WATER COMMITTEE
MARCH 28, 2012
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:	**Pete Frisina, Chairman**
	James K "Chip" Conner, Vice Chairman
	Brian Cardoza
	Jack Krakeel
	Tony Parrott
NON-VOTING MEMBERS:	**David Jaeger**
STAFF PRESENT:	**Russell Ray**
	Carrie Gibby
GUEST:	**Stephen Hogan**

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

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2012.

Vice Chairman Chip Conner made the motion and Jack Krakeel seconded, to approve the minutes from the meeting on February 22, 2012. There was no opposition.

II. WETLAND SITES AND BUFFER DISCUSSION.

Tony Parrott explained that the Water System is responsible for property in Fayette, Clayton, Spalding, Pike and Meriwether counties.

a. BROOKS CREEK WETLAND SITE ON GRANT ROAD.

Mr. Parrott explained that Brooks Creek is off Grant Road, and was done in 1994. Mr. Cole who lives on the other side of Grant Road has a lot in which there are two creeks that come together and then comes under the county road. In 1994, with the flood, Mr. Parrott said the water ran over the road. The road department then put in a bigger pipe. He referred to a site investigation done by Mr. Jaeger in 2003; the road elevation is approximately 12 feet above the downstream overflow area. They are saying that beavers are building downstream and that it is impacting them with the flooding. He said it does not appear to him that the beavers have raised the water level down there 12 feet impacting them with the flooding. Mr. Parrott said the problem is that Mr. Cole has two streams that come together on his lot before it goes under the road, which has been a problem for ten years.

Mr. Parrott said that Mr. Cole has talked to DNR, and DNR said they would trap beavers on the site for them. The trouble is, trapping the beavers is not going to solve the problem, because they will actually want the beaver dams taken out; that gets into we are supposed to leave the site alone, the beavers are part of what makes it a wetland site. He went on to say that this is a functioning site; it is one of those that came out so good there no additional work we had to do. When the Corp did the inspection, each time they went down there, they were extremely happy with how well it worked. There will be beavers on these sites; they are wetland sites (50, 75, 100 acres). As long as it is not impacting the adjoining property he said he does see a need to do anything.

Mr. Krakeel said that Mr. Cole is claiming that it is impacting his property. Mr. Parrott commented that he is more than willing to have Mr. Jaeger do another elevation check on the water level. It is not backing up water through the pipe. The road department cleaned it out when Mr. Cole called them; they took care of what was in the right of way. The first gabion downstream has been removed (naturally). Water pushed the rocks out of the way, so the first one is not even there anymore.

b. <u>SANDY CREEK WETLAND SITE.</u>

Mr. Parrott explained that our Sandy Creek Wetland site is off Sandy Creek Road in between the two phases of River Oak subdivision. The subdivision was built and they put a 48" pipe under the road and they dump straight out of that pipe down a channel that the Town of Tyrone recently rocked. There are no trees until you get to the wetland site. He pointed out on a slide where our wetland site starts. We are not impairing the flow of water; it goes down into the site, slows up and does like it is supposed to do (help grow trees). He pointed out rocks that are right where the Town of Tyrone did their work. He then showed a gabion (stone dam) that was put in with the project. He said that is has failed, it no longer backs up water.

Mr. Parrott showed a plat and pointed out the lot that is in question. The whole subdivision borders our wetland site, the water from the whole subdivision goes under the road to us, and there is no detention.

Mr. Jaeger said that his understanding, he just learned yesterday, that there may be a pond in the subdivision. He has not had a chance to look into it. He explained that he is involved in this from the Town of Tyrone's perspective because the land owner has complained to Tyrone as well. There are situations where stormwater can be released, if it is released basically directly into a floodplain and the local authority can waive stormwater detention if they are shown the fact that there is really

no impact to the floodplain downstream, there is no property in between that is impacted. He said he does not know for certain that is what has happened here; this was developed eight or ten years ago, prior to his involvement with the Town of Tyrone. The people that were there at that time are no longer there. The records are very minimal; he said he is trying to get records through the developer and the developer's consultant to figure out some of this. This is within the Town of Tyrone, but the county property abuts it.

