

UPPER OCONEE BASIN WATER AUTHORITY
NEGRC HEADQUARTERS
E.H. CULPEPPER CONFERENCE ROOM
MAY 25, 2016
9:30 A.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

Melvin Davis, Chairman
Elton Collins
Gary Duck
Wayne Haynie
Joe Goodman
Pat Graham
Amrey Harden
Eric Klerk

Alternates Present:

Mike Renfrew
Joey Leslie
Blaine Williams

Others Present:

Jim Dove, NEGRC Executive Director
Mott Beck, NEGRC Executive Assistant
Evans Brinson, NEGRC Comptroller
Chip Ferguson, Atkinson Ferguson
Bob Snipes, Owner's Representative
Brad Lanning, Jacobs
Mark Beardsley, Mainstreet Newspapers

CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF MARCH MEETING MINUTES

Chairman Melvin Davis called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. He welcomed those in attendance, and asked for a motion to approve the March meeting minutes. **Such a motion was made by Mr. Elton Collins and seconded by Commissioner Pat Graham. The motion passed unanimously.**

Chairman Davis introduced Barrow County Manager Mike Renfrew. Mr. Renfrew will serve as an Alternate for the County.

FINANCIAL REPORT

At this time, NEGRC Comptroller Evans Brinson gave the financial report for the period ending April 30, 2016. Liabilities and net position totaled \$53, 951,607. **A motion to accept the financial report as presented was made by Mr. Collins and seconded by Mr. Amrey Harden. The motion passed unanimously.**

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Joint Operations/Engineering Committee: The Joint Committee met on May 11th and reviewed the Water Supply Model and Bear Creek Water Treatment Plant Operational Revisions and Modifications. The following items were discussed at length:

Water Supply Model: Based on current available data, it is anticipated that stream flows will be sufficient to meet the water usage needs during the 2016 Drought Protection Period and there is no need to designate either a Drought Severity State or Drought Response Level. The Model is to be updated each month and the updated Model distributed to members of the Joint Committee. (See attached Memo dated May 16th.)

Bear Creek Water Treatment Facility – Revised Operational Processes: As a result of the subject review, it has been determined that the existing treatment plant control system will allow the Clarivac System to be operated based upon water control parameters and will usually result in this system operating once per day rather than the current time based twice per day. This operational revision should reduce the reservoir withdrawal volumes by approximately 100,000 GPD, about 3 MG/month, and about 36 MG/yr. The Joint Committee accepted the above summarized BCWTF operational revisions and requested that the Authority be advised of these operational revisions. (See attached Memo dated May 16th.)

Bear Creek Water Treatment Facility – Modification of Point of Lagoon Discharge: After discussion at the May 11th meeting, it is the recommendation of the Joint Committee that the Authority authorize staff to a) explore the subject modification with EPD and, b) if determined to be acceptable to EPD, propose actions necessary to implement the noted modification. **A motion to accept this recommendation was made by Mr. Duck and seconded by Mr. Wayne Haynie. The motion passed unanimously.**

Bear Creek Water Treatment Facility – Water Flow Meters: Type, Accuracy, Testing, and Possible Modifications: Based on discussion of this topic, it was the recommendation of the Joint Committee that the Authority approve the following findings:

1. No supplemental flow meters are necessary for measurement of in-plant flows.
2. Athens-Clarke County may wish to consider requesting the Authority to install an appropriate supplemental low flow sensor set on each of the 36" diameter raw water transmission

- lines. Of course, the cost for such an addition would be allocated to Athens-Clarke County.
3. The current practice of quarterly calibrating the Venturi meters at the Bear Creek Water Treatment Facility appears to be appropriate and should be continued.

A motion to accept the above recommendation of the Joint Committee and approve findings 1 through 3 was made by Commissioner Pat Graham and seconded by Mr. Collins. The motion passed unanimously.

A copy of the memorandum dated May 16th with documentation and explanation of all of the above matters is attached to these minutes.

