

WATER COMMITTEE
MARCH 26, 2014
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pete Frisina, Chairman
James K “Chip” Conner, Vice Chairman
Steve Rapson
Lee Pope
Commissioner Steve Brown

NON-VOTING MEMBERS:

Dennis Davenport
Frank Destadio

GUEST:

Jimmy Preau, Lake Kedron HOA
Ben Ferguson, Camp Southern Ground

STAFF PRESENT:

Russell Ray
Matt Bergen

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

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MEETING ON MARCH 12, 2014.

Vice Chairman Chip Conner made the motion and Commissioner Steve Brown seconded, to approve the minutes from the meeting on March 12, 2014. There was no opposition.

II. OPTIMIZATION PLAN UPDATE.

Mr. Pope reported that we have received more approval from the state for some of our tests that we are doing with some chemicals at the water treatment facilities. Also, they are approved for a temporary feed system for sodium hypochlorite system on the filters at South Fayette. We have ordered the parts to implement that. The chemical vendor who is currently supplying us with chlorine is going to supply us with a containment system so that we don’t have to buy any containment; they are being very accommodating with the test procedure. We have also received a sample of ferric sulfate which is a coagulant that we will be testing to see how that works in jar tests. We will probably do some seasonal testing and then do a full blown in plant test, maybe fall of next year. You never want to start that at the beginning of a high demand season. We will probably look at doing a coagulant change next fall.

Mr. Pope went on to say that everything at the plant is looking up; we are making a lot of improvements. We have made a lot of repairs and gotten some things back in better order.

Mr. Destadio asked if part of the Optimization Plan will be the ultimate decision at the Retreat on the CIP projects. Mr. Rapson commented that is absolutely correct. We are in the process of finalizing the Capital Plan this week; and get it published.

Mr. Destadio commented that there were items that were on the Sanitary Survey identified that you need to make sure that EPD are aware of what the plans are going to be. Mr. Rapson said that our Capital Plan will go way beyond the deficiencies that were identified as part of the consent order. Mr. Destadio said that is great, as long as you cover what they've got. Mr. Rapson said that we are going to cover all of that and more. Probably roll it out to EPD, go up there and systematically go through the process. It is a lot.

Mr. Rapson went on to say that we have narrowed the descriptions in the Capital Plan; those items are being prioritized between critical that need to be done immediately, then high and medium. We will be ranking those accordingly.

Mr. Destadio commented that will just continue with the great relationship that we have with EPD. Mr. Pope commented that he wants to make sure they are satisfied with our list. He is confident about the relationship and that they will accept it. Mr. Rapson said that it is well beyond; it is probably a fifteen to twenty year type plan.

Mr. Destadio stated that no one is expecting you to do it all; at least the Sanitary Survey critical items. Mr. Rapson said that it is a good road map for us to move in the future. He said that he equates it to the SPLOST projects that failed with the Stormwater Utility. The good thing about it was that he had a very good prioritized list of Stormwater related type projects that now, the staff can pick up and we can actually systematically start doing it; the same philosophy for the Water System.

Mr. Rapson commented, for the record, to give the Plant Managers as well as Russell Ray kudos for pulling a lot of that stuff together. He said that he is not so far removed from doing that himself ten years ago that he does not understand how much of a long drawn out effort that is on their part.

III. LAKE PEACHTREE DREDGING.

Mr. Rapson explained that the Lake Peachtree dredging project is also a Retreat item on April 4. He said that there is a copy of the position paper in the Water Committee package and he went through the power point presentation for the committee.

Mr. Rapson said that he talks about the purpose of the dredging project, why dredge. The options are dredging the dry lake bed, and then give the pros and concerns for one approach versus option 2, which is a filled lake dredging. Then they will talk about the components of a filled lake dredging. Option 3 is one of things being added from the Board of Commissioners as well as Peachtree City, which is what can we do to mitigate dredging's in the future. He said that he thinks this also gives Peachtree City some a la carte options in regards to if they want to go beyond the dredging project and do some stream mitigation type things. He said that he thinks working with them and working with their Stormwater folks, they will be able to get a better product at the end of the day. He said that the Board will be looking at those options and giving us the direction on which approach they want

to use. At that point we will have meetings with Peachtree City, and start drawing a time line so everybody can understand what the next step is.

Mr. Pope stated that the pictures on the power point presentation were not from our area. They were just showing a little bit about stream bank restoration; so people can understand how they take an area and mitigate it.

Mr. Destadio commented that one of the pictures is very similar to the area over by Flat Creek, just after the dam. It looks very much like that.

Commissioner Brown stated that he thinks we are going to have to start working with some of those private entities about how they need to maintain and repair the buffer. You cannot cut the grass to the edge of the creek.