Mr. Jaeger said that it is possible to show that the increased runoff from a development such as a subdivision could be released into an area that has an existing floodplain and not really impact the levels of that floodplain. If that is the case, then the local issuing authority can determine whether or not stormwater retention will be required. It is shown that waiving the detention does not create an impact on the floodplain. Mr. Parrott stated that on our side of the property line for the water to overflow the channel is how the whole thing is supposed to work. It would be changing what was approved for us to go in there and channelize these locations to get the water to go through. Then the wetlands we have spent money to develop no longer function as wetlands because they would no longer flood out the banks.

Mr. Jaeger said the property owner has complained to the town initially and then alternately called Mr. Parrott about the fact that the water does flow out of the channel and it is still on his property when it does that. There is a section of this channel that is still on his property prior to getting to the mitigation site property. He has requested that the town widen that channel and that the county, or the town and the county, widen the channel on the mitigation site, so that is has more capacity to handle the water out of the pipe. He said, from what he has been told, that it is his belief that the county would not be able to widen the channel in the mitigation site; and he thinks that Mr. Parrott confirmed that in future conversations with the property owner. Basically, because it is permitted by the Corp of Engineers and the intention of a mitigation site is that it does overflow. You are trying to get water out onto the overbanks and create additional wetland areas. The mitigation site predates the subdivision; it was purchased in the 1990's, part of the 1994 project with the Lake Horton project. The homeowner is on a two acre lot.

Mr. Jaeger stated that where this stands currently; from the towns perspective is that they have agreed to review the design of the subdivision from a stormwater management perspective. They have asked him to look at the drawings and hydrology study to determine, basically the amount of time it would take him to come to a conclusion on what is out there and whether it is sufficient or not. He said there has

been a little difficulty in getting his hands on the documents; John Wieland Homes has recently provided him with an electronic archive that he can get to on the internet for the drawings, but nobody seems to be able to find the hydrology study. He has asked if their consultant will look and see if they can find it.

Mr. Parrott explained that the head wall is behind the property owner's house. There is no flooding issue with the house. Mr. Jaeger said that the pipe takes the water from the road to within a hundred feet or so of his rear property line; it is behind the house close to the rear property line. He went on to say that some of what Mr. Parrott showed is a natural channel between the pipe and his rear lot line. The rest of it beyond that is on the mitigation site. To further complicate it, the area that is on his property is considered State Waters, so there is a protected stream buffer there also. It is not an easy solution even if it were just contained to what is on his property.

c. <u>Reeves Creek/Henry County Wetland Site.</u>

Mr. Parrott explained that Reeves Creek has a Henry County Water and Sewer Authority sewer line easement that goes through it. The easement floods out because beavers go in there. Norman Thatcher with Henry County Water and Sewer Authority called to say all the water went away, and they were happy, they could get to the sewer easement. They wanted some information on why it was drained. Mr. Parrott said that we did not drain it, it just went away. Now it has come back. When it came back, Henry County sent us a notice that they would like us to maintain it so that it does not flood out their sewer easement. It appears that beavers are building in the creek at the road, it backs up the water. When it is dry, there is no water, when it is wet, there is water. Because the beaver dams are at the road right of way, here on this site, if Henry County wants to clean it out so the flow goes through, he said he has no problem with it. It was not designed for the water to be stopped there. This is the downstream side, instead of the upstream side; exactly opposite from what is happening on the other two sites; this is water leaving the site.

Mr. Parrott said that Henry County wants to work with us, instead of having to go to court over the fact that their easement is flooded out. Their easement was under water for years; it went away and then came back. When it went away they were happy and now they want us to keep it away. This is a forty five acre site that we try not to do anything with.

Mr. Krakeel commented that when these sites were designed and developed, there weren't any beaver dams. Beaver dams were not designed as part of the wetlands. Mr. Parrott said they anticipated them coming; to the point where on this Reeves Creek site they fixed

underground piping at the road so that where the beavers built, it would still let water go through so that the water would not rise but a certain level. Beavers, being smart, stopped the pipes up.

Mr. Krakeel stated that even if they anticipated beavers building a dam, that they put in mitigation measures to mitigate the impact of the beaver dams. Why not take the dams out and resolve these issues. Mr. Parrott said to get to the Brooks Creek site, you would have to clear to get down there; at Reeves Creek you can clear the stream out from the road.

