

County Business

VIRGINIA:

At a regular meeting of the King George County Service Authority Board of Directors, held on Monday, the 16th day of June, 2020 at 5:30 p.m. in the Auditorium of King George High School at 10100 Foxes Way, King George, Virginia:

PRESENT: Cathy Binder, Chairman
Annie Cupka, Vice-Chairman
James Morris, Member
Neiman C. Young, County Administrator
Jonathon Weakley, General Manager
Matt Britton, County Attorney

Remote Presence: Michael Bennett, Member
Allen R. Parker, Jr., Member

00:00 Cathy Binder: I call to order this meeting of the King George Service Authority. I hereby invoke the Rules and Procedures previously adopted by the Board of Supervisors and the King George Service Authority, allowing for electronic participation by some members with the quorum physically present. This action is taken as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and the Governor's orders regarding limiting of gatherings and staying in place during a disaster. Electronic participation is encouraged and pursuant to the Governor's emergency orders, a maximum of 10 people will be allowed to be physically present. If you choose to be physically present, you will be screened by our authorized staff for signs and symptoms of illness. Based on the results of that screening, certain physical attendees may be denied entry. The following members are physically present: Ms. Annie Cupka, Vice Chairman, Mr. Jim Morris, and myself, Cathy Binder, Chairman. Online, Mr. Allen Parker, please state how you are attending the meeting.

00:58 Allen Parker: Allen Parker, attending remotely.

01:01 Cathy Binder: Mr. Bennett?

01:03 Mike Bennett: Mike Bennett, attending remotely.

01:06 Cathy Binder: Alright, they have notified the Chair that they have temporary disabilities under other medical conditions that exist that prevents the members' physical attendance. I direct the clerk to include this statement and the statement of remotely-participating Board members to be memorialized in the minutes. Alright, we have an invocation by Ms. Cupka. Everybody,

please stand if you're able.

01:35 Annie Cupka: Let us pray. Heavenly Father, please watch over all who gather here tonight. Please guide all of our governing bodies to have a pure heart and clear conscience and make decisions that are in the best interest of our community. In your name, we pray. Amen.

01:55 Cathy Binder: Amen. Mr. Weakley, Pledge of Allegiance.

01:58 Jonathon Weakley: Please remain standing, the flag is at the end of the stage for the pledge. I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

02:16 Cathy Binder: Thank you. Do we have any amendments to the agenda, Mr. Weakley?

02:21 Jonathon Weakley: No amendments, Madame Chair.

02:23 Cathy Binder: Thank you. Next up is public comment. Comments will be limited to three minutes per person in order to afford everyone an opportunity to speak. If comments relate to a specific public hearing item, we ask that you or others' comments at this time will wait 'til the public hearing. Do we have anybody online, Mr. Dines? For the...

02:43 Chris Dines: No, Ms. Chair.

02:44 Cathy Binder: Does anybody have any written correspondence? Mr. Parker, Mr. Bennett?

02:51 Allen Parker: No, ma'am.

02:54 Mike Bennett: No, ma'am.

02:55 Cathy Binder: Alright, thank you. We will now go to reports from members of the Board. Mr. Bennett?

03:02 Mike Bennett: No report, Madame Chair.

03:03 Cathy Binder: Thank you. Mr. Parker?

03:06 Allen Parker: No report, Madame Chair.

03:08 Cathy Binder: Mr. Morris?

03:08 Jim Morris: Nothing to report, Ma'am.

03:10 Cathy Binder: Ms. Cupka?

03:12 Annie Cupka: No report, Madame Chair.

03:14 Cathy Binder: My only report is I did visit Hopyard last week. Thank you to Mr. Weakley and Mr. Troy Cliff for a great tour and understanding a different plant, and I still have two more to go, Purkins Corner and Oakland Park, so I gotta visit there next. And that is the end of my report. Do we have a consent agenda? Motion for the consent agenda?

03:34 Annie Cupka: I move to adopt the consent agenda.

03:36 Cathy Binder: Do I have a second?

03:37 Jim Morris: Second.

03:40 Cathy Binder: Any discussion? All those in favor?

03:43 S?: Aye.

03:43 S?: Aye.

03:45 S?: Aye.

03:46 Cathy Binder: Aye. Any nays? Chair votes aye, motion carries. Alright, report from the County Attorney, Mr. Britton.

