

**WATER COMMITTEE**  
**FEBRUARY 14, 2018**  
**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Pete Frisina, Chairman  
James Preau, Vice Chairman  
Steve Rapson, County Administrator  
Lee Pope, Water System Director  
Commissioner Steve Brown

**ABSENT:**

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS:**

Dennis Davenport, County Attorney  
Harvell Walker, Frank Andre, William Andrews  
Russell Ray, Matt Bergen  
Carrie Gibby, Anita Godbee

**GUESTS:**

**STAFF PRESENT:**

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

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MEETING ON JANUARY 24, 2018.**

Lee Pope made the motion and Vice Chairman Jimmy Preau seconded, to approve the minutes from the meeting on January 24, 2018. The motion passed unanimously.

**II. PRIVATE WATER SYSTEM EMERGENCY ORDINANCE DISCUSSION.**

Attorney Davenport explained the document before the committee has some minor revisions, supplementing the last meeting. The first change comes up on page 3, Section 28-253, one of the things that we noticed in the permits for example for Fayette Mobile Home Park the permit has it down as a population of 78. We looked at that population of 78 as being 78 connections. It is not 78 households, it is 78 persons. When you convert that to households the connections were actually 30. Every system on this list was a downward adjustment because the population number was not the service connection number. It did not translate one to one. For example, Fayette Mobile Home Park went from 78 to 30, Dix Lee'On went from 556 to 214, Newton Plantation from 300 to 124, Rolling Meadows from 299 to 115, Four Seasons from 600 to 210, Longs Mobile Home Park from 78 to 35, Woodland Road Water Association from 39 to 15, Fernwood from 72 to 61, Starr's Mill Ridge from 151 to 52, Line Creek Estates from 291 to 97, Wendell Coffee from 25 to 1. That answered the age old question of what the 25 was there for the Wendell Coffee Golf Club. Now we know it is one connection. Corinth Woods subdivision is 29; the additional language there is this system is listed as Clayton County with the State. We do not have a Corinth Woods subdivision in our subdivision list; Corinth Drive comes off Corinth Road in Fayette County. There are two lots in Fayette County accessing on Corinth Drive, neither of their deeds make reference to Corinth Woods subdivision, etc. Mr. Davenport said it stays at 29. That translates into different dollars on the resolution.

Mr. Davenport explained there was a minor adjustment on page 6, in section 28-254 paragraph sub-section B line item vii. This was changed from \$2,000 feet to 20 feet as the distance to the nearest county line from the Woodland Road Water Association. He stated that is the extent of the changes from the last meeting.

Chairman Frisina commented this is up for re-consideration for the Committee to look at one more time before going to the Board of Commissioners. Mr. Rapson explained that he took those updated quantities from the permit and where we had used \$10.00 as a jumping point to figure out what the schedule of fees would be, he used \$10.00, \$15.00 and \$20.00 and then sent that to the Board. The majority of the folks he heard back from all said the \$20.00 would be the best, which is what you see in the fee schedule, all based on whatever the quantity is for the permit times \$20.00.

Mr. Davenport stated that fee schedule, even though it is times \$20.00, the numbers you are looking at, except for Fernwood and Corinth, all the others have decreases.

Mr. Harvell Walker with Woodland Road Water Association said on that particular one that is correct they had the wrong numbers. Why jump from \$10.00 to \$20.00, nothing has changed other than there was an error on that. He asked if somebody could explain that to him. He said he knows the dollar amount went down, but that is a hundred percent increase.

Mr. Davenport said to keep in mind there is not any current charge now. This whole process is to determine the baseline information to use to start up a brand new ordinance. The \$10.00 was not set in stone. It was a place setter to begin with and when the numbers were adjusted on the permit figure itself, we looked at the total package of what would be charged to a private water system. A private water system that pays nothing into the water system at all for the water infrastructure; what would be fair and equitable to the balance of the water system customers to allow a private water system to tap on. These numbers with the \$20.00 insert seemed more equitable to the group as opposed to the \$10.00.

Mr. Pope added for clarification that every customer in this Water System pays a meter and tap fee that assists us with the infrastructure required to meet them with services. When you come on as a private water system and bring twenty something customers, none of them paid that \$1,800.00 or whatever the cost for the size of meter, we did not feel it would be fair to charge you \$1,800.00 times twenty something customers. That would have been astronomical, so we tried to come up with a fee to assist with recouping some funds towards the infrastructure to deliver that. He explained infrastructure is the plants, the piping and the tanks in the system that is required to deliver services. Everybody else in the system paid for that service by paying a meter and tap fee. That is part of the capital cost recovery for that infrastructure. He said we tried to come up with a fee that was fair. You are not paying that per customer, so we are trying to come up with a fee that we feel like you did pay in something because potentially those other customers could come and say that water system that I paid \$1,800.00 to be a part of, why is he getting to be part of it for even \$20.00 or \$30.00. We felt like that was a fair amount because you do have some infrastructure on your end.