Further discussion pertained to anything we do is subject to the conditions set by the Corp of Engineers. Mr. Parrott recommended telling Henry County that if they want to drain it, they can take the dam out at the road each time they want to access their easement. We did not put it there, and we are not responsible for the beavers. This does not affect the design of this wetland site. Mr. Parrott said that he plans to meet with Henry County on this site to discuss this issue.

LAKE MCINTOSH BUFFER.

Mr. Parrott reported that a gentleman went out behind his house, took his ax and did about 40 "whacks" around 25 trees. These are not small trees. He showed a photo of one of the damaged trees. Since, then, Rocky, our Wetland Caretaker has painted them trying to see if we can't save them. He said he does not know if this is going to work. We have property owners that are coming onto Fayette County property adjacent to the lake starting to "prune" county trees to benefit their views from their porches and balconies. It is hard to catch somebody.

Mr. Parrott stated that in the past he had recommended erecting some used six foot chain link that we have in storage. He suggested putting this up between the adjoining property and our property in order to protect these trees to give them a chance to heal. This is not new chain link fence; he said he did not want to mislead anyone. It is some that was leftover, it is kind of rusty. We could secure it enough to protect the trees with some kind of hope that they might recover. He said this is beyond his authority; this will create a certain level of controversy. He asked if the committee has a suggestion.

Further discussion pertained to how to protect the buffer around Lake McIntosh. It is hard to catch them doing the damage. Suggestions ranged from fencing the entire county property around the lake, painting the damaged trees orange or putting fence around each tree that was damaged. Right now the area is accessible by the construction road, but once the lake gets full, our access will only be by boat and walking around the shore.

d. WHITEWATER CREEK WETLAND SITE FOR USE BY THE SHERIFF'S K-9 UNIT.

Mr. Parrott showed a photo showing an easement that goes through to our wetland site off Highway 85 close to Peachtree City Water & Sewerage Authority's property. We did not restore wetlands, this is just preservation. The Sheriff's office has asked to use this area to run their bloodhound once a week. They will have a man go through it and then they will have the bloodhound follow him. Because of the situation, it is not the wetland site itself, it is not impacting anything; he said he thinks we should have some kind of written agreement. This would mean we would have somebody going down there once a week or every two weeks checking on the place. He said if they wanted to run through a wetland site, he might have a different opinion of it.

e. SMOKERISE.

Mr. Parrott discussed county property on Lake Kedron, a property owner in Smokerise is complaining because some of the trees are leaning. He showed some photos of the trees and the area with and without underbrush. We had to cut a tree because of the way it was leaning, but did not remove it from the site. The property owner thinks we should do something about the leaning trees. The leaning trees are going to fall the other way; unless the tree is going to fall toward the property owner in the back of the yard and tear fencing and whatever; we haven't been doing anything. We have had to take out a couple of trees simply because they were over the golf cart path; part of the golf cart path is on county property. We are maintaining the site as best we can. Without it being a hazard to property, he said he sees no reason to take the tree down just because it is going to fall at some point in time. There is no danger of it getting to the cart path. The Board passed the rule that you cannot even fish from this area; this is county property around Lake Kedron where you can't even fish because the Smokerise property owners did not want people in their backyard fishing. There is no fishing and there is no access to it. If there is one that is going to impact one of the houses around, we will get a tree service to take care of it.

III. LAKE MCINTOSH UPDATE.

David Jaeger reported that the contractor is still working on the concrete work for the spillway. He showed an aerial shot looking from downstream to upstream; he described where the pipe comes through and Line Creek flows south out of the site. He explained the committee was looking at the downstream wave protection area (outlet channel). This is basically done; he said you can see some mud that has accumulated from some backwater that occurred during one of the

recent heavy storms. He then pointed out the stilling basin area, the slab is one hundred percent complete; he showed the impact blocks that dissipate energy as the turbulent water enters this and hits the blocks, it loses energy before it enters the outlet channel and goes back in the creek.

