

WATER COMMITTEE
JUNE 28, 2006
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: **Chuck Watkins, Chairman**
 Dr. George Patton, Vice Chairman
 Tony Parrott
 Chris Venice
 Pete Frisina

NON-VOTING MEMBERS: **David Jaeger**
ABSENT: **Bill McNally**

STAFF PRESENT: **Dennis Davenport**
 Russell Ray

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Chuck Watkins at 8:00 A.M.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MEETING ON MAY 24, 2006.

Vice Chairman Dr. George Patton made the motion and Tony Parrott seconded, to approve the minutes from the meeting on May 24, 2006. There was no opposition.

II. SANITARY SEWER SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT.

Mr. Parrott reported that the subcommittee has discussed both a septic system and a drip system. A drip system can be septic or non-septic, depending on the type of system they do. Currently what we have on the books is for drip, and it appears that soon we will have our first opportunity to review a drip system that would fall within these guidelines. They are looking at a drip system with a conventional collection system at Fleetwood Farms on McDonough Road. They have submitted the rezoning. Mr. Frisina stated they have started discussions with the State.

Attorney Davenport commented that the Board of Health continued to receive complaints about the odor from the system at Millbrook subdivision in Tyrone. They sent a letter to Brian Boutelle at EPD, trying to find out what was going on. From the Board of Health's perspective it looked as if this system was not operating properly. Mr. Boutelle was on site within a day or two after receiving the letter. He did an inspection and submitted a report to the Board of Health. The system is in compliance. The potential odor problem is the under utilization of the system as opposed to having a problem somewhere. The subdivision is still at 40 to 50% build out. They saw nothing associated with the system that was problematic. Everything was in compliance. The comment was, that under utilization can cause that type of an odor issue.

Mrs. Venice commented about the report of soggy ground. Mr. Davenport replied that this is also the area where all the stormwater flows through, and where some of the components are. He stated he does not know all the specifics of how the system is laid out, but this was straight from EPD's on site inspection, looking at all the components of the system, and going through a lengthy check list. It looks like these systems, even though they are functioning properly, have a potential odor problem. The question is, how do you address it? Mr. Parrott commented that all wastewater systems have some odor problem.

Attorney Davenport commented that an individual system, for example, seldom has an odor problem. If you put multiple units on one system, you would hope that same approach could be taken, and that it works as efficiently as an individual system would.

Mr. Parrott stated there are differences between our specs and the current regulations. The subcommittee will be looking at these differences and will bring something back to the Water Committee soon. It is more complicated than just community septic and drip.

Chairman Watkins asked if a peat system will be allowed. Mr. Parrott stated the subcommittee would consider this in its review.

III. DISCUSSION OF BACKFLOW CROSS CONNECTION PROGRAM.

Mr. Parrott commented that the State is requiring us to redo our Backflow Cross Connection Control Program. One option we have is to start having the customer begin testing the devices, instead of the Water System trying to test the devices annually. The recommendation would be that we test the assembly and after it passes we notify the customer that it is their responsibility. This way the testing would be staggered and all of them would not come up at the same time every year. The customer would be notified 90 days ahead. We would provide information on how to get a list of certified testers, but not provide the list ourselves. We would also provide them with a form on which assemblies they have, and what is required. With the program, we would keep up with the paper work through the inventory clerk with Distribution. That employee is actually a certified tester. The files will be maintained in accordance with their Cross Connection Control Program. We have to keep records for three years and be able to provide them whenever the Department of Natural Resources asks for them. Something new is that the assembly has to be repaired within 30 days. If they don't repair it within that 30 days, the Water System can discontinue the service. Something else in the new law is that future services with a bypass will have to have a backflow on that bypass. The bypass is only used one hour a year when we are testing, but it will still have to have a testable bypass. A hazard survey is part of the service approval process. When we first approve the water service; a plumbing plan will be required to be submitted to the Water System. Because we deal with multiple jurisdictions, we would be dealing with four different plumbing departments. The hazard survey is not very complicated. Most of the services we have are fire protection that has a backflow on it anyway. We probably have 350 double checks and over 200 of them are just firelines.