Finance Committee: The Committee met on May 11th to discuss an RFP for audit services and a uniform water rate. At that time, Mr. Brinson presented a draft of the RFP, along with a timeline for the process. A motion was made to proceed, and the RFP was issued on May 12th. Firms have until 5:00 p.m. on June 15th to respond, and the Finance Committee will meet on June 21st at 9:30 a.m. to review the proposals received. It is anticipated that a recommendation will be made at that time to present to the Authority in July.

At this time, Mr. Collins asked Mr. Snipes to report on the uniform water rate. At the conclusion of discussion on this topic at the May 11th meeting, the Committee recommended that the Authority approve the Uniform Rate Policy for Sale of Water between Member Counties as outlined in the May 16th memorandum (attached); that the Policy include the proposed guiding principles and proposed calculation methodology described in the memorandum, and that the Policy require that a copy of all contracts for short term water sales between Member counties be provided to the Authority and such documents be maintained in the Authority's files. **A motion to accept this recommendation as stated above was made by Mr. Collins and seconded by Mr. Gary Duck. The motion passed unanimously.**

OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE REPORT

Regarding High Service Pump #8, only one bid was received from Caldwell Electrical Contractor in the amount of \$316,416. The Engineer's estimate was \$287,938 and the JCWSA budget is \$285,000. Based upon authority granted at the March meeting, Chairman Davis approved the designation of this firm as the apparent "low responsive & responsible bid" and authorized staff to explore options for reducing the bid amount. Caldwell Electric identified value engineering alternatives that will reduce the contract amount to \$283,919. Jacobs staff has reviewed the Caldwell proposed revisions and find the revisions to be acceptable. The JCWSA is currently evaluating the revisions, and if everyone finds the proposed changes to be acceptable,

the Chairman will be asked to award the contract to Caldwell Electric concurrent with a "change order" reflecting the design modifications and noted price.

A cost proposal for the Barrow County water flow meter upgrade has been obtained from MR Systems for a Cellular connection between the meter and treatment plant to meet the requirements for the new policy. The cost for this upgrade is \$33,700, plus applicable taxes. In addition, the cost for the Jacobs professional services related to this project is \$5,000 maximum. The work will be accomplished under provisions of the existing Utility Services Contract between Jacobs and the Authority. Barrow County has agreed to this cost proposal, and the schedule for the work to be accomplished calls for all work to be completed prior to the September 1st date established for the new metering policy to become effective.

The next renewal date for the Utilities Service Contract with Jacobs, Inc. is September 26, 2016, and the Authority must advise the firm no later than June 27, 2016 if the Authority desires to terminate the subject contract. Chairman Davis asked Authority members at the March 23rd meeting to let him or Mr. Snipes know of any concerns or questions regarding the contract renewal. No comments were received, and Mr. Snipes advised that he would notify Jacobs, Inc. no later than June 1st of the Authority's desire to renew the contract for the September 26, 2016 through September 25, 2017. **A motion to renew the contract was made by Mr. Collins and seconded by Mr. Harden. The motion passed unanimously.** Mr. Snipes will forward an official notice of this action to Jacobs, Inc.

No one expressed interest in obtaining any of the surplus items discussed in the previous meeting, and the next step for disposing of the surplus items, as outlined within the Asset Management Policy, will be taken. This will involve placing these items on the internet for possible acquisition by other interested parties.

OPERATIONS AND MANAGEMENT REPORT

Operations are normal and in compliance with EPD rules and regulations. The reservoir remains at full pool, and the treatment plant pumped an average of 8.1 MGD, compared to 8.2 at the same time last year. Staff has been cleaning out the river intake, which is conducted annually. There have been no construction activities or maintenance issues at the site during the last two months.

PUBLIC COMMENT / EXECUTIVE SESSION

There were no requests for comment, and Legal Counsel advised that an Executive Session was not needed at this time.