03:53 Matt Britton: No report. Thank you.

03:55 Cathy Binder: Thank you. Next up, we have presentations and reports, the draft to the Purkins Corner WWTP PER from Wiley|Wilson. I'm guessing they're online, Mr. Weakley?

04:08 Jonathon Weakley: Yes, Madame Chair, at this time, I'd like to hand over the floor to Ryan Bogese and Aaron Tice, both with Wiley|Wilson, who were responsible for putting together the Purkins Corner Wastewater Treatment Plant Preliminary Engineering Report. Mr. Bogese, Mr. Tice, thank you all for joining us tonight. I just ask whoever is leading the slide, just indicate next slide for Mr. Dines and he will walk us through. Madame Chair and members of the Board, at any time if you wanna interject, or there'll definitely be time at the end of the presentation for Q and A. Mr. Tice, Mr. Bogese?

04:44 Ryan Bogese: Well thank you, we appreciate the opportunity to present the PER for the Purkins Corner Wastewater Treatment Plant this afternoon. Next slide please. I'd like to give just a brief overview of the agenda for what we're gonna cover this afternoon. As a background overview of the PER, I'd like to discuss some of the first scenarios that were looked at in the PER, discuss some of the existing site conditions, talk about the permit limits, talk about the three treatment options that we evaluated and then cover the cost and the portions of the cost that are eligible for the WQIF funding, and last but not least, talk about the next steps. Next slide, please.

05:44 Ryan Bogese: So just a brief overview, the existing Purkins Corner Wastewater Treatment Plant has limited capacity to support future growth. Expanding the wastewater treatment plant

will require supplies with more stringent DEQ VPDES discharge limit and due to the Chesapeake Bay general permit, state-of-the-art technology will be required to meet the anticipated permit limits by DEQ. Next slide please.

06:15 Ryan Bogese: So when looking at the growth scenarios, we considered three different growth scenarios, and looked at this based on the number of houses or equivalent residential connections known as ERCs, and this was based on the assumption of roughly 240 gallons per day per ERC. And we looked at the potential of 50 ERCs per year, 100 ERCs per year, and also 150 ERCs per year. Next slide, please.

06:54 Ryan Bogese: So this graph here displays those different scenarios, comparing it to the existing plant capacity and the potential future flow tiers for an upgraded expanded facility, in terms of one-year increments, displayed here at the bottom of the chart. The red line across the lower portion is the existing Purkins Corner Wastewater Treatment Plant capacity, which is 0.12 MGD. To go to a flow tier of 0.25 is shown by the gray line, and the black line demonstrates the 0.5 MGD flow tier, and the different flow scenarios are shown by the green, purple and blue lines. I think one of the key takeaways from this chart here is, even at looking at 50 units per year, there's pretty limited capacity with the existing Purkins Corner Wastewater Treatment Plant.

07:56 Ryan Bogese: Next slide please. So, in talking, looking at the existing site, one of the main things here to note is, with the upgrade or the expansion of the plant, the existing plant will have to remain in service to treat the wastewater and meet the permit requirements. So this limits the amount of space on the existing site, predominantly to the west of the existing plant and a little bit of the areas to the north. There's a fair amount of wetlands on the site to the north. A lot of these wetlands are naturally occurring along Pine Creek. Some of the wetlands on the middle of the site are man-made, it appears that maybe some ENS controls are left over from the landfill when it was removed. Nonetheless the Army Corps of Engineers consider man-made wetlands, wetlands, which with the proposed site, we see those man-made wetlands being impacted and will have to be disturbed, which will require the purchase of mitigation credits.

09:04 Ryan Bogese: If we go to the next slide, we can get a good view of the site. This is an aerial figure of the existing site and the proposed wastewater treatment plant layout. The existing access for the Purkins Corner Plant is kinda shown here, goes off the page to the right, but it goes up through Brooks Park. One of the things that we're looking at for the new plant would be to change the main access to come off of Government Center Boulevard, shown here as the cul-de-sac, this is next to the existing animal shelter, and to bring the main access through the woods there, kinda across that [09:44] _____ and coming to the plant from the west. Any questions on the site layout?

09:57 Cathy Binder: Do you have any questions? Continue on.

