

WATER COMMITTEE
JULY 10, 2013
MINUTES

<u>MEMBERS PRESENT:</u>	James K “Chip” Conner, Vice Chairman Steve Rapson Tony Parrott
<u>ABSENT:</u>	Pete Frisina, Chairman Brian Cardoza
<u>NON-VOTING MEMBERS:</u>	David Jaeger Dennis Davenport
<u>STAFF PRESENT:</u>	Russell Ray
<u>GUESTS:</u>	Stephen Hogan, WASA Raymond Thomson, Jacobs

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chairman Chip Conner at 8:00 A.M.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MEETING ON JUNE 26, 2013.

Commissioner Steve Brown made the motion and Tony Parrott seconded, to approve the minutes from the meeting on June 26, 2013. There was no opposition.

II. MIEX UPDATE.

Mr. Parrott reported the samples have been taken. Orica and CH2MHill are working on protocols; they are running the same thing. He said they had correspondence yesterday between the two of them on a variety of items.

Mr. Jaeger commented that the question was, in order to test for disinfection byproducts you have to simulate water that has been aged in the distribution system. The question became, what was the aging period, typically it is a seven day simulation. What temperature, what pH and what was the residual chlorine level that we were targeting of the disinfection byproduct evaluation. He said that

CH2MHILL responded to that late yesterday and he will forward it on to Orica so they are all measuring the same parameters for the disinfection byproducts.

Mr. Parrott explained that because of the notice that we had to send out on our violation of total trihalomethanes this is part of what will help solve future notices on that. Whatever we do, whether we continue with MIEX or do something else, we are going to have to do something in order to come into compliance. We are going to send out another notice of violation next quarter because; mathematically there is no way to meet the standard with a good reading. Across the board, with the eight sites we have a good reading will not generate an average running annual average that will take care of it.

Commissioner Brown commented that he thinks it was a good thing that we got ahead and did the press release and put that in with the bill. He said that he got a couple of good comments from folks about it. Having the press release and getting it up front, it wasn't a shock when they saw the notice, so that was a good idea.

III. PRESENTATION OF STATE LAB REPORTS.

Mr. Parrott distributed copies of reports for information on this item. He explained that Commissioner Brown gets a copy of these reports because he is the "owner" of the system. He gave an overview of the different reports that are received each month. TOC's are done monthly; the Crosstown Water Plant report shows the raw water and the finished water. Raw water includes alkalinity and what the total organic carbon was, which was 2.8. The next page shows that we reduced it to 1.8. The standard is that you have to reduce by 35%. Page 3, is the compliance determination form that is computed; this shows the alkalinity, the raw TOC and the treated TOC. We wind up with a removal of 35.7. Looking at the last column which is compliance, there is a Yes. Up above that there are 4 No's. How do you get 4 No's and not pass? Alternative compliance is when your treated water has TOC that is less than 2, and no matter what the percentage is, it passes. And, you can also have a running annual average that is less than 2 to meet the compliance. In the cases that we did not just meet it on those 4 No's above the YES (printed on the report), we either passed because we had a treated TOC under 2, but we did not have the 35% removal; or we had a running annual average that was under 2. He went on to say that we have to have 35% removal (column A on the report). When we had 23.1% in December 2012, we reduced it to 2 and that got us by in alternative criteria for compliance. This is a standard that is not really an MCL (Maximum Contaminant Level), this does not have a set number, it floats.

Mr. Rapson asked if this is why we did not get "gigged" in January 2012, because we are under 2, but even though we were at 36. Mr. Parrott said, yes. We have to remove 35 and better, anything 35 and higher gets us through. Mr. Parrott went on to say that he wanted to give an idea of how much work we are doing on TOC's on our end, he referenced the summary report from June from the Water System where we checked TOC's at both plants and came up with our own number on our own machine. This report shows where we test every day to give us an idea of what is going on, we had a Techmar Dorman 8,000, the same machine the state was using, the state upgraded and we have since upgraded. EPD got 36 on day 5, we got 41, and ASI (private lab) got 29. Mr. Parrott stated that TOC is a little volatile, no matter what you do in collection; it is difficult to achieve the same numbers. That is what the standard was built on. They built the standard on three different machines, from the same sample, from the same day. We hand carried to the EPD and to ASI the same day that we collected the samples. We cannot get the same numbers. If you don't make your compliance numbers, you wind up with a notice of violation and you get to report that to all your customers, which we have had to do before.

Further discussion pertained to the test average that runs by the quarter to get your numbers, and then an annual running average to get a yes on the Compliance Determination Report.