Mr. Walker asked if that is an average cost for anybody that taps on now, if you have a house and you just want to tap on, is it \$1,800.00 for the meter. Mr. Bergen said the cost for a standard meter is \$1,300.00, and then we have the infrastructure charge of \$3.50 per foot on your road frontage in addition to those fees.

Mr. Walker said he knows they made a correction, but then we go from \$10.00 to \$20.00, is that only because now it is less number because those were wrong before? Mr. Rapson said to keep in mind the \$10.00 was a function of whatever denominator was the number. When you look at this now, of the 12 fees we had, the fees being proposed even though the denominator went from \$10.00 to \$20.00, 10 of those are less than what we had proposed before for the total fee. In your particular case for Woodland Water Association, the original proposal was to charge \$390.00 that has actually been lowered to \$300.00. He said he thinks it is all a function of the math. Since we didn't have the right numerator to begin with it changed the function of the equation.

Mr. Davenport commented it is a fluid starting point for recommendation to the Board of Commissioners. The group selected \$10.00 because of the numbers that were there on the permit. When those numbers came down, the dollars did not work, they worked better with the \$20.00 as opposed to the \$10.00. It is not like we have been doing this for five years and all of a sudden we are going to raise it 100%. We haven't been doing it at all. We are trying to figure what is the right starting point and we figured \$20.00 was the right starting point.

Mr. Walker said he does not know about the other systems, but he knows it is going to be less than the number of houses that are there. They will have one connection, if this goes through and they do it the way it is now. You have one meter and it is probably going to be 4 inch and he knows all the other houses, five of them do have meters and ten of them do not have anything. It is just a flat fee because they quote on the system. They have one meter and that is like one \$1,300.00, he knows this is less than that, but is there any consideration for you are only hooking up at one place in their system if they do this. Has that been thought about? Does that make any difference?

Mr. Davenport responded what makes a difference is what you can have, not what you do have. Your permit allows you to have a particular number and that is what the fee is set at, what you can have. Mr. Walker said they are not going to hook up to the county water. Mr. Davenport said he understands that, we are not going to supply you with water on a regular basis either. This is only for an emergency. Mr. Walker said he understands. Mr. Davenport said you should not need us at all, but if you do, this is what it is going to cost you.

Mr. Pope commented what we are trying to do is get ahead of the curve to put something in place because traditionally water systems continue to age and we generally have to kind of help one another. We are trying to put something in place; we already have things in place with larger systems to assist us and us to assist them. What we are trying to do is take care of those in house right now, that are within the county that have their own water system,

but we are trying to put a vehicle in place so that if you do have an emergency and have to have assistance we have some language to give us direction on that. In the past, we have just said, what do we do? There is no method to the madness. Sometimes they got taps, sometimes they didn't, and there was no organization to it at all. We are trying to put something in place so that if something happens in a water system in this county that is not on the county system what is in place to take care of that system. So, when EPD comes and says "you guys have a problem, and you need to find somewhere else to get water for a few days so you can get this resolved", we have an agreement in place. He said he has only been here four years and he knows in the past there was no organized ordinance or anything to give any direction.

Mr. Pope stated most utilities such as Clayton County are an authority; they don't allow private systems to hook up to their water system because it doesn't meet their infrastructure requirements on minimum standards. Their ordinance says it is not going to happen.

Mr. Walker commented somewhere down the road, if this goes through and they decide to do it, do they just call the Water System and somebody comes out and looks at their system to see whether we can give it to you at some point or do whatever with it. But, somebody will evaluate it to see whether it is up to Fayette County standards?

Mr. Pope responded we are going to evaluate all the private water systems. We did a few through a task order last year that was brought to our attention from Commissioners and people living in the Districts, but this is the County Manager right here and his direction from him moving forward is next year to have all the rest of the systems reviewed. We will have a conditional assessment of where they are at as of today so we can make some plans, so yes, to answer Mr. Walkers question, we will be looking at the condition of your system.

Mr. Davenport commented there is an initial analysis done specifically for tapping on in an emergency basis which is different from what Mr. Pope is talking about. If you need emergency water there is an analysis made by the Water System to determine whether or not you are eligible for emergency water and that is what this ordinance is for. What he is talking about is the next step is you become a part of the system; there is a different analysis for that.

Mr. Rapson suggested discussing the items in the email from Derek Bunch. Mr. Pope asked Matt Bergen to go over the email in detail. Mr. Bergen said Mr. Bunch is with Georgia Community, which is Line Creek Estates and Starr's Mill. He is the owner of those systems.

