

County Business

VIRGINIA:

At a regular meeting of the King George County Service Authority Board of Directors, held on Tuesday, the 15th day of September, 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
- Michael Bennett, Member
- James Morris, Member
- Allen R. Parker, Jr., Member
- Neiman C. Young, County Administrator
- Jonathon Weakley, General Manager
- Matt Britton, County Attorney

00:00 Cathy Binder: I call to order this regular meeting of the King George County Service Authority Board of Directors. I hereby invoke the Rules and Procedures previously adopted by the Board of Supervisors and the King George County Service Authority, allowing for electronic participation by some members with a 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 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, and we'll start down with Mr. Parker.

00:48 Allen Parker: Allen Parker, physically present.

00:51 Ann Cupka: Annie Cupka, physically present.

00:54 Cathy Binder: Cathy Binder, physically present.

00:56 Michael Bennett: Michael Bennett, physically present.

00:58 Cathy Binder: And Mr. Morris?

01:00 Jim Morris: Mr. Morris, attending remotely.

01:05 Cathy Binder: Alright, Mr. Morris is attending through electronic means after notifying the Chair that temporary disabilities and/or other medical conditions exist that prevents the member's physical attendance. I direct the Clerk to include this statement and the statement of those remotely participating board members to be memorialized in the minutes. Right now, I'd like you to stand for the invocation by myself and the Pledge of Allegiance by Mr. Weakley. Please Lord, guide us in all the decisions we make tonight, that we make wise decisions, and we do the best as we always do for King George County. Thank you. Mr. Weakley?

01:42 Jonathon Weakley: Please face the flag at the end of the stage.

01:45 All: 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.

02:00 Cathy Binder: Please be seated. Mr. Weakley, do we have any amendments to the agenda?

02:05 Mr. Dines: No, Madam Chair.

02:07 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 offer those comments at the time of the public hearing. Do we have anybody in the audience who would like to speak? Mr. Dines, do we have anybody online who would like to speak?

02:30 Mr. Dines: No, Madam Chair.

02:32 Cathy Binder: Thank you. Do we have any reports from members of the board? Correspondence?

02:38 Allen Parker: No report, ma'am.

02:40 Ann Cupka: No report. Thank you, ma'am.

02:42 Mr. Bennett: Miss Binder, just real quickly, the latest from the county's engineers, Schnabel Engineering, on the Fairview Beach Riverbank Stabilization Plan, that I report on about every meeting, is that the Environmental Assessment is final, it is done, complete, finito. It has been approved by FEMA. The finding of No Significant Impact is also final and complete. So the only thing that left, is for FEMA sign off on the grant and that means that the roughly \$2 million in federal funds will then become available to King George County for the construction of this project. As of today, I received an email that the woman from the Virginia Department of Emergency Management said that FEMA is in the process of getting that approval finalized, that authorization is circulating as government agencies are want to do. So it's in the home stages and should be done very shortly, hopefully. Thank you, ma'am, that's all.

03:41 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Mr. Bennett. I have no report at this time, except can I have a motion on the consent agenda?

03:50 Mr. Bennett: I move that we adopt the consent agenda.

03:52 Cathy Binder: Do I have a second?

03:54 Ann Cupka: Second.

03:55 Cathy Binder: Any discussion? All those in favor?

03:57 All: Aye.

03:58 Cathy Binder: Any nays? Chair votes aye. Motion carries.

04:01 Mr. Bennett: Madam Chair?

04:03 Cathy Binder: Yes, Mr. Bennett?

04:04 Mr. Bennett: Do you want to get Mr. Morris's response?

04:07 Cathy Binder: Oh, apologize. Gotten used to everybody being here. Mr. Morris?

04:11 James Morris: Yes, ma'am. No report.

04:13 Cathy Binder: And do we have a yea or nay on that?

04:15 James Morris: A yea.

04:17 Cathy Binder: Sorry about that, Mr. Morris, I'm so used to everybody being here now. I apologize.

04:20 James Morris: Okay.