Mr. Jaeger went on to say the contractor has completed the wall of the stilling basin on the west side (Coweta County side); they are forming up and building the wall on the other side. He pointed out a vertical wall that is a step between the stilling basin and the upper slab where the labyrinth walls will be. He said that portion of the slab has been poured on the upper slab. He pointed out the future sections that will be poured. He showed the rebar that has been put in, stubbing up that will be extended into the walls of the labyrinth. He explained the shape of the labyrinth (a zig-zag pattern across the spillway). He said the purpose of that is that it creates more weir length so that we can discharge more water for the same total width of the spillway. It makes it more efficient that way.

Mr. Jaeger showed the construction photos showing the construction of the walls on the eastern side. He then showed the western side where they are backfilling the walls. He said the back wall will not be completely filled; the slope of the dam will come down behind the wall; much of the wall down the stilling basin will remain exposed from the back side. He then pointed out the installation of the internal drainage system (going up the slope on the abutment).

Mr. Jaeger referred to an aerial view of the construction project to point out the center line and showing the toe drain system that is being built (protection for the crease that is created where the fill from the dam intercepts with the existing ground), it is a place where water wants to accumulate and run down the slope into the lake, just surface run off. The rip rap ditch protects that, protects the toe of the dam and allows it to be a designated place for run off to move down the abutment slopes. There will be similar channels on both the upstream and downstream where the proposed fills tie into the existing ground.

Mr. Jaeger showed the pump station, the access road into the pump station, the creek has been permanently diverted and we will be able to pump from the reservoir at this spot. He then pointed the entrance to the sixty inch pipe that goes beneath the dam.

Mr. Jaeger said that the majority of the clearing is now done. They have cleared the buffers down to a certain spot and we stopped them there. He said we did not want them to clear all the buffers down all the way to the dam until they are further along in the dam construction. The majority of the reservoir is now cleared.

Mr. Jaeger reported that the pump station project is also going on at the same time. He showed photos showing the recent construction. He showed the top of the wall of the old structure, it has been extended up for the new top slab. They are building out the rear porch (deck). That will allow access to the operator for the sluice gate

that controls flow out of the reservoir. He said the contractor has also started the construction of the exterior of the pump station. The steel that is showing is the trolley being used for installation and maintenance of the pumps and motors.

Mr. Parrott commented that the back porch also has the air condition units and this means they will be secure.

Mr. Jaeger showed an aerial of the outline of the reservoir (780 full pool) and the orientation with the airport and the golf course. He said the contractor says they will be finished by June, but he is concerned about them meeting that schedule. They will bring the earth up as they complete the side walls, the concrete work and the earth work will finish simultaneously. They have had time extensions granted because of weather, they have had times when the water level of the creek has risen enough it has impacted their work as well.

IV. MIEX UPDATE.

Mr. Parrott reported that we finally got concurrence from DNR on us doing the MIEX project. They had trouble separating concurring with the fact that MIEX was a suitable treatment with approving the construction plans. Once he was able to get them to understand that they have a chance to approve the construction plans; if they want the building two feet higher or two feet wider, or if they wanted to be six inches instead of seven, they could review any of that in the construction. All we needed was for them to say that MIEX was the proper treatment for TOC's. We have concurrence with Mr. Jaeger's engineering report showing that MIEX will reduce TOC's in our water. The Water System bonds have been refinanced and we were able to save $2.5 million; we will be able to do this project without a water rate increase.

V. SCADA SYSTEM.

Mr. Parrott explained that the SCADA System (Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition System) for the water plant allows the plant operator to look at different screens that shows water levels in the tanks, what is going on at the plant, one plant can see what the other plant is doing, how much water they are pumping, all of it is tied together. Part of it is internal to the plant; part of it is external to the system. The problem is that part of this SCADA System started in 1986. Technology has changed since then; we had a 450 frequency for the SCADA system which the FCC will no longer let us have. We are going to have to go to a different frequency, at that point in time we need to look at changing out this system that is getting difficult for us to operate anyway. He referenced a slide and commented that each "C" represents a communication error. This represents a time during the day when the plant operators did not know for sure what was in each one of the tanks by looking at the system. This means the maintenance guy has to get in the truck and go check.

