

WATER COMMITTEE
MAY 27, 2009
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Pete Frisina, Chairman
James K “Chip” Conner, Vice Chairman
Tony Parrott
Jack Krakeel

ABSENT: Brian Cardoza

NON-VOTING MEMBERS: David Jaeger

STAFF PRESENT: Russell Ray

GUEST: Commissioner Jack Smith

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

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MEETING ON MAY 13, 2009.

Vice Chairman Chip Conner made the motion and Tony Parrott seconded, to approve the minutes from the meeting on May 13, 2009. There was no opposition.

II. LAKE MCINTOSH UPDATE.

David Jaeger reported that we are still waiting on the review comments from Safe Dams. He has heard that there has been at least one and he thinks two other major projects that have been submitted to Safe Dams for review. Since we were in ahead of them, there is an effort to get ours out the door before they start the others; he believes they are drinking water supply reservoir projects. He feels like this is a positive, and we are just waiting for the review comments.

Mr. Jaeger went on to say that the fencing contract is ongoing at the mitigation sites. The Contractor is substantially complete on the Mixon site. They will be moving to the Johnson site next. At a previous Water Committee meeting we discussed the easement going through Mr. Johnson’s property and his desire to move that easement. Mr. Jaeger stated that subsequent to that Water Committee meeting it came to his attention that the secondary location for the easement would require a significant amount of earth work to be done to make up the grade difference between the road elevation and the pasture and it became cost prohibitive to go that route. This item was pulled from the consent agenda and we are back to the original easement location and looking at other options that would allow for a less invasive, less obtrusive look to the access road. He commented that he is working with the contractor and he will approach the owner again about a modified solution.

Mr. Parrott commented that we would just use gravel, and over a period of time, with no more use than we will have, it will grass over. Mr. Johnson was concerned about the white streak through his green grass.

Mr. Jaeger stated that we have a Request for Qualifications that is being advertised. They have sent out eight or nine packages on the RFQ. This is to pre-qualify bidders for the construction bid, and we will be receiving those qualification statements through June 9. We have another bid opening on June 9, and will take that opportunity to publicly announce who has submitted RFQ packages to us for review. Then after review, we will decide who is pre-qualified and then invite them to bid on the project once we have achieved the approval from Safe Dams and the release of the mitigation credits.

III. WATER TANK DISCUSSION.

David Jaeger discussed the proposed water tank for the Flat Rock Middle School site. He presented a summary of cost analysis of the various sites on Jenkins Road that he prepared at the request of Chairman Smith. Looking at the map sheet, there are five different sites that are all located on Jenkins Road in very close proximity to each other. They were looked at initially when we got into this project and as a committee selected Jenkins Road as a possibility for location of the tank. Sites #2, #3 and #4 are all at very similar elevation, they are all around ground elevation of 1,000. Site #1 and Site #5 are actually a little lower than that. The goal in designing a water tank is to set the full level; when the tank is full the elevation of the full pool in the tank is set at a desired elevation. Where your ground is determines how tall the tank is. Sites #1 and #5 require taller tanks than Sites #2, #3, or #4. Site #4 was the site that was initially looked at, and at that time the county attorney visited with the principal at the school. There was some hesitation on the principals part so, it was determined that site #4 would not be used as the primary site because of some resistance by the school.

Mr. Jaeger went on to say the he and the county attorney visited some of the other sites and determined that sites #2 and #3 were on private property, would require potential condemnation as well as disturbance to somebody's life style, and elected to move forward on site #1. Site #1 is on church property. It is on the eastern corner of that property and it abuts the railroad track which runs in a diagonal on the map. They proceeded to some degree on site # 1; they did some sub surface investigations and determined that it was suitable as a tank site location. It does require a taller tank because of the slope of the ground down towards the railroad track. They moved forward to the point where they were ready to survey work to carve out a parcel of land out of site #1 with the church. The county attorney at that time did have discussion with the church and they were open to the idea of selling the county the property. He does not know if there was ever any discussion on price. At this point there was some turn over of the members of the Water Committee and we revisited site #4 and that culminated in a couple of weeks ago, the chairman attending a meeting with the School Board and their request to have a public hearing.