04:22 Cathy Binder: Next up is a report from our County Attorney, Hopyard Section 12 Deed Of Dedication.

04:29 Mr. Britton: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is a Deed Of Dedication pertaining to all of the approved plat. This is no change. I know on the Board of Supervisors' meeting later tonight, they have a hearing for a change of preliminary plat design, this is not that. This is just required under the proffers and under the rezoning, that they dedicate certain land and facilities over to the county. And this has been reviewed by Mr. Weakley, by Community Development, and by myself. And it is complete and accurate. And if you so wish, you could call for a motion to accept the deed, plat dedication.

05:13 Cathy Binder: Do I have a motion?

05:14 Mr. Bennett: Madam Chair, I move that we accept the deed as presented by the County

Attorney.

05:18 Cathy Binder: Thank you, do we have a second?

05:20 Allen Parker: Second.

05:21 Cathy Binder: Any discussion? All those in favor say, "Aye."

05:27 All: Aye.

05:28 Cathy Binder: Any nays? Chair votes aye, motion carries. Mr. Weakley, do you have any presentations and reports?

05:37 Jonathon Weakley: No, Madam Chair.

05:39 Cathy Binder: Thank you. Service Authority response letter to VA Senate Bill 5118. Mr. Weakley?

05:47 Jonathon Weakley: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is just an update. As you recall at the last board meeting, I brought to your attention the proposed Virginia Senate Bill 5118, that's in reference to an Emergency Debt Repayment Plan, an EDRP. The General Assembly had initially taken up... Basically, for utilities, we learned in August 2020 that the General Assembly had legislation introduced to require utility companies to develop an Emergency Debt Repayment Plan. Initially, the draft bill language allowed for a 24-month repayment period, which was capped at \$45.50 per month. The initial draft also included language, which would require our customers to submit annual income information to determine if repayment plan exceeded the annual income threshold of 4%. The Bill was then referred to the Finance & Appropriations Committee.

The Committee made some changes to the Bill, therefore the repayment period was reduced from 24 months to a 12-month repayment period, and the \$45.50 per month maximum payment and annual income verification language were both omitted from the previous draft language. Here's some information for you all to know. An average bimonthly customer use is based on 10,000 gallons. So the average customer bimonthly bill based on that usage would total \$273.38. The original \$45.50 per month requirement would equate to 16% of the bimonthly total of 273.38. Staff is strongly opposed to the original 24-month repayment plan, as well as the reduced repayment period of 12 months. For the customer accounts that are delinquent for 90 days or more, and should they be given a 12-month repayment plan, the Service Authority couldn't afford to operate with the reduced cash flow. So just think of it as an extended liability that the Service Authority would be carrying.

Staff recommendations would be for the Emergency Debt Repayment Plan be set as follows: The customer would be required to pay 50% of the account balance immediately and then pay the remaining 50% of the account balance within the following two billing cycles. So that's 25% per billing cycle. The customer would also have to stay current on all future utility bills. This approach will give the customer four months to bring their accounts up-to-date and out of

delinquency. So we bill bimonthly, so each billing cycle is essentially two months. We feel that the four-month repayment plan would be more appropriate.

Again, we count on revenues to run our operation, but we're also sensitive to the fact that folks may need time, and we feel that four months is time to be able to have an appropriate repayment plan, so we're not carrying a liability for a year. So this is before [08:53] _____, if the board wants to take action, my recommendation is the Service Authority Board of Directors authorize the General Manager to work with legal counsel and send a response letter to the appropriate state agency or official with the suggested staff recommendations regarding Senate Bill 5118, for the purpose of an Emergency Debt Repayment Plan. And I'd like to, Madam Chair, at this time, I've have discussions with the County Attorney, to see if he has anything he would like to add to the topic.

09:20 Matt Britton: I don't have anything at this time. Thank you.

09:22 Jonathon Weakley: Okay, thank you. So in your packet, behind the board report, there was the current bill language for Senate Bill 5118. I tried to condense a summary just to give you a timeline of where this originated, their initial language and then the revision. So this is placed on action item, it's the board's preference whether they want to or not, it's easier to obviously take action if it's on the agenda. So I'll open it up for discussion and direction for me of how the board would like to move forward, any thoughts you have on this Emergency Debt Repayment Plan, Madam Chair.