OTHER BUSINESS

The next meeting will be held on July 27th. Please be reminded that this meeting will be held jointly with the Resource Management Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Martha "Mott" Beck
UOBWA Secretary

Upper Oconee Basin Water Authority



Date: May 16, 2016

To: UOBWA Chairman Melvin Davis, Members, and Alternates

From: Bob Snipes, P.E. – Owner's Representative

Subject: Water Supply Model (May-July 2016) and Bear Creek Water Treatment Plant Operational Revisions and Modifications

The purpose of this memo is to summarize information related to the below discussed topics and, when appropriate, to convey associated recommendations from the Wednesday May 11, 2016 meeting of the Joint Engineering/Operations Committee (Joint Committee).

Water Supply Model

The Member Counties have all submitted the appropriate water usage information for input into the Water Supply Model (Model) for the upcoming 2016 Drought Protection Period. Diana Jackson, P.E. and Chris Adams, P.E., of Jacobs Engineering and I have collectively worked to adjust the initially provided water use information based upon water flows, and the associated peak day factors, measured at the Bear Creek Water Treatment Facility. This updated input information was provided to members of the Joint Engineering/Operations Committee by an email from me on May 8, 2016.

During the Wednesday May 11, 2016 meeting of the Joint Committee, Diana, Chris, and I reviewed with the Committee members the Model input and output information. It is noted that the initial run of the Water Supply Model is based upon input data as of May 1, 2016 and is intended to address the May-July 2016 Drought Protection Period. Further, this initial output of the Model anticipates minimum and maximum stream flows at the 60% and 70% probability levels, respectively. Therefore, based upon currently available information, it is anticipated that stream flows will be sufficient to meet the water usage needs of the Authority members during the 2016 Drought Protection Period and that there is not currently a need to designate either a Drought Severity Stage or Drought Response Level.

The Joint Committee requested that the Authority be advised of the above outlined output from the Model.

Bear Creek Water Treatment Facility – Revised Operational Processes

During the last several months, Engineering Committee Chairman Duck, Operations Committee Chairman Haynie, Brad Lanning and Diana Jackson of Jacobs Engineering, and I have been reviewing the volume of water that is typically withdrawn from the reservoir each day and not ultimately supplied to Member Counties and their customers. This treated or partly treated volume of water is almost entirely utilized in operational processes (a minor amount is loss to evaporation) of the Bear Creek Water



Treatment Facility (BCWTF). Typical uses included sample pumps, back washing of filters, ClariVac system removal of sludge from the sedimentation basins, periodic cleaning of the sedimentation basins, etc. These process uses can account for almost 18% of the total water withdrawn from the Reservoir during some months (April 2015) and averaged about 30.7 million gallons (MG) per month during 2015 or about 1 MG/day (MGD).

This level of BCWTF process use of water could have a significant impact on available water supply during periods of extended drought and/or when water needs approach entitlement share or withdrawal permit limits.

One of the BCWTF operational processes that consumes a significant amount of water each day, and which appears to be a candidate for modification, is the ClariVac sludge removal system. Until the above noted review was undertaken, the ClariVac system was operated once per shift (twice per day) in each of the two (2) sedimentation basins regardless of the time of year, reservoir level, treated water demand, etc. and consumed on average about 200,000 gallons per day (gpd), approximately 6 MG/month, and approximately 73 MG/yr.

As a result of the subject review, it has been determined that the existing treatment plant control system will allow the ClariVac system to be operated based upon water control parameters and will usually result in this system operating once per day rather than the current time based twice per day. This operational revision should reduce the reservoir withdrawal volumes by approximately 100,000 gpd, about 3 MG/month, and about 36 MG/yr.

In addition, the flow rate on two of the sample collection faucets has been modified from 29 gals per minute (gpm) to 8 gpm resulting in a reduction in process water use of approximately 60,400 gpd, 1.8 MG/month, and 21.7 MG/yr.

During the May 11, 2016 meeting of the Joint Committee, the Committee accepted the above summarized BCWTF operational revisions and requested that the Authority be advised of these operational revisions at the Wednesday May 25, 2016 meeting.

