

WATER COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 14, 2007
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pete Frisina, Chairman
Chris Clark, Vice Chairman
Tony Parrott
Jack Krakeel
James K “Chip” Connor

NON-VOTING MEMBERS:

David Jaeger

STAFF PRESENT:

Russell Ray

GUEST:

Rick Fehr, Environmental Health

The meeting was called to order by Water System Director Tony Parrott at 8:00 A.M.

I. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN.

Chip Connor nominated Pete Frisina as chairman of the Water Committee. Jack Krakeel seconded and all were in favor.

II. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN.

Chip Connor nominated Chris Clark as Vice Chairman of the Water Committee. Tony Parrott seconded and all were in favor.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MEETING ON OCTOBER 24, 2007 MEETING.

Tony Parrott made the motion and Chip Connor seconded, to approve the minutes from the meeting on October 24, 2007. There was no opposition.

IV. LAKE MCINTOSH UPDATE.

David Jaeger updated the committee. He explained the Board of Commissioners has awarded McIntyre Lumber the timber contract for the reservoir area. We are still waiting for the Corp of Engineers to release the credits from the wetland bank for stream channel mitigation. There is a percentage of the credits that have to be released prior to beginning timbering work. The mitigation bank submitted the information to the Corp about three weeks ago and the Corp is still reviewing that. He has been pressing our contact on a regular basis to try to get a specific date of when they will be released. Currently, he does not have a specific date; however the 404 permit stated that the release was fall of 2007 for those credits. We are anticipating release fairly soon. The timbering was set up to allow for this period and the timber contractor is anxious to get started. As soon as we get the release we will execute contracts and get the timbering started. Also, they are currently staking the timbering limits, which is the 780 contour. As of November 6, they had completed approximately seventy seven percent of the perimeter of the lake. He went on to say that he anticipates that within 30 days we will be complete

with the staking of the 780 contour. Mr. Jaeger referred to one area on the eastern side of the lake, indicated on his map as private lake area, that is actually county property and part of the reservoir, but it is also part of Planterra Ridge golf course. They made a decision to postpone timbering that one area until later in the project. There is not a lot of timber to get and there is no need to go in there and create a mess that will become an aesthetic issue for the golf course.

Mr. Jaeger went on to explain on the northern part of the lake, where the archaeological site is, they are working with the archaeological consultant to get approval by the Corp, and the State Historic Preservation office for the recovery plan. That is the only site with any remaining work on it. We cannot timber that area until the archaeological work is completed. On the Shoal Creek branch, the purchase of the Candler property required that the County reimburse them for the timber value in that area. Our timbering contract requires the contractor to access that specific area for timber value. Then the County will reimburse the Candler for the value of the timber right there.

Mr. Jaeger explained that in the center of the lake is an island. They have completed staking of the 780 contour so there will be no clearing above 780 on the island. Then, down at the dam site, the entire area will be cleared for the ultimate construction of the dam. Yesterday he received an email documenting some mussels that were located downstream of our project. We have a requirement as part of the 404 permit to do some monitoring at that site. He now has information showing where the site is and he will pursue determining access requirements to the site, then getting an environmentalist to assist with the monitoring requirements. At normal pool elevation the lake will be 650 acres.

Chairman Frisina asked about the soil and erosion control process during the clearing process. Mr. Jaeger stated they are attacking this in a multiple phased operation. The ultimate clearing and grubbing will be done as part of the dam construction project. He will have to discuss with Phil the specifics of the land disturbance permit issue to determine whether it will be issued by the County, or jointly by the County and Coweta County. Coweta County has visited the site, they have issued a letter which he forwarded to the State, as far as the project qualifying for a variance for stream buffer requirements. Fayette County has done the same thing. The initial contract is for timbering only, not clearing. We are going to leave the underbrush, leave the remaining timber and if you are dealing specifically with timbering, there is no land disturbance permit issued. The timbering contract includes the Best Management Practices by the Forestry Industry, which are similar to normal construction Best Management Practices.