Mr. Destadio commented that he has a couple of suggestions to add to the power point. Commissioner Brown suggested adding a bullet point on the partnership slide for the private property owners; in terms of communications on how they should maintain that buffer. Mr. Pope stated the only reason he put those on the slide is because they will be funding partnerships; they are willing to spend money.

Commissioner Brown commented that getting them to do the right thing is just about as good as spending money. We are paying for it on the downstream side if they don't do it right. Mr. Rapson agreed this could be added.

Mr. Rapson announced that everyone is welcome to join them on April 4 at the Retreat. It will be at New Hope South on Highway 74.

IV. CAMP SOUTHERN GROUND.

Dennis Davenport explained that this has gone through some kind of evolution from when we first started till today. He said that he wants to make sure that everybody is on the same page, where we are going. Because, initially, we talked about having an inter-governmental agreement so that Camp Southern Ground could take advantage of some possible cost savings through donations of time and/or materials through the contractors association. That was our first challenge, to put together some type of IGA to recognize that relationship. Our next step was to look at our waterline extension vendor; because that is who we typically use in waterline extensions. We already have costs and unit prices for everything. We find out after the fact that it turns out that those costs and unit prices probably are less expensive than the other route; fraught with less risk as well; the other route being the donations of time and materials.

Mr. Davenport said that he wants to understand what the relationship should be, not so much that that the county is contracting with Camp Southern Ground in order to do the waterline project through our waterline extension vendor and others. It is now just your normal waterline extension project where the county uses

its waterline extension vendor to perform the work and receives a certain level of contribution from Camp Southern Ground. He asked if that is where we are now.

Mr. Rapson said yes. Mr. Davenport said, if that is the case, there is no need for an IGA between us and Camp Southern Ground because this is what we would do with a waterline extension vendor anyway. We put waterlines in the ground. However, there probably should be some basic agreement for timing of payment; how much is going to be paid and when it is going to be paid. Having nothing to do with the actual duties and responsibilities of installing the waterline, getting permits, etc. That would be all up to the county and the county's waterline extension vendor to do that.

Mr. Rapson asked if that isn't the normal process now, that if there is a contribution for a waterline extension; don't they pay at the end of the project? Mr. Bergen explained that they pay at the beginning; that starts the entire process.

Mr. Ferguson explained that the point of the agreement, as far as the amount, they went through the breakdown of where the dollars would come from. Subsequent to the February 6 meeting there was one line item, it included the vault assembly. He said they thought everything else looked to be...we will take our savings up front, forego any contributions or in kind donations and cut right to the chase with Shockley. The vault, they thought was excessive, so they put it out for pricing and confirmed their suspicions. They went back and Shockley (or whoever) agreed and said yes, we can match that pricing, around \$10,000.00 difference. Then they had \$50,000.00 that they agreed on as a contingency fund; suitable soils and the like. They just need some type of mechanism to insure as they spend that contingency, that they can account for that and know, as they eat into that contingency he has to be responsible for spending that money. That is the only mechanical way to achieve that. He said that he does not want to get a bill for the entire amount, including the contingency and then how could the contingency have evaporated.

Mr. Davenport stated that he wants to understand the contingency issue. What is the contingency issue on a normal waterline extension? Is that what we do with normal waterline extensions? Mr. Bergen said since there is no reimbursement, if we run into unsuitable materials; that is something that we cover.

Mr. Davenport said that the point he is making is we are trying to hang onto issues in the original relationship that don't really apply when you transform this to a normal waterline extension. If there is an unsuitable soils contingency and the county and you agree with that; that should be something separate and apart from payment for the actual cost of the waterline. It is a variable, and it is risk that you are willing to absorb and we are willing to work with you as far as that is concerned. Other than the \$50,000.00 unsuitable soils contingency, there is a hard number for the waterline. He said that hard number needs to be paid pursuant to an agreement unless you are going to wind up paying it up front. He said that he is trying to keep it to a less complex relationship.

Mr. Rapson suggested, to keep it simple, he said that we know what the contribution amount should be, less the contingency. That should be paid up front; that will take care of that issue. As far as the contingency is concerned, who approves the amount of the contingency; is that something the county approves? What he doesn't want is to get into a situation where we are "boots in the ground", we approve a contingency for \$14,000.00 and you all turn around and say you think \$14,000.00 is too much.

Mr. Destadio commented that there is one other issue, how it falls in this plan. Mr. Rapson asked how we are going to handle the contingency. They can give us \$50,000.00 up front and then see the draws that we have done and we will write a check at the very end. He said that we need to resolve this particular issue.

Mr. Davenport suggested that since we have most everything handled and we just have the contingency and the issue that Mr. Destadio wants to talk about. It is probably better suited after the meeting, just have a conversation and hammer those things out.

Mr. Destadio said there were two things, when they were asked to take a look at the design that Integrated Science did, they had some comments on the design. He said that he does not know if they are going to result in Integrated Science changing the design or making modifications. Does the county pay for that or does Camp Southern Ground.