10:01 Ryan Bogese: Okay. Next slide, please. I'd just like to give a brief overview, a refresher. We've talked about some of these things in the past, but kinda refresh some items here on the nutrient treatment. The Chesapeake Bay Program establishes discharge restrictions also known as wasteload allocations on nitrogen and phosphorus. These are expressed in terms of pounds per year. And this really goes by river basin, so for all your plants, the Dahlgren, Fairview Beach,

and Purkins Corner Treatment Plant all discharge to the Potomac, so they can share wasteload allocations for the Potomac basin. Your other two plants, the Hopyard and Oakland Park plant discharge to Rappahannock Basin, so they can share wasteload allocations, but they can't share between the two bubbles, the two different river basins.

11:00 Ryan Bogese: Next slide, please. Some important things to note here, that wasteload allocations are fixed and there are no additional allocations available for growth. If King George exceeds its wasteload allocation, the Nutrient Credit Exchange allows wastewater treatment plants to trade wasteload allocations within a river basin. This is basically purchasing credits and pounds per year of nutrient, whether it's nitrogen or phosphorus. Or King George would have to treat to below state-of-the-art enhanced nutrient-removal technology. There are more nutrient credits available in the Potomac Basin than the Rappahannock Basin, so it's important to consider that nutrient regulations are our primary concern for supporting growth.

11:50 Ryan Bogese: Next slide, please. I won't go into a great detail about every one of these, but continue on the nutrient treatment strategy. The two important points here to note are: These are the expected limits we expect that DEQ require for the upgraded plant, expecting a 3.0 mg/L for nitrogen and for phosphorus, 0.3 mg/L, and these parameters here were used in our evaluation in looking at the different treatment processes considered in the PER.

12:26 Ryan Bogese: Next slide, please. So the three treatment options we considered: The first was a multi-stage nutrient treatment removal process contained in a sequencing batch reactor, this is also known as an SBR. The second process, we looked at a conventional multi-stage treatment removal process, with membrane filtration, also known as a MBR. And the last process was a conventional multi-stage nutrient treatment removal process with secondary clarification.

13:00 Ryan Bogese: Next slide, please. Some key points here of our evaluation, that all the treatment options considered are capable of meeting the expected treatment requirements by DEQ. The conventional treatment processes and Alternatives Two and Three, this is the MBR and the conventional process for secondary clarification, tend to be more operator-intensive than the wholly-automated SBR treatment process, Alternative One. Also, the MBR process tends to have higher energy costs than the other alternatives. Also it's important to note that the authority currently operates two SBR plants in the county, these are the Fairview Beach Wastewater Treatment Plant and the Hopyard Wastewater Treatment Plant.

13:51 Ryan Bogese: Next slide, please. So I'd like to go over the opinions of probable project costs. We looked at each alternative, the SBR, the MBR and the conventional process for secondary clarification, and looked at two flow tiers; a 0.25 MGD flow tier and a 0.5 MGD flow tier for each of these processes. You'll notice here a range for each of these estimates, and the lower number is the base cost. The higher end of the range, we took a base cost and used a 30% contingency to give a low range and a high range for each expected process and flow tier. But I won't go through every detail here, but just cover the 0.5 MGD. For Alternative One, for the SBR process, we're estimating between \$13.8-17.3 million for a 0.5 MGD facility. The membrane facility, this is Alternative Two, was significantly higher, we're estimating between 16.5-20.7 for a 0.5 MGD facility. For Alternative Three, for conventional treatment with secondary clarification, the estimate for a 0.5 MGD facility is between \$12.8 and \$16.1 million.

15:11 Ryan Bogese: Next slide, please. So the DEQ Water Quality Improvement Fund has funding available for nutrient treatment reduction technologies. And so looking at an upgraded facility, not all these parts and processes of the plant are eligible, it's only those parts and processes that help with the nutrient treatment. And so looking at the DEQ standards, we took those different parts and processes of the new facility costs with their grant eligibility percentages, to estimate what is potentially grant-eligible for a 0.25 and 0.5 MGD SBR facility. For the 0.25 SBR facility, we're estimating that approximately \$1.3 billion of the construction cost or the project costs are eligible for grant funding.

