

WATER COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 22, 2014
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pete Frisina, Chairman
Steve Rapson
Lee Pope
Commissioner Steve Brown
Jimmy Preau

ABSENT:

James K “Chip” Conner, Vice Chairman

NON-VOTING MEMBERS:

Dennis Davenport
Frank Destadio

GUESTS:

Stephen Hogan, Dave Borkowski

STAFF PRESENT:

Russell Ray, Matt Bergen

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Pete Frisina at 8:00 A.M. A request was made to add White Lining and Water System Notes to the agenda. Lee Pope made a motion to add this as number 6, Jimmy Preau seconded and there was no opposition.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 24, 2014.

Lee Pope made the motion and Steve Rapson seconded, to approve the minutes from the meeting on September 24, 2014. There was no opposition.

II. LAKE PEACHTREE UPDATE.

Frank Destadio reported that they are finishing the 60% design review of the dredging. This will be given to Mr. Pope tomorrow; all the survey work that needed to be done has been completed. They have finished the depth analysis, the area times the volume, the depth gives them the volume so they know how much they have to haul out. They have finished all of the soil sampling, which is clean. He said that all the soil samples are clean so the soil can be used, it does not have to be hauled to the contaminated fill area. He said that he has spoken to Mr. Pope and Mr. Rapson; there may be some use within the county. If they know that in advance they can determine how much they would actually have to haul out, and the distance. He went on to say that they are right on schedule for a December bid. He said he thinks tomorrow, after Mr. Pope sees the options that he has, he will be pleased that we are on track with the lake dredging. Even though some people don't think it is ever going to happen, it is actually well on track.

Mr. Rapson commented that he sent an email to the elected officials and to the City Manager in Peachtree City, and gave our Commission an update giving them the fact that we are pretty much on schedule, everything is working really well. The letting for the actual first dirt being moved which is really where he thinks everybody is interested. We are still scheduled to put that out for a December bid

with the first dirt being moved in January. We are still estimating January through May.

Mr. Destadio commented there will be a thirty day, on the street, he does not know how long, to get the contract out and received. But it will be bid in December and soon thereafter you will get work started.

Mr. Pope reported that he received a copy of the Corp permit last night. It states a copy is being mailed to Mr. Rapson and Commissioner Brown, too.

Mr. Rapson went on to say that the next critical path for us is coordinating with GDOT to access Highway 54, getting with the city and laying all that out. Mr. Destadio explained there are two Corp permits, both a 404 and a nationwide permit; both of those came back ok, even though they asked for additional data. He said they have been working with GDOT just to get the access, the curb cut onto Highway 54.

Mr. Rapson commented that he is sure David would like to know what that looks like, where is that road physically going to go, how it is going to egress. Mr. Destadio said that will part of the design review tomorrow. They will show the egress road the City has asked for; where that will be, how that will be constructed; it will be a road that goes across the parking lot, across the grass and they will have to cross the golf cart path and the drainage ditch.

Mr. Rapson stated that once that is all done, we will shoot it to David. Mr. Destadio said they are basically showing the egress route and the plan, they still have to do the quick design for that so they know how much sub base they want, what kind of pipe they want in that drainage area so it doesn't get crushed.

Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Borkowski if they are meeting with the lake association and giving them all the updates. Mr. Borkowski responded that he is not sure about that. Mr. Destadio mentioned that Tom Fulton was at the Planning Commission meeting that he chaired on last week and was asking for status. Mr. Destadio said that he told Mr. Fulton to call and talk to Mr. Borkowski. He said that he told him the design was fine, things were going good, but if he wanted details to call Mr. Borkowski.

Mr. Rapson said that he could forward the email from him to Mr. Fulton. Mr. Destadio commented that we are getting lots of rain; the less water we can drain out of Kedron the better it is going to be as we get ready to start dredging because we need it as dry as possible.