10:02 Cathy Binder: Thank you. Does anybody have any thoughts? Mr. Bennett?

10:12 Mr. Bennett: As I understand it from the draft bill, it would require us, just like every other utility, to establish an Emergency Debt Repayment Plan, and then anyone who wants to get the treatment under that would have to enroll in that. That may be the wrong word, but they have to somehow sign up or somehow get into that program. Mr. Britton, do you know, do you recall sir, if that's something that they have to qualify for?

10:44 Matt Britton: No, I don't recall that. I did read the amended bill, I don't recall that being in there, it could be I wasn't focused on it, but I don't think there's a pre-qualification. They may just have to announce that they're in it. This bill is going in the direction that you've already passed what the SCC requires, that is not required of the Service Authority, and you've already passed that you can't shut down services during the declaration of a local emergency, that's one of the issues. One of the objections that we originally had was that it was a maximum of 45.50 a month, so if you got \$1200 in arrears, it'd take forever. And they did what makes more sense, which is not having a dollar amount.

So I don't believe the enrollment stayed in, where you had to enroll it and you'd recoup it later, but what this bill did was made a more sensible change, which is they took the number of months, which is the same as a percentage of the bill and said you had to pay it back. And I think Mr. Weakley and I's only comment and I know this doesn't go to enrollment, was that perhaps 12 months, which would be six billing cycles, would be awfully long and that six months would be more appropriate as he talked about. But as I understand it, any enrollment language or pre-

qualification fell out in the second iteration.

12:06 Cathy Binder: Mr. Bennett, do you have any other thoughts on it?

12:12 Mr. Bennett: Well, they've already reduced it from 24 months to 12, it hasn't passed yet. But I guess my concern, Mr. Weakley, your recommendation, again, was how many months you wanted to have it repaid?

12:23 Jonathon Weakley: Within four months, two billing cycles.

12:26 Mr. Bennett: That's a third of the amount of time that this bill is allowing. It just... I'm not disagreeing with you, Mr. Weakley, but I'm just thinking in terms of a political objection, that it's hard for me to imagine they're gonna cut it from 12 months to four.

12:44 Cathy Binder: Six might be a little more realistic, possibly.

12:48 Mr. Bennett: And I understand that we go bimonthly, but I'm thinking six might be more palatable for the legislature, rather than asking them to cut it down to four. I guess my concern is, it's just not clear to me what it takes to get into the Emergency Debt Repayment Plan. It says we'll develop one. And, you know, they have to somehow get accepted into it. But I guess... I'm just not sure that I'm reading anywhere, and maybe I haven't studied it carefully enough. But clearly, the point here is that the pandemic is causing you to be unemployed, and you're therefore not able to pay your utility bill, you ought to get some help. But I'm not sure that it says that in this language that the emergency repayment plan is strictly related to, that you have to qualify for it based on unemployment or employment problems from the pandemic. So I have that concern. Mr. Weakley, can you shed any light on that?

13:54 Jonathon Weakley: Sir, is it a question on how one would be enrolled in the repayment plan?

14:00 Mr. Bennett: Yes.

14:00 Jonathon Weakley: I don't see language in here for us to address that. There is language on page two of that text that requires utilities to provide an aggregate anonymized report to the chairs of the House Committees on Labor and Commerce and Appropriations. And there are five items that you have to meet for submitting the information: The number of accounts participating in a repayment plan, the total amount of and average of debt for accounts participating in a repayment plan, the number of accounts removed from a repayment plan, categorized by reason. Four would be the amounts... Excuse me I lost my place... The amounts of and average of debt still remaining per account removed from a repayment plan. And lastly, the carrying costs of the debt for accounts participating in a repayment plan and in any associated administrative costs. So I don't want to go on assumptions. I'm not sure if our regulations would step in based on how it's defined as delinquent now. That would be certainly a good question that I could ask someone on this committee to define for me and report back to the board. It definitely is not clear in the language that I see that there's a qualifier that pulls you in, other than we would definitely have a list of those who are delinquent. And that is what we would use to provide that number of

accounts of delinquents to the House Committees on Labor and Commerce as outlined in the bill text.