Mr. Bergen read the email: "Hello, Mr. Pope, I would like you to reconsider your recommendations regarding your proposed stance on supplying the water to privately owned public water systems, it is troubling that a privately owned system will be charged a different rate than publicly owned."

**Mr. Davenport commented that the first statement needs to be corrected. We are not supplying water to privately owned water systems; we are making water available on an emergency basis to privately owned water systems. There is a marked difference in that statement. If we were looking at supplying water to private water systems it is a different discussion.**

**Mr. Bergen continued reading the email: “Additionally, I am unsure why you are treating privately owned systems desiring a connection to the county water any differently than commercial accounts with master meters such as apartment complexes, condos, or subdivisions. “**

**Mr. Rapson commented that he thinks that goes back to what Mr. Davenport just said. Mr. Davenport added the meter cost. Mr. Rapson said this isn’t an apartment complex or commercial complex that is asking us to supply water for them. That would be handled completely different. Mr. Davenport asked about the cost of a meter for a commercial account. Mr. Bergen stated if it is multi-family, again you are looking at somewhere around \$50,000.00 to \$60,000.00 range.**

**Mr. Davenport said if we treated them the same way as a multi-family account we would charge them \$60,000.00. He said he is trying to correct what Mr. Bunch is saying in his email. He is looking at this like all the people that are on the system are paying is the monthly charge. To get on the system, they had to pay \$50,000.00 or \$60,000.00 to get on the system, which is a substantially higher rate than the cost stated in the emergency water ordinance. Mr. Rapson said we would not connect that type of a system to one master meter. When you connect a system to a master meter, and you have a bunch of other folks that are paying money towards that, like it was an HOA, which is inherent to a lot of problems he does not think this Board would want. We bill individual meters, not a master meter; even that scenario is not likely. We probably need to have that discussion with him as well; he is just trying to put it on the record.**

**Mr. Bergen continued with the email from Mr. Bunch: “Regrettably, I was unable to attend the original meeting as I did not receive the letter informing me of the meeting until after the meeting was held. I just learned of this morning’s meeting a few minutes ago. This quick note does not list all of my concerns, but would like you to present them to this morning’s meeting. From the outside looking in, there seems to be a conflict of interest that presents bad optics when the county presents such seemingly harsh guidelines. I think the county system should be pleased if all private systems were connected to yours. Such connections provide additional revenue with very little additional effort, while at the same time, providing the security of additional water to county constituents. However, your proposals make such connections unfeasible. While that may be the goal, it is odd that the county is working hard to sell more water, but when it comes to privately owned systems the county is seemingly doing its best to throw up barriers. Private systems are purchasers of water that the county is then not required to maintain lines, read meters and handle billing. If you are open to discussing this proposal I would be happy to meet with you, please let me know when a convenient time is to meet. Thank you for your consideration. Derek”**

Mr. Davenport stated he would like to expand on what Mr. Pope said earlier. Before this discussion with this ordinance, if Derek wanted to tie on, we would say no. If Derek had an emergency and wanted to tie on we would say no. Anybody with a private water system that wanted to tie on for any reason, we always said no. We didn't allow private systems to tie on simply because of the problems we have been talking about. One of the main reasons he understands we are even discussing this issue right now is because we know there could be an emergency issue arise, where it is necessary to have some type of water source on an emergency basis. Because, quite frankly, if one of your systems ran out of water today and you went to the State; the State would come to us and say "ya'll need to figure something out". That is what would happen. We are trying to figure something out before that happens. It might not be the prettiest thing; it might not cover all the bases. But, we see it as a starting point and we are trying to recognize those emergency situations where we could work with private water systems. We are trying to define what those parameters are. We welcome suggestions, just because we don't agree with some of the opinions doesn't mean that they are wrong. We just need to understand what the lay of the land is. This is a two-step process where we get information for the Water Committee; the Water Committee makes a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners and the Board of Commissioners goes through this whole thing all over again; and they make a final decision. It all points to this process. We welcome public input and he thinks if Mr. Bunch wanted to come to the next meeting, he is welcome to do that. This is a hot button issue. We are trying our best to at least have an alternative for people that are in an emergency situation. This is not your regular run of the mill supply me water. This is emergency situations only.

Mr. Pope commented he thinks that is where there is some confusion. He thinks they either think we are trying to take over their systems or we are trying to force them to have a connection. That is not what is happening at all.

Mr. Rapson said his only concern is he said he was not aware; he did not receive the letter. His question is, is this brand new to him? Mr. Bergen said he was aware. He stated that he did not receive that particular letter until the meeting was held. Mr. Pope commented we have sent two letters. Mr. Rapson said what we need to do as a Board is decide do we want to have a meeting with him prior to making a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners?