Mr. Parrott said that he believes we can use the 800 frequency that the county has. This is a project we need to get started on, get Mallett Consulting working on it. Mr. Jaeger said the estimated cost is about $200,000.00 for the upgrade; going from analog to digital, replacing all the remote telemetry units, about 31 of them; upgrading the equipment at each of the plants, and replacing the antennae's as well. There are some cost savings if your antennae's are compatible with the new frequencies, but we don't know that right now. If the new frequency creates a communication issue with the way the system is currently programmed, it would have to be re-programmed. We don't know that yet; $200,000.00 would not have to re-program everything, just replacing the hardware and updating the license to the new frequency. This is a budget estimate for installed construction cost.

Mr. Parrott commented that because of the size of the project, he wanted to let the committee know this is coming up in the near future. Funding is available out of our Renewal & Extension Fund.

VI. FLINT RIVER TRAVELING SCREEN.

Mr. Jaeger showed a slide that is an overview of the current existing Flint River raw water pump station that is located on Hampton Road. It is just under a mile back to Highway 92. He pointed out the county line between Fayette County and Clayton County on the slide. The pump station sits adjacent to Hampton Road in the Flint River; it has an existing 36" buried intake pipe that goes out into the creek; there is a trash rack on the end of that pipe. He showed a floor plan showing where the intake pipe comes into the structure. Down into the wet well structure we have some baffle walls that channelize the flow, so the water comes in through a pipe, turns 90 degrees and runs along the back wall down underneath between the baffle wall and the side wall. Then, at that point, it passes through an existing manually operated debris screen, then into the wet well into the pump area. At the time the pump station was designed the permitted withdrawal rate was about 8 million gallons a day. Since that time we have had at least one, he thinks two upgrades, so we are currently at 14 million gallons a day, which means we are pulling in raw water from the creek at a higher velocity, meaning it would pull with it, more debris. The original design worked well for quite a while, but now it is causing an overburden of debris into the base of the pump station. He said that we have had strainer baskets on the bottom of these pumps clog up and collapse due to the pump trying to pull water with too much debris in it.

Mr. Jaeger explained that a long term solution to that is to install a traveling screen that will continuously remove debris from the water flow. It would be mounted up at the floor level of the pump station and extend down into the wet well. It would be constantly moving any time the pump is running, debris would be pulled along the screen. At the top there is a wash system that would wash the debris off into a drain pipe which would then flow back down into the creek. The trash would be taken from the creek and put back in the creek; it would be all natural leaf litter and things like that. He went on to say that we have had the equipment representative

on site to look at it in preparation of the drawings. He has given an equipment cost estimate between $200,000.00 and $225,000.00, and then estimated between $100,000.00 and $150,000.00 for installation and electrical upgrade, etc. This is a fairly significant project from the cost standpoint, probably in the neighborhood of $350,000.00.

Mr. Parrott explained that our current system, what it has done to the raw water pumps in just the last six months, conservatively we are talking about 200 million gallons a day that we were not able to pump out of the river because one or the other pump was down; we were having to shut one of them down because the strainer basket had collapsed, we even had a company come out and pump the trash out of the wet well to get it cleaned out to start fresh, put new trash baskets on the pump.

Mr. Krakeel asked if this will require any modification of the wet well or will it slide into the existing. Mr. Jaeger replied that it will fit within the existing; there may be some slight modifications that need to be made. Currently there is some screening on the top of the baffle walls that extend up to the base of the bottom of the of the top slab; that screening may need to be made tighter so that we make sure we follow all the debris through the traveling screen. There is no other concrete work to be done or any significant changes to that wet well.

VII. LAKE PEACHTREE DREDGING.

Mr. Jaeger stated that the County has a contract with the City to periodically dredge Lake Peachtree. This was last done in 2001, based on a job number that he has referenced. He said that he recently re-topoed the silt levels in some designated areas that were identified previously and worked on previously. He pointed out Highway 54, the lake body and the withdrawal point on the map he provided. Areas 1 through 6 are along the western side and up at the top. He explained that the bold numbers are the depth of silt at various locations along some designated cross sections through areas 1, 2 and 3. The silt level varies from something in the neighborhood of a few inches up to some localized pockets where we have over two feet. He said he has compared this with drawings that were prepared the last time we dredged the lake. The depths are very similar; he said the extent of it is probably greater now than it was then. It seemed to be isolated more towards the shore line and then it would drop off towards the main body of the lake where now it is more consistent across the lake.

