forth from Coweta County was that they would like for Fayette County to provide elevation certificates to the properties that abut the reservoir on the Coweta County side. The intent being that if the reservoir is built and the hundred year flood plain encroaches onto the property on the Coweta County side, that these property owners can be subjected to higher flood insurance premiums. Mr. Jaeger said in his initial response back, that the County owns an easement for flooding and these properties either sold the easement to the County or were purchased with the easement already there. That did not seem to go very far, as far as the Coweta County officials were concerned. Their response had to do with somebody not knowing when they sold the easement to the County or bought the property with the easement on it, that at some point, the hundred year flood plain could end up in that easement, resulting in a higher insurance premium.**

**After he and Mr. Parrott discussed it, Mr. Parrott felt that it was appropriate to talk to the Water Committee about it. Mr. Jaeger said he asked how many properties were potentially impacted, and was not able to get a real number. He**

said it is probably a couple dozen properties, smaller properties in the subdivision off Christopher Road and then larger tract subdivisions along the lake shore. The information he has is based on when the County bought the land and a lot of the development was not there then. He does not have current plats or property boundaries on that lake shore, just what was there when the County bought the land. He can get the information, but he did not want to volunteer the County to supply these elevation certificates unless the County feels it is something they want to do. You have to go out and do a survey and establish the finished floor elevation of the structure on the property and the relation to the floodplain.

Mr. Parrott commented that this is just a small part of it. Does this mean that we will offer elevation certificates to every property owner around the lake, which winds up being a large amount, we can't very well just do it for these two dozen just to get Coweta County to sign the paper, then on the Fayette County side we have property owners, too.

Mr. Krakeel asked if this is something that would hold up construction. Mr. Jaeger stated that he does not think so; what has been submitted to FEMA is the conditional situation. To do an actual revision of the map, the project has to be there. We are telling them that this is a proposed project, it is planned, and we believe that it will require revisions to the floodplain map. It is his understanding that they will not stop us from starting construction, but he does not think they will begin their review of it until they receive their concurrence form from Coweta County. Coweta County is hesitating to sign it knowing that if they sign it, then somebody's insurance rate goes up, they somehow "authorized" it. He said in discussing it with Mr. Parrott, they feel that the County has an easement there for flood rise; and those easements are on these properties, and if it results in a hundred year floodplain encroaching into the easement, that is part of an easement being there. If it results in a higher premium and somebody needs an elevation certificate, it is their responsibility to get that.

Mr. Parrott stated that the easement should be on all the plats. They should not have their structure in that easement. The easement existed before the subdivision was built. The committee further discussed this subject.

Mr. Parrott reported that the fencing on the wetland sites is moving along. We did not bid fencing Helmer Road because we were looking at additional property next to it because we needed a couple of extra credits. We have since acquired that property at Helmer Road. He went on to say that we had a low bid for the fencing that we are doing, and he would like to see if the current fencing crew that we have working will give us a price to fence that. If they are willing to do it at the low bid price, then he does not see a reason to go out to rebid. This would be a change order to the current bid. It would save us money, because they don't have to get bonding insurance. He said he would bring this information back to the committee at the next meeting.

Mr. Parrott said they were talking to Eco South about the mitigation site where they were going to do the work itself. They made a proposal to the Board and he needs to get this moving along. They have been working with the County attorney on the bond for it. The Corp is going to want the work on these mitigation sites complete when the dam work begins.

## **V. TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON UPDATE.**

Mr. Parrott commented that we passed our treatment technique for the second quarter ending June 30 for both plants. This is good news. The July sample also passed for both plants. He went on to explain that we have looked at other treatment techniques in order to take care of the total organic carbons. The rules will change in 2012 on the trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids. While we are passing both of those tests currently, we are not going to pass those tests, if they go to the standards in which they are going. Mr. Parrott said they are going to look at a different treatment technique option tomorrow. They looked at Miex last week.

Mr. Jaeger explained that Miex is an ion exchange process that attacks the dissolved organics in the raw water. It helps remove those prior to the settlement treatment. We had a demonstration on it at the South Fayette Plant last week. They took samples of the raw water in the South Fayette Plant and raw water samples into the Crosstown Plant and ran it through this process. Then they also compared that with the standard dose of coagulant that the county uses currently. Then they compared it with a half dose of the coagulant. The results were substantial; the removal of the total organic carbon was very substantial. The word that he gets in discussing this technique with different people is that there is really no disputing that it works. The issues come more into cost, it is an expensive technology. Also, there is a waste product, a brine solution that ends up having to be dealt with. If you are in a place where you can easily connect to a sewer system, you can pipe it to the sewer line and then let the sewer plant downstream take care of it.