Mr. Davenport commented you can respond to him and let him know that we meet the 2nd and 4th Wednesday and he is welcome to come to any meeting and discuss this topic if he wants to. The Water Committee will make a recommendation and if you want to come to the Water Committee, fine, if you want to go to the Board of Commissioners, fine, but we can't stop because one person sends an email because he couldn't make a meeting.

Mr. Pope said we are just a recommendation board, we will make a recommendation and it will be on the Board of Commissioners meeting and he can certainly come to those meetings. Mr. Davenport said he does not know what meetings they will be, but once we make the recommendation Tameca will take that and calendar it at the particular meeting.



She can let the Water Committee know and if the Water Committee wants to let Mr. Bunch know, that is fine. All the meetings are published, all you have to do is look on the web site and find what is going on with all the meetings.

Frank Andre with the Woodland Road Water Association commented he has been a resident and taxpayer of this county for over 35 years. He said he applauds what you gentlemen are trying to do, but he has a couple of questions. He does not agree at all with the definition in the minutes of February 7 about water unavailable. This is sort of a logical question where a private water system or a well experiencing low pressure is not deemed to have water unavailable. That needs a little bit more finesse. He said he does not agree with that. If you gentlemen were all in a line and you have a well in your back yard and you had the end receptacle for water, he might have water pressure and you might have one half psi. Therefore, according to your definition you don't have water. He said that needs to be finessed a little bit.

Mr. Davenport explained the distinction is water not available from the source. In the example, water is available from the source; it becomes a mechanical issue, a pumping issue as opposed to a source issue. If you have water available at the source and you have, as in the example, low pressure for the last guy, get better pumps. If you don't have enough water to get out there because you don't have water at the source, now you have water unavailable. It is a matter of can you fix it, or is it something that is just not available. Mr. Davenport said he is not wed to the particular wording for that definition that is the concept; we don't want to fix a pump problem. We want to address a situation where you don't have water period. That is what we are trying to address; your well is dry.

Mr. Andre commented on the statement that people receiving emergency water haven't paid any of that, so the emergency rate is triple the rate of the normal rate for water system. He said he finds that by definition probably a little punitive. He said he does not see why someone in an emergency situation has to be put to the wall so to speak, and pay a triple rate. They are hurting, they need water. He said he applauds the efforts here to straighten this out; an emergency is something unforeseen by a catastrophic nature. Charging somebody a triple rate in a time of need he does not think is much of a Christian attitude.

Mr. Pope said part of that goes back to us recovering what it costs to put our system in place. We traditionally pay higher rates if we have to purchase water from other systems and what we don't want is for it to become habitual use. He said that is also outlined in the agreement. We don't want people to say, it is going to cost me \$15,000.00 to fix that pump or drill another well, I can just keep buying water and keep supplying to my customers and I have no incentive to fix that well. If you are paying a much higher rate, there will be an incentive there in place to say I need to get off that system as quickly as possible. There is nothing punitive, we are letting you know way in advance what the rate is, so you can put other systems in place to back up. For instance, you may say what I don't ever want to have to do is enact that emergency agreement. So, what I am going to do is buy an extra pump and put it in the warehouse so I never have to worry about it. I can just switch pumps. Or maybe I will put some redundancy in my chemical treatment processes. He

said that is what we do in our plants; we have redundant pumps, so you could put some other things in place in lieu of having to enact this.

Mr. Andre said this is for 30 days, maybe 60 days only, so if it is not going to go past that under the system you guys set up. Mr. Davenport responded practically speaking, yes. But, when you look at a situation with somebody as Mr. Pope just talked about, where the cost to fix your system is \$50,000.00 and I can ride that out for 120 days as opposed to fixing the system. This ordinance says you can't do it for more than 60 days. But, what are we going to do at the end of 60 days? The fact of the matter is, we don't have a whole lot we can do on the back end if we don't take care of it on the front end.