Bear Creek Water Treatment Facility – Modification of Point of Lagoon Discharge

All water withdrawn from the reservoir by the BCWTF each day, and not ultimately pumped into the Clear wells or distribution systems of Member Counties, is utilized by treatment plant processes and then discharged into the treatment plant's primary and secondary lagoon system. The lagoon discharge system subsequently releases these waters into Bear Creek at a point downstream of the reservoir dam. During calendar year 2015, this volume of water (minus evaporation) totaled approximately 368 MG (an average of about 30.7 MG/month or an average of approximately 1.0 MGD). Again, this loss of water withdrawn from the reservoir could have a significant impact on available water supply during periods of extended drought and/or when water needs approach entitlement share or withdrawal permit limits.

It has been determined that the discharge from the lagoons could be modified, with EPD approval, to direct this volume of water back into the reservoir rather than into Bear Creek downstream of the reservoir dam. This modification would in turn reduce the volume of water that is withdrawn from the river; thus, reducing operational costs while making this volume of water available for distribution to customers within the limits of the EPD withdrawal permits.

The cost for such a modification is estimated to be \$9,000 to \$12,500. Staff is currently of the opinion that such a modification would not have a negative impact on the reservoir water quality and Jacobs staff is currently investigating what approvals might be necessary from EPD for such a modification.

This topic was discussed at the Joint Committee meeting on Wednesday May 11, 2016. At the conclusion of Committee discussion on this topic, the Committee recommended that the Authority authorize staff to a) explore the subject modification with EPD and, b) if determined to be acceptable to EPD, propose actions necessary to implement the noted modification.

*1st: Gary
2nd: Wayne*

I concur with the Joint Committee's recommendation.

Bear Creek Water Treatment Facility – Water Flow Meters: Type, Accuracy, Testing, and Possible Modifications

The five (5) individuals noted in the earlier part of this memo have collectively reviewed the location of water flow meters at the BCWTF, the accuracy of these meters, the possible need for supplementary meters to enhance accuracy at certain points, testing frequency, etc. This review produced the following observations and recommendations.

Observations:

- 1) Flows at the BCWTF are measured at key locations (e.g. flows into the transmission lines for each Member County) utilizing venturi flow elements/meters for closed pipes.
- 2) Venturi meters are reported by the manufacturer to be accurate within +/-0.5% based upon certain conditions related to pipe diameter and flow rates.
- 3) A venturi meter is expected to be within the noted accuracy range for a 36" diameter pipe when the rate of flow is 1,014 gpm (1.46 MGD) or higher and for a 30" diameter pipe when the rate of flow is 847 gpm (1.22 MGD) or greater.
- 4) The minimum flow through the BCWTF during low flow periods typically exceed 3.0 MGD with short periods that may drop to about 1.5 MGD. Therefore, the flow rates within the plant appear to exceed the minimum thresholds necessary to obtain optimal accuracy for the venturi meters.
- 5) Minimum flows to the Barrow County/Oconee County transmission line during the lowest demand periods exceed the minimum 1.22 MGD flow necessary to obtain optimal accuracy for the associated 30" diameter pipe and the venturi meter. Therefore, a supplemental meter (e.g. a full profile insertion flow meter) would not appear to enhance the accuracy of the measured flow.
- 6) Minimum flows to the Jackson County transmission system during low demand periods typically exceed the minimum 1.22 MGD flow necessary to obtain optimal accuracy for the associated 30" diameter pipe and the dual sensor set venturi meter. Never the less, there are short periods when flows may drop as low as 0.8 MGD and below the accuracy threshold for the existing dual range sensors in this venturi meter. However, treatment plant staff advises that the finished water pumps to Jackson County are typically shut down when flows drop to the 0.8 MGD range. Therefore, a supplemental meter (e.g. a full profile Insertion flow meter) would not appear to significantly enhance the accuracy of the measured flow.

- 7) Minimum flows to Athens-Clarke County appear to have high likelihood of being below the 1.46 MGD accuracy threshold for the associated 36" diameter pipe and existing single sensor set venturi meter during some periods. Therefore, a supplemental low flow sensor set may be desirable on the venturi meter associated with each of the two (2) 36" diameter pipes that provide raw water to Athens-Clarke County.
- 8) The venturi meters at the BCWTF are currently calibrated every quarter. This calibration frequency appears to meet or exceed the manufacturer's recommendation. Therefore, there does not appear to be a need to modify current practice.