Mr. Jaeger explained that the anticipated time line for this project is about a six month design period once the geotechnical report is complete. Then we will submit that to Georgia Safe Dams Program. In the past, that has been about a one year review process to get approval through Georgia Safe Dams. After that approval, we would then have a thirty day advertising period for bid, and probably another

thirty day period for award of the bid, then, approximately a two year construction. Upon completion and approval by Safe Dams and impoundment, it could range anywhere from months to a year or more to fill the reservoir. He anticipates if we are not in a severe drought, that it will fill quickly. This reservoir is smaller than Horton Creek Reservoir and has a drainage area that is about five times as large. The geotechnical work is done and they have started the subsurface investigation in the dam footprint and they are working on the report now. They will do additional work, coinciding with the timbering for borrow analysis searching for fill material to use in the dam within the reservoir remnants.

Mr. Connor asked if there were any way to speed up the one year process under the circumstances of the drought. Mr. Jaeger commented that he attends their semi annual engineer meeting. Each time they talk about their backlog and how they are trying to speed it up. In the past, they have committed to two and three month turn around, but it is possible we will get better than a year because of the drought, because of the priority status of the drinking water reservoir. If we do, he thinks it will be a benefit. Based on our past experience he does not want to count on it. He believes that there will be a priority placed on it; it will get moved up the ladder. It took a year to get the approval by Safe Dams for Horton Creek Reservoir.

Vice Chairman Clark commented that the Speaker and Lieutenant Governor have said they are going to author a bill that would expedite all the permitting and the real strict bench marks. They have talked to them about, instead of doing that, putting together a rapid response or strike team, having a policy to make those a priority and do those quicker, so you can get away from having to have a bill in place that might counter act with the State Water Plan once it is enacted. Negotiation is going on now. One way or the other, members of the General Assembly are going to make those folks expedite the process.

Mr. Jaeger commented they have already had preliminary meetings with Safe Dams. They are aware of this project, we have talked about the conceptual scope of the project, and how they think they will attack it from a design standpoint. It will not hit them cold, they know about the job and we will have additional meetings prior to our final submittal, which should late next spring. It hinges on the geotechnical work.

V. RESERVOIR MANAGEMENT PLAN DISCUSSION.

Mr. Parrott stated the basic portion without the attachments is included in the package for review today. Mr. Frisina and Mrs. Quick have made all the changes. The committee reviewed the document. Mr. Parrott went on to explain that when Mr. Jaeger submits to the State, they will ask if we have updated the Reservoir Management Plan, and does it include Lake McIntosh. They will also ask for this every time we have an update to a withdrawal permit. We have two coming up within the next eighteen months.

Vice Chairman Clark made a motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners approval of the revised Reservoir Management Plan. Chip Connor seconded and there was no opposition.

VI. DISCUSSION OF LEVEL FOUR DROUGHT RESTRICTIONS.

Mr. Parrott commented that the group that includes the Cities, the largest water users, and many others will meet tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. Tim Thoms, a member of the group, will speak on water conservation. He referred to the water usage for November; our minimum day was 5,855,000. The governors 10% goal off what we were doing is 6.3 MGD. Our minimum day was under that. However, for our first twelve days of the month of November we were 6,600,000. We are still 300,000 above for the first twelve days. The City of Fayetteville has reduced what they are getting from us, also.

Mr. Krakeel asked if the reduction is due to conservation measures or increased production of their wells. Mr. Parrott said he thinks it is due to conservation measures, because he thinks they are running the wells at the same rate all the time.

The committee discussed that under Level 4 you can still water newly installed landscaping for thirty days. The water restrictions have hurt several industries; the exceptions to the restrictions are to try to keep a certain amount of business going. Car washes have not been shut down everywhere, but this is on a county by county basis.

Mr. Krakeel commented that Mr. Thoms became concerned when Peachtree City met and were looking at some stronger enforcement within Peachtree City which included banning use of wells and pumping out of the lake. Within Peachtree City the County provides the water. One of the discussions that took place at the City Council meeting centered on enforcement inside Peachtree City and then any fines or anything associated with citations issued would then reside in Peachtree City. He asked how that works on our system, inside the City of Peachtree City. Do they have authority to enforce our regulations on our system?

Mr. Parrott replied that they adopt the water restrictions in the City, the same thing in Fayetteville and Tyrone. They enforce the same restrictions, but when their code enforcement or their police force issues a citation, they have it set up to go to City court instead of State court. The Marshals office can enforce the water restrictions in Peachtree City, but with the size of the system, it is good that the Cities are doing additional enforcement.

Mr. Krakeel commented that since the 1st of October, when he asked the Marshals to start getting more aggressive with the monitoring and they went to a 24 hour shift, countywide, including all the municipalities and the enforcement activities that the Cities have been doing, there have been 160 violations countywide. That is not that bad. A number of those were people who were on wells.