16:13 Ryan Bogese: Next slide, please. So for a 0.5 MGD facility, the key differences here is there's more tankage for the SBR, lot item one, and additional costs for the site work, yard piping, electrical, construction and administration costs for the last row item here. The processes in the middle are unit processes, which will be pretty much sized for a 0.5 MGD facility regardless of whether it's 0.25 or 0.5. So the real cost differences for this, between these two different tables, is in those two rows. But for a 0.5 MGD flow tier facility for SBR, we're estimating roughly 1.56 of those costs would be grant eligible. Any questions on the WQIF portion?

17:11 Cathy Binder: Do we have any questions, Mike, Allen?

17:17 Allen Parker: Not currently.

17:19 Cathy Binder: Okay, we'll move on. Thank you.

17:22 Ryan Bogese: Okay, next slide, please. So, I guess the next steps, we would finalize the PER to include any service authority comments. We are currently working on preparing the WQIF grant application for the Purkins Wastewater Treatment Plant. And if the project moves forward, the authority will need to coordinate with DEQ for a permit modification for the Purkins Corner Wastewater Treatment Plant. Next slide please. And that's the end of the presentation, if... Does anyone have any questions?

18:07 Allen Parker: I've got one. Mr. Parker. Of the three options, obviously... Which is the more scalable of the three? Say there's a Board of directors sitting here 20 years from now, an explosive growth in the area, what one of those three options would be able to be scaled up past... If we could, 0.5 MGD, would be able to be scaled up most easily in the future?

18:45 Ryan Bogese: That's a good question. I think we'd have to look at that a little bit further, just due to some of the site constraints and the potential future nutrient requirements. We can look at that a little bit further and get you a response.

19:04 Allen Parker: That would be great. I just think for the future, future planning, it would be good to know which one would be most easily scalable in the the future, should it need to be.

19:17 Cathy Binder: Mr. Parker, do you have any other questions?

19:22 Allen Parker: That's the only one currently.

19:25 Cathy Binder: Mr. Bennett?

19:28 Mike Bennett: Yes, Madame Chair, I have a couple questions. This one's actually for Mr. Weakley. Mr. Weakley, when we met with Hopyard Farm last year, it seemed that they were using 300 gallons per day, per residence as the amount of wastewater capacity that would be needed by each home. Is my memory correct on that?

19:58 Jonathon Weakley: Yes, sir.

20:00 Mike Bennett: And when we looked at what they were actually using, it was nowhere near 300 gallons a day, correct?

20:10 Jonathon Weakley: That is correct. We're currently around 55,000 gallons per day, and that sub-division is a little over halfway built out.

20:20 Mike Bennett: So I guess what I'm getting at is, I know that 300 gallons a day at one time, was sort of the industry standard, and then apparently, plumbing fixtures and such have gotten more efficient, so that the 300 gallons per day is really high. And I'm not criticizing Mr. Bogey by any means, but I'm just wondering if the 240 gallons per day figure is higher than what we're seeing, particularly with regard to Hopyard. At Hopyard, if I recall correctly, we have roughly 500 homes built. Is that right? And we're getting 55,000 gallons a day?

21:03 Jonathon Weakley: We are around about 470 homes. That was the last count I have. I can check in with the office later on just to see where we're at on connections, but that's roughly where we're at, and we are seeing about 55,000 gallon per day.

21:20 Mike Bennett: That's faster than I can... What's the math?

21:24 Allen Parker: 120 gallons per day, about half...

21:28 Mike Bennett: That's why we have engineers. Thank you, sir. So in other words, that's about half of what we're estimating in terms of the Wiley|Wilson estimate. I'm not saying you guys are wrong by any stretch, I don't wanna imply that even. I'm just saying that our experience with Hopyard, which are some of the newer homes built in the county, relatively speaking, is roughly half that amount. Thank you, Mr. Parker. One other question for you with you Mr. Bogey, when you were talking about the nutrient credits that we're gonna have to purchase because of the wetlands, is that a one-time purchase?

22:06 Ryan Bogese: Yeah, just to be clear, that the mitigation credits is kinda separate from the wasteload allocation nutrient credits, not to confuse the two, but there's a separate mitigation credits for disturbing wetlands, and that's a one-time purchase for the wetlands. And I think we're looking at probably less than... It's less than half an acre. It's not significant in terms of land use. I'd have to go back and look at what the recent numbers are, but I think mitigation credits for wetlands disturbance are probably running... Last time, I checked, it was probably around 45,000

per acre, so we may be talking 20-something thousand, 30,000 for mitigation credits for the wetlands disturbance.