Chairman Watkins expressed concern about having 30 days to fix a failure. Mr. Parrott stated residential accounts do not have a testable backflow device. We install a dual check, which is not a testable device. Mr. Parrott stated that if a business needs an RPZ, that RPZ needs to be installed at the point of use. For example, Falcon Field put in a foam fire protection system. We required them to put an RPZ in the hanger with that system, so that it discharges inside the hanger where it stays warm. It is not ours. Funeral homes and hospitals have separate RPZ units.

Mrs. Venice asked what should we do within the 30 days? Mr. Parrott commented that we would not know the unit failed, with the customer doing the testing. If it failed the customer would have it repaired and re-tested and then send the information to the Water System. Chairman Watkins commented that if we let the customer handle the testing, we don't know that it failed. He will send in a certificate that it has been inspected. We might not know that they did any repairs. You just know that somebody certified inspected it and it passed. There is an open window, that if you had a cross connection or some kind of backflow problem in your system, contaminants could be sucked back in during that period.

Mr. Parrott explained that our firelines do not have a bypass with a backflow and the fireline. Firelines are a straight service; you take it out of service for an hour to test it and put it back in service. It does not have a bypass, but it does have backflow prevention. Mr. Parrott commented that he is looking at putting a 2" bypass on the backflow devices on the larger meter assemblies.

Mr. Parrott stated he would make the changes to our Backflow Cross Connection Program and bring it back to the Water Committee for review.

IV. BID OPENING – ANNUAL WATERLINE CONTRACT.

Mr. Jaeger reported we had a bid opening on June 20 for the annual waterline contract for the upcoming fiscal year, which is July 1 to June 30. Bid packages were provided to ten different utility contractors. He commented he has the list available for anyone who would like to see it. There was one bidder, Shockley Plumbing. Shockley has done the annual contract for the county as long as we have been doing it, four or five years. He tried diligently to get more interest from other bidders to guarantee a competitive bid, but was not able to get anybody other than Shockley to submit a bid. However, in comparing Shockley's numbers to last year, there is only a marginal increase. That only applies to a few of the bid items. There were about 90 bid items in this contract, and about two thirds of them had zero increase from last year. Overall, the bid is 6% higher compared to last year's price. Considering the inflation and escalation he has seen in construction cost, he thinks 6% is extremely reasonable. The increases in unit prices from specific items that we do a lot of work; such as 8" waterline was \$2.00 a foot, it is less than 10% on that one item.

Mr. Jaeger stated he believes we have a good number, and he thinks if we had other bidders it would have been competitive with Shockley's numbers the way they are. This contract has been beneficial to the County. It allows the County to have a quick response for waterline extensions and repairs. Shockley is a local contractor, which gives him the ability to respond quickly. Mr. Jaeger commented that he thinks this is part of the issue with other contractors not bidding. They know that they would need to be able to respond quickly and they may not be able to, based on where they are located. With that in mind, he made the recommendation that the Water Committee award this contract to Shockley, Plumbing. The total of the bid was \$1,124,340.00. In round numbers, it is about 6% more than last year.

Mr. Parrott commented that the price for a track hoe and a five man crew, which is what we need for repairing the loop waterline, stayed the same. When we need them for a large main break, we really need somebody that has the experience and the equipment to come out and do it.

Mr. Parrott made a motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners award of the bid to Shockley Plumbing, Inc. Vice Chairman Dr. George Patton seconded and there was no opposition.

WATER RESTRICTIONS

Vice Chairman Dr. George Patton asked if the water restrictions have changed. Mr. Parrott replied that the State has determined we are in a drought. Now we are on odd/even and you cannot water between 10:00 A.M. in the morning and 4:00 P.M. in the afternoon. Sod can be watered for 30 days.

Mr. Parrott announced that we hit 17,919,000 gallons on the 21st of June. This was an all time high. Then, the next day, the State upped the drought restrictions. We were in the 90% range with production. Lake Horton and Lake Kedron are both about 1 ½ feet low. Lake Peachtree is full.

There being no further business, Chairman Chuck Watkins adjourned the meeting at 8:30A.M.

Chuck Watkins

The foregoing minutes were approved at the regular Water Committee meeting on the 12th day of July, 2006.

Lisa McElwaney