Mr. Davenport said he would argue and contrary to what Mr. Pope is saying, he thinks it is designed to be punitive for two reasons. Number one, you don't pay the tap fee and number two we don't want you on the system for more than 30 days. If we made it easy, you would have an incentive to stay on the system for more than 30 days. You either stay on the private water system or you come to the county system, that is the choice, but there is nothing punitive about charging somebody that rate for a 30 day period when it is a fraction of what everybody else pays that bought into the system. You look at it as punitive because it is coming out of your pocket at that particular time, but it never came out of your pocket on the front end when people paid \$1,500.00 and \$1,800.00 to tap onto the system. They paid for the ability to have a lower rate per month. No one on the private system paid for that ability to have a lower rate per month so you are getting a higher rate. In water contracts with people between jurisdictions for example, governments charge other governments higher rates if they don't pay some type of a tap fee or some type of a operations and maintenance fee. That is common in the industry to charge higher rates for people that don't pay those tap fees. You look at it as punitive and he would agree it looks punitive, but it is that way for a reason; those two reasons that he talked about; you don't pay the tap fee and you shouldn't be on the system for any more than 30 days period. Your system is independent. You are getting potable water and you should be getting it at a pressure level that is consistent with the minimum standards of the State. There is no reason for us to be involved. But, in an emergency, a lot of this is us telling you, folks, lets plan together. Let's get this done. This is what we are looking at here. You may not like the numbers, but it is a source, it is an alternative. Before this, there was no alternative. He said he is not pushing the triple rate. The triple rate is in there to promote this discussion; it may carry the day as far as the Water Committee is concerned. But, we are not trying to keep you on as a customer. We are trying to tell you get off as quickly as you can because this costs you more than it costs everybody else and we want you to go back onto your own system. Because that is how it should be working. You should be on your system, and we are on our system. For those two reasons, he would say yes, it is punitive, but it is punitive for a reason.

Mr. Andre asked Mr. Davenport to define tap fee. Is it just the meter or is it when you pay a tap fee is it really more than just the meter that you are paying the tap fee.



**Mr. Bergen said the \$3.50 per foot on your road frontage helps offset the cost for the pipe, the infrastructure that goes in the ground to serve that parcel. That fee is in addition to your meter and your tap fee.**

**Mr. William Andrews asked about the stipulations for getting off the private water system; as far as getting away from the private system and tap into the county system. Mr. Davenport said it first has to be a desire on the part of the owner of the system to make that happen. Our biggest hurdle right now is the owners of systems want to be paid compensation for their system and we don't desire to pay any compensation to put you on our system because there is a lot that has to be done to put you on the system by way of upgrading of lines.**

**Mr. Pope said the infrastructure does not meet our minimum standards so we would be paying for a system for no benefit to us because we would have to redo the lines. It is almost like we are laying lines for a whole new subdivision.**

**Mr. Walker questioned the ordinance saying your system has to be up to standards and it is the private owner's job to have it up to standards before you can even hook into your system for the long time if you wanted to. Mr. Davenport commented there are two things happening here. The emergency connection; we are telling you where we are, we can say as long as you are a less than 6" line subdivision, you don't need a vault and you pay the emergency activation fee and you pay triple the water rate and you can have water for up to 30 days. That is pretty much all we are going to do. If you get past that thirty days, now you need to tell us what you are doing to fix this, because if you are not, we need to transition you to the county Water System. That takes an evaluation process and we are not going to pay that owner of that system anything for that system because he or she has two choices. He either upgrades and makes the fixes to the system and keeps it private or he transitions it over to us and we don't pay for that. We wind up looking at what that cost is going to be, and we work out whatever we need to work out with the owner of that system without paying him value for the system but get his assistance to give us as much of a contribution to upgrade that system as possible. It is going to be a give and take relationship at that point.**

**Mr. Walker said he understands we are getting aware from the emergency now, we are onto the other, and this is something we need to look at further down the road. Is it the private owner or in their case, the group has to bring their system up to standards to hook up to you forever from now on, or do you all come in and make those corrections, whatever they might be.**

**Mr. Davenport said the easiest process to look at is we would go out and survey your system to determine where you are, what size pipes you have, what is the integrity of the pipes, how old are they, see how that compares to our minimum standards, to the extent it does not meet our minimum standards, we have to evaluate what the cost would be to bring it up to our minimum standards. We can put a dollar amount to that. We can say in order for you to come onto our system it is going to cost you, let's say \$350,000.00. Who pays that cost? First of all, we are not interested in paying that cost, because if it were done like it**

was done from day one, the developer pays for that cost and then gives it to us. That is how it is done traditionally. If you want to get onto our system, if you want us to do the work, it is going to cost you \$350,000.00 for us to do the work. And if you don't want to pay the \$350,000.00 stay a private system.

Mr. Walker commented it is not a matter of wanting, it is a matter of can't do it. Mr. Davenport said he hears him, he is just saying that is the starting point. It is going to be a give and take relationship. We don't have all the answers here for that kind of situation today. But, those are the dollars we are talking about and how it is going to work out.

Mr. Pope said in reality as a private system, you can get a business loan to upgrade your system to minimum standards; or you could try to get grant money to do that. Mr. Walker said there are fifteen people. There is no option. Mr. Pope said USDA could probably get them a grant.

Mr. Andrews asked who oversees the owner of the private water system to ascertain that he has met the requirements from the EPA. Mr. Pope said that would be EPD. Mr. Pope said he has no jurisdiction himself.