Recommendations:

At the conclusion of discussion on this topic, the Joint Committee recommended that the Authority approve the below noted findings:

- a) No supplemental flow meters are necessary for measurement of in plant flows.
- b) Athens-Clarke County may wish to consider requesting the Authority to install an appropriate supplemental low flow sensor set on each of the 36" diameter raw water transmission lines. Of course, the cost for such an addition would be allocated to Athens-Clarke County.
- c) The current practice of quarterly calibrating the venturi meters at the BCWTF appears to be appropriate and should be continued.

*1st. Pat
2nd. Elton*

The Joint Committee asked that Jacobs staff develop the following information for further consideration by the Authority and/or Committees:

- I. The feasibility of utilizing clearwell storage levels as a supplemental accuracy check of metered flows to assist Member Counties in EPD required Water Loss Audits, and
- II. An estimate of the cost for installation of a supplemental low flow sensor set on each of the venturi meters associated with the Athens-Clarke County raw water transmission lines.

Please contact me should you have questions or comments regarding the above information.

Copy:

Chip Ferguson, Attorney
Jim Dove, RDC Director
Mott Beck, RDC Admin Asst.
Diana Jackson, P.E. — Jacobs Engineering
Brad Lanning, P.E. - Jacobs Engineering

Upper Oconee Basin Water Authority



Date: May 16, 2016

To: UOBWA Chairman Melvin Davis, Members, and Alternates

From: Bob Snipes, P.E. – Owner's Representative

Subject: Uniform Rate for Short Term Sale of Water between Member Counties

The purpose of this memo is to provide information regarding a proposed policy, guiding principles, and methodology for establishing and annually updating the "Uniform Rate" for the short term sale of water from one Member County to another and to convey a recommendation from the Finance Committee regarding this issue.

At the March 23, 2016 meeting of the Authority, Chairman Davis asked that the Finance Committee and staff develop a recommendation regarding the "Uniform Rate" for the sale of water among Member Counties. This topic was considered at the Wednesday May 11, 2016 meeting of the Finance Committee.

Section 210 (e) & (f) of the "Intergovernmental Reservoir and Raw Water Supply Agreement between Upper Oconee Basin Water Authority, Oconee County, Athens-Clarke County, Barrow County, & Jackson County, Georgia" and Section 210 (e) & (f) of the "Intergovernmental Water Treatment and Transmission Agreement between Upper Oconee Basin Water Authority, Oconee County, Barrow County, & Jackson County, Georgia" address the requirement that a "Uniform Rate" be established by the Authority for the "short-term sale of water from one Member County to another".

It is my understanding, after consultation with Authority Attorney Chip Ferguson, that the above noted Sections of the referenced Intergovernmental Agreements are applicable to the sale of water between Member Counties when both are operating within the limits of their respective Entitlement Shares and EPD withdrawal permits and that these provisions of the Intergovernmental Agreements are not for the purpose of allowing Member Counties to exceed either of these limitations. Other Sections of the noted Intergovernmental Agreements address the short-term and/or permanent sale of Entitlement Shares and a different cost calculation methodology would be utilized in such transactions. In addition, it is my understanding that modifications to EPD withdrawal permits would also be necessary if Entitlement Shares were being sold on either a permanent or short term basis. Therefore, this memo is intended to address only the short term (not greater than 10 years) sale of water between Member Counties.

In the past, the Authority has periodically established a specific dollar amount per thousand gallons ("kgals"), for treated and/or raw water, as the "Uniform Rate" for short term water sales among current Member Counties. This past process requires periodic Authority action to keep the "Uniform Rate"



current and, depending upon the established value, could result in a Member County being asked to sell water to another Member County at a unit cost less than the unit cost paid to the Authority for the same volume of water.

