

## CLAYTON COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY

1600 Battle Creek Road  
Morrow, Georgia 30260

Regular Board Meeting, April 3, 2003

Chairman McQueen called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

Present at the meeting were: Chairman, Pete McQueen, Vice Chairman, Lloyd Joiner, Secretary/Treasurer, Marie Barber, Board Members, Wesley E. Greene, Sr., J. Alan Horton, and John L. Westervelt, General Manager, M. Wade Brannan, Deputy Manager, Terry R. Hicks, Department Managers, Frank Conort, Jim Poff, Dennis Hammock, Herbert Etheridge, Jr., Teresa Adams, Guy Pihera and Mike Thomas, Executive Secretary, Janet Matthews, Assistant Manager of Administration, Scott Bailey, Project Manager, Mike Buffington, Human Resource Director, Ed Durham, Contract & Procurement Administrator, Karen Riser, Information Services Supervisor, Rodney Crowell, and Administrative Secretary, Dianne Hammock. Also present were: Greg Hecht, Fincher & Hecht, L.L.C., Rick Hirsekorn, of CH2M Hill, Farrar Wood, of Jim Wood & Associates Public Relations, Visitors: Eric Hoover, Forevermore Video Productions and CCWA employees: Terry Worley, Tony Ferrari, Eric Osborne, and Stephen Tarpley.

Chairman McQueen called on Michael Shinn, Senior Engineering Technician, to give the invocation.

Chairman McQueen called for any omissions or additions to the minutes of the called board meeting, March 4, 2003, regular and executive session board meeting on March 6, 2003, called and executive session board meeting on March 17, 2003 and called board meetings on March 24, 2003 and March 25, 2003, hearing none these minutes stand approved as presented.

Financial and Statistical Report: Chairman McQueen called on Frank Conort, Manager of Administration, who presented the monthly financial and statistical report. Mr. Conort answered Board questions and gave additional information.

Chairman McQueen took a moment to thank the Board for their attendance at the Bond Rating Agencies luncheons on March 24<sup>th</sup> & 25<sup>th</sup>. Chairman McQueen stated that he appreciated the entire Board being there both days and felt the Board's presence impressed the Bond Rating Agents.

Employee Recognition-30 Year Service Pin: Chairman McQueen called on Terry Hicks, Deputy Manager, who introduced Terry Worley, Warehouse Supervisor. Mr. Hicks gave some background information on Terry's time with the Authority. Terry started working at the Authority in March of 1973, after graduating from Jonesboro High School. Terry began as a meter reader, then moved to dispatcher, was promoted to assistant warehouse supervisor in 1978 and promoted into his present position as

Regular Board Meeting  
April 3, 2003  
Page Two

Warehouse Supervisor in 1984. Terry has served as Warehouse Supervisor for the past 19 years. Mr. Hicks stated that Terry is very knowledgeable, quite involved in ERP and the implementation of the warehouse going "live". Mr. Hicks commented how much he appreciated Terry and thanked him for his thirty years of service to the Authority. Terry received a round of applause.

Chairman McQueen, on behalf of the Board, thanked Terry for his thirty years of service and wished him many more years with the Authority.

Chairman McQueen called on Guy Pihera, Manager of Water Production, who updated the Board on the status of the Authority's water production and raw water reserve. Mr. Pihera discussed the information shown on the Water Supply Weekly Update for March 31, 2003 that was distributed to the Board. Mr. Pihera commented that the Authority started the year with a 5" deficient, but with the additional rainfall that we have had in the last month, we are only 2 ½" short of our 15" normal.

Treatment Chemical & Filter Media Bid Recommendation: Mr. Pihera next reported on the annual bid recommendation for the Treatment Chemical Water and Wastewater chemicals for the fiscal year 2003. Mr. Pihera commented that the information distributed to the Board is a list of all the treatment chemicals used. Mr. Pihera noted that there are about twenty-five different chemicals and a number of vendors. Mr. Pihera directed the Board to the Treatment Chemical Bid Results Comparison sheet in their agenda book and commented that there was an estimated total annual cost decrease of 1.2% comparing fiscal year 2002A and 2003. Mr. Pihera stated that it was the recommendation of the Authority's staff to approve the low bidder for each individual treatment chemical listed.

**Clayton County Water Authority**  
**Water Treatment Chemicals**  
**Bid Tabulation Sheet**  
February 25, 2003

	Allied Univ.	Altivia	CALIQUEST	Carus	Cheney	DPC Enterprises	Dravo	E&C Chemicals	Fini Enterprises	Fort Bend	Gen. Chemical	Geo Specialty	Harcros	Industrial Chemicals	Int'l Dioxide	Kem Iron/Midland Resources	LCI, Ltd.	Shannon Chemicals	Southern Lime	Sweetwater
Liquid Aluminum Sulfate											139.90 /ton	179.58 /ton				155.92 /ton				
Dense soda ash								8.75 /bag					5.70 /bag	5.00 /bag						
Bulk Hydrated Lime					79.31 /ton		85.43 /ton												85.00 /ton	
Chlorine-Flatbed truck	329.80 /ton	422 /ton				310.00 /ton							378.00 /ton	464.40 /ton						
Chlorine-Crane hoist		422 /ton				318.00 /ton							420.00 /ton							
Powdered Activated Carbon		18.80 /bag											22.25 /bag	19.00 /bag						
Sodium Silica Fluoride													13.60 /bag	13.00 /bag			15.00 /bag			
Potassium Permanganate		1.58 /lb	1.29 /lb	1.22 /lb									1.4425 /lb	1.47 /lb				1.277 /lb		
Copper Sulfate Med. Cry.		37.50 /bag											34.725 /bag	28.85 /bag						
Sod Chlorite 30% Tote		.4151 /lb													.387 /lb					
Sod Chlorite 30% Bulk		.3365 /lb													.307 /lb					
Ortho Phosphate			1.20 /gal	1.21 /gal										68.5440 /tanker or 1.72 /gal				1.57 /gal		1.40 /gal
Sodium (12.5%) Hypochlorite	42.50 /drum												47.85 /drum	43.45 /drum						
Calcium Hypochlorite	1.01 /lb												.90 /lb	.92 /lb						
Caustic Soda	.0681 /lb	.0838 /lb	.99 /lb										.156 /lb	1.63 /lb						
Ferric Sulfate									.59 /lb of Iron								.5578 /lb of iron			
Sodium (15%) Hypochlorite	.55 /gal	.92 /gal				.53 /gal		.63 /gal					.58 /gal							
Solar Salt													3.575 /bag	3.50 /bag						
Aluminum Chloride		1.2054 /lb of aluminum								1.066 /lb of aluminum	1.64 /lb of aluminum			1.311 /lb of aluminum		1.3357 /lb of aluminum				
Acetic Acid								.17 /lb						.159 /lb						

Prices highlighted in yellow are low bids. We recommend awarding contract for individual chemical to low bidders.

No bids:

