

Middle Chattahoochee Regional Water And Sewer Authority Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, August 9, 2022
Union City- City Hall
5047 Union St, Union City, GA 30291

- I. Chairman Mayor J. Clark Boddie called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.
- II. Roll Call was taken by Secretary Jessica Davis with the following board members present:

The Honorable Chairman Mayor J. Clark Boddie
The Honorable Mayor Mario Avery The Honorable Councilwoman Tara Miller
The Honorable Vice-Chair Sonja Fillingame The Honorable City Manager Tony Phillips
The Honorable Councilman Brian Jones

The following board members were absent:
The Honorable Mayor Vince Williams

The attendance of the board constituted a quorum and the meeting proceeded.

III. **Approval of Water Authority Minutes:**

The motion to approve the July 12th, 2022 MCRW&SA Meeting Minutes and the July 25th, 2022 MCRW&SA Public Hearing Meeting Minutes was made by Vice-Chair Fillingame and seconded by Councilman Jones. **Vote: 6-0; Motion Carried**

IV. **New Business:**

V. **Discussion and Approval:**

VI. **Reports:**

A. **Water Authority Attorney-**

Attorney Dennis Davenport did not have a report from the attorney's office.

B. **Financial Report-**

Attorney Davenport presented requisition #236 in the amount of \$19,163.55.

The motion to approve requisition #236 was made by Mayor Avery and seconded by Councilman Jones. **Vote: 6-0; Motion Carried**

C. **Project Managers-**

- Project Manager Benz informed the board that each authority city turned in its water permit report. The water permit reports were submitted to EPD. The authority is still in compliance with the water withdrawal permit.
- **Mitigation:** The authority is receiving little revenue and will be on hold until there is a new release of credits. The project managers spoke with the owners of the mulberry creek site to ensure they have the prior contract documents. The owners assumed that someone was going to pay their taxes. The owner is responsible for paying their taxes.

- **GEFA:** The next GEFA board meeting is August 23rd. GEFA will consider the application that's pending. The project managers attended a conference meeting on August 1st. Mr. Tom Owens joined the meeting. If the authority were to apply for a second 25-million-dollar loan, the loan requires individual applications from each member city. GEFA will be underwriting each city if chosen to do so. Currently, GEFA is struggling to complete the underwriting due to the lack of financial information regarding the audits. The project managers are working with an auditing firm to get as much information as possible for Palmetto to supplement the information submitted. GEFA is one of the easiest companies to work with, and they're willing to work with the authority. Representatives from GEFA have been reaching out to the cities individually for questions.
- **Drinking Water Fund:** Only one person attended the public meeting. The presentation was published on the authority's website, and residents had the opportunity to make comments. There weren't any comments, and EPD issued a letter regarding no significant impact on the project. GEFA directed the authority to publish a notice to award the finances. It will publish in the South Fulton Neighbor Newspaper for \$1700.00. It must run in the local origin (newspaper).
- **Covid Relief Funds:** The authority has received word that Walton County was awarded \$42 million for their water treatment plant. No one else received an award since the first round. The applications are closed, and they may reopen for people to reapply. Walton County hired a lobbyist named Judd Turner to assist with their application.
- There was an announcement for each of the individual cities that they're doing a Regional Water Plan Seed Grant Opportunity. The cities can apply to undergo any of their local planning. The grant award is limited to \$75,000, and the project must be completed within 30 months and emailed by October 31st. The pre-application meeting is on October 15th. Project Manager Benz will send the link to the board members to see if they're interested in pursuing the opportunities.
- Councilman Jones inquired about the 0.14 monastery credits. Project Manager Benz informed him that they are available.
- City Manager Phillips stated that concerning the GEFA loan application in the pending decision on the 23rd, is there anything specific the project managers could recommend to mitigate those concerns? Project Manager Gray responded by informing the board that they must have the most up-to-date audits.