Mr. Andrews made a comment that he has met the minimum standard of 20 psi, correct? When your fire truck goes in there, it is not 20 psi, so what is the minimum your fire truck requires to get their system working? Mr. Pope said as long as they can get water in their trucks they can boost the pressure to what they need within the truck. Mr. Andrews said they put the water in the trucks, but they exhaust all that water, so they have to get new water. What is the minimum psi that they must have for the truck to work. Mr. Pope said they actually pump out of onsite pump pool; they have a daisy chain system where trucks come in and dump water into that pool. It is a temporary pool and they pump the water out of that.

Mr. Andrews then asked the 20 psi, is that constant all the time, he can guarantee you, if 50% of residents were to turn their faucets on at the same time; you will not have 20 psi going into the home. If his wife is taking a shower, he waits until she is through. Who is the over seer here to ascertain that the owner maintains that 20 psi constant pressure. Mr. Pope said that would be EPD. That has nothing to do with us. Mr. Andrews said that is the problem he has. His understanding is the owner sits on the Board. He sits on the EPD Board.

Mr. Davenport asked if he is Newton Plantation. Mr. Andrews replied yes. Mr. Davenport stated Senator Rick Jeffares owns that system, correct. Mr. Andrews said yes. Mr. Davenport said he does not think he sits on the Board, but he is a State Senator. Mr. Andrews stated that is a conflict of interest because he owns the system, he has a problem with the system; he has been told there are several violations that have not been corrected. It makes sense he sits on the Board, he is not going to do anything about it. If the county wants to purchase that system he has to get it up to...He keeps hearing this thing about it will cost a million dollars to get this system going over a 30 year period. Now, if your predecessors thought that way, you would not have paved streets today. You wouldn't

have street lighting, and Ford was the first one to make a V8 engine. If he thought about getting a return on his money yesterday or tomorrow, we would not have the V8 engine today. What you are doing is for future generations, not for us. That is a safety issue, for just something that is a situation that is not yours. Say, you go out of town and you have a fire in your subdivision and your house is affected. The fire truck goes there, push into that thing, nothing. This is not welfare. He said he went to a meeting down in your complex and there were animal rights. He said he is a dog lover and he does not see. The money was there. Last Thursday, GDOT, they want something done and the Commissioner tried to hold the money out. It is human life. You cannot put a price on human life. You can do something today, generations down the road, they will benefit from it. He said he thinks it is up to our spokesperson or the EPD who has more power than us, to put some pressure on the owner of the system and get it upgraded or whatever it takes. Month after month, it is just like an exercise in futility, because nothing is done. We don't have enough clout. We can come and speak, but we need people in authority, whether it is the commissioners, the State or what to do something about it. These people pay taxes. He said he was waiting on Mrs. Smith, she is the spokesperson, but she has not arrived. He said those are his concerns.

Mr. Rapson commented that one of the things that he is working with Commissioner Rousseau is we are going to evaluate the remaining systems. Your subdivision has been evaluated in regards to what it would take to bring that infrastructure up to the Water System standards. We have not done all of them, we are going to do a task order to do all of them, once we have all that information, at that point the Water Committee would decide do we want to move forward with trying to replace some of those systems and that would be something we would have to talk to the Board about; whether the Board of Commissioners agrees that that is a logical approach. He said he would agree that those are some of the concerns; you raised valid concerns. Over twenty percent of the county has the same water issues that you have. In your particular case, you may have fire hydrants, but we do not count on that system in regards to fire response any differently than if we go into a neighborhood in areas of the county that do not have any water lines. They handle the dispatch and they handle fire services different in those areas. They don't count on those systems. There isn't any fire suppression issues associated with this because we have already responded with our protocols to make sure that we don't have that issue. Therefore, we daisy chained those pumpers. That is why we have pumpers in the system. One of the things that Mr. Pope is working on in his long term plan is to actually put water lines in and connect those areas where waterlines currently don't exist so that we can get ourselves less and less resistant to having to do those types of protocols. The answer to your question, each of those systems has to be individually analyzed. No different than if there were no homes there and they put a brand new system in; when they get that system done and that system is connected and they put that infrastructure in, that system then is donated over to the county and we assume ownership of that system. In your particular case, he thinks with your subdivision it has been evaluated and they said we would have to replace all those pipes. But, you have to understand, we can't even take over that system because right now it is not part of our water service area, because it is actually delegated to another permit through EPD to that owner, so we have to negotiate with that owner to even

alter that equation. But, before we take that step we really have to know where we are with all the systems and that will be the next step we take.

Mr. Pope commented that he thinks what he is asking is, to clarify, is he is asking for help. What he is saying is we have a private system that is owned by someone who you think is not taking the action to take care of you. That is really not our jurisdiction. It is EPD. Mr. Pope said he can assist with setting up meetings, because it sounds like you need to have a meeting with your system owner and EPD at the same table.