Mr. Parrott explained that the TOC levels that we have are what goes out in the system with the chlorine that creates our next problem, which is our trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids. Mr. Parrott explained the laboratory report for THM's and HAA's. He said that you take the number for THM's, a 46 and 9.9, add this up and you get 55.9 which is under 80 and you are in compliance. Mr. Parrott then referred to the report on the location that did not pass that generated our THM's. The second quarter was 92, third quarter was 131, fourth quarter was 89, and the first quarter this year was 93 and then 118. We had an annual running average of 101.9 and 108.2. That is what we got "dinged" on. However, looking at the HAA's it passed. Mathematically, there is no way that we will be in compliance the next quarter.

Further discussion pertained to the age of the water in the pipe. Mr. Parrott explained that if you have a subdivision, such as this one, that has water coming in and going out four different streets, they dead end and you have houses out there; they have quit watering because it is rain season, or it is wintertime, the water stays longer. Even with us flushing everything every six months, it is not sufficient. He said that we are going to take the three highest places we have with the THM's and we are going to start flushing them on a more aggressive schedule to see if this will help. The locations are picked based on distance from the water plant on given lines. What you wind up with is all eight locations are places where the age of the water would be us guessing, a long time. Because three of these things are pretty high, we did a good job of picking where they are supposed to be. Then we submit them, the state looks at it and then says that is where you are going to collect. The age of the water is a major factor and also this subdivision has a twenty inch pipe going in it to a water tank site that is not there. Mr. Parrott stated that we will be making some adjustments on flushing. He said that we cannot test for this. Some of those that spike drop back down. It is hard to tell when flushing; we have an area in North Fayette that has a loop. He said that he has Distribution checking to be sure all the valves are open and the flow is good. That could solve part of the problem. It is a difficult standard; we go from treating the water that has mostly dissolved TOC's, chlorinating it and winding up with a THM problem. Our goal has been, in working with the project that we had; that we wound up with the MIEX to reduce the TOC's leaving the plant, which would reduce the amount of THM's. Once we finish with this peer review we will know where we are going.

IV. GAPS IN WATER SERVICE IN THE DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM.

Mr. Parrott explained that we have a start with GIS, he showed the fire hydrant level on the screen. It shows where the fire hydrants are in the system. He said that we have gaps, he pointed out the subdivisions that are off the left hand side of Gingercake Road, such as Beverly Manor and Winding Way. It comes all the

way back to Whitewater Creek, and then nothing crosses because there is no bridge, then Forest Hills. He pointed out the Pinewood Property; there are no fire hydrants because the water line stops at the school site because the Board of Education had to pay to get the waterline extended to the school site. We have water going up Flat Creek which is the way the water goes from Crosstown to the 92 tank. So we had development along Flat Creek Trail because the waterline went to the tank. There are not hydrants in the area that has not been developed. When it develops, whoever develops it will have to participate and pay for the water. Mr. Parrott said that we have a 20" line coming down and we will participate between what they need for an eight inch or ten inch line, or whatever they need to continue the 20" on down to Highway 54. We have places similar to this all over the county just because of the way the development is run. He pointed out the area that was put in 100% by the developer and donated to the Water System. Every one of the subdivisions off Flat Creek Trail were 100% funded. We now will extend the waterline down and charge all the homeowners a frontage fee, plus the meter, to get water down into a subdivision. In the past, one person would have to pay to do the waterline extension and then they would get reimbursed when the neighbors tied on, but that got very difficult. Now, we front the money and we get the money back without having to deal with property owners. Mr. Parrott mentioned that Huie Bray did an extension several years ago. He passed this lady's house and he decided that he just wanted her to have a meter and tap with no reimbursement. However, we have had others that are just adamant that they will pay exactly half of what the line extension cost was. Then the next one that tied on would have to pay back each one of the first two. We are down to the last year and a half of that ten year reimbursement policy. He went on to say that Adams Road has a gap.

Mr. Rapson asked about the distance between hydrants within a subdivision. Mr. Parrott stated that when he started, Highway 54 from Peachtree City to Fayetteville, a hydrant was placed once a mile, then they went to 800 feet as a standard. The fire department got it reduced to 400 feet, but the Board approved the fire department paying for the fire hydrants out of the fire fund since they wanted them every 400 feet. We would put them in and the fire department would reimburse the Water System for the fire hydrants. We are now at 600 feet for the current standard. The difference is, a fire hydrant is not always at the very end of the cul-de-sac, because of the standard in the 70's. The standard when they were installed on Flat Creek, the fire hydrant is at the very end so that you can flush even for the last two houses at the end of a cul-de-sac. The developers did not like it because they had to run another hundred feet of pipe to get through the cul-de-sac. City of Fayetteville's standard is closer than the county. Mr. Parrott stated that they will let you build lot line to lot line, leaving just enough space to run a lawn mower through and cut both neighbors' yard at the same time. Building that close, you need an extra hydrant or two. The Pinewood Entrance is located at an existing fire hydrant. Water is available at their first entrance, but when they come down further, they will have to run a line extension for service.