15:51 Mr. Britton: Madam Chair, the only, to answer Mr Bennett's question, the only surviving language that Mr. Weakley and I discussed was the EDRP shall allow for a residential customer to rollover remaining debt and any debt accrued under a subsequent state of emergency. And I think that means that there's no enrollment, no reason, if you accrued a debt, if you can pay it, you don't have to, you can roll it over upon request. What remains unclear is when we promulgate the regulations or the EDRP ourselves, whether we can say, "This allows for it, but it doesn't guarantee it, you have to show some qualification." And so that still remains outstanding. Perhaps that could be if you choose to ask for a lower amount, like six months or a percentage, perhaps that could be that you could request a clarification of whether the EDRP, as promulgated by the utility, can make enrollment qualifications.

16:54 Mr. Bennett: Madam Chair, my concern is, if you're working from home during the pandemic and you haven't missed a single paycheck, but you haven't paid your water bill, I don't think you should get any relief.

17:08 Cathy Binder: Gotcha.

17:09 Mr. Bennett: The pandemic is not the cause of you not paying your water bill. So I don't see why... And as I read this, and I'm trying to read it on my phone, which is pretty little... So it just seems to me that it's overly broad as it's drafted. And maybe that should be our comment. We don't have to decide tonight obviously, and Mr. Weakley and Mr. Britton can do some follow up on that if that's amenable to them. But it just seems to me, if you've lost a job as a result of the pandemic and clearly then you're having some financial problems and you're not paying your water bill, that's one thing. But I don't see where that sort of qualification to get into this program is a part of the program. Maybe I'm missing it, but I'm just not seeing it, and it seems to me that it should be in there.

17:53 Cathy Binder: When I looked it over, I didn't see it either there. I kind of alluded that you're creating one. And then it might be eventually in the final bill there's an outline, I don't know. But that would be a very good question to ask is so we need some more clarification on what exactly what Mr. Bennett said. Does anybody else have any thoughts? Miss Cupka?

18:14 James Morris: Yes. Miss Binder.

18:17 Cathy Binder: Oh, Mr. Morris, I'll let you go first.

18:19 Ann Cupka: Thank you, Madam Chair. No, I would agree with Mr. Bennett and you that, perhaps we do need some more guidance, particularly given the fact that as Mr. Britton pointed out, the language was in the original bill, and then subsequently was removed. So yeah.

18:40 Cathy Binder: Because we don't wanna send a letter without more clarification, since it's changed a couple of times. But Mr. Morris, you had a question.

18:48 James Morris: More of a comment, ma'am. My big objection to the state bill is putting a time limit and a dollar amount on it. These amounts, these times, could work with big utilities, Dominion, Columbia Gas, Washington Gas, Fairfax Water, the big folks. But I don't think the state should be dictating to us smaller utilities, what we can and can't do. If they feel the need for this, then it should just be, we're responsible for coming up with some plan to help our customers and our citizens, and leave it up to us to decide what is manageable at our level, because what they're proposing is gonna hurt us and many other smaller utilities in the Commonwealth. And like I said, it should be our decision what we need to do to help our citizens and our customers.

19:57 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Mr. Morris. When I was on the call where they initially discussed this, they talked about that, that the bigger utilities could absorb a payment plan because they have a bigger, not even customer base, but a bigger pool of money that they can tap into, whereas the smaller utilities, they didn't have that, they could absorb long-time payment plans and not being able to receive that income into the organization. Mr. Parker, did you have any thoughts?