Cargill Salt  
Luffman Salt & Chemicals  
Polymer Systems

CIBA Specialty  
MAGCO  
Stile-Kem

CMC Central Minerals  
PB&S Chemicals  
Vulcan Performance Chemical

Regular Board Meeting  
 April 3, 2003  
 Page Four

**TREATMENT CHEMICAL BID RESULTS  
 COMPARISON  
 FISCAL YEAR 2002A & 2003**

Chemical	Annual Quantity Used	2002A Low Bidder	2002A Low Bid \$/Unit	2002A Annual Cost \$	2003 Low Bidder	2003 Low Bid \$/Unit	2003 Annual Cost \$
Bulk Hydrated Lime	250 Tons	Southern Lime	82.00/ton	20,500	Cheney	79.31/ ton	19,827
Calcium Hypochlorite	800 Lbs	Industrial Chemical	0.92/lb	736	Harcros	0.90/lb	720
Caustic Soda	32 Tons	Industrial Chemical	196.00/ton	6,272		136.20/ton	4358.40
Chlorine	230 Tons	Allied Univ.	238.05/ton	54,751	DPC	310/ton flatbed 318/ton hoist	72,220 half by hoist/half by flatbed
Copper Sulfate Med. Cry.	55,000 Lbs	Industrial Chemical	0.564/lb	31,020	Industrial Chemical	.58/lb	31,900
Dense Soda Ash	60,000 Lbs	Industrial Chemical	0.106/lb	6,360	Industrial Chemical	0.100/lb	6000
Ferric Sulfate	90,000 Lbs	Kem Iron/Midland Resources	0.542/lb	48,780	Kem Iron/Midland Resources	0.5578/lb	50,202
Liquid Aluminum Sulfate	1000 Tons	General Chemical	148.00/ton	148,000	General Chemical	139.90/ton	139,900
Ortho Phosphate	19608 Gal	Carus	1.35/gal	26,470	Calciquest	1.20/gal	23,529
Potassium Permanganate	135,000 Lbs	Carus	1.32/lb	178,200	Carus	1.22/lb	164,700
Powdered Activated Carbon	6000 Lbs	Industrial Chemical	0.38/lb	2,280	Altivia	0.376/lb	2256
Sodium Hypochlorite 12.5%	28,000 Gal	Harcros	0.79/gal	22,120	Allied Univ.	0.77/gal	21,560
Sodium Hypochlorite 15%	24,000 Gal	Allied Univ.	0.48/gal	11,520	DPC	0.53/gal	12,720
Sodium Silica Fluoride	60,000 Lbs	Harcross	0.2525/lb	15,150	Industrial Chemical	0.26/lb	15,600
<b>TOTAL ANNUAL COST</b>				<b>\$572,159 for 2002A</b>			<b>\$565,492 for 2003</b>

**Cost reflect an estimated total annual cost decrease if 1.2%.**

Regular Board Meeting  
 April 3, 2003  
 Page Five

Upon Motion by Marie Barber and seconded by Alan Horton it was unanimously

RESOLVED: that the Authority accepts the low bidder for each of the listed treatment chemicals for the fiscal year 2003.

Chairman McQueen asked Mr. Pihera to continue with the bid recommendation for Filter Media. Mr. Pihera stated that the Authority uses two delivery sizes of Filter Media: a one cubic foot bag (1) and a fifty cubic foot (50) Super Sac. Mr. Pihera stated that the Authority's recommendation is to use the low bidder, Anthrafilter (US) for both products for fiscal year 2003.

Clayton County Water Authority  
 Filter Media  
 Bid Tabulation  
 February 2003

BIDDER	Bid: 1 cu/ft bag	Bid: Super Sac
<b>CMC Inc.</b> 2625 Bald Ridge Drive Cumming, GA 30131	<b>No Bid</b>	<b>No Bid</b>
<b>Anthrafilter (US) Inc.</b> 4992 Sweet Home Road Niagara Falls, NY 14305	<b>\$5.26</b>	<b>\$199.74</b>
<b>Carbonite Filter Corp</b> <b>P.O. Box 1</b> Delano, PA 18220	<b>\$5.2215</b>	<b>\$201.98</b>
<b>Reading Anthracite Company</b> 200 Manhantongo St. P.O. Box 1200 Pottsville, PA 17901	<b>No Bid</b>	<b>No Bid</b>
<b>The F.B. Leopold Company, Inc.</b> 227 South Division Street Zelienople, PA 16063	<b>\$6.15</b>	<b>\$321.00</b>
<b>Unifilt</b> P.O. Box 88 Fombell, PA 16123	<b>\$6.8483</b>	<b>\$234.333</b>

Regular Board Meeting  
April 3, 2003  
Page Six

We recommend accepting the low bid from Anthrafilter (US) Inc. for both products.

Upon Motion by Alan Horton and seconded by John Westervelt it was unanimously

RESOLVED: to accept the bid from Anthrafilter (US) for the Filter Media for the fiscal year 2003 at a cost of \$5.26 for a one (1) cubic foot bag and a cost of \$199.74 for a fifty (50) cubic foot Super Sac.

Particle Counter Proposal Recommendation: Mr. Pihera next discussed the Particle Counter Proposal for the Hooper Plant. Mr. Pihera stated that the Authority is upgrading the system by increasing the number of units. Mr. Pihera commented that the proposal is based on a combination of cost (50%) and specifications met (50%). After evaluating all the proposed costs, the Authority recommends using the system provided by Chemtrac Systems, Incorporated in the amount of thirty-seven thousand dollars (\$37,000). Chemtrac Systems was the low bidder for the Particle Counting System. Mr. Pihera answered questions from the Board and there was discussion concerning this information.

Regular Board Meeting  
 April 3, 2003  
 Page Seven

**Clayton County Water Authority**  
**Particle Counting System**  
**Tab Sheet**  
**March 26, 2003**

<b>Vendor</b>	<b>Proposal Cost</b>	<b>% Cost Evaluation (based on a total of 50%)</b>	<b>% Specifications Met (based on a total of 50%)</b>	<b>Total % Achieved</b>
Chemtrac Systems, Inc. 6991 Peachtree Industrial Blvd. Building 600 Norcross, GA 30092	\$37,000.00	<b>50%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>95%</b>
Hach 5600 Lindbergh Drive Loveland, CO 80539	\$48,322.50	<b>45%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>85%</b>
Laser Pure Corporation 740 SE Main Street Roseburg, OR 97470	\$74,770.00	<b>30%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>78%</b>
Inter Basic Resources P.O. Box 250 Grass Lake, MI 49240	\$64,385.00	<b>40%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>75%</b>
M.L. Ball Company, Inc. 6255 Atlantic Blvd. Norcross, GA 30071	\$73,182.00	<b>35%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>75%</b>
U.S. Filter, Stranco Products 595 Industrial Drive Bradley, IL 60915	No Proposal	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
ARTI 1055 Redwood Avenue Grants Pass, OR 97527	No Proposal	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>

Evaluation was based on a combination of cost (50%) and specifications met (50%)  
 \$37,000 was included in 2002A Budget for this purchase  
 Local references checked: DeKalb County, Cobb County, City of Clarksville  
**We recommend that we accept the proposal of Chemtrac Systems, Inc. for \$37,000**

Regular Board Meeting  
 April 3, 2003  
 Page Eight

Upon Motion by Lloyd Joiner and seconded by Alan Horton it was unanimously

RESOLVED: that the Authority accepts the low bid from Chemtrac Systems, Incorporated for thirty-seven thousand dollars (\$37,000) which was included in the 2002A budget for this Particle Counting System.

Annual Maintenance & Construction Service Bids: Chairman McQueen called on Herbert Etheridge, Manager of Maintenance & Construction, who discussed the annual Service bids. These are bids that the Authority puts out for "as needed work". Mr. Etheridge stated that the Masonry Work is basically block work and the Authority only received one bid from Southern Builders. The Authority recommends that we accept the bid for Masonry Work from Southern Builders for forty-three thousand two hundred twenty-five dollars (\$43,225) for fiscal year 2003.

**Clayton County Water Authority**  
**Masonry Work**  
 Tab Sheet  
 March 2003

<b>Vendor</b>	<b>Bid</b>
C&M Masonry Contractors Group, Inc. 174 Bellamy Place Stockbridge, GA 30281	No Bid
Commercial Masonry Specialist 100 Felton Drive Fayetteville, GA 30214	No Bid
Garner Construction, Inc. 3887 Jodeco Road McDonough, GA 30253	No Bid
Martin's Masonry, Inc. 5156 E. Fairview Road, SW Stockbridge, GA 30281	No Bid
Meadows Masonry 196 West Mill Road Jonesboro, GA 30236	No Bid
S&W Masonry Construction, Inc. P.O. Box 1345 Forest Park, GA 30298	No Bid
Southern Builders 209 Wallis Street Jonesboro, GA 30236	\$43,225.00

Staff recommends the approval of Southern Builders for these services.

Regular Board Meeting  
 April 3, 2003  
 Page Nine

Upon Motion by Lloyd Joiner and seconded by Wes Greene it was unanimously

RESOLVED: that the Authority accepts the bid from Southern Builders for Masonry Work for forty-three thousand two hundred twenty-five dollars (\$43,225) for fiscal year 2003 contingent upon approval of bonds and insurance as required by the specifications and to authorize the General Manager to sign the contract documents.