D. Gresham Smith:

- **Collaboration Charter:** G&S finished up the collaboration charter and revised it. Nothing changed, but the format and G&S would like to display it in the plant. Ms. Lindsay asked the board if they wanted additional room on the charter for signatures. The authority agreed not to provide signatures.
- **July Meeting:** Mr. Scott Thompson provided a list of considerations for the authority's website updates to provide some community outreach. G&S presented a brainstorming list to include visions for the website. They're proposing to keep it simple and comprehensive. Mr. Thompson stated if there's no feedback, they can draw up a sketch website to look at next month.

- Chairman Boddie asked G&S how far back the project goes and how will we gather the information. Per Ms. Lindsay, if the board identifies how the authority was formed, and the water withdrawal permit date, they will have enough information to suffice.
- Councilman Jones asked, “will the authority have Twitter and Facebook for their social media? Mr. Thompson informed the board that it can be proposed in a future task order.
- Ms. Lindsay informed the board that G&S had initial meetings with the three cities regarding water demand projections. In those meetings, questions about the cities' costs arose. G&S relayed the message individually. The authority needs to have a calibrated hydraulic model to run scenarios to understand how many interconnections are needed within the cities to reinstate and ensure there's adequate fire flow. There must be a clean-up map to have a calibrated hydraulic model. G&S has been advocating for that to occur. Fairburn has awarded it, and Union City is considering proposals. G&S is expecting to receive the mapping updates in three months for Atlas and IES to complete the work. Afterward, the proposal will be sent to the board members. G&S is working to have a cost by October 4th. They're making progress on knowns and unknowns, and items reviewed at the last minute. Ms. Lindsay will not be present for the September meeting, and they're not expecting new business.
- **South Fulton Parkway Routing for the Transmission Lane:** Limited access corridor. There have been several routes proposed for this corridor, and many are on surface streets within the three cities. It was built as a limited-access freeway. Any time there is a limited access corridor, the utility manual states in section 2.5 that the owner of the utility transmission lane has the right to make an appeal and justify it into a case study to GDOT. G&S is prepared to begin the appeal process. They have had a preliminary conversation with GDOT.
- **Delivery Model Workshop:** The two most important factors are cost opinion and knowns and unknowns. What's important when considering project delivery models and alternatives? Leading Indicators:
 - ✓ Getting the right team-Designer, Constructor, and subs
 - ✓ Managing knowns and unknowns
 - ✓ Recognizing Owner Preference and Tolerances- What is the authority ok with doing? Where is the authority's flexibility?
 - ✓ Getting the project delivery team engage early is critical and highly valuable.
 - ✓ Understanding the level of collaboration and team cohesion to have a good team and trust level
 - ✓ Flexibility and Innovation
 - ✓ Risk Management
 - ✓ Cost awareness
- **Key Knowns and Unknowns:** Ms. Lindsay is preparing a document that will summarize knowns and unknowns.
 - ✓ Construction cost
 - ✓ Contractor Availability/Interest- This is a saturated market in terms of contractors and construction work and depending on the type of delivery model you choose it can generate interest.

- ✓ Schedule-Where does the schedule falls in terms of the authority's expectations
 - ✓ Stakeholders-City of Atlanta, local stakeholders
 - ✓ Distribution and Storage Infrastructure- This project will construct an intake and a treatment plant but in terms of managing and operating distribution and storage system for that water, that's relative to each of the municipalities.
 - ✓ System Operations Management
 - ✓ Revenue base
 - ✓ Cost of service.
- **Authority Preferences and Tolerances-** What are the authority's sensitivities, where do the authority want to place more or what would the authority compromise on?
 - ✓ Project cost- Extremely high factor in terms of priority
 - ✓ Ratepayer Perceptions
 - ✓ Cost of Service-As a result of setting up this project.
 - ✓ Collaboration- The authority's interest in what's being involved.
 - ✓ Delegation to Technical Staff- Bord interest
 - ✓ Stakeholder Engagement- City of Atlanta and others. How the authority want to engage them
 - ✓ Transparency
- **Project Delivery Options:**
 - ✓ Standard Delivery-
 - ❖ Design Bid-Build
 - Three entities involved, Owner, Designer, and Builder
 - All contracted directly to the owner
 - ✓ Alternative Delivery-
 - ❖ Design-Build (DB) Fixed Price where the owner is dealing with a single entity- Design/Builder
 - ✓ Collaboration Delivery-
 - ❖ Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) GMP or Progressive Design-Build (PDB)
 - ❖ Both allows for flexibility and adaptability
- **Standard Delivery:**
 - ✓ Design-Bid-Build (DBB)- This includes a general well-defined scope that is descriptive and allows for confidence in the scope of the project. It theoretically offers the best opportunity for a low-cost delivery. Once the scope is fixed, one will go through a bid process and procure an instructor. Owner deals with separate entities, a designer, a constructor, and a construction manager.
 - ✓ Design-Build (DB)-Fixed Price-Dealing with a single entity mechanism for changing risk from the owner.
- **Collaborative Delivery-**
 - ✓ Key differences between Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) GMP and Progressive Design-Build (PDB) GMP: CMAR requires two entities- a designer and a construction manager. PDB requires one entity which is a design-builder. Both are a much greater