22:51 Mike Bennett: Okay, that's where I was headed. Thank you very much, that's all I have, Madame Chair.

22:56 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Mr. Bennett. Mr. Morris.

22:56 Jim Morris: No questions, ma'am.

23:00 Cathy Binder: Miss Cupka?

23:03 Annie Cupka: No questions. Thank you, ma'am.

23:05 Cathy Binder: [23:05] ____ I had requested this last week, Mr. Weakley, about if we had piped Purkins Corner to Hopyard or decommissioned and rebuilt about the allocation credits, and you had found some information from DEQ, correct?

23:23 Jonathon Weakley: Yes, ma'am.

23:24 Cathy Binder: Could you explain that?

23:25 Jonathon Weakley: Yes, ma'am. In one of the slides Mr. Bogey covered, it talked about either the Rappahannock bubble or the Potomac bubble. Our treatment facilities discharge to a particular river basin, and they outlined which plants. While you could technically, if the Board chose to reroute flows, so that would be decommissioning Purkins Corner existing plant, building a sewer interceptor pipe or force main to Hopyard, you can reroute the flow, you just can't transfer that nutrient credit. So the poundage that you heard Mr. Bogey speak of, for total nitrous, total phosphorus, you could transfer that to the Potomac. Basically, you have two options to keep that wasteload allocation. One, you can mothball the plant, just meaning essentially cut off flow to it. You would be rerouting flow to the Hopyard plant. You would keep that permit active and there is an annual fee, I'd have to look to see what that is, but basically, your annual permit maintenance fee is what DEQ calls it. That's option one. Option two, you would just transfer your waste allocation over to the Dahlgren Wastewater Treatment Plant, which may require a permit modification, but you can... I posed this question to DEQ, can the Board, if they decide later to build a facility at Purkins, even if rerouting was a choice made in the near future, could you pull the wasteload allocation needed back out of Dahlgren and construct a newer facility? And the answer was, yes, under current regulations.

25:00 Cathy Binder: I just wanted to clarify that so everybody knew that, and that was one of the things that I had a question on for a long time, whether we could do that or not.

25:07 Jonathon Weakley: Right, and if I may, Madame Chair, Ryan, I'd like to coattail off of Mr. Bennett's question, or as far as when you're going back to evaluate the 240 number, can you see if that is any potential because there's more? Or is there a commercial factor that's built into that number? 'Cause the Purkins Corner Wastewater Treatment Plant takes customers in an area

that has more commercial than Hopyard. I don't know if you know that now, and I hate to give you something cold, but when you go back to look at that, can you see if that was a factor in the 240 gallon per day number or not?

25:48 Ryan Bogese: Sure, I mean we can go back and look at that. I mean, when we look at ERCs, it doesn't really take into account, I guess, the commercial factor.

25:56 Jonathon Weakley: Okay.

25:56 Ryan Bogese: If you were gonna add in commercial factors, then you would say that this commercial factor's X amount of ERCs, whether that's 10 or 20 or 30. It was just a way of presenting that. We can revise those numbers, I know the numbers for gallons per day are lower for Hopyard. And we could go back and take a look at that with looking at some of the numbers from the county and revise that accordingly.

26:24 Jonathon Weakley: Okay. And I think it's fair to say, I don't think VDH has revised those numbers yet, but just for the Board and the public's information, that 300 gallon per day, that's a number, that's a unit that VDH has given us to expect gallon per day per the ERC, just for your informational purposes.

26:45 Cathy Binder: Then my next question is, what is the timeline that we have to follow for what decision we have to make?

26:53 Jonathon Weakley: I spoke with Mr. Rahn and Mr. Crocker at the WQIF, the grant department. Their grant submittals or the application are ongoing. I thought we were originally up against a July timeline, but they are ongoing. They did say along, with Ms. Thompson, the permit writer, that they would rather us wait, have a determined factor, 'cause we were geared up, regardless of the public hearing tonight, we were geared up to submit, assuming we would go down the path that the Board decided, "Hey, we wanna look at a new plant. Apply for the grant eligibility." That would mean two things, you needed a permit modification of the existent Purkins plant, plus the PER to be completed. So the PER has been done. We have not applied for the permit modification. Ms. Thompson gave me the... It's an easy process. There is a fee, there's always a fee, but that's a simple process. But it's waiting for the Board of Directors to give direction on the final determination. If it's a new plant, we would apply for that. I will wanna leave you with conveyance. Conveyance is the huge terminology for decommissioning, if you're rerouting the flow to another facility, you're conveying that over. Conveyance under the House bill that was passed last year allows that to be also included for grant eligibility. So, either project, whichever route the Board of Directors chose would be eligible for grant funds from DEQ.

