

WATER COMMITTEE
JULY 27, 2011
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ABSENT:

Brian Cardoza

NON-VOTING MEMBERS:

David Jaeger

GUEST:

Stephen Hogan, WASA

STAFF PRESENT:

Russell Ray

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

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MEETING ON JUNE 8, 2011.

Vice Chairman Chip Conner made the motion and Jack Krakeel seconded, to approve the minutes from the meeting on June 8, 2011. There was no opposition.

II. LAKE MCINTOSH UPDATE.

David Jaeger presented the latest aerial view of the dam site showing the area where the contractor built the surcharge pad. The settlement on that pad had gotten to the point where the Geotechnical Consultant was satisfied that the settlement had tapered off. He referenced a table showing that beginning May 24, the surcharge pad topped out; then down to July 6. The bottom of the table shows the cumulative settlement for each of those plates after the top off. The numbers are in decimal feet. He said that it is not a considerable amount of settlement after the surcharge pad was topped out; a lot of the settlement takes place as they are building it. Around July 6, the Geotech folks decided that settlement had subsided enough, they were satisfied and they began removing the surcharge pad on the 20th. He said that operation is still under way now. At the time the surcharge pad was in the settlement mode, they began putting in some of the drainage systems.

Mr. Jaeger pointed out what was taken out of the top of the surcharge pad, looking back towards the west. He pointed out the abutment slope going up the dam center line and some of the internal drainage that is being put in. He showed aggregates, sand and gravel, and filter blankets used for building the drains. He said the drains intercept water that wants to penetrate through the dam on the sub-grade once the lake is full, then collect it in the piping networks, then bring it out at specific locations where it can be watched and measured; so they can determine if there is any earth material moving through the drainage system as well, it is just the amount of seepage of drainage.

Mr. Jaeger went on to say that during the time the surcharge pad has been in place, the clearing operation has continued, he showed the areas that have been cleared, and the area where debris has been piled up for possible burning in the fall. The

rest of the clearing debris has been buried. The streams and stream buffers have not been cleared. We are required to leave these buffers as long as possible; they will be the last thing to be cleared before the water starts to be impounded at the 780 contour which is the full pool. He showed a slide with an aerial view with the lake super imposed; what it would look like from the air with the dam. He went on to say that Water System staff has been putting up signage along the property lines to encourage people to stay out of the buffer areas and to not clear between their property line and the lake shore. He showed a slide of one of these signs.

Vice Chairman Conner asked when Mr. Jaeger thought they will start pouring concrete. Mr. Jaeger replied the contractor will be moving this earth for a few more weeks; he said he hopes within thirty days, he does not know yet, because they are not fully mobilized back on the site. Their full crew is not back on yet.

MITIGATION SITES

Mr. Jaeger mentioned the storm damage at the Danielly Wagner mitigation site. There is about 5,000 feet of fence that was damage that abuts a single property owner, Mike Sebran. Mr. Sebran has cattle and had an interest in getting the fence repaired as soon as possible; he actually took it upon himself to remove the storm debris from the fence, and left that as pretty much done. There is another 2,300 feet of fence that does not abut his property and that still has storm debris on top of it. Mr. Jaeger said he has pricing to replace the fence, the part that already has storm debris cleared; Mr. Sebran is willing to put the fence back for \$3.00 a foot. The contractor that put the fence up to start with, Trammell-Horton's price is \$4.00 a foot. He said that he also asked both parties to price the 2,300 feet of fence that has not been cleared yet. Mr. Sebran said he would do the clearing and the fence for \$3.75 a foot. Trammell-Horton has not give us a price yet, because they want to visit the site and assess how much needs to be cleared. Mr. Jaeger went on to say that given Mr. Sebran's prices and the fact that Trammell-Horton's price is above that even without the clearing, would we want this property owner to do the work; it would be the cheapest price we have. Trammell-Horton's price is consistent with what their original price was for the contract. Mr. Jaeger said he does not have a problem with the price; we just have this guy who is in a hurry to get the fence up.