III. TANK MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS UPDATE.

Mr. Pope reported that he has submitted an RFP to Ted in our Purchasing Department. He has reviewed it and came back with three or four questions. He

said that he has answered those questions and got that back to him. He is expecting to have something ready to go out at the end of the month; hopefully get it on one of the Board agendas to get it advertised. He said that he would get Mr. Davenport and Mr. Rapson to review before it is advertised. We want to keep the tanks on a regular maintenance program. This will be a program to initiate that.

IV. WATER LINE EASEMENTS – BRIDGER POINT AND CRABAPPLE LANE.

Mr. Rapson made a motion to table this item until the next meeting. Mr. Pope seconded and there was no opposition.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT.

There was no public comment.

VI. WATER SYSTEM NOTES AND WHITE LINING ORDINANCE.

Mr. Bergen explained that the Water System notes were tabled earlier. We had a request from the Fire Marshal for us to table it until they had a chance to review. They knew they were interested in number 16, as far as hydrant spacing. He said after they read it, everybody is on board with it and they are all ok with how we have worded the spacing on it. The main key for Chief Scarborough was where it says 600' with a variance option, because down in Brooks we do want the option to place at 800' intervals because of the larger parcels. That would fall under the variance and that would not affect any of the developers. We want to add this and then send it over to have Mr. Davenport put it in ordinance format so we can post it to Municode and have it available online for them to access rather than them having to wait for him to get back into the office and send it out to them.

Mr. Destadio commented that it is 600' unless it sits in front of a driveway or something; you move it to the side of the driveway. Mr. Bergen stated that typically what we do is we place them on property lines. That is why it says spacing not to exceed 600' because some of the density issues that they have in Peachtree City, they want to be able to dictate, and the fire code mandates that they do 400' intervals, not to exceed 600', still has them covered in that. The variance gives us the option when we are down in Brooks to not be restricted by 600'. That would be approved through the fire marshal's office. It keeps us out of the driveways. Typically, the fire department carries 1,000 foot of hose, so even 800 foot of spacing is good in those instances. Mr. Bergen commented that we wanted them to have the option when we are going to space them at 800 feet, even we will have to request a variance to be able to do that if we do an extension in house.

Chairman Frisina clarified that Mr. Davenport would put this into ordinance form, and then it would be brought back to the Water Committee for recommendation to the Board of Commissioners.

WHITE LINING ORDINANCE

Mr. Bergen explained that he met with GUCA and some of their members to address some of the issues that they had with our White Lining Ordinance. Some were relevant, some we did not feel were relevant. He said we made some changes. The first change is on the first page, a definition for potholing was added to explain that any recognized soft digging method is recognized under the potholing definition. That was one of the concerns. On the second page under the definitions for large projects, verbiage was added. Mr. Bergen stated that they seemed to be a little confused with the way it was written prior. He said the verbiage was changed to make it read easier. Damages were also changed from 5 to 3 and under the shut-down period, added that we would take into consideration their 12 month record within our service area to determine how long we would shut them down and if we would even shut them down for a damage.

Mr. Bergen stated 3, 4, 5 and 6 stay the same. On page 7, we added the enforcement portion for large projects reference the Public Service Commission rule, how the agreement should read and then our requirement for them on damage prevention; for contractors, excavators and other utilities, to give them the explanation. Basically white lining is going to be mandatory. The only issue that we may have come up in the future, he has discussed with Mr. Davenport; under the definitions for the Public Service Commission, they have electronic and virtual white lining as an option, whereas we are not recognizing it. That may or may not be an issue, but from some of the feedback that he has gotten from other municipalities that could be something that if they are on board with it, once we are completed with it, that may end up going state wide anyway. Unfortunately we are the first ones to do it. We are the guinea pig.

Mr. Rapson commented that he thinks it is fair to say that they are supportive of us doing that, but it is more restrictive and the other folks are not going to like it. We will see how it plays out, if it plays out well, we will make it statewide.

Mr. Bergen explained what virtual white lining is; there is an option to send us an aerial photograph with a white line on it saying this is where we are going to be, but the problem that we run into with that is, if they tell us both sides of the road at the intersection for 200 feet and they send us the drawing, we go out and they have dug 200 feet and we have marked 1,000; we have not accomplished anything.