28:27 Cathy Binder: And I know Purkins Corner, of all them, is the one that has to be taken care of first and has the most need. What is a time frame when we really need to make this decision by?

28:43 Jonathon Weakley: I don't wanna be too greedy, but I would just say, just as soon as possible. I think we have a few months, I would say, as a recommendation to the Board,

somewhere in the next 12 months or less. Obviously, any development in that courthouse area, that sewer goes to Purkins and water is used from that courthouse waterworks. So it all depends. If there's nothing driving that, then I think we have a different conversation about, "Okay, what are some things needed to make repairs to give us some extended life or the recommendation be to reroute that?" Rerouting, you're probably looking at two to three years. Depends on weather, the awarding of the contract, how fast a construction crew can build that line. You got all the front-loading stuff such as putting it out for bids and awarding. So I would like to recommend, as soon as the Board feels comfortable, but I think you have a couple of months, I know we do not meet again as a group until July 14th after this, because there is somewhat of a break, but I think based on any decisions of development would drive how fast that goes. Because if you all, as a Board, approves development, we gotta send that flow somewhere.

30:07 Jonathon Weakley: We know that we can accommodate 205 ERCs currently, and as folks buy up that capacity, that number goes down, but we can treat that. Anything beyond that, and I know you're gonna get into a fiscal impact tool for your public hearing that kind of shows capacity scenarios. I emailed you all some notes on that as well, but every time any sizeable development chews away at that capacity. If it's within that 205, we can look to see if the Board wants to decommission or if we wanna put some funds in that plant. The plant from a safety concern and a life expectancy, it's really reached its end of life, in my opinion. Oakland Park, which is another plant we're not really talking about here tonight, but those were the two that were looked at in our feasibility study of taking offline and rerouting. Oakland Park staff has done a wonderful job of pumping life back into that. And there's not a lot of growth in that area. Maybe the industrial park? And we hope folks come. We want them to come, but we have plenty of capacity remaining there to handle. So Purkins would be the one that I would say to the Board, it's on the radar right now to make a decision. The time frame can deal with development, what's gonna be coming, and then ultimately a decision, if that comes, which route does the Board desire, decommissioning or a new facility.

31:35 Jonathon Weakley: Quite honestly, I think we have to look at long-term solvency of the agency. What can we afford? What can our customers afford? Because that's where that debt service is coming from. I think that's a conversation in the near future based on any future decision of the development. Madame Chair, I think, drives that timeline of a decision.

31:55 Cathy Binder: Thank you for your honesty, Mr. Weakley. Do we have anybody else who would like to make a comment after that discussion? Mr. Bennett or Mr. Parker?

32:04 Mike Bennett: Madame Chair, I'm sorry, I'm not hearing you guys in the group clearly, I'm hearing people online. Can I offer a suggestion on in terms of timing?

32:15 Cathy Binder: Go ahead, Mr. Bennett.

32:18 Mike Bennett: From my perspective, and I'm sure I've said this many times before, but if we don't have additional development, I don't see how we afford a new plant at Purkins Corner. So I think we've gotta wait and see what happens with your meeting tonight, and what the supervisors decide, and what other development may be on the horizon, but for us to pay for a new treatment plant without offsetting some of the cost of that, a significant amount of the cost

with development, I just think is a bridge too far for our customer base. I don't know how we would pay the debt service on that. I think this is all good information from what I know, so then I appreciate it. But for me, personally, I just think we've gotta wait a while to see what happens in terms of the county's plans for development before we go any further.

33:12 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Mr. Bennett. I agree. Well, yeah, thank you, Wiley|Wilson, for giving that presentation. It was very informative. And thank you, Mr. Weakley for finding all the information you did in the last week for me about the sewer and from DEQ.