Mr. Jaeger asked if the municipalities are required to adopt the conservation measures. If the water is provided from the County system to a City, does the City have to play along? Vice Chairman Clark replied that everybody has to reduce by 10%. It is the system wherever you are getting your water from. So, if they are getting their water from us, we tell them they have to reduce by 10%, and they have to reduce by 10%. Mr. Parrott explained that there are certain requirements to be a certified municipality that tie in with bonds, grants and loans. If they don't participate, overall, in enforcing something like the water restrictions, it catches up with them later.

Vice Chairman Clark commented that right now, the four of them are going into some communities where the municipalities are not working with the County. They are telling them they have to do it or they will be back, and they will tell them how to do it. They are giving communities opportunities to come up with a solution themselves, and the municipalities play along, but those that won't, they will go back.

The Committee reviewed the letter that is being inserted in the water bills. Mr. Krakeel stated the group Mr. Parrott talked about is being called the Drought Advisory Committee here in the County. We have a meeting tomorrow morning with that entire group which includes all of the City representatives, and as Mr. Parrott indicated our large users. He went on to say that it is his understanding, that the Board of Education has gone ahead after our last meeting, and implemented paper products in the schools. A component has been added to the County web site with all of the information and the links to the State programs in terms of conservation measures, up to date information so people can access that information fairly rapidly. We will begin putting our usage on there as well, charts showing what our water usage is, so that people can be aware of how much water is being consumed on a daily basis here in Fayette County, what we need to do to further get down to where we need to be in respect to our requirements. We have put together a fairly aggressive action plan that includes a number of different elements that was actually presented to the Board of Commissioners at their meeting before last. Identifying strategies and measures that the County could take to further conserve water, and many of those have already been implemented. Mr. Parrott's folks and the Cities have pretty much locked the majority of irrigation meters that we are aware of. Those have been shut down.

Mr. Parrott commented that we have made a request to anybody with an irrigation meter to turn it off and then we will start them up next spring whenever you can actually water again, without charging them a reconnect fee, so they would not have to pay the monthly bill. He went to say that he needs to ask the Board about those few that don't want to turn them off. He cannot turn off a current paying water customer. As long as their bill is current, he cannot turn them off. We have a certain number of these customers with irrigation systems that are still on, because he does not have the authority to shut them off. Most of these are separate meters for a yard, so they would not have to pay the sewer fee on the watering. Most of

them are in Tyrone and Peachtree City, private individuals. Most of the shopping centers have been willing to turn them off.

Mr. Krakeel said one area we are working on is actually rewriting our current ordinance with respect to the authority and the fine structure, because even our fine structure is \$10.00 to \$100.00 right now. That is the maximum fine that we can charge for it. We are going to modify that and put some additional language in there that will give Mr. Parrott the authority to shut these meters off under situations like we are currently facing. He is hoping to get that on the Board's agenda for November 29.

Mr. Parrott commented that the current fine, once someone is issued a citation it goes to State court and it is \$10.00 to \$100.00. Mr. Krakeel made the comment that some other cities have \$500.00 for the first violation, \$1,000.00 for the second violation, and third violation, your water is cut off. Mr. Parrott does not have the authority to cut the water off right now, other than for nonpayment of a bill. Given our current situation, that needs to change, so we need to provide some latitude and give Mr. Parrott and his staff the ability to do that, and make the fines significant enough to get peoples attention.

Mr. Parrott explained that currently we are giving people a warning, because we had one the other day that had not been being used, but it came on. The meter reading on his meter shows it was not running. It was one of these flukes. Not only does he now have the meter off, he also has the electronics to the system off. He was actually embarrassed about it and the fact that because we got the meter reading, we knew he had not been using it anyway. We really need to be able to give a warning. Then, at that point, he said he has no problem with a first offense \$500.00, the second offense being \$1,000.00. Mr. Krakeel suggested that we have uniformity throughout the County with respect to the enforcement side of it.

Chairman Frisina commented that we do not regulate the type of irrigation people put in for landscaping. No department he knows regulates the type of fixtures that are put in. Mr. Thoms is on the Planning Commission and he says that is something we should do. We need to have specifications for the type of irrigation people can put in, that it be the most efficient. Mr. Parrott commented that we view plumbing past the water meter as somebody else's problem.