Mr. Etheridge next discussed the Rock Drilling & Blasting bid. Mr. Etheridge explained that this bid is for fiscal year 2003 with a renewal for two (2) additional years at no increase in price. Mr. Etheridge explained that the Authority has not done any blasting in the last two years, but must have a contract in place so that when the Authority does have a need to do blasting, the work can be done that day. Mr. Etheridge recommends the Board accept the bid of ninety-five thousand six hundred ten dollars (\$95,610) from Rolling Rock Blasting Company for fiscal year 2003.

**Clayton County Water Authority**  
**Rock Drilling & Blasting**  
 Tab Sheet  
**March 2003**

Vendor	Bid
Brent Scarbrough & Company, Inc. 146 E. Georgia Avenue Fayetteville, GA 30214	No Bid
Hardrock Drilling & Blasting, Inc. 2380 Buford Drive, Suite 106-304 Lawrenceville, GA 30043	No Bid
Powerhouse Blasting, Inc. P.O. Box 566692 Atlanta, GA 31156	No Bid
Precision Blasting Inc. 4688 Kings Highway Douglasville, GA 30135	No Bid
Rolling Rock Blasting Company 117B Commerce Drive Dallas, GA 30132	\$95,610.00

Staff recommends the approval of Rolling Rock Blasting Company for these services.

Regular Board Meeting  
 April 3, 2003  
 Page Ten

Upon Motion by John Westervelt and seconded by Marie Barber it was unanimously

RESOLVED: that the Authority accepts the bid from Rolling Rock Blasting Company for Rock Drilling & Blasting for ninety-five thousand six hundred ten dollars (\$95,610) for fiscal year 2003 contingent upon approval of bonds and insurance as required by the specifications and to authorize the General Manager to sign the contract documents.

Annual Maintenance & Construction Material Bids: Mr. Etheridge continued with the Annual Maintenance & Construction Material Bids. Mr. Etheridge recommends that the Board accept the lowest bidder for the Authority's need and if they are not available, to automatically use the next lowest bidder for Ready Mix Concrete, Picked Up Quarry Products, Precast Manhole Products, Plant Mix Asphalt, and Concrete Products Picked Up & Delivered. Mr. Etheridge stated that the Authority uses all the bidders as listed in the information distributed to the Board. Chairman McQueen noted to the Board that Mr. Etheridge was referring to the next five (5) bids in their agenda book.

**Clayton County Water Authority**  
**Ready Mix Concrete**  
 Tab Sheet  
 March 2003

Vendor	Bid
Allied Ready Mix P.O. Box 728 Decatur, GA 30031	\$115,150.00
Blue Circle Concrete 1800 Parkway Place SE, Suite 1100 Marietta, GA 30067	No Bid
Thomas Concrete of Georgia 2700 Cumberland Parkway, Suite 500 Atlanta, GA 30339	\$134,825.00
Walker Concrete Co. P.O. Box 2637 Stockbridge, GA 30281	\$119,800.00
LaFarge Building Materials 12735 Morris Road Extension – Ste. 300 Alpharetta, GA 30004	\$124,412.50

Regular Board Meeting  
 April 3, 2003  
 Page Eleven

Staff recommends authorization to purchase from all vendors that submitted bids. Orders will be placed according to price, timely delivery, and overall quality of service.

**Clayton County Water Authority**  
**Picked Up Quarry Products**  
 Tab Sheet  
**March 2003**

Vendor	Bid
Florida Rock Industries 225 Lees Mill Road Forest Park, GA 30050	\$86,165.00
Vulcan Materials Co. SE Division P.O. Box 80730 Atlanta, GA 30366	\$86,735.00

Staff recommends that we use Florida Rock Industries for the purchase of these materials. We would also ask for authorization to use Vulcan Materials in Stockbridge based on the geographical location of a worksite.

**Clayton County Water Authority**  
**Precast Manhole Products**  
 Tab Sheet  
**March 2003**

Vendor	Bid
Cole Products P.O. Box 666 Forest Park, GA 30051	\$7,150.00
Foley Products 5526 Schatuga Road Columbus, GA 31908	No Bid

Staff recommends the purchase of these materials from Cole Concrete Products.

Regular Board Meeting  
 April 3, 2003  
 Page Twelve

Note: These products are used for Maintenance activities only. The purchase of manhole products for new installations is bid/quoted on a job-by-job basis.

**Clayton County Water Authority**  
**Plant Mix Asphalt**  
 Tab Sheet  
 March 2003

Vendor	Bid
Baldwin Paving Company, Inc. 1014 Kenmill Drive Marietta, GA 30060	No Bid
Metro Materials, Inc. 1318 Henrico Road Conley, GA 30288	No Bid
Moore Brothers Paving 54 Old Griffin Road Hampton, GA 30228	No Bid
Riverdale Paving, Inc. 328 Lee's Mill Road Forest Park, GA 30050	\$26,988.00

Staff recommends that we purchase asphalt from Riverdale Paving along with authorization to purchase asphalt from the other vendors listed above at market price in the event that Riverdale Paving cannot provide materials when needed.

**Clayton County Water Authority**  
**Concrete Products Picked Up & Delivered**  
 Tab Sheet  
 March 2003

Vendor	Bid
Allied Ready Mix P.O. Box 728 Decatur, GA 30031	\$13,322.50 delivered \$4,202.50 picked-up \$17,525.00 Total
Evans Sand & Gravel 114 Quarry Road Stockbridge, GA 30281	No Bid
GMS Select Products 1940 Highway 42 South McDonough, GA 30253	No Bid

Regular Board Meeting  
 April 3, 2003  
 Page Thirteen

Leach Sand and Gravel, Inc. 279 Lees Mill Road Forest Park, GA 30050	\$14,425.00 delivered \$4,357.50 picked-up \$18,782.50 Total
--	--

Staff recommends authorization to purchase from all vendors that submitted bids. We will always attempt to use the lowest bidder and will use other vendors only in the event that the low bidder cannot meet our schedule/needs. We will use the additional vendors in the order of their bid amount (2<sup>nd</sup> lowest bid next, and so on).

Board member John Westervelt commented that he was glad to see that the bids were from local companies. Chairman McQueen explained to Mr. Westervelt that the Authority makes the bids available to local vendors and tries to use these local vendors as much as possible. Mr. Etheridge recommended to the Board to accept the lowest bid of the vendors named for each appropriate work discussed. Marie Barber, Secretary/Treasurer of the Board, asked Mr. Etheridge to explain how the Authority documented the bid process. Mr. Etheridge explained that the Authority posts a legal notice in local papers and also sends a cover letter along with the bid package to local vendors. The Authority does not always receive a response from each vendor. Mr. Etheridge stated that some vendors, who have bid on the Authority's work before, would send a response letter.

Upon Motion by Marie Barber and seconded by Wes Greene it was unanimously

RESOLVED: that the Authority accepts the bids as presented for the Annual Construction & Maintenance Material Bids for Ready Mix Concrete, Picked Up Quarry Products, Precast Manhole Products, Plant Mix Asphalt, and Concrete Products Picked Up & Delivered for fiscal year 2003.

CCWA Retirement Program Update: Chairman McQueen called on Terry Hicks who gave the Board an update on the pension program. Mr. Hicks stated that the Board of Commissioners and the Clayton County Water Authority are equal members of the pension program. There was some concern about the amount of overtime that was being paid out and how that would affect, on a long-term basis, the liability of the pension program. The Actuary took a look at the possibility of eliminating overtime and what affect that would have. Also, the Actuary looked at eliminating the overtime but retaining the amount of employer contribution (on an average year) that was equal to what would be paid into the pension program for the overtime. Currently the employer (the County and the Authority) pays 12.4% on each dollar into the program. The employees pay 3.5% into the program. The program currently has reached a point that the unfunded status as of June 30<sup>th</sup> last year was at 27 years. Unfunded basically means that they look out over the life of the program for everyone and apply the actuarial studies to it and say what will be the ultimate cost and what is the status of the program

Regular Board Meeting  
April 3, 2003  
Page Fourteen

currently. Mr. Hicks stated that the plan has enough money to pay accrued benefits through today. The State of Georgia law states that currently a program cannot exceed forty years (40) unfunded. In 2007, the law will drop to thirty years unfunded. With the losses that the plan has suffered over the last couple of years because of market losses, the Actuary did a run through January 31, 2003 and the unfunded jumped to 29 years. Mr. Hicks stated that the plan is right out there on the edge now.