Mr. Andrews said the system owner was present at one of the meetings at the church and he raised that issue with him about the pressure. He said when he got back to his office he would turn it up. Mr. Andrews said he is still waiting. He said thank you for the update and allowing him to speak.

Mr. Rapson recommended that the Water Committee recommend to the Board of Commissioners consideration of this item on the March 22 Board of Commissioners meeting. He said he thinks that is far enough out in advance that if we need to have a couple of more of these meetings with folks that could not make it, then we can provide a better update to the Board of Commissioners for that March 22 meeting. Mr. Pope commented they could also go to that meeting and speak. They could come see us for every meeting we have until then and they can still go that meeting and speak to the actual board.

Mr. Rapson made this a motion and Mr. Pope seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

### **III. MNGWPD REGIONAL MULTI-FAMILY TOILET REBATE PROGRAM.**

Mr. Pope explained when we talked about this last time we all agreed to move forward because it satisfies one of our action items with our agreement with the Metropolitan Planning District. What we did not do is clarify a couple of the blanks that have to filled out in the document. He said he just wanted to inform the Committee of his recommendation. On the second page letter E requires us to set a limit to the number of toilets. The statement (iv) reads be applying to replace at least 30 toilets but not more than, he said he recommends the more than be 400 toilets. That would cover our largest system we have identified. Mr. Rapson agreed with this.

Mr. Pope went on to the next blank which is cost paid by utility, number 3. He recommended we allocate funds in our next budget which would be the next fiscal year beginning July 1, 2018, of \$100,000.00. That would be enough to cover several systems. In fact, just about all the systems if they chose to participate in this program. Moving forward in the fiscal budget we will continue to leave those funds available for those systems. The agreement says that it ends and we always put in there when funds are expended, so we can actually go during a calendar year and add funds should those funds be expended. That is how we have handled the other toilet rebate program. He commented there is an update in every meeting packet on the current toilet rebate program. Today's report shows \$11,170.00 available. Should anyone apply for toilets between now and July 1 we could utilize those funds if those funds became expended as

always, we could come back and say we need to add funds to that. He said he does not anticipate that would happen because he does not think the initiative from Metropolitan Planning District is really going to kick this thing up until later next year anyway.

Mr. Pope said his recommendation is that we make it a maximum of 400 toilets at a time, and we allocate \$100,000.00 in the budget starting July 1 and the terms to be as funds are expended. Mr. Pope said generally they let us know way ahead of time when funds are getting low. Then we will come back to the Committee to let them know we need to add funds. Fortunately, he said he does not think that has happened mid-stream since he has been here.

Mr. Pope made a motion to recommend 400 for the maximum toilets, \$100,000.00 for the funds to fill out the document with those numbers. Vice Chairman Preau seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **IV. WATER PLANT UPDATE.**

Russell Ray reported there has not been much activity lately. Lakeshore has done some cleaning in the pipe gallery and we should be finished in that area, the painting contractor will be back to touch up some more of the pipes in the pipe gallery. The work that was done to correct some problems has been successful, but there is some painting still to be done.

Mr. Ray said two projects at Crosstown were done. A liquid lime system (lime slurry system) was installed. The second system was a chlorine dioxide system; both the companies that represent those products have done an excellent job of working through issues and maintaining that equipment. That is what we had planned on and hoped for. That has continued to happen.

CH will be continuing the plans for our work at the South Fayette Plant which will occur in the next fiscal year. He said he will bring a final slide to the Committee in the near future showing Lakeshores final cost and completion of that contract.

Mr. Pope commented we will schedule a meeting down there once the cleaning and the painting is finished. Everybody will be able to tour the facility and see the new equipment. It is all new and everyone can see the final product.

#### **V. DISCUSSION OF WATER COMMITTEE MEETING MEMBERSHIP.**

Mr. Davenport stated we have talked in the past about how there is no formal template for guidelines for membership of the Water Committee, terms, etc. We have gone back in the history of the county records and really could find nothing since the Water Authority was sought to be established back in the 80's. He said what you have before you is a draft ordinance which is similar to the committees we have put together for Fayette County in the recent past. Specifically the Transportation Committee and the Public Arts Committee; if you look on page 2 you will see how much of a template this is because under

section 2 about 7 lines down it says the Fayette County Senior Water Committee. This is also the planning document for the Senior Services Council. That senior will be omitted, obviously. This is a template to show you the types of issues that need to be addressed by the Water Committee. For example, under section 2, there is a blank there. He said he was hoping to get some input as to what the purpose and goals are of the Water Committee. That is the first issue to deal with. Under section 3 on page 3, membership from conversations he heard Commissioner Brown speak of at the last meeting, he promotes 7 members to the Board. Mr. Davenport said he put in 5 members slash 7 members because he wanted to make you aware that while we don't know what the correct number is until you provide a recommendation, we currently have 6 and 6 is probably not a good number. He said pick one of these, 5 or 7 and it is going to drive everything else. For example, a quorum of 4 members, if you pick 5 a quorum will be 3 members. It is half plus one. He said if there are questions with anything else within the document he will be happy to answer them to the best of his ability. This is our attempt to make this look more like the committees we have recently established.