20:28 Allen Parker: Just scanning through the bill and whatnot. In my opinion, it's fairly vague. It says for up to 12-month repayment period, but it doesn't say it has to be equal payments for the 12 months. Honestly, you could charge 99% for the first month and the last 1% over the 12. It's really, honestly, super vague, which in my opinion works well, 'cause if you can play in the vagueness, you can come up with something that we don't get struck with. But we're meeting the letter of the law though, I know it may not be the intent. But I do share the concerns with Mr. Bennett that almost anybody, it seems like, could get into this repayment program for any reason, which would be problematic if you're sitting home and making money, and then decide not to pay your bills, and get to pay it for 12 months instead.

21:29 Cathy Binder: Thank you. So I think our consensus is to have Mr. Britton and Mr. Weakley reach out and get some more information before we draft a letter or draft a letter asking for clarification and more information. What do you guys think? Go for the letter asking for more clarification?

21:49 Allen Parker: Yes.

21:49 Cathy Binder: Okay, so go ahead, Mr. Bennett.

21:51 Mr. Bennett: One last option based on what you said, Madam Chair, is maybe there should be some relief in the bill for utilities with a certain number of customers. So in other words, for us, if we have less than 5,000 customers, maybe everybody who has less than X number should be exempt from this, just because we have so few customers that we've really gotta be able to manage our revenue. So I don't know if that's something to consider, but it does... It is true, we are not Fairfax, Prince William County. And they may be able to take a year to get their money back, but it's gonna be a lot tougher for us. At a minimum, people should be really qualified to get in the thing, and maybe we should consider asking them for an exception for really small utilities like us.

22:41 Cathy Binder: Have it in the letter, where we clarify and ask more information, a small

paragraph about that smaller utilities with under 5,000 customer base, this could be a challenge, basically, on the revenue side. How would everybody feel like that being included in the letter? Just to make them aware of that, everybody's not a big utility. Go ahead, Mr. Weakley.

23:01 Jonathon Weakley: I've captured that, so absolutely. I wanted to coattail off Mr. Bennett, so what I'm hearing or what I think I heard is maybe there should be some kind of verification if you've been affected. When my wife went through a temporary furlough, she was given documentation from her employer, so you could take that to a power company, a water company or whatever. Am I hearing that you would like some type of, and don't let me put words in your mouth, but some type of verification, so you can distinguish between those with hardships and without hardships?

23:38 Cathy Binder: Yes, that's what... Mm-hmm.

23:40 Jonathon Weakley: Yes. Okay. Yes. Alright. And then the idea is, we'll pool more information together, come back next meeting, or I guess just issue a letter, a draft letter out... No, I can't do that way. I guess what's the appropriate way, Matt, I guess, help me, sir, as far as, you can draft a letter and have it reviewed.

24:02 Mr. Britton: Madam Chair, I think if you wanted to do it quickly, you can authorize Mr. Weakley to send out a letter on your behalf, at the direction of the board of directors, or we can bring it back at the next hearing for you to endorse. But I think it's pretty clear what we're asking for, which is clarification on whether or not we can have regulations, having some qualification for enrollment and whether there can be a ceiling for size or debt structure, and we can send that out. I think Mr. Weakley and I have a good understanding of exactly what needs to be amplified and the possibility of reducing it, 'cause I think that there can be a blend, which is that authorities of a certain size may be able to have it such as not more than two billing cycles or not more than four months or six months, so they may wish to blend it. I think we can craft something to be acceptable. If you wanted to appoint... The other way you could do it is to appoint someone to review it on behalf of the board, so that it doesn't go out with another board, without another board optic, or we could wait 'til the public hearing. But those are the only three ways I know: Authorize Mr. Weakley, bring it back to the board or appoint one of the board members to review it prior to it going out.

25:22 Cathy Binder: How would you guys feel about just authorizing Mr. Britton and Mr. Weakley to draft a letter and send it out?

25:32 Allen Parker: I have no problem with that.

25:34 Ann Cupka: Nor do I, Madam Chair.

25:35 Cathy Binder: Mr. Bennett?

25:36 Mr. Bennett: Fine with me.

25:37 Cathy Binder: Mr. Morris?

25:40 James Morris: Fine with me.