In place of this past process, it is proposed that the Authority adopt a policy and associated methodology for establishing the subject "Uniform Rate". Further, it is suggested that such a policy be based upon the following principles:

- a) Established by objective methodology that annually updates the Uniform Rate without specific action by the Authority.
- b) Ensures that the Uniform Rate is not at a level that requires any Member County to sell water at a rate that is less than the Member County is paying the Authority for an equal volume of water.
- c) Ensures that all Member Counties' selling price is equal; thus, maintaining equity among Member Counties.
- d) Provides an element of the Uniform Rate that will reimburse the selling Member County for administrative, etc. expenses associated with contractual arrangements.
- e) Provides price equality within reciprocal agreements.
- f) Is easily understood and easily explained by Authority members and local officials.

For background to this discussion, it is observed that the 2016 estimated unit cost (per kgals) for water purchased from the Authority is different for each of the Member Counties. This unit cost differential is primarily the result of the fact that each of the Member Counties reimburses the Authority for certain fixed costs (e.g. debt service) which are different and that each Member County utilizes a different percentage of their respective Entitlement Share. Thus, these fixed costs are distributed over a different annual volume for each Member County resulting in the below noted estimated annual unit cost per kgals.

Treated Water

Barrow County – \$2.84 per kgals

Jackson County – \$2.81 per kgals

Oconee County - \$1.97 per kgals

Raw Water

Athens-Clarke County – \$0.41 per kgals

Barrow County – \$0.61 per kgals

Jackson County – \$0.69 per kgals

Oconee County - \$0.42 per kgals

With the above background information on the 2016 estimated unit cost (per kgals) and the above noted suggested guiding principles, the following methodology is recommended for consideration.

- 1) The highest annual estimated unit cost is determined for both treated and raw water using the approved current annual budget and the then current cost allocation methodology. For 2016, this would result in the following:
 - a. Treated Water - \$2.84 per kgals (Barrow County)
 - b. Raw Water - \$0.69 per kgals (Jackson County)
- 2) Establish an element of the Uniform Rate that will reimburse the selling Member County for administrative, etc. expenses associated with all contractual arrangements. It is suggested that this be a multiplier of 1.05. This element of the Uniform Rate could of course be a different multiplier as determined to be appropriate by the Authority.
- 3) Establish the Uniform Rate by application of steps #1 & 2. For 2016, the Uniform Rates would be as follows:
 - a. Treated Water - \$2.84 per kgals X 1.05 = \$2.98 per kgals
 - b. Raw Water - \$0.69 per kgals X 1.05 = \$0.72 per kgals

I am of the opinion that the above proposed methodology meets the guiding principles outlined earlier in this memo.

At the conclusion of discussion on this topic at the May 11, 2016 Finance Committee meeting, the Committee recommended that the Authority approve the above outlined Uniform Rate Policy for Sale of Water between Member Counties and that the Policy include the above noted proposed guiding principles and proposed calculation methodology. Further, the Committee also recommended that the Policy require that a copy of all contracts for short term water sales between Member Counties be provided to the Authority and such documents be maintained in the Authority's files.

*1st Edition
2nd Edition*

Please feel free to contact me should you have questions regarding the above information.

Copy:

Chip Ferguson, Attorney
Jim Dove, RDC Director
Evans Brinson, RDC Comptroller
Bobby Sills, Nelsnick, Inc.
Mott Beck, RDC Admin Asst.

Upper Oconee Basin Water Authority



Date: May 16, 2016

To: UOBWA Chairman Melvin Davis, Members, and Alternates

From: Bob Snipes, P.E. – Owner's Representative

Subject: Annual Renewal of Utilities Service Contract with Jacobs, Inc.

The purpose of this memo is to remind members of the Upper Oconee Basin Water Authority (Authority) of the annual renewal provision of the subject contract and to advise of proposed related actions.

As you may recall, the Utility Services Contract between Jacobs, Inc. and the Authority automatically renews each year during the 5-year term (September 26, 2012 through September 25, 2017) of the contract unless a notice to terminate is provided by either party at least 90 days in advance of the renewal dated. The next renewal date is September 26, 2016. Therefore, the Authority must advise Jacobs, Inc. by no later than June 27, 2016 if the Authority desires to terminate the subject contract.