The problem with exceeding the unfunded is that the State can then cut off funds coming back to the County. Fortunately, Mr. Hicks added that this plan has what's called a "smoothing effect" so any losses that happen in one year are taken at 20% and are spread out over a five (5) year period. This does not give an up-and-down effect, but a "smoothing effect". The Authority is currently looking at all overtime. The Pension Board had a called meeting last Friday and made a recommendation to the Commissioners to take a look at eliminating certain types of overtime. The Pension Board is still trying to define how that is to be handled. Also, the Actuary recommended that the employer continue to fund the plan at the same dollar level, which would equate to the 12.4% increasing to 13.1%. Mr. Hicks stated that he looked at the Authority's plan for the same period of time and our contribution was .83% for the overtime. Mr. Hicks stated that the .7% for the plan is probably pretty close. The Pension Board makes recommendations, but the Commissioners actually amend, and adjust, and adopt any new changes to the plan. Their goal is to try and eliminate certain types of

overtime out of the plan by July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2003. There is no effect on us as far as the budget that you passed a week and a half ago; we had money built in to pay the employer expense on the overtime. If the overtime is cut out, but they raise the percentage on the regular time, it's almost a wash in money. Mr. Hicks looked at the Authority's plan and it is \$20,000 less by going that way. Effective the first payday in July, the employer contribution will increase, unless something gets changed before then, from 12.4% to 13.1%, but will drop the employee contribution out on whatever is not a benefit to them. Our biggest challenge between now and then will be to establish the definitions of "overtime" versus "overtime". Mr. Hicks stated that the minute an enhancement is made to a plan like this, the unfunded automatically jumps up because now you are looking at future benefits under the new program with no money to back it up because you are just now starting the money process. The Board complimented Mr. Hicks on his informative presentation.

Property & Casualty Insurance Proposal: Chairman McQueen called on Mr. Hicks to continue with an explanation on the renewal of the Authority's Property & Casualty Insurance. Mr. Hicks explained that the Property Insurance covers buildings and plants and Casualty covers general liability, auto liability, your umbrella, and two or three minor items, crime, and travel accident. Mr. Hicks commented that the Authority had a carrier

Regular Board Meeting  
April 3, 2003  
Page Fifteen

that was underwriting our property for five years and they would not even bid on it last year. The Authority was down to the next to the last day trying to get the renewal in place for the property insurance.

Mr. Hicks stated that the Authority started working on this back in November or December and talked to Mr. Greene a little after the last Board meeting. The Authority had about a 70% increase last year and in some cases was just glad to get a quote. After reading several articles this year that stated that the market is still very volatile, the Authority increased the amount budgeted for Property & Casualty Insurance by 50%. This equates to about \$750,000. Mr. Greene was told last month that the Authority had some initial renewal

premiums that looked like they were in the \$650,000 range. Mr. Hicks stated that the Authority does have one renewal in right now and is negotiating with some others. The numbers on the other renewals received are actually lower than this one. This is a renewal from St. Paul that currently has everything but the property and they have also proposed on the property this year. Last year some policies still included anything that would be deemed terrorism acts. As of November 26, 2002 Congress passed a terrorism insurance act so that the Federal Government will actually get involved with the insurance carriers if there are terrorism acts, but there are a lot of criteria to meet before it is deemed as terrorism acts. In the event that you do not purchase terrorism coverage, then if an act deemed as a terrorism act were to occur then the carrier doesn't have to cover it.

The quote the Authority received from St. Paul, along with the other small coverages that we have, is six hundred sixty-six thousand three hundred six dollars (\$666,306). Mr. Hicks stated that \$26,859 is terrorism coverage on several of the policies. Normally, you would be looking at \$640,000 renewal. Mr. Hicks reviewed the quote and there is about a 30% overall increase from last year versus 70% on the year before. Mr. Hicks explained that it's only about a 20% increase in the rate with the other 10% in exposure. In other words, the

Authority has added over twenty million dollars worth of property since last year. The Shoal Creek Plant expansion has about fifteen million dollars that falls under our coverage. In addition, the UV is coming on-line, the Hooper Plant Phase I is also on-line and all of this is new coverage. Mr. Hicks stated that when the Authority looks at just the pure rate increase versus looking at the premium increase, it's about 20% under St. Paul. Board member, Wes Greene asked if the \$666,306 includes the property coverage. Mr. Hicks stated that that figure did include everything, property and terrorism.

Regular Board Meeting  
April 3, 2003  
Page Sixteen

Mr. Hicks stated that it's going to be the Authority's recommendation that we include terrorism, but we don't have to. For twenty-six thousand eight hundred fifty-nine dollars (\$26,859) against this type of premium the Authority probably ought to. Mr. Hicks said that he would be communicating with Mr. Greene and Mr. Moore when other insurance bids are received. Mr. Hicks stated that the Authority has three good competitive bids on the Property insurance and two bids on the Casualty part. The renewal date for this insurance is May 1, 2003. What the staff would like for the Board to do today is to approve this not to exceed amount, with these coverages and then the Authority will continue these negotiations. Mr. Hicks stated that this is a good bit below the budgeted amount and quite a bit below the increase the Authority had last year. Mr. Hicks stated that it is our recommendation that we do this. Mr. Horton asked Mr. Hicks that he understood that in forecasting the budget that we anticipated a 50% increase. Mr. Hicks stated that \$750,000 was in the budget that was approved on March 17<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Joiner asked if the three companies competing were solid companies. St. Paul, Chubb, and Allianz, parent company of Fireman's Fund, which was the carrier here for five years, are the competing firms for the Property Insurance. Mr. Hicks stated that St. Paul and Chubb have visited the site, Allianz has not. The competing firms in the Casualty portion are St. Paul, along with a subsidiary of AIG. We are dealing through a brokerage that does specialty work in water and wastewater only, but it's underwritten by AIG. Mr. Greene asked Mr. Hicks how soon the quotes would be received. The quotes for the Casualty will be any day now Mr. Hicks stated. The Allianz and the Chubb quotes are in hand, but staff has not had time to review the policies. The St. Paul quote has been in hand for some time. Mr. Hicks stated that the early part of next week a decision would be ready to be made. Mr. Greene recommended that the Authority purchase the terrorism coverage and that the Board give management approval to act on this insurance as expeditiously as possible. Mr. Greene stated that if something were to happen of a terrorist nature in our country in the next few weeks, these insurance companies would go back into shock and withdraw their bids and raise quotes. Mr. Greene stated that he believes that it is in the Authority's best interest to secure the rate as quickly as we can and then make a decision to lock the rate in.

Upon Motion by Wes Greene and seconded by John Westervelt it was unanimously

RESOLVED: that the Authority accepts the recommendation from Terry Hicks in reference to Property & Casualty Insurance, that the Authority does purchase the terrorist coverage, not to exceed twenty-six thousand eight hundred fifty-nine dollars (\$26,859) and that the overall cost of the insurance for Property & Casualty not exceed six hundred sixty-six thousand three hundred six dollars (\$666,306) and that the General Manager & Deputy Manager have the authority to purchase, as soon as possible, the best coverage that is presented to us based on quotes the Authority receives.

Regular Board Meeting  
April 3, 2003  
Page Seventeen

Chairman McQueen called on Wade Brannan, General Manager, who asked the Board how long the Authority had to defer a decision on the Property & Casualty Insurance. Board member Wes Greene stated that he had written down the tenth, but he did not want the Authority to go beyond next Friday, April 11, 2003. Mr. Greene stated that the quotes should be in the Board's hands by next Tuesday or Wednesday at the latest. Mr. Hicks stated that the alternate Casualty quote is the only quote that is not in hand. Mr. Greene restated that the quotes should be in hand by Tuesday, April 8, 2003.

Chairman McQueen asked for any questions or comments. Mr. Hicks stated that the Authority is insuring roughly one hundred fifty to one hundred sixty million dollars worth of property and that does not include the water and sewer lines out in the system. Chairman McQueen commended Mr. Hicks on his presentation.