25:40 Cathy Binder: And I'm fine with that. And that does not need a motion, correct, Matt? Or do we need a motion on that?

25:46 Matt Britton: No, you do not need a motion, Madam Chair.

25:47 Cathy Binder: All right. Thank you. You have consensus. I appreciate your work on this. Alright, now we're at the General Manager's report, Mr. Weakley.

26:00 Jonathon Weakley: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Dines, can you pull that up please, sir? Next slide. First up, just a few water topics, the courthouse water system, we have placed the Purkins Well Rehab project on schedule. The idea is that mobilization will occur in two weeks and we would then have to do a yield test, share that information with Office of Drinking Water, get their approval before the well can go online. These are pretty standard items, but I wanted to let you know from last time that this has been placed to schedule. Two other items for the courthouse system, there were two wells, they've been offline since we acquired the system, however, per DEQ'S Groundwater Withdrawal Permit, we were supposed to abandon those a while back.

We are now doing that and we anticipate that work being done over the next few weeks, and then that documentation will flow to both VDH and DEQ to satisfy that requirement. The Ninde's water system, we have [27:04] ____ scheduled to do the start-up tomorrow. So that's pretty standard, anytime there's any work or new application, they verify proper operation, obviously before we even sign off on that, or have any final payment. From there, once I know everything is in working order, I'll come back as promised to the board with some cost associated with that project, so you can have a final look at what we actually spent to bring that project to completion versus past estimations. That's for the water system.

Mr. Dines, next slide please. These are just updates from last meeting, I appreciate the board approving this, and Mr. Britton and Miss Cobb's time reviewing these documents to get them in proper order, the Oakland Park Waste Water Treatment Plant, the blowers that you all approved, they have been ordered, that had a 16-week maximum lead time. The Dahlgren Wastewater Treatment Plant, the clarifier drive work, that is being scheduled, or in the drive arm wasn't an issue, it's just actually having the work scheduled, so... But that is in the works. And then the pump station alarms, they actually arrived today, so you all approved that last time, and we have the units in-house and we will start installation next week.

Other information, next slide, please. This is just some information. I really thought about this lately, I've had some conversation with some of you, so I need to just give you some updates time to time when I'm reviewing plans, maybe not every plan but at least something of size. Had a conference call with the engineers that are doing the Potomac Landing development site plan. This was a subdivision, I believe, the zoning and all was approved, now they're coming back with the site plan, so that's beyond erosion and so forth, it's also involving, what does water and sewer infrastructure look like?

They wanted to know, could they have a special exception to where the site plan would be approved by the Service Authority without showing the infrastructure, I.e, booster station or storage tanks. I do not have local review authority, any time you're dealing with booster stations or storage tanks, think about Walnut Hill, for example, those things have to be reviewed and approved by Virginia Department of Health, the Office of Drinking Water, and once they have given approval it comes back, I get notification, I take a final look at it, then we can give approval. So, we had a good, what I feel like, a productive conversation on Friday, the firm understands that, in order to obtain that approval that's the next process, it's up to them if they wanna go that far but that's the next phase.

30:03 Cathy Binder: And Mr. Weakley, this is Section 4, correct? The last section?

30:08 Jonathon Weakley: No, ma'am... Oh, I don't... I apologize, I'm not sure if this was Section 4, as far as the original Potomac Landing development. I believe this may be in addition to. I know there was a lot of concern when this came up, this is about right, I believe.

30:25 Cathy Binder: Correct, that's why I just wanted clarification on that, it should be the last piece but...

30:28 Jonathon Weakley: Yes, ma'am. Just to give a visual. So if you're turning off 218 on the Potomac Landing, it's all of the undeveloped land as you go down...

30:37 Cathy Binder: To the lot?

30:37 Jonathon Weakley: Yes, ma'am. As you go down Potomac Landing, before you get to the wastewater treatment plant. They proposed two sewer connections to the existing system and two water connections to the existing system, and there would have to be a booster station involved. There have to be pressure zones because the topography changes quite a bit from the portion that's already developed versus what's going up on the hill, to use the term. But they're well aware that we cannot give a special exception, we didn't wanna set a precedent, we want to stay strictly to the guidelines we have and passed approval, so... Mr. Bennett, do you have a question, sir?