Mr. Rapson stated in essence, if they only need the 10 feet back to the intersection, now you have done an extra hundred feet on one side and the entire 90 foot on other. Mr. Bergen said that we need them to be more involved to let us know so that we can utilize our resources better. Mr. Rapson stated this is already in red-line form, do we want to move forward with this.

Mr. Davenport said that he would give the committee a little bit of context on what they are looking at. The last time we revisited white lining was back in June. The purpose of doing that was to decrease the tolerance zone from 24 inches to 18 inches

based upon the change in state law. At that time, a red-line version was put together and it included the reduction of the tolerance zone, but it also included additional issues. For the June 26 meeting he put together a two page handout on the dais for all the Board members to see the additional changes. All those changes were voted in on June 26. He said that he brings that to your attention because for example: On the first page of today's handout, potholing was one of the changes that were added on June 26. That is already in the ordinance; that is done. On the second page exceptions to white lining is new information and will need to be added in, if that is your choice to do so. On the third page, where it says large projects, that is new information; A, B, and C. The next page, all of that is already in, that was in the handouts, facility protection, stop work orders and penalties is already in. Really, all you are talking about is the information on the top of page 2, and information at the bottom of page 3 as far as the revisions.

Mr. Davenport went on to say that there is an issue that he needs to make sure that we all have a good handle on, because it is going to be a problem. He said that he wants to make sure that when you make your decision, you realize it is going to be a problem and you are ok with the heat. It is going to cause some heat. When you look at the ordinance as it sits today, on page 1 at the bottom, under C; Examples: Timing. The last sentence at the bottom; electronic virtual white lining is not an acceptable or recognized method. He explained that he and Mr. Bergen talked a lot about that yesterday. He said he understands why he puts this in there the way he does; don't have a problem with his justification. The problem is in state law, state law defines white lining, not regulations, not rules, but state law defines white lining as virtual or white paint. One could say the state is trying to put a regulatory provision in a definition which is bad, but others would say they are trying to show what they mean by white lining with a demonstration. For example: it can be virtual or it can be white paint. If state law says it can be virtual or white paint and we say you can't do virtual, people are going to hang on that and they are going to use that as your chink in the armor to go after any part of your ordinance. That is a major red flag, the reason we are putting that in there and the discussion yesterday was there are really two steps in the white lining process. The people doing the work have to tell us where the work is going to be so we can go out and specifically locate the facilities. If they don't give us anything to go by, we have a 48 hour clock to locate our facilities. Up until now, basically our solution is require them to give us documentation to go by. That is contrary to virtual; virtual basically is not a lot of anything.

Mr. Davenport explained that Mr. Bergen needs that information to locate. He said that he told him if they are using sufficient particularity, they said this over and over at the meeting with the folks here; he said that he even asked them, please provide me the information from the GUPCA web site which state law refers to as providing a definition for sufficient particularity. The response he received was there is no definition for sufficient particularity; he commented that he was not surprised by that. Sufficient particularity is very subjective. The example that he used with Mr. Bergen is if the contractor feels he or she is providing sufficient

particularity because the contractor knows where it is, he or she will say “I provided with sufficient particularity”. Mr. Bergen does not have sufficient particularity to be able to say what he is talking about. The problem is the reference point is to the parcel or tract of land; and that is causing the problem. It is not good enough for you to tell me what parcel or tract of land you are working on; I need to know where on that parcel or tract of land I need to locate, where your job is going to be. We have such a tight time frame to deal with that. All UPC does, they are a clearing, somebody punches a time clock with them and they measure 48 hours. If you haven’t located, that is your problem and you get punished for that. Nobody at UPC looks to determine whether or not there is sufficient information for us to do a locate. It is a given there is sufficient information, whether there is or not. The problem in the regulatory framework and the way it is put in the statute; all the burden is on the locator to know what to do without a lot of information; and a time clock that is running against you. In response to that, we are saying we are prohibiting virtual white lining.

Mr. Davenport stated this is a battle that the focus is going to be on whether or not you can conflict with state law. It is not going to be whether or not you are given proper information, people are going to argue that you are superseding state law and a good number of people will agree with that.