Sewer System Evaluation & Capacity Assurance Plan: Chairman McQueen called on Mike Thomas, Manager of Program Management & Engineering, who gave the Board information on a Task Order from CH2M Hill that involves the Sewer System Evaluation & Capacity Assurance Plan. This Task Order includes an evaluation of the sewer system capacity and the identification of potential overflow locations based on rank and flow monitoring that was done on our system. Mr. Thomas stated that the Authority is taking a pro-active approach environmentally with our sewer capacity.

#### **CH2M HILL TASK ORDER SEWER SYSTEM EVALUATION AND CAPACITY ASSURANCE PLAN**

This task order was developed to assist the Water Authority in minimizing overflows from our sewer system and to address anticipated rules regarding sewer system capacity management and maintenance and operation (CMOM) activities. CH2M HILL has assisted us with several activities related to this issue including:

- surveying and digitizing sewer manholes in order to accurately map them in our GIS;
- analysis of sewer flow monitoring data to determine the relative amount of infiltration and inflow to the sewer system;
- development of a hydraulic model of the sewer system to identify potential for overflows during wet weather; and
- continued evaluation of additional flow monitoring and recalibration of the Casey basin model.

Regular Board Meeting  
April 3, 2003  
Page Eighteen

Based on these activities and design criteria for our sewer system, CH2M HILL has developed a proposed solution to eliminate sewer overflows for a 2 year rain event or smaller; some overflows would likely occur for larger rain events. The most simplistic but probably the most expensive solution is to place parallel sewer pipes along many of the major outfalls to provide additional capacity during rain events. The cost of this solution for the Casey basin is estimated at \$24 million.

This task order includes assistance from CH2M HILL to identify, evaluate and plan alternative solutions for the Casey & Shoal Creek sewer basins including:

- Recommendations for using permanent flow and portable monitoring stations in the sewer system to identify specific sources of infiltration and inflow (I/I);
- Recommendations for sewer maintenance and rehabilitation methods that will significantly reduce I/I and how much of a reduction we can expect;
- Additional modeling runs to determine how much I/I reduction is needed to eliminate the need for new parallel sewer pipes;
- Development of a method to calculate I/I reduction from flow monitoring data; and
- Evaluation of potential sewer storage facilities that would temporarily store sewage during high flows and then release it back into the sewer system.

It is anticipated that we would be able to significantly reduce the \$24 million cost of proposed solution.

### **TASK ORDER \_\_-\_\_-\_\_**

This attachment is to the AGREEMENT between CH2M HILL, INC., (“ENGINEER”) and CLAYTON COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY (“OWNER”) for a PROJECT generally described as *Preparation of the Addendum for the Current System Evaluation and Capacity Assurance Plan (SEACAP) and Sewer Computerized Hydraulic Modeling for Casey and Shoal Creek Basins.*

The purpose of this Task Order is to provide additional technical and cost information on alternatives to manage sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs); to provide supporting assistance for sustaining a flow monitoring and rain gauge system; and to further model and report on the Casey and Shoal Creek sewer collection systems. An addendum to the March 2002 SEACAP report will be provided with results, conclusions, and recommendations for Casey and Shoal Creek Basins. Tabs will be provided for the other two remaining basins, Jackson and Northeast, for future updates. Further analysis for the Jackson and Northeast basins may occur after additional flow monitoring is completed in those basins.

Regular Board Meeting  
April 3, 2003  
Page Nineteen

## **BACKGROUND**

The Clayton County Wastewater Collection System Evaluation and Capacity Assurance Plan (SEACAP), Revision 1, Final Report is dated March 2002. This report includes preliminary “pipes-only” solutions for all four sewage basins; i.e. Casey, Shoal Creek, Northeast and Jackson. These results were preliminary because RDI/I estimates were based on only one rainstorm. For the sake of clarity, the Executive Summary for the March 2002 SEACAP report is attached as EXHIBIT B.

Later, in year 2002, additional flow monitoring was accomplished for the Casey basin and more hydraulic modeling of the Casey Basin was recently accomplished in January 2003. The results of that work indicated that “pipes-only” solution for the Casey Basin increased to \$24 M versus the \$18.8 M shown in Table ES-2 of the Executive Summary in EXHIBIT B.

In a February 13, 2003 meeting with the OWNER, the ENGINEER presented the initial findings of the Casey Basin sewer system model analysis for a “pipes only” alternative. The alternative considered what increased sewer system pipe sizes are necessary to contain and convey wet weather design flow to the treatment plant and established a cost baseline against which to compare other wet weather control alternatives such as a combination of larger pipes and infiltration/inflow (I/I) reduction and/or temporary storage upstream of the treatment plant.

After discussing current regulatory drivers and enforcement emphasis across the United States and the recent Associated Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies (AMSA) survey results on collection system sizing standards, the OWNER decided it would be beneficial to have additional information to better evaluate and select a long term capacity program. The OWNER requested that the ENGINEER prepare a task order that will expand the current SEACAP scope to include evaluation of other wet weather management alternatives for both Casey and Shoal Creek Basins. The task order will also include the ENGINEER’s assistance to OWNER staff for flow monitor and rain gauge selection and implementation; I/I reduction rehabilitation subbasin prioritization; and pre and post data processing assistance for I/I reduction rehabilitation.

## **ARTICLE 1 — SCOPE OF SERVICES**

The ENGINEER agrees to furnish the OWNER the following services:

### **Task 1 — Revise the Current Clayton County Water Authority Wastewater Collection System Evaluation and Capacity Assurance Plan (SEACAP) for the Casey and Shoal Creek Basins**

The March 2002 SEACAP will be expanded to include an Addendum for the two Clayton County sewage basins that have recently completed additional flow monitoring. The SEACAP Addendum (PLAN) will present conclusions, recommendations, and present a discussion and summary of the hydraulic modeling findings for various combinations of wet weather control alternatives and their costs.

The PLAN will specifically focus on presenting budget level costs for implementing each of the alternatives listed in Table 1 below. These will be compared to the “Pipes only” alternative already completed. These alternatives reflect the desire of the OWNER to perform I/I reduction as a basic operational function.

Table 1: Clayton County <b>Casey Basin</b> System Evaluation Capacity Assurance Plan			Wet Weather Alternative Combinations			
Model Run No	Wet Weather Event	Base System	Enhanced Pipe Sizing	I/I Reduction	Upstream Storage	At Plant Storage
1	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	All basins: 20%	None	None
2	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 30%	None	None
3	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 40%	None	None
4	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 20%	Yes	None
5	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 30%	Yes	None
6	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 40%	Yes	None
7	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 20%	None	Yes
8	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 30%	None	Yes
9	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 40%	None	Yes

This Task Order does not evaluate the cost of implementing watershed options. These options may become of interest pursuant to the NPDES permit application submittal and renewal process.

Other activities included in the Task Order are:

- Hydraulic model run to estimate the number of existing baseline SSOs simulating “Characteristic Year” base system flows. This provides a benchmark to measure the impact of the program investments.
- A discussion of the regulatory approaches that are presented by EPA Headquarters in their proposed SSO Rule (CMOM Provisions) and other guidance documents. Plus a discussion of the State and EPA Region 4 regulatory perspectives on related collection system issues.
- In conjunction with OWNER, produce a 10-20 year long term implementation schedule to perform the recommended alternative. Using existing flow monitoring data, rank the subbasins for performing I/I reduction rehabilitation.
- Produce a technical memorandum that recommends a design for a sustained flow monitoring and rainfall measurement system throughout the OWNER’s wastewater system. Radar and static gauge systems will be evaluated. An objective of the system will be to support the measurement of both short term and long term rehabilitation effectiveness. This includes documenting in the technical memorandum how the OWNER can process pre- and post-rehabilitation flow monitoring data to calculate I/I reduction effectiveness.

Regular Board Meeting  
 April 3, 2003  
 Page Twenty-One

**Task 1- Deliverables**

- SEACAP Addendum with summary, discussion, results, recommendations, and costs for Casey and Shoal Creek Basin.
- Characteristic Year analysis using 2003 Base Flows for the Casey Basin
- Results of the Hydraulic modeling analysis for Casey Basin as per Table 1, listed above.
- Technical memorandum providing alternatives for design of a sustained flow monitoring and rainfall measurement program.