Mr. Parrott pointed out on the map the Sandy Creek Road area that still has no water. This area will fill in as wells go out. He went on to say that the water came into Adams Road through Swanson Road to a subdivision and stopped, then came down from Sandy Creek and then came north up from Tyrone Road. We have gaps in between, but it will fill in depending on how the wells do. The only reason there is no fire hydrant is that there is no water line. We have over 600 miles of piping and the majority of the six and eight inch pipe was put in by the developers.

V. LAKE PEACHTREE DREDGING.

Mr. Parrott reported that we finally got notice back from the Corp of Engineers about the project. They basically said that we are ok. Mr. Jaeger stated that we are not under their jurisdiction. There is no permit required by the Corp for the dredging project. He said that this is an amazing result. Mr. Parrott said that we are at the point in this process where we need to do a bid and get a contractor, watch over it and get it done. One of the things that we did not do is that Mr. Jaeger's approval was to get us to this point and the Board did not get to the point of approving Mr. Jaeger to do the bid and project management on this job because of the amount of time it took to get to this point, it has taken a year and a half.

Mr. Rapson stated that he and Mr. Jaeger have talked about this and he asked Mr. Jaeger to get him a cost estimate of what the project management fees would be. Then we would compare that to if we went out and tried to do a procurement to do the project management. He said that a dredging is done every ten or fifteen years, and our Purchasing Department does not have the expertise to do project management for that. The lion's share of the problem with doing a dredging project is going through the Corp which has pretty much been done. At this point it is just the oversight of coordinating with the City. He said that he and Commissioner Brown were with the City when we did the last dredging, so they kind of understand a bit more than what the other Board members will. Ultimately, you have the site preparation of how that is done, where all that is coordinated, all the coordination effort with Peachtree City and then the actual oversight of making sure that someone is looking at the quantities coming out and how the sludge is removed, where it goes.

Mr. Parrott explained that part of the other coordination is that Drake Field and Lake Peachtree are used more now than they were ten years ago. They have the triathlon event, plus they have other events down at Drake Field. Commissioner Brown said that it is an off leash dog thing now, too. A lot of people take their dogs down there. Mr. Rapson said that he has always wondered, even when they did it the last time, why they didn't use the side over at the conference center. That is real easy to do, there is a big field actually adjacent to that island that was built with all the sludge they had last time. That is an easy one to do, but the other side, do you use the tail end of down by all children's play park as opposed to Drake Field. It would pretty much take either one of those out of the loop for that period of time.

Mr. Parrott stated that you could figure six months. Mr. Jaeger commented that there is also coordination with GDOT for an entrance off of Highway 54, which last time we built a temporary construction entrance off of Highway 54 so that we didn't come through the parking lot of the City Hall. That has to be coordinated and then restore it once it is finished.

Mr. Rapson suggested that Mr. Jaeger give him an estimate of what the PM and all that would be and then he will compare that to what it cost last year and then take it to the Board. Mr. Jaeger said that he has asked for some assistance from Finance on what the billings were last time we did this. It was some time ago and before he had access to the billing records for the company, so he does not have those records in house. Mr. Rapson said that we will proceed accordingly from there. If they think it is reasonable and they can reach an understanding, they will bring it back to the Water Committee for approval and recommendation to the Board of Commissioners for approval. He said that this is a niche thing; there are not a lot of people that do that type of stuff. The fact that the Corp is not involved makes it a whole lot easier.

Mr. Rapson asked about the impact of this on TOC's when you are churning up all that water. Mr. Parrott replied that it takes that source out of service for six months. They don't make much of a problem, but we have options. In the middle of July if we were to hit 17 MGD for averages, we could have a problem. Mr. Jaeger said they use a vacuum dredge, usually, so you are pulling the sediment instead of mixing it or disturbing it as much. Mr. Rapson said last time they had a mini barge and it worked pretty well. They opened the road, closed the road, resodded and a couple of Japanese maples had to be replaced. Mr. Jaeger said that we were braced for a very difficult project because of how visible it was, and it was really smooth. We were very pleased.