Mr. Rapson suggested everyone review the document and be prepared to decide what to do with it at the next meeting. Then we will make sure to get a copy of it to Commissioner Brown for his input as well.

Mr. Pope asked if we decide to expand to 7, can we put stipulations on who those 7 are? Can we state they are the head of another department in the county, or could it be another city we could request to place somebody on the Board. Mr. Davenport referred to page 3, paragraph 2B. Mr. Rapson stated right now it is the Chairman, his designee, County Administrator, Director of the Water System, and then Planning and Zoning, and then we are saying 3 residents. If you want to put restrictions, you can say 3 residents and one of the residents has whatever type experience you would like to add to it. He said he is not sure you can be completely restrictive. It is preferable to have residents that have an interest in the Water System, obviously.

Mr. Davenport commented those are the three wild cards as far as the membership that will either be one or three. It can be whoever the Committee thinks will be a good pool to work from. If you want to look at another department head or somebody from Peachtree City, that is when you would put that in, as 2B. Mr. Rapson said the makeup for these three citizens would follow the same process with the Board of Commissioners we currently do for Committee appointments and that is we would ask for two of the Board of Commissioners to be on the flushing Committee and they would go through that process. Obviously, we would encourage them to have the Water Director in those interviews, but that is really up to those two Commissioners to decide. That is the process we have today.

Mr. Pope said we would not consider saying that we wanted our City to place someone on the Board, we would not do that? Mr. Davenport said he is not saying that, he is saying this is where you would take up that recommendation. Right now, it just says 3 residents or Water System customers, that is all it says. Mr. Pope said he is only asking for discussion. Mr. Davenport said it could be one or three.



Mr. Rapson commented we will put that on the next agenda and make sure that everybody understands we will talk about it and finalize it.

## **VI. PUBLIC COMMENT.**

Mr. Walker asked when the minutes are posted. Mrs. Speegle explained the minutes are posted online once they are approved by the Committee. Mr. Pope stated he appreciates the gentlemen being here and if they would like to have agendas sent to them, we could add them to an email list on a regular basis. If a topic is being discussed and they would like to attend, we will always welcome their attendance. They are always welcome to come to any meeting.

Mr. Rapson shared the updated Water Committee meeting schedule with Mr. Walker and commented that we do have a couple of meetings that are at 6:30 at night. Mrs. Speegle stated the meeting schedule is also posted online. Mr. Walker asked about the Commissioners meeting. Mr. Rapson stated the Private Water System Emergency Ordinance will be on the March 22 meeting of the Board of Commissioners. That meeting starts at 6:30 p.m. at Stonewall.

### **Peachtree City Rowing Club RowRun Biathlon Challenge**

Anita Godbee explained she would like to brief the Committee on a Special Event Application that they received from Peachtree City Rowing Club. They are going to have a RowRun Biathlon Challenge on March 17. It will be from 6:30 a.m., which is when they will start setting up that day, and it will end at 3:00 p.m. Basically they will be running within the park and then they will be rowing on land. It will not involve the water reservoir; they will be using the ergs that are inside their storage area. They are anticipating spectators at peak times to be as much as 150 and participants to be 100. She said they have not sent her a site plan yet, this is one thing she is waiting on, to see how they are running, what they are anticipating set up to be. They will have tents set up; a lot of the events will be in the parking lot. She said with the number, we may want to look at closing the park during that time frame. She said she is not sure if the general public can come in to utilize the amenities like they would want to. The general public is welcome to come and watch and participate, they are taking registration now. She said she is here to brief the Committee and see what the Committees wishes would be regarding this event.

Mr. Pope said we definitely would want to get the sign down there from the Road Department. Mr. Rapson said we can put the sign down there, the question is do we want to close the park and go ahead and announce that to everybody. Mr. Pope said he thinks it would be wise to go ahead and close it. He can't see anybody being able to bring a boat in there and be fishing. They will be totally at a loss.

Mr. Pope made a motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to close the Lake McIntosh Park on March 17 for this event from 6:30 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. Steve Rapson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT.**

Vice Chairman Jimmy Preau made a motion to adjourn the Water Committee February 14, 2018 meeting. Steve Rapson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Peter A. Frisina

The foregoing minutes were approved at the regular Water Committee meeting on the 28th day of February, 2018.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Speegle