**Task 2 — Data Reduction and Quality Assurance**

Data reduction and quality assurance of the current flow monitoring of the Shoal Creek basin will be performed. This task is very similar to data reduction and quality assurance task done for the Casey basin during February 2002 to June 2002. RJN is the OWNER’s contractor who provides flow monitoring data within the Shoal Creek basin. The ENGINEER will assist the OWNER in evaluating the adequacy and correctness of RJN’s data and will advise the OWNER when sufficient information has been collected for re-evaluation of the Shoal Creek basin.

**Task 2- Deliverables**

Technical Memorandum outlining quality assurance procedures, conclusions and results.

**Task 3 —Analysis of the Shoal Creek Basin**

This task is similar to the re-evaluation of RDI/I and base flows recently completed for Casey basin. Further evaluation of the Shoal Creek basin hydraulic modeling will be completed to differentiate rainfall dependent infiltration and inflow from the base flow. The ENGINEER will utilize regression analysis to enhance calibration of the Shoal Creek hydraulic model using flow and rainfall data collected during Spring 2003 by RJN. The “re-calibrated” Shoal Creek model will then be used to

determine required improvements using the Design Peak Flow Standard (DPFS) event as defined in the SEACAP report. The preliminary “pipes-only” solution costs listed in Table ES-2, of the Executive Summary in EXHIBIT B, will be adjusted according to the newly computed RDI/I factors and the anticipated increase in base flows. A detailed analysis to determine the cost of the “pipes-only” solution increase over the preliminary estimate is not needed. Instead, as was described for the Casey Basin, the PLAN will specifically focus on presenting budget level costs for implementing each of the alternatives listed in Table 2. These alternatives reflect the desire of the OWNER to perform I/I reduction as a basic operational function.

Table 2: Clayton County <b>Shoal Creek Basin</b> System Evaluation Capacity Assurance Plan			Wet Weather Alternative Combinations			
Model Run No	Wet Weather Event	Base System	Enhanced Pipe Sizing	I/I Reduction	Upstream Storage	At Plant Storage
1	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	All basins: 20%	None	None
2	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 30%	None	None

3	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 40%	None	None
4	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 20%	Yes	None
5	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 30%	Yes	None
6	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 40%	Yes	None
7	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 20%	None	Yes
8	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 30%	None	Yes
9	2 yr-24 hr	growth build out	Yes	all basins: 40%	None	Yes

In addition, the ENGINEER will include in the PLAN the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for Shoal Creek as part of the work listed in Task 1.

**Task 3- Deliverables**

- Analysis to Finalize Base Flows and Separate RDI/I for Shoal Creek
- Analysis to Complete Regression Analysis for new Flow Monitoring Data for Shoal Creek
- Characteristic Year analysis using 2003 Base Flows for the Shoal Creek Basin
- Results of the Hydraulic modeling analysis for Shoal Creek Basin as per Table 2, listed above.

**ARTICLE 2 — COMPENSATION**

Compensation for the Scope of Services outlined in Article 1 shall be in accordance with the terms specified in Attachment B. Compensation shall be cost-reimbursable-per diem (time and expenses), with a maximum, not to exceed amount of \$207,271 without written approval from the OWNER.

**ARTICLE 3 — INSURANCE**

The insurance coverage required for this task order is shown on the attached insurance Exhibit A.

**SCHEDULE**

The ENGINEER will begin the work under this task order when authorized by the OWNER. It is anticipated that work under this task order will be completed as follows:

**Task 1** — Five months after OWNER authorization to proceed

**Task 2** — July 1, 2003 assuming flow monitoring is completed in June 2003

**Task 3** — Six months after completion of Task 2

This task order will become part of the referenced AGREEMENT when executed by both parties. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties execute below:

Regular Board Meeting  
April 3, 2003  
Page Twenty-Three

For the OWNER, CLAYTON COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY  
Dated this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2003

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Name Title

For the ENGINEER, CH2M HILL  
Dated this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2003

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Name Title

Regular Board Meeting  
 April 3, 2003  
 Page Twenty-Four

**EXHIBIT A  
 INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS**

**TASK ORDER NO. \_\_-\_\_-\_\_**

**Preparation of the Addendum for the Current SEACAP Report and Shoal Creek  
 Basin Sewer Modeling**

**ENGINEER's Insurance**

The Engineer will maintain throughout the completion of the above and any subsequent task orders in connection with this project and after completion as required in this Exhibit A.

(a) Workers' compensation as required by the State (Statutory) where the work is performed and Employers Liability in the amount of one million (\$1,000,000) Each Per Accident, Per Disease Each Employee and Per Disease Policy Limit. ENGINEER shall also indemnify and hold OWNER harmless for any such liability that may attach to OWNER as a "statutory employer" of any of ENGINEER'S employees, agents or subcontractors. "An Alternate Employer Endorsement" naming the Owner as a protected Alternate Employer will be added to the Workers' Compensation policy.

(b) Automobile Liability insurance covering claims for injuries to persons and/or property arising from the use of motor vehicles, including onsite and offsite operations, owned, non-owned or hired vehicles, with \$1,000,000 Combined Single Limit.

(c) Commercial General Liability, Occurrence Form, including Contractual Liability, per Project General Aggregate Limit of Liability, losses caused by explosion, collapse and underground (X,C,U perils). The Owner is added as an Additional Insured using ISO Form CG 20-10 extended to include Products/Completed Operations, or an equivalent Additional Insured endorsement, either form must be acceptable to the Owner. The coverage is primary as to the work of the ENGINEER for the Owner and includes separation of insureds (cross liability). Additional Insured status will be certified to the Owner for a period of five (5) years following completion of the project. The General Liability shall cover claims for injuries to persons or damage to property arising out of any covered negligent act or omission of ENGINEER or of any of its employees, agents, or subcontractors.

The limits of coverage shall be:

\$ 1,000,000	Per Occurrence
\$ 1,000,000	Personal or Advertising Injury
\$ 1,000,000	Fire Damage
\$ 5,000	Medical Payments
\$ 1,000,000	General Aggregate
\$ 1,000,000	Products/Completed Operations Occurrence and Aggregate

Regular Board Meeting  
April 3, 2003  
Page Twenty-Five

In the alternative, the ENGINEER may substitute a claims made policy in the same amounts and for the same coverages, provided that it has full prior acts coverage and a five (5) year Extended Reporting Period included in the current policy.

(d) Professional liability insurance to include coverage for the Owner and all Subs, Engineers and Design Consultants, with a minimum limit of \$10,000,000 per claim and in the aggregate. The OWNER may increase the limit requirements where in the opinion of the OWNER such increase is desired. The policy shall contain an eight (8) year Extended Reporting Period or the Engineer will furnish the Owner evidence of continuing coverage for that same period of time after completion. The Retro-active date under the policy will predate any work for the Owner. Sixty (60) days prior written notice of cancellation or non-renewal shall be given to the OWNER in the event of termination or non-renewal.

The Owner may elect to obtain a PROJECT policy on a primary or excess basis. The Engineer will amend their PRACTICE policy to provide primary or excess coverage to increase the combined limits of coverage. Deductibles included in the policies will be the responsibility of the Engineer.

(e) An Umbrella policy, including Excess following form, will be provided with a minimum limit of \$25,000,000 Per Occurrence and Aggregate (Per Project) and will apply over underlying policies for Automobile Liability, Commercial General Liability and Employers Liability. The Umbrella policy limits may be combined with the underlying limits to obtain the total limits required.

(f) The ENGINEER will furnish a Certificate of Insurance to the Owner for coverages (a) Workers' Compensation/Employers Liability; (b) Automobile Liability; (c) Commercial General liability; (d) Professional Liability; and (e) Umbrella Liability. The certificates will include a copy of the endorsement on each policy, which requires written notice to the Owner in the event, or termination or non-renewal of at least sixty (60) days.

The certificates for the Commercial General Liability will also include a copy of the endorsement naming the Owner as an Additional Insured, providing primary coverage for Operations and Products/Completed Operations.

Waiver of Subrogation – ENGINEER waives subrogation against Owner as to Workers' Compensation including Employment Practices Liability, Automobile and Commercial General Liability Policies.

(g) Each and every policy required by this contract shall be with a company that is rated by Best as A- or better. Further, the OWNER shall not be responsible for any deductibles established by such policies.