Vice Chairman Clark asked about the computer programs. Mrs. Quick said that the water bill format can be changed to show individual customers their usage for the past twelve months. It would cost about \$800.00 and take about three months to implement. This does not generate a report. Generating a report is time consuming but we are working on gathering the information. This is not something that Munis could do quickly for us. Mr. Krakeel commented that it is something we need to continue to pursue as this persists. Because at some point, for us to get to 6.3 MGD, right now we have to cut another 300,000 gallons and he doesn't know where we are going to do it. Short of continuing to educate people, provide information and do

bill stuffers. There are additional measures and steps we can take, the ordinance is one of them, but that is really an enforcement issue. It is not really a conservation issue other than the fact that we have stopped people from irrigating.

Mr. Krakeel asked if we have the ability to determine how much water is being used by irrigation meters. Do we know whether or not anybody is using water for irrigation at this juncture? Mr. Parrott replied that we ran a report that shows how many uses more than 20,000 gallons, which is our top tier water users. It had dropped down. Mrs. Quick stated 26 accounts showed usage, but these were because the billing cycle crossed over the time that we started calling people to ask them to stop using these meters. We have contacted all irrigation users, and most people were compliant. This next month, when we run the report, we will be able to tell which ones have usage. Mr. Krakeel stated this would be an interesting number to know, because if they have had usage, and we change our ordinance, then that gives us the capability to go lock it. Mr. Parrott commented that the Staff has been aggressive in contacting the customers, they made multiple calls to them.

Mr. Parrott went on to say that one thing the District recommended was making water conservation kits available. He showed a sample to the committee. Mrs. Quick stated the cost of the kit is \$6.95, plus freight and delivery is about four to five weeks. Mr. Parrott recommended making them available at cost at the office if somebody wants to purchase one and retrofit their home. The committee discussed what might be available at Home Depot, what other communities are doing, the cost for providing kits to 25,000 residential customers, replacing toilets and rebates for replacements. Some communities are giving \$100.00 rebates for replacing toilets. New construction is covered under the building code. Mr. Krakeel suggested putting a letter in the water bills saying the kits are available and the Water System would reimburse the customer for 50% of the cost. Then we could mail it out to the home and add the cost to the bill. The kits could also be made available for pickup at the City Hall in Tyrone and Peachtree City. New homes should not make a request because they should not need them. To be able to target homes built prior to a certain time; we might be able to use the data base from the tax assessors. Some places have tried to use census tracking. Creating a rebate program might give people the incentive to purchase the kits, and rebates on toilets since they are the biggest users. The committee tabled this item for two weeks.

VII. LAKE HORTON WEST RAMP REQUEST.

Mr. Parrott explained that we had a request to make the boat ramp longer. The west ramp is at Antioch Creek where the sailboats put into the lake. At the current time, both ramps at Lake Horton are not usable for boats. Neither is the ramp at Lake Kedron. He does not want to discuss making one boat ramp longer at one reservoir without also discussing the fact that you also can't get into the other reservoir because of the boat ramp. The boat ramps at Allatoona and Lanier as you can read in the paper, there are a lot of them you can no longer launch from. He does not know what length or at what extent we want to make the reservoir accessible when the water is eight feet low. The last three years we have been in the

seven to eight feet range. Because it is a drinking water reservoir and it is going to drop about that much every summer because we are using that much water out of the lake. But, once you make it accessible at that level, you also wind up with other problems within the reservoir, because even though we did grub the reservoir, there are some shallows within the reservoir that crops up when the water comes down. The island at Lake Kedron is a lot larger than normal, and it is rock. They would have used the dirt for the dam if there had not been so much rock.

Mr. Parrott went on to say since we had a request to improve one of the facilities, he wanted to bring up that just doing one would probably not be what we want to do. The committee further discussed the cost of doing the work, and safety of the shallow water for a boat. The committee agreed not to act on this request.

VIII. DISCUSSION OF SANITARY SEWER SPECIFICATIONS.

Mr. Parrott explained that when we looked at sewer specifications before, what held up submitting the entire package to the Board was in discussions with DNR, they were saying that we had to get our District plan modified in order to have capacity. Mr. Parrott said he talked with the District and they said that it was not necessary according to the District plan if you were just doing community septic and drip systems. You do not have to increase the capacity within the District plan because the District plan did not address it. They look at that as the intermediate step. Being an intermediate step, there is not a requirement for having the plan change just to show that you are going to permit these types of systems. DNR will follow what the plan is and it does not come up often. DNR has agreed that if the County has a plan for accepting these systems, then they will only approve the systems going through the County, as compared to what was done in the past. They did not even give the County notice in the case of The Registry. Only part of the subdivision was done. The Board of Commissioners approved the concept in February to go forward, but they wanted the Water Committee to come up with a package for review.