He went on to say that from a depth standpoint we are more or less at the same point we were last time we had a project. He said that he has not gotten to the point where he has calculated any volumes; that would be something he would do in preparation of a bid package. He went on to say that he pulled the old contract; this contract included not only dredged silt out of the lake, but Drake Field Park was used as a point to dewater the material. There was cost involved in preparing and restoring Drake Field; that cost was $175,000.00. The total bid price was

$632,000.00, based on 20,000 cubic yards of silt removal. He said he does not know for certain, if we re-bid it we would have the same price, or more. Just from the magnitude of the size of project we are talking about in the past, this was over a half a million dollars and we could exceed that this time. When the pump station was built, the lake was drained; the lake was dry when they did the dredging; and they were able to get in with earth moving equipment. This was during the drought in 1986 and they just pushed it all to one spot and built an island.

Mr. Jaeger explained that the second time the sediment was removed they built an under drain system of perforated pipe and gravel at Drake Field, piled the silt on top of it, let the water drain out of it, then out of the pipes and back into the lake; then once the silt was dry enough to haul, they loaded it on trucks and hauled it off. They then disassembled the drain system and then restored Drake Field, re-sodded it. Considering what they did and where they did it, it actually went very smoothly. He said that he does not know if that is an option to do that again. He does not know the Cities position on it or if the County would want to entertain doing that again.

Mr. Krakeel asked about other options. Mr. Jaeger said that he thinks you would have to have a provision for hauling wet material. You would have to have sealed trucks and pump it to a point where the truck could haul it.

Mr. Parrott stated that this project, because of the contract the City has, we get the information, we present it to the City and the City decides on whether we can dredge or not. In 1994 and 1995 the City engineer looked at it and said there was no need. So, we did not do it then. He said he does not expect that to be the option this time.

Mr. Jaeger said the last time they dredged the lake, they used a floating barge that sucked the sediment up and pumped it to Drake Field. Then they dumped it out on the drain system and let it dewater. There was no scooping, it was all sucked up. The depths are based on a surveyor with a rod being able to force down through the silt to what he considers to be the bottom.

Mr. Parrott stated that we have a sinking fund that we put money in to do the dredging when it is needed. There are sufficient funds to do this project. Nearly a third of the cost is directly related to having a site to put it to dewater it. Mr. Jaeger will figure up the quantities and the information will be presented to City of Peachtree City.

VIII. BID OPENING – ELECTRICAL MODIFICATIONS TO RAW AND FINISHED WATER PUMPS.

Mr. Jaeger reported that we had two bid openings yesterday, this one for a project to do some electrical modification to the raw and finished water pumps at Crosstown Water Treatment Plant. He said there are two items, the first is to replace a solid state voltage controller which is basically the mechanism that starts

and stops the pump motor on a 600 hp finished water pump. That piece of equipment is currently out of operation. The second item was to replace the variable frequency drive on a 200 hp raw water pump.

Mr. Jaeger said there were three bidders. East Electric Company was the low bidder; they are a contractor we are currently using on the generator connection project. He said we had used them in the past, and they have also been sub-contractor on a lot of work. We are very familiar with them, they are a good contractor and he said he had no problem recommending award to them.

He explained how the bid was set up; the base bid was based on a certain type of equipment to go back into the starter cabinets. We also offered them the opportunity to submit an alternate deductive price for alternate equipment. East submitted both a base bid and an alternate bid. The alternate bid for East was using Square D equipment in lieu of the Allen Bradley equipment that was base bid. There is about a $12,000.00 cost savings by going to the alternate bid equipment. Mr. Jaeger stated that his electrical consultant is very comfortable with Square D; he has no problem with that. The only issue that is still pending is delivery time of the alternate equipment versus base bid. He talked with East Electric yesterday and they told him they hope to have an answer to that this morning.

Mr. Jaeger recommended that we go with the alternate bid and award it to East Electric pending confirmation that it does not create a delay in shipping of the equipment. Getting the pumps back on line as soon as possible is higher priority than saving $12,000.00. If there is a delay in getting the project done by going to the alternate bid, he suggested going with the base bid.