Mr. Parrott commented that Mike Sebran cleared the debris on his side of the fence and had somebody come in, grind it up and haul it off. It could be used for something else. He had a bargain on this. Mr. Jaeger said he had some heavy duty equipment out there. He really needs to get the fence restored because his cattle is in one particular pasture and that will be eaten up quickly and he has to move them.

The committee discussed having the job done by an individual. Payment would be made once the work is completed. Mr. Parrott said that Mr. Sebran is a rancher and has put up a lot of fence in his life. The fence will have to be replaced. It was severely damaged; even posts have to be replaced. There is 5,000 feet of fence to be replaced at \$3.00 per foot, then 2,300 feet at \$3.75 per foot. Insurance for the job will need to be addressed.

Mr. Parrott commented that we need to get the fence up to protect the plantings that we have in the wetlands. Once they get clean up on our side done, they have to divert the stream. The fence is four foot hog wire and the replacement fence will be the same.

Mr. Krakeel commented that we are looking at a project that will be in excess of \$20,000.00. This will need to be bid. Mr. Jaeger said \$15,000.00 worth of work is shared/abutting property with the county and Mr. Sebran (one section of the work). He does not own the other property; Mr. Jaeger said he just asked him for a price. Mr. Krakeel said essentially, we are dealing with one tract of land, the mitigation site, that has damage. To repair this, it will exceed \$20,000.00 which puts us in the bid process. If the individual wants to bid it, and he can provide proof of insurance, then that is okay. Mr. Krakeel went on to say that he thinks it will be problematic to go to the Board and say that we have a property owner that is willing to do the fence repair for \$3.00 per foot and then we have a total cost that exceeds the parameters for what we normally require projects to be bid at.

Mr. Parrott stated that a bid would be prepared for this project and then he would put it on the Boards agenda for approval.

A. RECREATION.

Mr. Jaeger presented a concept plan for the park at Lake McIntosh. He said he has adjusted it a little from the first time he presented it to the committee. He explained that what he has done, since the original lay out that he presented was to increase the parking capacity to be close to what is at Horton Creek Reservoir. Horton Creek Reservoir has three different areas for parking; there are two boat ramps and a parking lot down by the pavilion. The parking lot at the pavilion at Lake Horton has 53 parking spaces. He showed the pavilion and the playground with a parking lot of 60 spaces for Lake McIntosh. The two boat ramps combined at Lake Horton have 20 trailer size spaces, at Lake McIntosh we have 24. There is additional car park spacing at those boat ramps, so there are a couple more at Lake McIntosh. Because of the proximity of them being close to each other, we don't have as much regular car park spacing at Lake McIntosh as we do with all 3 lots combined at Lake Horton. There are about 79 spaces at Lake Horton, if you count all 3 of them together, excluding the trailer spaces.

Mr. Jaeger went on to say in past discussions about the use of Lake Horton Park we realized that the parking lot helps keep it a passive recreation area. The more parking you provide the more active it becomes, and the harder it is to manage. He said his drawing for Lake McIntosh is conceptual and we can add or reduce parking as necessary. He said he also provided for golf cart spaces, as well. Being close to Peachtree City and the golf course, people might come by golf cart. There are walking trails, a front and back trail. He said this is all outside the area that will be fenced off for the dam. He showed a main gate that would be similar to the gate at Lake Horton. It would be closed at the end of operational hours at the end of the

day. You would not be able to access the park or the dam at that time without having authorization. Fencing has been added from the gate to limit access around the gate, and also some fencing to discourage people from going onto property not owned by the county. A rest room facility is planned that is consistent with the other parks in the county. The pavilion is similar to what is at Lake Horton, and a gazebo, which is conceptual in nature, somewhere to get out of the rain if walking on the path or just to rest or relax. There will be a boat ramp and boat docks similar to what is at Lake Kedron. Mr. Jaeger said the front park acreage is 9.3 acres, the back park acreage is 5.2.

Mr. Parrott pointed out that the trees on the drawing are not on the site. Mr. Jaeger said it is conceptual; his CAD artist rendition. Once we go forward with the park project, we can come up with a landscape plan. Mr. Parrot said he plans to put benches along the walking trails.