## **EXHIBIT B**

### **MARCH 2002 SEACAP EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Clayton County Water Authority (CCWA or the Authority) selected CH2M HILL to assist the Authority in developing a comprehensive wastewater collection system evaluation and capacity assurance plan (SEACAP).

This SEACAP report presents the Authority's established basin capacity through the Year 2020 to meet its service objectives. In addition this plan was prepared to include the regulatory intent of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) proposed Sanitary Sewer Overflow (SSO) Rule and Capacity, Management, Operations, and Maintenance (CMOM) provisions for each of its wastewater collection and treatment basins.

The purpose of the CCWA wastewater collection SEACAP is to document the process and programs used to identify, characterize, and address hydraulic deficiencies in Clayton County and fulfill the objectives of the Sanitary Sewer Overflow (SSO) Rule Preamble for System Evaluation and Capacity Assurance Plans. To accomplish this, CH2M HILL conducted the following:

- Flow and depth monitoring at 37 manholes with precise flow and depth measurements occurred during April and May 2000.
- Field survey of manholes on 10-inch and larger sewers was completed with approximately 2,200 manholes field verified with x-, y-, manhole rims, and manhole bottoms measured.
- Hydraulic models simulating 2,743 existing manholes on 10-inch and larger sewers were developed for four major basins (Casey, Shoal Creek, Jackson, and Northeast) within Clayton County.

Clayton County's conveyance system performance was assessed using both continuous and event modeling. After reviewing a 51-year data set of rainfall (i.e., 1948 to 1999), 1953 was selected as the characteristic year rainfall. A design peak flow standard (DPFS) was developed, using a 2-year storm event and Year 2020 base flow projections. The hydraulic models were used to identify pipeline improvements, limiting the computed water surfaces to reach within two feet of the manhole rim, before adding new pipelines. The modeling scenarios used for all basins are listed in Table ES-1. All of the scenarios (Runs 2-5) include the Year 2020 base flows, except the characteristic year (Run 1).

Regular Board Meeting  
 April 3, 2003  
 Page Twenty-Seven

**TABLE ES-1**

Clayton County SEACAP Model Scenarios

*DPFS – Includes the base flows for Year 2020 as described in Section 2.*

<b>Run No.</b>	<b>Model Scenario (Name)</b>	<b>Deliverables from Model</b>	<b>Modeling Issues</b>
1	1953 characteristic year with existing collection system	Number, location, and annual volume of overflows	Simulates the performance of the collection system during the characteristic year. Uses year 2000 base flow rates.
2	1-year, 24-hour design storm with existing collection system	Max. HGL throughout the system, predicted overflow sites, comparison of the HGL with the DPFS	This analysis showed that there were only minor difference between a 1-year and 2-year DPFS. The Authority selected the more conservative 2-year, 24-hour storm as the DPFS
3	2-year, 24-hour design storm with existing collection system	Max. HGL throughout the system, predicted overflow sites, comparison of the HGL with the DPFS	This analysis indicated the locations that required additional capacity. Improvements were added until the DPFS was met
4	2-year, 24-hour design storm with recommended improvements	Max. HGL throughout the system, predicted overflow sites, comparison of the HGL with the DPFS	Confirm that the recommended improvements meet the DPFS
5	5-year, 24-hour design storm with recommended improvements	Max. HGL throughout the system, predicted overflow sites, comparison of the HGL with the DPFS	Show the predicted response of the improved system to a less frequent more intense rainfall event. Provides some insight into the risk associated with the chosen DPFS. Requires additional planning for mitigating the consequences of possible overflows.

All of the scenarios (Runs 2-5) include the Year 2020 base flows, except the characteristic year (Run 1).

The cost summary of pipe, manhole, and under crossing improvements for Clayton County are shown on Table ES-2. Under crossings refer to caisson pipes placed across the road to carry a sewer pipe. Tunnel boring under the road is required for under crossings.

**TABLE ES-2**

Summary of Estimated Pipeline, Manhole, and Under Crossing Costs

(If adding pipelines is the only improvement used) Costs in millions of dollars

	<b>Casey</b>	<b>Shoal Creek</b>		<b>Northeast</b>		<b>Jackson</b>	<b>County-wide</b>
		w/o LoveJoy	with LoveJoy	South	North		
Pipeline Costs	10.6	1.27	1.85	0.96			
Manhole Costs	1.5	0.18	0.31	0.15			
Under Crossing Costs	0.4	0.12	0.2	0.12			
Contingency (50%)	6.3	0.78	1.18	0.60			
<b>Total</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>2.35</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>1.82</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24.2</b>

Jackson Basin includes 1 mgd from Fulton at Manhole NC 14

Shoal Creek improvements depend on whether City of Lovejoy sewage will be directed into the Shoal Creek interceptors.

Under crossing allowances of 500-, 150-, and 250-feet, respectively, for Casey, Shoal Creek, and Northeast were made.

Regular Board Meeting  
April 3, 2003  
Page Twenty-Eight

### **5-Year Design Storm**

The 5-year design storm event was simulated on the CCWA improved collection system to show the effects of the larger storm event. Overflows will occur even with the recommended improvements, if a big enough rainstorm arrives. These modeling results are provided as approximate, qualitative

predictions that need to be refined later with better information. These areas should be investigated to gain insight into the ramifications of potential spills. The point being made is that eliminating overflows by adding larger and larger pipelines is not practical or affordable. Other supplemental improvements consistent with CCWA's risk management plan should be developed and implemented.

### **Other Considerations**

The improvement recommendations determined to-date have been based solely on increasing pipe capacity. Several other options are available reducing costs and liability. These are:

- I/I reduction;
- Storage;
- Real Time Control;
- Peak Excess Flow Treatment Facility;
- Rain Monitoring Network; and
- Watershed Approach linked to Peak Flow and SSO criteria.

All recognize that the pipeline improvements determined to-date are based on very limited flow monitoring data, because only one storm event occurred during the flow monitoring period, due to drought conditions. It is recommended that CCWA consider additional flow monitoring in the context of other types of improvements. Considerations of a source detection program (smoke testing, CCTV inspection, etc.) and subsequent rehabilitation program could be done in concert with additional flow monitoring. This could potentially significantly reduce rainfall dependent inflow and infiltration and pipeline costs.

EPA soon will issue new SSO rulings that should guide CCWA in selecting other control options for evaluation. Obviously, one reason for more evaluation will be to develop a stronger link between SSOs and the impacts on water quality in the surrounding streams and watersheds.

Mr. Thomas reviewed the proposed Task Order and the alternate solution to improve the capacity of the Authority's sewer system. Mr. Thomas stated that the Authority would fund this using the 2001 Bond issue. The Task Order budget is two hundred seven thousand two hundred seventy-one dollars (\$207,271). Mr. Thomas explained to Mr. Westervelt, the newest Board member, that as the Authority enters a new fiscal year for 2003, CH2M Hill evaluates their rates and these task orders, including the construction manual task orders, and adjusts their rates based on their contract. There was discussion concerning this information.

Upon Motion by Alan Horton and seconded by John Westervelt it was unanimously

Regular Board Meeting  
 April 3, 2003  
 Page Twenty-Nine

RESOLVED: to approve the Sewer System Evaluation and Capacity Assurance Task Order in the amount of two hundred seven thousand two hundred seventy-one dollars (\$207,271).

Huie Wetlands Phase I Bid Recommendation: Chairman McQueen asked Mr. Thomas to continue with the Huie Wetlands Phase I Bid Recommendation. Mr. Thomas reminded the Board that they had received a bid packet for the Huie Wetlands at the Budget Board meeting. Mr. Thomas presented the following information to the Board.

#### PHASE ONE HUIE CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS BIDS

The Huie Constructed Wetlands project includes the first phase of constructed wetlands at the Huie Land Application Site that will receive treated wastewater from the Casey WRF.

Phase I includes:

- a splitter box that will split the flow from the Casey WRF between the land application ponds and the wetlands;
- a pipeline to carry water from the splitter box to the constructed wetlands; and
- approximately 55 acres of wetlands which will provide 3.6 mgd of treatment capacity when the new Casey WRF is completed.