Mr. Parrott stated that the two 600 hp pumps pump to the Crabapple tank. This is the only way we have to get water to the Crabapple tank from the Crosstown Water Plant. The redundancy is down. With technology changes there is a certain degree of modification, the process is not plug and play. Everything we have is starting to get ten, fifteen, twenty five years on it.

Brian Cardoza made a motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to approve East Electrical Company to do the modification in the amount of $36,600.00 for the alternate (Square D Company), pending confirmation that there is not a delay in delivery of equipment that will negatively affect the completion of the project. Vice Chairman Chip Conner seconded and there was no opposition.

IX. BID OPENING – WATERLINE EXTENSION TO LAKE MCINTOSH PARK.

Mr. Jaeger said this was the second bid opened yesterday. This is to get water to the park that is going to be built on Lake McIntosh. It is a two" diameter, essentially a service from the water plant down to the park; there were six bidders, Strack, Inc. was the low bidder. They are a local contractor. He said he thinks they

are a quality contractor and he has no problem recommending award to Strack. The bid was competitive, the numbers were fairly tight. Strack was low at $39,777.76. Based on his review he said that he recommends award to Strack in that amount.

Jack Krakeel made a motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to approve awarding the bid to the low bidder Strack, Inc. in the amount of $39,777.76. Vice Chairman Conner seconded and there was no opposition.

HYDRILLA NEWS ARTICLE.

Mr. Parrott mentioned an article in the Water Committee package about hydrilla and how it affects ducks, geese and eagles feeding on them. We have eagles that show up at Lake Horton. They live at J. W. Smith Reservoir in Clayton County and they come visit us. He went on to say that we don't have much hydrilla because we put out grass carp; we have made an effort to keep it down because it creates taste and odor problems.

CONSOLIDATION OF SERVICES.

Mr. Krakeel reported that he has had an initial meeting with the City Manager of Fayetteville. The Board of Commissioners and the City Council have both given their blessings for the two of them to meet and initiate discussions on consolidating services. Those discussions include fire services, building official and their water system. He said they have had an initial meeting. The City is updating their financial numbers and will be forwarding the information to him in the not so distant future. He said they spoke again yesterday. He thinks there is a sincere interest on behalf of the City to make this work. We will have to see what the final numbers end up looking like; Mr. Parrott will be involved in this in the not too distant future.

Mr. Krakeel went on to say that he does not think our intent has changed from what it was the previous time this was discussed. Should this effort be successful, then we would essentially shut their treatment facility down on First Manasass Mile. We do not have a need for it; have sufficient cross connections and we already sell them a ton of water. According to Mr. Parrott we would be able to service the City without having to utilize that particular plant; which should generate long term savings for both parties. One of the other issues is that previously their staff; he does not know what the total number of staff positions were with respect to this matter, but they have attritioned out a number of positions over the course of the last three years or so. He said he does not think the staffing issue will be as big a concern as it was last time; having to absorb their staff. There will probably be some absorption, but it would not be to the extent that we had previously thought.

Vice Chairman Conner asked what would happen to the treatment plant. Mr. Krakeel said he did not know, they will retain ownership of the treatment plant. He

thinks the way they would like us to approach, rather than a full purchase we have a program similar to what we had for the Town of Brooks. We essentially contract to take care of their water needs. Once you enter into a fifty year contract to run their water system, the limitations they have on their boundaries, it would be very difficult, down the road, for them to re-enter into a water production capability, and a treatment capability. Plus, we would look at transferring their withdrawal rights to us. He asked Mr. Parrott if there was a particular issue with that the last time we went through this. Mr. Parrott said that he did not think so. It looked like we would be able to pump down at Whitewater Creek the additional capacity. We have the pump station built with the extra holes to put in the pumps. We are currently pumping from Whitewater Creek on a daily basis to the Crosstown Plant. That is one of the reasons why our water level has gotten better.

Mr. Krakeel said there will be more discussion over the next 60 to 90 days. It is preliminary at this juncture, but we have received formal approval to move forward with the discussions.

There being no further business, Chairman Pete Frisina adjourned the meeting at 9:35 A.M.

_____
Peter A. Frisina

The foregoing minutes were approved at the regular Water Committee meeting on the 25th day of April, 2012.

_____
Lisa Quick