Mr. Krakeel asked, looking at it from a management perspective, are we looking at a utility approach to this? Is this part of the recommendation? Mr. Parrott replied that is will be part of the Water System, just like anything else we do. The only systems that will be accepted will be those that are on County water. The only ones we will accept are the ones that come through the County permitting process that we submit to DNR that is installed according to these specifications. If they have one existing currently, we won't accept those as part of the system, even if they are on the County water if they don't meet our specifications. The entire engineering approval portion will be using the States forms that they are currently using. The only difference is that we will have Mallett Consulting review their calculations for the system prior to resubmitting it to the State for becoming part of our overall system. The plan is to gradually staff it. For example, once it is adopted, we won't have one for six months, because of the amount of time it takes to go through the process for a subdivision, and construction of the subdivision. Then, once we reach that point, we won't have a customer for three to four months after that. We are

not even looking at Staff to handle this until after a year. We will just work it with our distribution crew on taking care of any maintenance needed in the system.

Mr. Krakeel clarified that we will be able to identify revenues generated by this program as opposed to expenditures. Mr. Parrott replied yes. It will be another line item within the budget process. The County attorney will need to review the documents.

Mr. Fehr stated that about a year ago, Dennis Davenport came to the Board of Health and indicated that there was concern on the part of the County that the State was approving certain community systems, and they were not being inspected. They asked the Board of Health to have him oversee community systems which the Board said it would be happy to have them do it. He went on to say that he would like to clarify what their role will be, if any. If they need to go back to the Board and indicate that the County is going to handle community systems or just work out the kinks in the situation.

Mr. Parrott explained that was something needed during the time in which we were then and where we will be, because they did not want to leave the gap or the opportunity there. Mr. Fehr said they have not had any lately and he wants to clarify for the Board of Health. Mr. Krakeel commented this was on an interim basis and once this is adopted it becomes the Water System responsibility. The permitting process would go through DNR not Environmental Health.

Mr. Parrott said that currently you can do a community system and then the homeowners wind up being the owner/operator with a trustee. The trustee can be almost anybody. Homeowners associations get to manage a wastewater system. An example of one that is not working is in Tyrone. Millbrook has had problems and nobody seems to be in charge. This past Monday it stopped up. The rate structure follows what Peachtree City Water & Sewerage Authority uses. It is based on water usage.

LAKE PEACHTREE AQUATIC REPORT.

Mr. Parrott pointed out information from the Lake Peachtree Aquatic Report is in the package for the committee to read. It will be part of the discussion at the next meeting. By that time, the creel survey at Lake Kedron should be complete. He cannot get his boat into Lake Horton.

DISCUSSION ABOUT DNR WAIVERS.

Mr. Krakeel mentioned that Mr. Parrott has spoken with DNR about the issue of Fayetteville's 800,000 gallons not being counted against us. But, we haven't had anything formally in writing. Vice Chairman Clark explained that he spoke with Carol Couch and she said that they are giving waivers to communities that are supplying other systems because they have been shut off with drought. They are being fairly lenient and are working with them. Mr. Parrott stated that he would follow up with DNR again. We also have Brooks to think about. Vice Chairman

Clark said they are sending out teams to 36 systems. They have an internal ranking system that they rank all the systems. Fayette County has had that visit and is now on the list, with the lowest rating of the communities that have been rated right now. The highest rating basically means that you have less than three or four days of water, or you are based upon a river or stream system and you don't have a reservoir. Fayette County may be 2nd or 3rd from the end of last week's list. The team is hitting about ten communities per week.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Parrott made a motion to adjourn to executive session for discussion of one property acquisition item. Jack Krakeel seconded and the committee adjourned to executive session. No action was taken.

There being no further business, Chairman Pete Frisina adjourned the meeting at 9:30 A.M.

Peter A. Frisina, Chairman

The foregoing minutes were approved at the regular Water Committee meeting on the 28th day of November, 2007.

Lisa Quick