33:28 Jonathon Weakley: You're welcome, Madame Chair. I would just ask, we'll kinda keep this... Obviously, there are questions here tonight and I took some note, Ryan, and I hope you were as well, we'll need to follow up on those, but at some point, we'll get back with Wiley|Wilson with final comments, because even, regardless of the status of this, we need to turn this into a final product. So if you have any questions or comments between now and the next time, whether that's July or August, that we come back to this, please let me know 'cause we wanna capture that in a final PER, which if you go the route of submitting for a grant, we need to have that complete product. So we still have time, but we're gonna hold. We'll follow up in an email to all Board members on the questions asked here tonight, but we wanna allow a period for any future questions, so we could close out and get a final product. Thank you, Madame Chair.

34:17 Cathy Binder: Alright. Thank you. Thank you once again. Next up. Any action items or discussion items, Mr. Weakley?

34:26 Jonathon Weakley: No, Madame Chair.

34:27 Cathy Binder: And then we have your General Manager's Report.

34:31 Jonathon Weakley: So Madame Chair, I'm gonna keep it pain-free tonight. I do not have a GM Report for you, I just wanna add a few words. My hat's off continuously to our staff; as many of the other great department and functions of this county, they have been at the helm through this whole health scenario, and we've been fortunate and blessed that we've been able to keep it full service. We want to put out to the general public, we do have some vacancies, so if you have some operators in your family or some utility mechanics, please send them my way. We are looking to add to our great team and we wanna continue to build. And thank you for coming by and bringing your daughter by for that tour. I have not forgot about the request, so I know we're in social distancing, but the weather has permitted a more favorable outside and inside tour, so any member, we can definitely set up individual tours. I'm saying that for members at home, as well as here at the meeting. Just let me know, we'll set that up. It doesn't have to be two-on-ones, it could be one-on-ones, however, but I wanted to let you know I have not forgot about that request and we would love to have you out whenever you would like to come out and tour the facilities.

35:52 Cathy Binder: It was great and my daughter loved the slides and I thought it would be a good resource when it's a little more of a normal time that maybe school trips can come and learn about wastewater, 'cause she was really into the whole checking for the organisms and looking at the chart. And she's a fifth grader now, and so that age group would probably really do good by

going and visiting it and asking questions. And your operator, Mr. Cliff, who I coached a long time ago, and it was great to see him in a different role, but he did a really good job, and he was able to communicate to a 10-year-old, even though that you were talking a lot of big terms for a 10-year-old, [chuckle] and I thank you again. And she appreciates it for that Girl Scout batch. [chuckle]

36:32 Jonathon Weakley: Well, we're happy to have her. And one last thing I wanna leave you, and I was sharing this with Mr. Parker earlier, just some forecasting of future meetings to come. Main topic, so pump stations, we're getting ready to start the new fiscal year. There were three priority schedules for correcting DEQ Class I reliabilities for all of our 35 pump stations. Well, I believe it was just under that. The ones at Hopyard overall meet that criteria. Priority one are the alarm systems. It's not an issue. You all funded that. It's just getting those installed, reporting back to DEQ. I don't want us to run the time out and just say, "Hey, we'll wait on priority two here." I, at least, like to have those discussions of which projects through our research we have found, if we have data dedications, easements or if we don't. There's gonna have to be decisions made on what we wanna do with that. So, I have some ideas. Mr. Hoglan and I have been talking about some of these parcels and pump stations, so that will be the next thing I bring to you all, so we can kinda get the ball rolling on any needs to address that. So, that's all I had, Madame Chair.

37:43 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Mr. Weakley. Do I have a motion to adjourn?

37:50 Annie Cupka: Move to adjourn to Tuesday, July 14, 2020 at 5:30 PM at King George High School.

37:55 Cathy Binder: Do I have a second?

38:00 Allen Parker: I'll second.

38:00 Cathy Binder: Any discussion? All those in favor?

38:03 Annie Cupka: Aye.

38:03 Allen Parker: Aye.

38:04 Mike Bennett: Aye.

38:05 Cathy Binder: Any nays? Chair votes aye. The meeting is hereby adjourned to the next regularly scheduled meeting on July 14th, 2020 at King George High School's auditorium. That meeting may be held by electronic means and remote participation only, and may be closed to the public being physically present. All citizens are encouraged to participate in advance or during the meeting by electronic means as provided by the county. This meeting is adjourned.