You will also recall that Chairman Davis advised the Authority at the March 23, 2016 meeting of the subject upcoming contract renewal with Jacobs and asked that members advise him or me of any concerns regarding the contract renewal. I have not received any comments from Authority members and Chairman Davis has not indicated that he has received any comments related to this issue. Therefore, I anticipate notifying Jacobs, Inc. by no later than June 1, 2016 of the Authority's desire to renew the subject Utility Services contract for the September 26, 2016 through September 25, 2017 period.

Please contact me if you should have questions or comments regarding the above information.

Copy:

Melvin Davis, Authority Chairman
Chip Ferguson, Attorney
Jim Dove, RDC Director
Evans Brinson, RDC Comptroller
Brad Lanning, Jacobs Engineering
Mott Beck, RDC Admin Asst.

*Approve
Contract
1st: Elton
2nd: Amrey*



Owner's Representative Report
Wed May 25, 2016

1. Engineering Projects:

- Drought Management Plan
 - No comments were received from any Authority member regarding the April 6 technical revision in the first paragraph, referencing Chapter 391-3-30, as outlined in my email of April 22. Therefore this revision has been included as part of the Authority approved Policy/Plan.
 - See May 16 memo regarding Water Supply Model:
 - a) Model is to be update each month and the updated Model distributed to members of the Joint Eng/Op Committee.
- High Service Pump #8
 - a) Bids were received on April 28, 2016.
 - b) Only one bid was received and that was from Caldwell Electrical Contractor in the amount of \$316,416.
 - c) The engineer's estimate was \$287,938 and the JCWSA budget is \$285,000.
 - d) Based upon authority grant at the March Authority meeting, Chairman Davis approved the designation of Caldwell Electric as the apparent "low responsive & responsible bid" and authorized staff to explore options for reducing the bid amount.
 - e) Caldwell Electric has identified value engineering alternatives that will reduce the contract amount to \$283,919.
 - f) Jacobs staff has reviewed the Caldwell proposed revisions and find the revisions to be acceptable.
 - g) The JCWSA is currently evaluating the revisions.
 - h) If everyone finds the proposed revisions to be acceptable, the Chairman will be asked to award the contract to Caldwell Electric concurrent with a "change order" reflecting the design modifications and noted price.
- Upgrade to Barrow County Water Flow Meter
 - a) A Cost Proposal for this upgrade has been obtained from MR Systems for a Cellular connection between the meter and treatment plant to meet the requirements of the new policy.
 - b) The cost for this upgrade is \$33,700 plus taxes.
 - c) In addition, the cost for the Jacobs professional services related to this project is \$5,000 maximum. The work will be accomplished under provisions of the existing Utility Services Contract between Jacobs and the Authority.
 - d) Barrow County representatives have agreed to this cost proposal and the schedule for the work to be accomplished calls for all work to be completed

bid

prior to the Sept 1, 2016 date established for the new metering policy to become effective.

2. Plant Operations:

- Revised Operational Process for ClariVac system and sample collection faucets – See memo of May 16, 2016.
- Modification of Point of Lagoon Discharge and Sample Collection Faucets – See memo of May 16, 2016.
- Water Flow Meters: Type, Accuracy, Testing, & Possible Modifications – See memo of May 16, 2016.

3. Management

- Annual Renewal of Utility Services Contract with Jacobs. – See memo of May 16, 2016.
- Uniform Rate for Short Term Sale of Water between Member Counties - See memo of May 16, 2016.
- Surplus Property Listing
 - a) Authority approved the list of surplus assets at the March 23, 2016 meeting.
 - b) Asset Management Policy established the process by which surplus assets are disposed of or abandoned.
 - c) By email of March 30, each of the County Chairs were provided a copy of the list and requested that they advise me and Brad Lanning, by no later than April 29, of any interest that their government, and/or City governments within their County, have in acquiring any of the listed surplus items.
 - d) We did not receive any express of interest in the surplus items by the noted deadline. Therefore, the next step for disposing of the surplus items, as outlined within the Asset Management Policy, will be taken. This will involve placing these items on the internet for possible acquisition by other interested parties.