Mr. Parrott explained that Lake McIntosh has an island that will be attractive. Lake Peachtree has an island. Lake Horton has an island, but we put a causeway and connected it. The end where the tot lot is located would have been an island if we had not connected it. He said the island will be there and we need to discuss it. He asked if we wanted to post the island for people not to go out there, some places make people sign up before they go out to the island to have some kind of control over it.

Mr. Krakeel suggested putting up a sign that says Water Fowl Habitat, No Trespassing. He said he does not know how you control it. One difference in Lake Peachtree is there is residential activity around it 24/7. We don't have that at Lake McIntosh, we are dealing with day light to dusk. Without having someone stationed there, how would you control it?

III. LAKE HORTON PARKING DISCUSSION.

This item was tabled.

IV. PEACHTREE CITY WATER AND SEWERAGE AUTHORITY WATER BILL INSERT REQUEST.

Stephen Hogan distributed a sample of the insert they would like to include in the billing mail out. In an effort to operate a little more transparent and create some public outreach, they decided to issue a newsletter on a regular basis. Originally they had thought that they might try on a quarterly basis, but they feel like at this time that is a little too aggressive. He said what they are looking for is two opportunities, at a minimum, maybe three during the year to include a newsletter, information along the lines of Fats, Oils and Grease and the problems they are having in the system; how to dispose of your pharmaceuticals, don't put it in the sewer system. Some of their upcoming permit issues that they are having with the phosphorus, and inform folks of rehab projects they have going on and maintenance they will be doing in their neighborhoods. The sample is 8 1/2" X 14", it will fold up into the size to meet the envelope of current bills. He said in talking

with Lisa, this insert weighs less than the CCR, which is 11 X 17; this is underneath the postage limit.

Mr. Hogan requested that they be able to put it on a schedule that they could set a publishing deadline. He does not want to interfere with the CCR; that is paramount to the Water System. He said he knows there is competing interest with The Fred and that kind of thing. He said his first request would be for September and March or April; to get it out there so they can set their deadlines to not hold up billing cycles. Maybe next year or the year down they would try to do it, maybe quarterly, just to get a feel for how this works out in the scheme of things.

Mr. Parrott said it is fairly simple, they provide the insert and we mail them out. It does not increase postage. Mr. Hogan said they are trying to take advantage of the postage they are already paying for the billing cycle that is part of the combined billing.

Vice Chairman Conner made a motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to accommodate this request to insert a mailer in the water bills this coming September and then again in March or April for the second insert. Jack Krakeel seconded and there was no opposition.

V. BACKFLOW DISCUSSION.

Mr. Parrott explained that we have a current backflow cross connection program which has the business responsible for testing the backflow device. We have had a problem with some of them who were a little slow testing the backflows. He said his only leverage would be to turn it off, which means you turn the fire protection off on a warehouse or something like that. These are all non residential accounts. We would end up with a situation where the fire marshal would evacuate the building because we have turned the fire line off. He said he would like to know from the committee if there is any interest in adding an addendum to our program to just test it and add it to their bill, if they were unwilling to do it. We would do an annual contract for backflow testers, have one of the companies give us a price for the year; if someone won't do it, we notify them, we go test it and then put it on their water bill.

Vice Chairman Conner asked what other systems are doing. Mr. Parrott said some are doing it this way, they are in the same situation. He said he had talked to some others, people don't understand that if you were to take Haverty's and it ends up being shut down because we have turned off the backflow device because it wasn't tested; it is not good for public relations. These devices are tested once a year, the Water System sends out a notice, a ninety day letter, and then we follow up. The trouble is, at a certain point, we wind up with a problem with the Drinking Water Program because of the backflow device not being tested. Some of them are absolutely no trouble; just like clockwork, we send them a letter; they send the results back in. Mr. Krakeel stated that he thinks that is exactly the way we should go about it; put them on notice, give them 90 day, 60 day, 30 day letter and then if

they don't respond to those letters, then have it done and bill them for it. Put this in the letter.

Stephen Hogan asked what if we have refusal to pay that fee. Mr. Parrott replied that would be considered not paying the water bill, the public understands not paying the bill and the water being cut off. That does not create the problem that not having the test creates. Mr. Parrott stated that he would bring back an updated Backflow Cross Connection Control Policy. Because it is a DNR approved program, we have to also go through that step also.