Mr. Davenport asked if there are going to be changes made to the design. Mr. Destadio said he does not know what was decided. They asked the question are we going to send it in before the permit or after the permit. Mr. Bergen said no, if there is anything on there that needs to be changed by ISE, they are responsible for making those changes.

Mr. Davenport asked if there is anything that needs to be changed by ISE. Mr. Destadio said that he thinks there are comments that they should review and decide, based on the assumptions that they have given, they thought there were some things that ought to be looked at.

Mr. Rapson said that he thinks all those issues have to be resolved through our Engineer of Record. Mr. Destadio said that there is also the permit; they had most of it filled out, there were some things they needed to get from Mr. Bergen such as ID numbers. He asked if the county is paying for the application for the permit.

Mr. Davenport asked what we do in normal waterline extensions. Mr. Destadio stated that the applicant normally pays for it. Mr. Bergen stated that is rolled into the cost. Mr. Davenport clarified that it is the cost of the actual waterline extension itself. Mr. Bergen said that we don't have a line extension that requires it. Since we are disturbing more than one acre we are required to get that.

Mr. Davenport suggested after the meeting, go through the three issues – contingency, engineer design and permit; and that should be the end of it. Mr. Destadio said the he thinks having Integrated Science do the design, so that if there are any changes, then Integrated Science would do that for you. Mr. Rapson said that he thinks so, too.

V. REQUEST FROM MR. NEWHART – 600 JANICE DRIVE.

Mr. Pope explained that this is about a piece of property that the county, he does not know if we actually condemned the property, but we did purchase it for road work. Mrs. Speegle commented that Janice Drive was part of the West Fayetteville bypass. Mr. Pope stated they gave him fair market value and he was pleased with that whole situation. But, he is now living on Gingercake and he asked if he could have...what happened basically with his meter and his tap.

Mr. Pope said what he is asking is Mr. Newhart wants to know if we will give him a tap and a meter on Gingercake. Commissioner Brown said in exchange for the one he had to pay for. Mr. Pope said he does not think in any other circumstance we would ever do that, and he can kind of see his case. Normally, it would go with the property, but since the county purchased the property for a road. Commissioner Brown said that he is pleading a hardship.

Mr. Rapson explained that what happened is when they acquired the house; they took the meter he paid for out of the ground, and redefined it to another residential unit. Now, he has moved to another house and needs that meter. He has already paid for the meter once. What they are saying is he should not have to pay for the meter because I had a meter over here and you all moved the road, which is what caused me to move over here. I want my meter back. We have repurposed that meter.

Mr. Davenport stated that we have paid him for his house, paid him for everything. Mr. Rapson said, apparently not this meter. Mr. Davenport said that his first reaction to all this is if we pay somebody fair market value for everything, we own everything. Everything includes everything he owns, did he own the meter? Mr. Pope said no, the meter would be ours. He said that he wondered if we would consider waiving the tap fee.

Mr. Davenport stated that he is having a hard time understanding the relationship between why we consider giving him a free tap if we bought his property. He does not understand that relationship. We buy a lot of properties on a regular basis, and nobody gets any free taps. Commissioner Brown stated that the appropriate time for him to have brought that up was when he was negotiating the property.

Mr. Davenport stated that this is after the fact, all the deals are closed. If we are going to reopen this, how many people on West Fayetteville bypass are going to ask for free taps because he got a free tap. Probably nobody, but they could. Mr. Rapson stated that is a good argument. Mr. Davenport asked what our basis for

giving it to him is. Commissioner Brown commented that there is nothing that is not complicated with the West Fayetteville bypass road.

Mr. Davenport stated that he will be happy to look at the documents that were prepared for the conveyance of the property to see if there is any wiggle room in there. Other than that, he got good fair market value for his property.

Mr. Pope said that he wants to make sure it is on the record that Mr. Newhart did not come in angry or upset. He was just asking. He is an older person, near retirement. He said that he thinks now there is about to be water available there and he just asked if that would be something we would consider. Mr. Pope said that he told him he would bring it before the committee to consider.

Mr. Rapson asked about the property that he is paying for, he assumes that property and that parcel paid for that waterline, they paid for their frontage. That is the normal process? Mr. Bergen asked for Janice Drive? Mr. Rapson said right, somebody in the past paid their portion; otherwise he has to pay his portion and the tap.

Mrs. Speegle explained in this situation everybody in the neighborhood paid at one time and they split it evenly. They all paid for the waterline extension to go into the ground. He paid his portion when they ran the waterline. At the time he paid \$900.00 for the meter and \$416.75 for the line extension.

Mr. Davenport stated that whoever has any paperwork about this conveyance on the Janice Drive property, he would like to see it. He said he does not know where to find it. Mr. Rapson said that he is sure we paid fair market value based on...