Commissioner Brown asked if we could put restrictions on the virtual lining. Mr. Rapson commented that he thinks any restriction we want is going to have that argument. The problem that he has with that argument is all they have to do is say parcel 12F, and 12F may have a thousand feet of linear frontage and now all of a sudden Matt has to go out and locate a thousand feet, even though you only need twenty foot on that. He said that he thinks they have a weaker argument because it is part of the definition as opposed to part of the code. That is our hook, he said that he thinks that is going to have to be defined; without us stepping up and trying to define it, it is going to have to get defined at some point. That or the counties are going to; he has talked to other county managers; this is an extremely time consuming effort. It is all labor, boots on ground for us out marking and we are marking eighty percent of what does not need to be marked.

Mr. Davenport commented that we have to throw more resources at it than we have proper information. Mr. Destadio asked why can’t you not say “I want to eliminate virtual marking or virtual marking is not acceptable”, but define it more precisely, that if you are going to do virtual marking you have to be within “X” number of feet of the appurtenance that you are going to be working on, or the asset. Make it get it down to that point. You are not eliminating it; you are just making it precise.

Mr. Davenport said that the rub here is the state statute says it has to be sufficient to identify the tract or parcel. That is the only burden the contractor has. Mr. Destadio asked if your ordinance expands upon that. Mr. Davenport said if you are going to prohibit virtual marking, that is one red flag, if you allow virtual marking

and have some type of structure as to what you are requiring, it is a different kind of red flag, but is probably a smaller red flag.

Mr. Rapson suggested instead of saying not acceptable recognized method, you could say electronic virtual white lining is acceptable with a plus or minus margin of ten feet, whatever is reasonable. This way you are not eliminating it, you are watering it down, but you are being a lot more reasonable.

Mr. Davenport commented that watering it down is a lot better than prohibiting. An argument is, it is not a requirement, and it is a definition. He went on to say that Mr. Rapson's point is not lost, when you put something like that in a definition, it is not, per se, regulatory, it is just demonstrative. All we are saying is, you are saying that is called white lining, and this is called white lining; if you are going to do this kind of white lining, you are going to do it this way, if you do that kind of white lining, you do it that way.

Mr. Rapson said that he is sure we have examples of people that are following this that are doing the virtual marking that is not acceptable; in other words, here's a parcel, that's my parcel, that is a thousand feet. He is sure they have people that probably do a pretty decent job with white lining; they say here's the parcel but we only need this fifty feet, which is really what we are looking for. Maybe what we ought to do is put the electronic virtual white lining is only acceptable with a margin of plus or minus ten feet.

Mr. Davenport cautioned that one thing we have to be mindful of, this is something that Matt drove home to him very clearly yesterday; he does not have any input in the virtual method. What happens is, the contractor flips the switch with UPC saying I have put in my locate request. Whether the information is sufficient or not, it does not matter to UPC, they count 48 hours. You are going to have a rough phase where there will be a lot of late locates because we don't have enough information. He said to just keep in mind this is going to spawn some problems with UPC because they are not used to this kind of reaction.

Mr. Rapson stated that our focus needs to be making this a requirement under the proper procedures and policies with the UPC. We can make it our procedure, but they do not necessarily have to follow and agree to that procedure. They are going to get the same pressure we are getting. The difference is, for us it is a third party relationship; for them, it is people they deal with every day.

Mr. Davenport explained that we have to have adequate documentation to show why we are greater than 48 hours on a locate because we can't locate where we don't have sufficient particularity, which was not provided due to virtual white lining which did not follow our procedures. He stated there will be a number of those. After a while, people will get with the program, but it is going to be rough for a period of time; and you are going to get dinged by UPC.

Mr. Bergen explained there is not a mechanism in place for them to submit anything electronic to us through Georgia 811. They would have to submit the ticket and say yes, I am submitting a drawing and then submit that to us separately.