VI. BID OPENING – ANNUAL WATERLINE CONTRACT FOR WATERLINE EXTENSIONS.

Mr. Jaeger reported that we had the bid opening on July 19th. There were two bidders, Lantz Construction and Shockley Plumbing. Both of these contractors have bid this project every year we have had it. Shockley was the contractor for the first few years, and Lantz has been the contractor for the last four or so years. The way the bid was set up was to prioritize work that is done routinely weighting that with a 75% factor and then the lower priority bid items, weighting those 25%. At the bottom of page 2 he said there is a summary of the base bid which is the total of all the bid items. Lantz was low on that at \$765,355.00. Then there is a break down, the high priority bid item total, the low priority bid item total and then the total of the weighted bid, which is how the bid was awarded. Lantz Construction was low with the weighted bid at \$472,488.75 versus \$520,625.00.

Mr. Jaeger said that he reviewed the bids thoroughly and he has compared it with last years bid and he thinks Lantz's numbers are consistent with what he has done in the past. He said he thinks it is a very competitive bid. He said they adjust the estimated quantities a little bit each time, based on what we have done the previous year. He said last years total bid was \$660,000.00 (roughly). This contract would be awarded for \$765,355.00 which is the total of the bid; the weighted bid just being used to determine award.

Mr. Jaeger said his recommendation is that Lantz Construction be awarded the contract. He said he thinks this contractor has been very useful to the county and the Water System allowing them to do extensions as they come up as well as emergency repairs without having to go through a bid process every single time.

Vice Chairman Conner made the motion to recommend the Board of Commissioners accept the low bidder, Lantz Construction on the bid for Annual Waterline Contract for Waterline Extensions; total base bid amount being 765,355.00. Jack Krakeel seconded and there was no opposition.

Mr. Krakeel asked why we did not get more bidders. Mr. Jaeger replied that it is hard to answer that question. Last year we had quite a few bidders on this project, and in years past we have had times where there have been very few bidders. He said he thinks the nature of the work is that you have to have somebody that is fairly

close by, logistically; they are able to respond quickly in a repair situation; he also thinks that people have had a hard time competing with Lantz's numbers in the past. They lose interest knowing that their chances of getting the job are low. Shockley Plumbing is one that has continued to want the work and tried to compete with Lantz, but has been unsuccessful in the last few years; to get below his numbers. They had about a 10% difference this time. Sometimes it is just a matter of what they have on their plate currently.

VII. BID OPENING – LAKE MCINTOSH RAW WATER PUMP STATION.

Mr. Jaeger reported that the second bid we had on July 19th was for the pump station modification project at Lake McIntosh. We had about a half a dozen plan holders on that project. Two contractors submitted bids. Both of these contractors are quality contractors that have done work for Fayette County in the past, Willow Construction was the low bidder at \$1,293,600.00. P. F. Moon was the second bidder at \$1,375,000.00. Willow Construction built Lake Kedron dam, they built portions of other pump station projects at Horton Creek Reservoir and Flint River. They have done multiple smaller projects; repairing filters in the water system and things like that. He said we have a lot of experience with Willow. He said, just for the record, P. F. Moon has also done work for the county; they did the water plant expansion at Crosstown and Starr's Mill Pump Station. Either one of these contractors would be an excellent choice; he said that he is pleased that Willow was low and he has no problem recommending Willow get the project. He said when we issued the bonds for the Lake McIntosh project, they had estimated, pre-design, \$1.2 million for the pump station. After the design was done and prior to the bid, he estimated \$1.5 million; the bids came in within what they were thinking it would be. He said that he knows, in talking with Tony, that there is money that has already been assigned to this project through the bond issue to cover this. He said he does not think there are any budget issues.

Mr. Jaeger stated that there were six plan holders, including the two that responded to the bid; four did not bid. All South Construction had too much work and could not take on any more at this time. Brad Cole, who is the dam contractor also was considering bidding; they told him there was too much of the work they would have to sub-contract, Lanier Contracting never gave him an answer why they did not bid. He said he felt that we had exposure and it boiled down to two contractors that were really fighting it out for it.