This project will be funded by a low interest loan (3%) from the State Revolving Fund through the Georgia Environmental Facilities Authority (GEFA). The funds are drawn down monthly when payment requests are submitted and loan repayment does not begin until EPD has certified that the project is complete. The loan repayment terms are 20 years at 3.0% with a 2.0% (\$156,000) closing cost. This loan program also requires the contractor to solicit bids and participation from subcontractors that are woman or minority owned business enterprises (WBE/MBE).

The estimated cost for this project was \$9.0 million. Bids were opened on February 25, 2003 and are listed below.

<b>Contractor</b>	<b>Total Bid</b>
Gary's Grading & Pipeline Co., Inc.	\$7,795,441.00
Eagle Excavation, Inc.	\$8,833,920.00
Shepherd Construction, Inc.	\$9,506,863.50

CCWA staff is currently working with the Georgia EPD and Georgia Environmental Facilities Authority to insure that the low bidder meets all WBE/MBE and other bid requirements.

Regular Board Meeting  
April 3, 2003  
Page Thirty

CCWA staff recommends the contract for the Phase One Huie Constructed Wetlands be awarded to the low bidder, Gary's Grading & Pipeline Co., Inc. for the amount of \$7,795,441.00 contingent on approval by Georgia EPD and GEFA.

Upon Motion by Lloyd Joiner and seconded by Marie Barber it was unanimously

RESOLVED: that the Authority accept the management's recommendation to award the contract for the Phase I Huie Constructed Wetlands to the low bidder, Gary's Grading & Pipeline Co., Inc. in the amount of seven million seven hundred ninety five thousand four hundred forty one dollars (\$7,795,441.00) contingent upon approval of bonds and insurance as required by the specifications and to authorize the General Manager to sign the contract documents and give management approval to handle the Georgia EPD and GEFA documentation that is needed to complete this project.

Fire Station #4 & Fire Station #12 Sewer Update: Chairman McQueen called on Mr. Brannan, General Manager, who gave the Board an informational slide presentation on the Sewer Extensions for the new Fire Stations. Mr. Brannan stated that the cost of the extension of the sewer lines for the new Fire Stations would be reimbursed to the Authority from the County's Fire Fund. Mr. Brannan wanted to make the Board aware of the work that the Authority is doing in cooperation with the County. The total cost should be approximately fifty-two thousand six hundred thirty-three dollars (\$52,633). Twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000) is actual material costs and the Authority will work those costs out on a cost-sharing basis with the County, just as the County does on projects with the Authority. The out of pocket expense to the Authority, the County would pay, but where the Authority can provide labor to reduce the County's overall cost, the Authority provides.

Mr. Brannan continued with a discussion on Fire Station #12 at Mundy's Mill Road where the new high school is located. Mr. Brannan explained that the Authority wants to tie this sewer line into the pump station at the high school with a cost of about eight thousand dollars (\$8,000). Mr. Brannan stated that once again, the Authority would be reimbursed from the County.

Tara Field Water Line Extension: Mr. Brannan discussed a water line extension for Tara Field that is owned by the County but actually located in Henry County. Mr. Brannan stated that the County is making some additional hanger improvements on that site. With cooperation from the Henry County Water Authority, the County has a planned design that will cost roughly fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) for some water improvements at that site, where the hangers will be built. Mr. Brannan added that once again, the Authority would be reimbursed for these improvements.

Upon Motion by John Westervelt and seconded by Wes Greene it was unanimously

Regular Board Meeting  
April 3, 2003  
Page Thirty-One

RESOLVED: to approve the recommendations for the sewer extension at Fire Station #4 for a cost of approximately fifty-two thousand six hundred thirty-three dollars (\$52,633) and the sewer extension at Fire Station #12 for a cost of approximately eight thousand dollars (\$8,000) and the Tara Field Water Line Extension for a cost estimated not to exceed fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000).

Chairman McQueen asked if there were any questions from the floor. Chairman McQueen recognized Mr. Hicks. Mr. Hicks wanted to personally thank Karen Riser for all her hard work, not only on the contracts for the Authority, but she has been the project manager on ERP, which is heading into it's third year now, and for the many hours she has spent on the risk management, insurance issue. Karen received a round of applause.

Board member Wes Greene asked Chairman McQueen if he could direct a question to Frank Conort, Manager of Administration. Mr. Greene referred to the February Board Book, under Statistical Information, page 1, and the "net customer growth", in section 2. Mr. Greene read that the Authority shows in February 2003, under water, current year to date, residential, 1,482. Then the Authority shows previous year, 1,884. Mr. Greene asked, "does that mean that we dropped, by that number"? Mr. Conort explained that what we actually mean under the "net customer growth" the Authority has new customers coming onto the system every year at a rate of around 2,000-2,500 a year. Mr. Conort then explained that if a residential customer sells his home this month and the account becomes inactive for some time, the Authority at that time counts active accounts. Mr. Greene stated that the Authority dropped four hundred accounts? Mr. Greene asked Mr. Conort to what did the Authority account the drop in accounts to? Mr. Conort stated that the reason for the decline in accounts is largely due to the economy. Mr. Hicks explained that once the account becomes inactive, the account does not come off the Authority's books, but Mr. Conort does not count that account in the report. Mr. Conort commented that the Authority's accounts are in transition constantly. Mr. Greene asked Mr. Conort about the commercial accounts in the report. Mr. Greene read that last year YTD was fifty-four (54) accounts and in February 2003 YTD was minus eight (-8). Mr. Conort stated that those figures were due to the area up around the airport.

Chairman McQueen stated that he would entertain a motion for the Board to go into executive session to consult with legal counsel.

Upon Motion by Marie Barber and seconded by Wes Greene it was unanimously

RESOLVED: that the Board adjourns into executive session, the Board reserved the right to return to the open session.

Chairman McQueen called the regular Board meeting back into open session.

Regular Board Meeting  
April 3, 2003  
Page Thirty-Two

Chairman McQueen called on Greg Hecht, legal counsel, who provided information to the Board with regard to employee Health Care Benefits. There was discussion concerning this information.

Upon Motion by Marie Barber and seconded by Alan Horton it was unanimously

RESOLVED: that on December 3, 1992 the Authority adopted an Extended Health Care Benefit which provided that 100% of the Health Care Premium for Fully Vested Retirees would be paid by the Authority. The Benefit also provided that a portion of the Health Care Premium would be paid for Retirees Not Fully Vested as delineated in that adopted Benefit. The Authority now moves to amend that Benefit as it applies to current employees and those hired after April 3, 2003 and hereby moves and elects to retain the right to modify or terminate the Benefit as it applies to those specific classes of employees.

Chairman McQueen called on Mr. Brannan who on behalf of the employees of the Authority stated that he understood the employees' concerns in regard to any benefits that they currently have, they would hopefully be able to retain. Mr. Brannan stated that he also understood the Board's decision for any future liability that would require the Board to make an adjustment that would affect these classes.

Chairman McQueen called on Mr. Brannan who explained to the Board that the Authority did auction fifteen (15) vehicles that the Authority had taken out of service after vehicles had been purchased. Mr. Brannan stated that for those fifteen (15) vehicles the Authority received thirty eight thousand dollars (\$38,000).

Mr. Brannan stated that the statewide water restrictions that have been in the news from the Department of Natural Resources are not law currently, but at some point they may be made into law for the entire State to be under an even/odd type of water restriction with one day a week that no one can water. Mr. Brannan stated that Mr. Greene had mentioned about putting some notice in the water bills sent to our customers. Mr. Brannan suggested that the Authority hold off until a definite decision is made in regard to the statewide water restrictions.

Mr. Brannan stated that the Authority did have a request from someone in the armed forces that had a current account, but because of being called to active duty, their ability to pay may be affected. Mr. Brannan stated that there are some federal regulations that the Authority will have to comply with, that will apply for any active soldier. Mr. Hicks stated that these accounts could be put in what the Authority calls "no penalty status". The accounts are being paid, but no penalties will be added.

Upon Motion by Wes Greene and seconded by Lloyd Joiner it was unanimously

Regular Board Meeting  
April 3, 2003  
Page Thirty-Three

RESOLVED: that the regular session board meeting be adjourned.

There being no further business to come before the open meeting the meeting was adjourned.

---

Pete McQueen, Chairman

---

Walter Marie Barber, Secretary/Treasurer