Mr. Rapson asked what do they do now; if they do electronic virtual white lining, what do they do? Mr. Bergen responded that we have not had that happen yet. Mr. Destadio asked what WASA does for sewer. Mr. Hogan replied they do whatever they are asked to do. Contractors go out and put paint on the ground, WASA does not do the virtual.

Mr. Bergen explained that what WASA does is when they get the request they do the same thing we do. They determine if they need to go out and mark it; if they do, then they go and mark it. The problem is, like the one we had at the South Fayette Plant when Comcast went down there; he said yes, we are running a cable in there. Mr. Bergen said that he needs to know exactly where; you are not talking about one pipe on one side of the road, once you get beyond that fence.

Mr. Davenport stated that one thing you need to keep in mind is the language we had in there originally, state law changed in July; not just with the tolerance zone, but with this definition of white lining. Virtual white lining was added in addition to using white paint.

Mr. Rapson stated that he thinks we narrow it based on staffing resources, and we take our lumps and just know they are coming. Mr. Davenport commented that one of the things he and Mr. Bergen talked about yesterday as well is whatever the Water Committee decides, the prudent course would be to take this information and funnel it straight to the people that met with us several months ago. To let them know, this is what we want to take to the Board of Commissioners; to give them a chance to respond to it. Once they respond to it, maybe bring it back to the Water Committee and say look, this is their response, this is what your original direction was, any changes as a result, yes or no.

Mr. Rapson stated that it would be nice to have a compromise that everybody can agree with. It is a whole lot easier for UPC to adopt something that now we have come up with that is a compromise. Mr. Davenport stated this is the contractors association. This is not the UPC folks; this is the folks actually making the request. He said that he does not know the guy that is taking lead with it now; the attorney that was here passed away since our meeting. He does not know how up to speed the new attorney is; he knows once we get the information to Vicki and those folks, they will turn it around. It will probably take a thirty day period, most likely. It would be reasonable to go from here, to there, back to here, before you go to the Board.

Mr. Pope said that he agrees; when we take it to the Board this time, he would like it to be done once and out. Chairman Frisina asked if this needs to be tied back to GIS; is that helpful? Mr. Bergen said no, because at this point what needs to

happen; if they are going to utilize electronic white lining, UPC needs to come up with a method where that drawing comes through them with the ticket. Otherwise, there is no rhyme or reason; there is nothing for us to base what their drawings are going to be.

Mr. Rapson commented that may be one of the reasons why you haven't seen a lot of virtual lining to begin with, because there is no way for UPC to handle it. Mr. Davenport said you do not see drawings otherwise because they put white paint on the ground, you know where the project is going to be. But, you need drawings with virtual. Mr. Bergen said that is correct.

Mr. Davenport stated that he is going to develop some language with Mr. Bergen that kind of goes with the idea that we are talking about to be more restrictive with respect to if you choose virtual this is what you have to do. Probably develop that in the next week or so, take that and send it to the contractor folks and have them submit back to us. Then bring it back to the Water Committee.

MURAL AT CROSSTOWN PLANT

Mr. Rapson explained that as part of the arts project that the County is doing, they are in the process of getting ready to start the mural at the Crosstown Plant. When you first pull into the Crosstown Plant, if you look to your left, you see the settling basins. They are going to pressure wash all that and they are going to do an art mural. He said that he will email a copy of what the mural looks like to the committee. Once the mural is done, a sign will be put up explaining what it is. Primarily, people leaving the McIntosh Park will be able to see it as they are coming out of the park. It is part of the ongoing countywide arts program that we are doing. Commissioner Brown commented that it is a nice aquatic theme.

CUSTOMER CORRESPONDENCE UPDATE

Commissioner Brown asked about comments from Mr. Carr. It looks like he is making a good point. Did we assess what he was saying? Did we look at that? Mrs. Speegle replied that we are still working through that issue. Commissioner Brown asked that the committee be updated once this issue is resolved.