Mr. Jaeger said that he is hopeful that Water Committee would recommend award and then get on the soonest Board agenda.

Mr. Krakeel recommended that when this is submitted to the Board of Commissioners for approval; include the ones who got plans and the reason why they elected not to do the project. This would minimize any more discussion.

Mr. Krakeel made a motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to accept the low bidder, Willow Construction for Lake McIntosh Raw Water Pump Station

bid in the amount of \$1,293,600.00. Vice Chairman Conner seconded and there was no opposition.

VIII. MIEX PROJECT UPDATE.

Mr. Parrott stated that he was told by staff that DNR was finishing up the review on the engineering report. He said he is waiting for them to finish their review.

ADDENDUM

1. CUSTOMER REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT FOR DAMAGED CLOTHING.

Mrs. Quick explained that we had a main break on Saturday, June 27th. She referenced the marshals report of the incident, and the procedure used when a customer has muddy water and their clothes are ruined. This customer had clothes in the washing machine and they were damaged. Water System staff took Red B Gone out to the customer; they used it, but there was still some damage. They are asking for reimbursement for two shirts, in the amount of \$103.07. Current policy says that the request comes to Water Committee for a recommendation. Mrs. Quick said these were his father's day gift; both shirts were damaged beyond being able to wear them in public. A third shirt had damage that was not visible so he was okay with that one.

Mr. Parrott stated this does not come up much, the policy says the request comes to Water Committee and then the Board has to approve the payment. This policy was adopted years ago. He said that Red B Gone usually clears up the problem; the chemical makeup of it takes out the iron and manganese. It did not do it on these two shirts.

Mr. Krakeel asked Mr. Parrott what he recommended. Mr. Parrott said we are responsible with a main break.

Mr. Krakeel made a motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to approve the payment with one condition, have the customer come to the Water System office to pick up the check and bring the shirts with them. Vice Chairman Conner seconded and there was no opposition.

II. ORION METER CHANGE OUTS.

Mr. Parrott explained that we were already working on a change out program from our Trace radio read system to the new Orion profiler system and had budgeted this year \$884,000.00 to do that. We were notified about six weeks ago that the FCC is messing with the radio frequency of what we have for our Trace system and that frequency will not be available exclusively for us after the first of the year. They are re-banding (splitting) frequencies. The profiler already meets this requirement, so we don't have a problem with the new Orion profilers, but we

will have a problem sometime next year or the year after with the Trace units that we have.

Mr. Parrott stated that Badger Meter has made an offer for every two that we buy replacing our register and transponder, they will give us one free, provided we do it with one order, and then they will let us pay for that one order over the next 12 months. We need 21,713 units, and a third of those would be free (7,258). We would purchase 14,495. Our total cost would be \$2,018,000.00. The bottom line is, we are talking savings of \$1,009,761.49 on buying 3 million dollars worth of transponders and registers. The FY 2012 cost would be what we have budgeted, which is 884,000.00. We would pay for the additional \$1,134,465.78 out of FY 2013. Water System staff has changed out roughly 6,000 meters so far, and will continue to do so. Mr. Parrott said that he thinks it will take about a year to do this project.

Mr. Krakeel asked about the Water System's cash flow. Mr. Parrott said this means, in the next budget year we will have to have \$250,000.00 more in order to pay for these additional meters. He said he believes we can do that within the system because we have looked at what we are doing.

Mr. Krakeel asked about the MIEX project coming from Renewal and Extension fund. Mr. Parrott said this would not come out of R & E, we budgeted this cost. In order to save \$1 million, we will spend \$250,000.00 more next year. Badger's offer is that we have to place the order by September and take delivery in November. They offered the 12 month payment terms.

Mr. Krakeel made the motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners purchasing Orion profilers from Badger Meter at a total cost of \$2,018,466.78 to take advantage of a two for one special offer to complete the installation of these radio read meters in the distribution system. Vice Chairman Conner seconded and there was no opposition.

There being no further business, Chairman Pete Frisina adjourned the meeting at 9:00 A.M.

Peter A. Frisina

The foregoing minutes were approved at the regular Water Committee meeting on the 10th day of August, 2011.

Lisa Quick