Mr. Jaeger referenced the document showing a summary of cost. At the time we looked at the other sites we had not done a cost analysis and cost was not the major factor that was used in determining which site would be selected. He went on to say that he identified major issues of cost, property cost, water tank construction, altitude valve and vault, tie in to the existing water line, road bore across Jenkins Road for sites that are opposite the existing water line, the length of the water line to tie from the water line to the tank, the access road and then fencing of the site. He said that the numbers he presented are ball park numbers. For property cost he used \$40,000 an acre, which is a number that he has used in some budgeting on road projects lately. The reason site #1 is higher than site #2 or #3 is because it is sort of triangular; you end up with more than you might need if you were just creating a square site.

Mr. Jaeger explained that he assumed for this exercise that sites #4 and #5, because they are Board of Education properties, would have no cost for property. He does not know that, he just made that assumption. The water tank construction numbers on sites #2, #3 and #4, since they are the highest sites have the lowest cost for tank construction. That is basically a base number for a million gallon tank built today. He confirmed this yesterday with the tank manufacturer. He told him as of last January that number would have been \$2,000,000.00, but the price of steel has dropped in the last six months. It is still significantly higher than these prices were three or four years ago, but they are lower than they were more recently. Sites #1 and #5, because of the elevation difference would be approximately \$100,000.00 more because of the taller tank. The cost for the altitude valve and vault and the tie in are essentially the same for all the sites. Sites #1 and #5 require a bored crossing of Jenkins Road. The length of the water line to each of these tanks varies, so the numbers there show the difference in cost to get a water line to the tank from the main on Jenkins Road. The same is true with the access road.

Mr. Jaeger stated that he made some assumptions on the fencing figuring that on site #1 we would fence the entire portion of the property bought from the church. Sites #2 and #3 would be essentially the same, but slightly smaller size. And then sites #4 and #5 since they are on Board of Education would require a smaller area to be purchased or agreed upon through an easement and therefore a smaller fenced in area. Site #4, which is Flat Rock Middle School, is actually the cheapest, based on this analysis. The church site is the most expensive.

The committee discussed at length the site that should be selected. Mr. Jaeger said that Site #1 gives us easy access to Jenkins Road, the access road and water line are shorter, there is less in the way of issues with neighbors, the railroad would be no issue from our consideration and the church was not in opposition of the project. From an engineering point of view or a functional point of view any of these sites will work.

Mr. Parrott pointed out that the growth in the county has stopped. When he brought this up that we needed to do something about pressure in the area, Tyrone

was a boom town, and Tyrone now only sells a building permit every other month. The Town of Tyrone was opposed to any place along Highway 74 that we wanted to put the tank. The school is opposed to the tank being on school property. We still need to build a tank at some point in time. The church site is a little bit more property because we are taking the corner, but it also leaves a tree buffer between us, the railroad, and the neighbors on the other side of the railroad.

Mr. Krakeel stated that the last conversation he had with John DeCotis essentially the Board of Education wants a public hearing to be held and on more than one occasion he has reiterated to him and members of the school board that if they wanted to have a public hearing, they needed to conduct the public hearing. The Board of Commissioners is not going to hold a public hearing because fundamentally, all they were looking for was an answer and he indicated to him that the Board of Education has no intentions of holding a public hearing on the matter.

Commission Chairman Smith commented that we made a decision that this was the best site and asked them to approve, yet they want us to have a public hearing to give them information so that they can make a decision. Further discussion pertained to what site should be pursued, the advantages and disadvantages of the different sites, the cost involved, timing of constructing the water tank during the summertime, growth in the area, the immediate need for the tank at this time and whether to have the public hearing, and if having a public hearing would set a precedent.

Mr. Jaeger explained that tank projects are notoriously slow. If we bid it today, it probably would not be erected for a year. Contractors are set up with specialty subs that come and do portions of the work. They will come in and bore deep foundations and then they will be gone for awhile, then they will come in and pour the slab or the footings, then they will be gone for awhile. Then the crew that is actually erecting the tank will be on site for a few months.