Mr. Jaeger went on to say that the South Fayette Plant has no sewer available. We would have to store it on site and then haul it off and dispose of it like a septic flow into a sewer system. The quantities are fairly substantial with this discharge. He said that this is something, that once we evaluate the entirety of that technology will be a deciding factor; along with the operational cost. The ion exchange is the result of a resin being used to interact with the raw water that ionically attracts the organics. The resin, while it is a closed system, you do have some loss of the resin, so you constantly have to replenish this resin. The resin is a proprietary item, the technology is patented and their resin is patented. You are locked in with purchasing this resin from a single source. That is what the competitors argue; you will get yourself locked into this resin supply.

Mr. Jaeger said that he brought this question to the people at the AWWA conference at the exhibit hall. Their response was that they are more than willing to enter into long term contracts, and they are willing to tie their inflation or escalation

of price to a consumer index that is independent of anything else. It would just rise and or fall based on what the general economy is doing. He stated that he does not know how long long term is; if they are willing to enter a ten year contract, twenty or fifty. That is something that we would need to fully understand before recommending going in that direction. The good news is it works. They have seen that. He mentioned that Mr. Parrott actually did the TOC evaluation himself on the water that was treated. They have seen the results first hand, and they did work.

Mr. Ray mentioned that in the results there was twice as much removal of the TOC. It was 60% removal using the Miex resin, versus 30% removal with our normal process. Mr. Jaeger stated that 35% is the minimum reduction; these removals were prior to flocculent to coagulation itself. One of their selling points is that if you use their system, your chemical use will go down. You will have to use less coagulant, which seems to be true, and your disinfectant dosages will go down because there are less organics to have to neutralize. You are just looking at chlorine residual versus disinfection. He said they looked at those numbers, just in rough terms, and based on what they are telling us in the way of cost per million gallons treated; it is still higher than what you save in your chemical reduction. There is some chemical reduction that you see, but there is an operational cost that will increase, the net change will be an increase in operational cost. There are pluses and minuses. When they saw some of the technologies discussed in San Diego, Miex along with GAC were the most costly of the different technologies. It is not a surprise that they are seeing it, but they felt we should weigh all these options and make decisions based on a broad range of investigations.

Mr. Ray commented that one of the other positive points is that it will also help with iron and manganese removal and any taste and odor problems, by removing those organics and it will also remove any iron and manganese. We have to treat these separately already. That is one of the secondary benefits.

Mr. Parrott explained that our current treatment meets current standards, even though we have had trouble with the TOC's; which is a treatment technique. The trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids, when that hits, we need to be ready. That is why Cobb Marietta, Birmingham and Columbus are all going to something else. Birmingham looked at fourteen different combinations of enhanced coagulation treatment in order to try and meet the rule. Miex has a pilot filter trailer set up that we can rent and try. Before he recommends going that way, we would actually have a recommendation to rent it and run it for a while, even though the jar test is good, he wants a little more assurance on the finished product through what we have as a treatment system because of the 2012 changes. He wants to be able to meet 2012; he does not want to just meet the treatment technique for TOC. There are several organizations that are lobbying for either a change or a push back on the date, but we cannot depend on that. We are going to be ready for 2012.

The committee discussed the different treatment techniques being used in different utilities, physical changes that might be needed at the plant depending on the

treatment technique chosen, disposal of any waste product, and operational cost increase at the water plant.

Mr. Parrott mentioned that we received a request for information from Green Law Environmental Group. They asked for the last three years reports on TOC, HAA and THM information.

Mr. Parrott reported that the minimum day usage for July was Friday, July 17. The customers are watering less on Fridays, usage dropped from over 17 MGD to less than 10 MGD and we are complying with the State regulations.

Mrs. Quick reported that the tax free weekend for energy efficient appliances is October 1 - 4, 2009. The Metropolitan North Georgia Planning District have prepared a bill stuffer that can be used to mail to the customers with their water bills about the toilet rebate program. The stuffer could be inserted in the bills from the middle of August through the middle of September.

Chip Conner made a motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to insert the bill stuffer from the Metropolitan North Georgia Planning District in the water bills. Jack Krakeel seconded and there was no opposition.

Mrs. Quick stated that we have 35 water saver kits left. There have been 514 toilet rebates that have been so far. This has been a savings of 21,000 gallons estimated daily water savings. The amount of \$37,750.00 has been credited to customer accounts for the toilet rebates.

Commissioner Smith stated that every two years the representation on the Water District Board changes. His representation dropped July 1. Ken Steele is the new representative.

There being no further business, Chairman Pete Frisina adjourned the meeting at 8:50 A.M.

---

Peter A. Frisina

The foregoing minutes were approved at the regular Water Committee meeting on the 26th day of August, 2009.

---

Lisa Quick