USGS GAUGES

Mr. Preau asked for an update on the gauges that were installed to monitor the water leaving Lake Kedron. Mr. Pope explained the contract goes before the Board tomorrow night. USGS is calibrating them and they are online except for the cfs, it takes thirty to sixty days because it is such a meticulous process for them to make sure it is accurate. He said that we have made no adjustments to gates at Lake Kedron. The reason for that is because they are trying to calibrate the flow that is there now. If we go out there and keep adjusting gauges, it is going to completely mess up their calibration, so we are holding steadfast where we are at. He told Mr. Preau that he can let the residents know that we know we are still over releasing because we have not made any changes. He said that the assumption he can make is

that they will come back with a standard flow; then we will back it back to whatever the minimum is.

Mr. Destadio asked if it is wise to do that before we do the dredging, we are going to want to shut it off as much as we can; obviously we have to keep Flat Creek flowing, but we may have to do it all over again after the dredging. Mr. Pope asked if he is asking if it would be wise to close the gate as we reduce the flow into Lake Peachtree that we are trying to keep dry already. Mr. Destadio said yes. Mr. Pope said that he thinks that would be a good thing, we are trying to keep it as dry as possible anyway.

Mr. Destadio commented that the second part is, if you close them, then does that affect what Paul has done to try to calibrate it and they have to go back in and calibrate it again. Mr. Pope said it would if we messed with it right now. That is why we are not making any changes. He assumes they are pretty close, those gauges have been in place; he spoke to John yesterday. Once they are in place, then they will do a regular monthly check on them.

Commissioner Brown suggested Mr. Pope send some material on what that process is and what we are planning on doing to put out as a press release. That would be a good thing to put out there, so folks around Lake Kedron know what we are doing. Mr. Destadio pointed out it is more than Lake Kedron people. He said that he does not live down there, but he goes down there all the time with his grandkids. Commissioner Brown said this would be good information to get out there.

Mr. Pope said that it is a good idea to expound on what we are doing with USGS altogether; we are upping that partnership for several reasons. It is not only just to manage Kedron and all of our reservoirs, they will be able to give us a gauge height on every reservoir which will give us real time storage so we will know exactly how much water we have. If we get into a drought in the future we will know how much water we have, the state always wants to know days of water storage that you have in place. We are also looking at monitoring the quality of the major creeks as they enter and leave our county. The reason for that is so that we can go back to the state and delist a lot of those that are pre-delisted streams. He said he is working with Vanessa on that and they are going to set up some meetings with Mr. Hogan so that we are all on the same page together. But, as a county we all want to make sure we are taking care of those streams. We should be able to show that we are improving the waters as they flow through this county, and he thinks we are. We just don't have the data in place to show that. If we are able to show that, then we can delist these streams, which is very important. It could minimize the amount of monitoring we have to do as well as show people that we are improving the quality of the water as it flows through our county.

Commissioner Brown commented that is definitely a good press release. Mr. Rapson said if you get the press release drafted up, then they can mention it

Thursday night when they approve the monitoring and it goes hand in hand with that.

Mr. Preau commented that helps, because the concern has been that it appears that we are trying to keep Lake Peachtree drained, yet they are releasing a lot of water from Kedron into Peachtree. Kedron is virtually dry, how can Kedron be dry, when we are releasing water into Peachtree which we want to be dry. We want one dry and we want one full.

Mr. Pope mentioned that Peachtree City has a project on a bridge that they are going to have to do. They need the reservoir actually lower. He asked Mr. Borkowski to talk about what they are doing. Mr. Rapson suggested putting that in the press release saying in conjunction to this that Peachtree City is working on a bridge. Mr. Borkowski explained about the bridge that goes over the little finger of Kedron; what they were trying to do this winter was to clean and paint the pyles and the cross bracing on that bridge. They are rusted pretty good. That is going to require that the lake level be very low to expose all that steel; lower than what it is now.

Commissioner Brown stated that we definitely need to give them a heads up. Mr. Preau said that you really need to let the residents know what is going on. Mr. Pope said that we are already trying to calibrate gauges as well as it is benefiting something that Mr. Borkowski has coming, too.

Mr. Borkowski asked if it is going to be more beneficial to wait until the spring to do the cleaning and painting. If we are really going to be doing that dredging in January... Mr. Rapson stated that we are doing the dredging in January. Mr. Borkowski said if we have any storms we will be releasing a lot of water to keep that lake level down. He said there may be some give that has to be done on his end.