Mr. Jaeger agreed to speak with the church about their property and report back to the committee on this site.

IV. REQUEST BY PEACHTREE CITY FIRE DEPARTMENT TO USE LAKE HORTON FOR TRAINING.

Mr. Parrott explained that Peachtree City has a request for rescue scuba dive training at Lake Horton. He said they want to do it on a Saturday when we have a bunch of boaters, not only local residents, but people from out of county who pay to be there. We don't have a policy. They have trained in Lake Peachtree, but Lake Peachtree is owned by the City of Peachtree City. The bodily contact rules that the State has don't fit in there. When the county had a dive team, we allowed them in Lake Kedron. Lake Kedron has never had the amount of boat traffic that we have at Lake Horton.

He went on to say that some of the Fire & Emergency staff feels that we ought to because they would be one of the responding groups to come down there. Chairman Frisina asked if this is a one time thing, or would it be ongoing training. Mr. Parrott responded that they would probably want it to be annual. Any recommendation should encompass more than just one municipality, or we would have to do approvals for individual requests.

Mr. Jaeger asked if the State has any input on this or is it strictly a local decision. Mr. Parrott responded that it can be a local decision because it is health and safety. It is the same way they allow a gas motor for the Marshal's office or for Fish & Wildlife to come. That is an exception because health and safety is an issue. There is no way you can have rescue with an electric motor.

Mr. Krakeel stated that from his perspective he does not fundamentally see the difference between Lake Peachtree and Lake Horton in conducting dive rescue training. Chairman Frisina asked if there is anything significant about Lake Horton depth that they can't do somewhere else.

Mr. Krakeel explained that the fundamental thing you are training on when you are doing dive rescue training is search patterns and how to do a search. The water visibility in any of our lakes is to the level where you are not going to visually identify anything under water. There are certain ways to conduct searches. They are called grid searches. How you conduct those is basically on a tether, and they move four feet and four feet ... in a grid search (pattern search). Whether you are doing this training in ten feet of water, eight feet of water or fifty feet of water, it is more difficult in fifty feet of water, but the real issue is lack of visibility in conducting that search without any visibility. It is just a feel. He said that he does not see any difference between Lake Peachtree and Lake Horton. He does not know why we should expose ourselves to scrutiny from the general public having wave runners running up and down, and boats and everything else, when they can do it on Lake Peachtree without any criticism.

Vice Chairman Conner commented that the Lake Peachtree Association does not allow wave runners. Every time they go out to do the training, the phone starts ringing. The same thing will probably happen at Lake Horton. They don't stay in just one area, they go all over. Mr. Parrott mentioned that we have paying fishermen out there and this could rock their boats.

Vice Chairman Conner made a motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to deny this request. Jack Krakeel seconded and there was no opposition.

V. TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON UPDATE.

Mr. Parrott reported that John Otto and Wayne Jackson from DNR came down to the South Fayette water plant and they recommended changing where we

add the potassium permanganate to the raw water. Move it to the raw pump station on site and try to see if that makes a difference. If it doesn't, they recommended we move the potassium permanganate feed to the Lake Horton pump station which would give it even more contact time. He left the staff setting up a temporary feed yesterday. They have almost accomplished this task and we should be able to try it out today. There was not a water source available in the pump station and we will fix something temporary to get it going.

Mr. Parrott went on to say he was surprised at the amount of calls that he had over the TOC. It has been interesting. Clayton County Water Authority run a SUVA ultraviolet light test for TOC. It is a different way to come up with total TOC. They came up with a passing grade with one test. John Otto contacted them and they are going to run more tests for us every two weeks. We would have to make some purchases and upgrade the lab to get it certified to be able to run this test. He has contacted Bill Morris, who is over part of the Permitting and Engineering Department with DNR, to see if they will accept the SUVA test by Clayton County Water Authority for us on an interim basis. He is waiting on Mr. Morris to contact him back.

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 10th day of June, 2009.

Lisa Quick