Mr. Davenport commented that there is something to be said for somebody that negotiates with you without having you spend your resources to go to court, etc. He is just trying to look for any loop hole that he could possibly benefit.

Vice Chairman Conner asked if it is truly a hardship case. Mr. Pope said no, he thinks that he is just now finding water will be available there, he is on a well, but he prefers to be on county water.

Commissioner Brown commented that this is the road of inconsistency. We have a road all the way through there and we still have many properties to settle with. We still have not settled with them and the road is almost completed. Mr. Davenport commented there are probably a dozen to fifteen properties still pending in litigation.

VI. DISCUSSION TO CANCEL THE APRIL 9 MEETING.

Mr. Pope stated that he will be out of the country, the committee could meet without him or he could dial in.

Vice Chairman Chip Conner made the motion and Steve Rapson seconded, to cancel the meeting scheduled for April 9, 2014.

EMAIL FROM MARY GILES.

Mr. Rapson commented that we have a nice email from Mrs. Giles; she has requested that the Committee consider perhaps moving our meeting time. Her concern, obviously 8:00 in the morning doesn't work for everybody. He said that we had a fairly quick discussion in regards to 6:00 does not work for a lot of people either. One of her suggestions was maybe move it to 6:00, maybe to Peachtree City. He said that he told her that the committee had contemplated, maybe taking our meeting on the road and moving it to Crosstown one time, then moving it to South Fayette. He said he told her he would bring it up for general discussion.

Commissioner Brown commented that it would be a good idea to move it around. Mr. Pope asked if we want to vary, do we want every now and then to have one in the morning and then have one in the evening, so that people can come when it is available. We meet twice a month normally. Mr. Rapson stated that we could, but the problem is going to be if you have a 6:00 meeting and if you work in Atlanta 8:00 to 4:00, 6:00 is not going to work for you. It depends on when we have the meeting, and where you have the meeting.

Mr. Rapson said that he does not mind exploring doing it once to see if anybody else shows up, but his experience has been those that are interested show up regardless of when the time is.

Commissioner Brown gave the example of some of the items that were discussed at the last meeting with Brooks. It might not be a bad idea to have a meeting in Brooks and we do the show for them; kind of show them this is where we are with this. This is what we are looking at. We can invite their council there, build up that relationship. It is not a bad idea to float it every now and then.

Mr. Destadio stated that if you do things that are more convenient, he does not mean that we do it to be inconvenient, but quite honestly, the people that are interested come. If you do it at 7:00 or something right after dinner, you are going to get people that are mildly interested and you better have a bigger room.

Mr. Rapson suggested moving this meeting to 7:00 a.m. because that would get the people that were interested in the room prior to going to work. No matter what day you pick, no matter what time you pick there will be people who can or can't. Mr. Pope said that is why he suggested rotating. Maybe do some in the evening, some in the morning.

Mr. Destadio stated that he thinks it would be important to do a Brooks thing. If it is a specific problem, you need to do it there. Mr. Rapson said once we have the solution to the problem is when he thinks we should have the meeting, not go down and say "here's a problem" and then leave.

Mr. Destadio commented that as a non-voting member he wanted to say that it is convenient when you know every other week it is at this time, you put it on the calendar and nothing else gets scheduled.

Commissioner Brown stated that it would be good to have one in Peachtree City, right before we do the dredging project. Then, the public can come. Mr. Rapson stated when they have a sense of direction on April 4 for the dredging project, one of the things we will do is present whatever our approach is going to be to the City Council. He said he hopes the Water Committee members would be present at that meeting as well, so they can put a face to a name.

Mr. Pope said that he knows that Mrs. Giles reads all of our minutes because she sends him emails. She is very engaged and he thinks there are other people, when she voices this comment, he thinks it stand for a lot of people who probably don't say anything.

Mr. Rapson suggested moving the meeting to one of the plants next time. We can move it to a different time, if we want and just see. The question is going to be logistics, if you move it to the plant, where are you going to meet.

Mr. Destadio stated that you have to get the notice out, because everyone knows that it is here. Commissioner Brown said it would be nice, we had talked about doing tours of the plants, having a meeting and then look at the plant. Mr. Rapson said he thinks, if you have it at the plant and you have a meeting, like now, and then there is going to be a tour of the plant. That would give the people that are interested in the plant the opportunity to do the tour as well. He suggested the last meeting in April.

WATER COMMITTEE MEMBER

Chairman Frisina asked if we are looking for another committee member.

Commissioner Brown said yes, interviews will be done next week.

There being no further business, Chairman Pete Frisina adjourned the meeting at 8:25 A.M.

Peter A. Frisina

The foregoing minutes were approved at the regular Water Committee meeting on the 28th day of May, 2014.

Lisa Speegle