opportunity for collaboration and innovation. The idea is to promote collaboration and design development to a certain stage. You're offered the opportunity for the constructor and any other entity to be involved in the design process. There is no meaningful project cost associated with the owner of a collaborative delivery project. It will be developed through the process. Both models allow for risk transfer, greater flexibility, and a guaranteed maximum price at a 16% design development. Both will offer the opportunity to develop a design at a certain stage. The owner can make a design to take as is and offer another delivery model. Both options are typically not done to achieve maximum low-cost outcomes. They're done to deal with uncertainties regarding scope. Once you engage with the progressive design builder or the CMAR, they are looking to meet their guaranteed maximum price. There is an opportunity to get quality over low cost, but it may not result in an overall low cost. The owner will know it.

Mayor Avery asked which delivery option is better for the authority. Mr. Randy Booker stated there's a lot to be said from the progressive design given the flexibility it offers. However, there's a high level of cost sensitivity, and it's a big unknown.

Mayor Avery asked Councilman Jones for his recommendation regarding his experience. Councilman Jones stated that seeing that G&S talked about cost and not knowing the cost, the process is similar to how the cities do their budget. They begin with the design process because it's affordable in the current budget, and the build is completed in the following budget. He recommends the progressive design-build.

Mayor Avery stated that his personal, and professional experience with GMPs has been a nightmare from working with them in the county. Mr. Booker stated that depending on a bunch of factors, going into a traditional design bid build, completing the design and putting it on the shelf, and waiting for market conditions or money to be avail could be an option as well. When you go into the CMAR or PDP model, it becomes a little less attractive because you have the train moving. Offers are made, but it's a little less clear in terms of putting it on the shelf.

City Manager Phillips inquired about the hesitancy due to the lack of flexibility. Mr. Booker stated that there is hesitancy, more from a sense of knowing there are several moving parts in terms of perspective within the authority and stakeholders. There may be factors that cause the need for course correction, and once you embark upon a design bid build process, any deviation can be managed. It occurs significant changes in order and schedule impacts. The designer, contractor, and owner to collaborate and develop a flexible and adaptive project approach can all be lost.

Mayor Avery asked, "What is meant by potential conflict? Mr. Booker replied that the authority hires a designer, the authority hires a contractor based on the designer's construction documents, and the authority may hire a construction manager. There may be three different entities, but all have their contracts with the owner, and all may have their interest in terms of project progress, project role, and getting paid. It doesn't necessarily contribute to the best interest of the owner. The owner is charged in that model with managing all those separate contact entities, and the designer would generate specifications, drawings, and construction documents when pressed by the contractor about means and methods. There's no sense in wanting to fix and solve it in the best interest of the owner. There's no sense of collaboration and partnership.

VII. The motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:57 pm was made by City Manager Phillips and seconded by Vice-Chair Fillingame. **Vote: 6-0; Motion Carried**



Mayor J. Clark Boddie, Chair



Jessica Davis, Secretary