VI. ANNUAL CONTRACT FOR WATERLINE EXTENSIONS.

Mr. Rapson said that he had Mr. Burgess start to pull together an RFP for the waterline extensions. When he got the first draft of the type of construction documents and the type of professional management and construction management, stuff you had to put together, Mr. Burgess learned really quickly that he really didn't have the expertise on his staff or was aware of anybody that had the expertise to put this out. Mr. Rapson said that he suggested to go ahead, since we are getting ready to put the broker of engineer for the Water System out for service, that we would go ahead and use our existing broker of record to do this particular one. We only do these projects based on resident's requests to do waterline extensions, so it is kind of hit or miss to begin with, but that would be a typical thing that the engineer of record for the Water System would do. He said that he suggested going ahead and awarding the contract. He said that we are trying to get the cost estimates for that. It is kind of hard to put a cost estimate to it, because you don't know what waterline extensions you are going to do. He said that he went back and looked at

the last dozen or so that we have done and it seemed like a no brainer that it was done by the hour and the more lines that were extended, the more people involved, the more it cost. There was nothing unreasonable with any of those costs. He said that his recommendation to Mr. Burgess, and Mr. Burgess agreed, was to go ahead and let Mallett Consulting do the waterline extension. He said that he does not know if we need a contract, but wanted to put it on the board so that we discuss it because he wanted Commissioner Brown and Mr. Davenport to hear what was going on at the same time. But, the existing contract contemplates this being done already, so he does not think that we need to do anything from the Board of Commissioners perspective, but he did not want to do that in the darkness of night, either. He said that he wanted to let the Board know that is their thought process and how they arrived there. He said that he wanted to get the Water Committee's approval to say yes that makes sense to us, too.

Commissioner Brown asked what we are anticipating for waterline extensions. Mr. Parrott said that we don't know. Mr. Rapson gave the example of we had \$750,000.00 last year for the construction contract. Most of Mr. Jaegers billing was in the \$9,000.00 to \$12,000.00 range based on individual segments that made up when those things would come. What Mr. Jaeger is billing for is basically the project management, oversight and he also, to some extent, has some oversight in regards to making sure that whatever they said they were going to build.

Mr. Jaeger stated they oversee the construction and approve the pay requests. They prepare the initial bid package that the contractors bid on to be the annual contractor. It is basically job by job as it comes up, the County accepts the request from the public to extend a line and then they are given some preliminary information to develop the drawings for the contractor to build it from. It is hourly billing.

Mr. Rapson said that looking at Mr. Jaeger's total billings for the year; it was roughly 5 or 6 percent of his entire billings for the year. Altogether it was less than \$40,000.00 for the \$750,000.00 that was done. For us to get a contractor to do the PM side and the CM side, we would also have to hire a third party to develop the contract documents that go out to tell them this is the waterline we want done and this is how we want it done. The problem is we don't have the expertise to do that. We would have to go out and get professional contracts for those. Those are typical things. He said what he had Mr. Burgess do in the RFP for the engineer broker of record; was put those type of aspects in as a Scope of Services so that whoever we select knows part of what we want them to do is to do these types of things on an hourly rate.

Commissioner Brown asked if we need a contract for that. Mr. Rapson said that we already have a contract for that; there is a contract for Mallett Consulting that incorporates that. He said that he thinks when we get the next engineer broker of record; it will be in that contract as well. The RFP for engineer of record is close to going out within the next week.

Commissioner Brown asked if we establish this as a contract up until we bring on the broker of record. Mr. Rapson said yes, ultimately we may not do anything for six months. It is up to the residents to request the waterline extensions. Mr. Parrott said we had two one year and another year we had probably ten. We are talking about 600 or 1,200 feet at a time. None of them are over 2,500 feet, because we got the Department of Natural Resources to approve that Mr. Jaeger can approve the line extension up to 2,500 feet. After 2,500 feet it has to go to the state. Mr. Parrott said that Bernard Road is coming up. Mr. Jaeger stated that it is under the existing contract, so it won't be in the July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014 contract. Mr. Rapson commented that we may not have any before we get a broker of record, and at that point the broker of record would be in charge of waterline extensions.

STOCKBRIDGE NEWS ARTICLE

Commissioner Brown asked about the Stockbridge news article. Mr. Parrott explained that this is next to our wetland site. The biggest green space they have on that part of town is our wetland site. It goes up the creek on the other side from our wetland site. They took the floodplain wetland swamp on that side of the creek and that is what their greenspace is. It matches up to ours. The residents probably think that the whole great big area is theirs. You can't walk over it, it has too much water, but it is a great site right next to the City.

Commissioner Brown asked if we allow the City access to that site. Mr. Parrott stated that no one is allowed, it is completely fenced; on occasion before the subdivision on the Stockbridge side, we would have problems with deer hunters, because there were still some areas in there that were dry. He said that we would disassemble the tree stands.

There being no further business, Vice Chairman Chip Conner adjourned the meeting at 8:45 A.M.

James K. Conner

The foregoing minutes were approved at the regular Water Committee meeting on the 24th day of July, 2013.

Lisa Speegle