Mr. Pope stated that what Mr. Borkowski is saying is we are going to be trying to hold that lake at a lower level, and if we have a major storm or we have water come through there, we have to release it and we will be flooding out the dredging. Mr. Destadio commented that if we are dredging you are not going to release water down there. That is the cheapest way for the City, to go ahead and drain the water, but you can also isolate some of those pylons without draining the water. It cost more money to do it, but you can do that and therefore expose the pylons to let you do the maintenance.

Mr. Rapson asked Mr. Borkowski how long is the project. Mr. Borkowski stated that it has not been put out for bid yet, so he has no feedback from the contractor on how long that would take. Mr. Rapson said if he is on a thirty day bid cycle, and it is a sixty day project, then that is ninety days. If you are going to keep the lake drained, and use the cheaper approach, then you are looking at Kedron being drained a lot lower than what it is now for ninety days. It may be that now is not

the time to do that. Mr. Destadio commented that maybe you delay the dredging until after that is done. Mr. Rapson stated that we are not delaying the dredging.

Mr. Borkowski stated that he agrees that the dredging needs to be the priority. Mr. Pope commented that he thinks the spring would be good for this, if he is comfortable waiting a few months. He said that he does not think they have a sense of urgency about it. Mr. Borkowski stated that he can wait until the spring if they need to.

Mr. Destadio pointed out the schedule for the dredging, it won't be done until May, and so it is not a few months. Mr. Rapson clarified the timing on this project. We start turning dirt in January, we are not finished until May, so the dredging is from January until May, assuming we have a spillway solution, it may be right after that is a good time, because at that point all the water would be flowing to Peachtree.

Mr. Destadio said there is the second survey, he asked what part of the contract includes after it is dredged is to re-survey so that you know the exact bottom. Mr. Rapson suggested expediting that part and hopefully if the spillway gets fixed, we are filling up Lake Peachtree and that would be an ideal time to keep Kedron down.

Mr. Rapson asked Mr. Borkowski if that makes sense; if we know we are going to finished with the dredging around May, if he could do all his bids so that he is ready to go in June with that project. In June, hopefully, if we have the spillway fixed and we are filling up Lake Peachtree, we are going to be keeping Kedron dry.

Commissioner Brown commented that the social community dynamics is at the time when most people are going to want to use the lake, you are going to drain. We need to take that into consideration, too. Mr. Rapson said that he is sure Peachtree City will take that into consideration. Mr. Pope said that we are not draining Kedron we are bringing it down to a level for them to do some maintenance. Commissioner Brown stated that the people who live around it are going to say we are draining the lake. It is pretty dry now. Mr. Destadio stated that the Smokerise side will be pretty well drained. To get to the pillars underneath, you are going to have to have the Smokerise side pretty low; that is the shallowest part. That will drain down to get water on the other side to get those pillars free.

Commissioner Brown stated that we have got to send a press release out well in advance of doing that, whenever that date is. Our phones will light up; he said he will get cell phone calls from people like crazy. Let's make sure that we get that out there, that this is going to happen and give them a realistic picture of what it is going to look like.

Mr. Destadio referred to the email that was sent out with the schedule that has been going out has been to the City for quite some time. The City needs to look at that schedule and decide how they want to fit their project into it. Mr. Rapson stated that our schedule for dredging has not changed.

Russell Ray said to keep in mind one of the scenarios from the drought; if you bring it down ten feet in the spring and then we have a dry summer, it won't fill back up. Mr. Pope said they could probably have this done before we start in January. Mr. Rapson said if they are going to do that, it would be nice if Peachtree City put a press release out saying Kedron is being drained because of this bridge project. Mr. Pope commented that he is sure they will after this discussion.

There being no further business, Chairman Pete Frisina adjourned the meeting at 8:45 A.M.

Peter A. Frisina

The foregoing minutes were approved at the regular Water Committee meeting on the 12th day of November, 2014.

Lisa Speegle