31:14 Mr. Bennett: Madam Chair, I was just gonna comment. My first meeting on this project was when Mr. Hingley was our interim General Manager.

31:21 Cathy Binder: Yeah, I remember that.

31:22 Mr. Bennett: So this is before Mr. Weakley came to be with us. So that's how long it's been rattling around. For those of you who aren't familiar with it on this board, it's roughly 80 homes, maybe a few more, and it's... My recollection is it's both sides of the road, Potomac Landing Drive, going up the hill from the river up to 218. Many of my friends in Potomac Landing hate the idea of this and are vehemently opposed to it. From the Service Authority perspective though, that could be \$1.6 million roughly in connection fees, so naturally I love it, but my neighbors and friends, we just have to agree to disagree on that one. The tricky part of

this project from our perspective though is, if you've ever been in that neck of the woods, and it's the same as Fairview, when you leave the river and go up to 218, it's a pretty severe uphill climb. So, we've gotta be able to make sure that the water that we have in our wells gets all the way up the hill, and that's up to them to do, because they're bringing these homes in and they're gonna do the infrastructure, so they're gonna have tanks or whatever Mr. Weakley decides as appropriate, in terms of the engineering and what's gonna work for us. So that's really what the Service Authority's perspective has been on this, and we've been commenting on it, as I say since before Mr. Weakley got here.

32:42 Cathy Binder: Yeah, the topography is quite a challenge in that last section. Does anybody else have any questions? Mr. Morris?

32:55 James Morris: No, ma'am. No questions.

32:56 Cathy Binder: Alright, Mr. Weakley, continue.

32:58 Jonathon Weakley: Okay, and then the last item... And thank you, Mr. Bennett for that. The last item is just an update, housekeeping to let you know, I submitted the pollutant minimization plan for the Dahlgren Waste Water Treatment Plant permit. Sometimes through permit cycles, there's additional requirements they put in, that was one of those submittals. And that's all I have for my GM report, unless there are any questions from the board.

33:20 Cathy Binder: Not at all. Alright, thank you, Mr. Weakley. Miss Cupka?

33:26 Ann Cupka: I move that the King George County Service Authority Board of Directors convene in closed meeting pursuant to State Code Section 2.2-3711A38 and 29, for discussion or consideration of the acquisition of real property for a public purpose or of the disposition of publicly held real property where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body. And for consultation with legal counsel, employed or retained by a public body, regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such legal counsel regarding a potential waste water treatment facility, and for discussion of the award of a public contract involving the expenditure of public funds, including the terms or scope of such contract, where discussion in an open session would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body concerning wastewater treatment and related facilities. I invite the County Administrator and County Attorney to attend the closed meeting because they are deemed necessary and/or their presence will reasonably aid the board in its consideration of the topic to be discussed, pursuant to Virginia State Code Section 2.2-3711A38 and 29.

34:51 Mr. Bennett: Second.

34:53 Cathy Binder: Any discussion? All those in favor?

34:56 All: Aye.

34:57 Cathy Binder: Wait for Mr. Morris. Chair votes aye. We are adjourned into closed

session.

35:08 Ann Cupka: I move that the King George County Service Authority Board of Directors, return to public meeting and certified by vote that only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law, and only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed or considered.

35:29 Cathy Binder: Alright, Mr. Parker, do you certify?

35:32 Allen Parker: I so certify.

35:33 Cathy Binder: Miss Cupka?

35:34 Ann Cupka: I so certify.

35:35 Cathy Binder: Mr. Bennett?

35:35 Mr. Bennett: I so certify.

35:37 Cathy Binder: Mr. Morris?

35:38 James Morris: I so certify.

35:40 Cathy Binder: Cathy Binder so certifies, we are back in session. Do I have a motion for adjournment?

35:47 Mr. Bennett: Move that we adjourn until October 6th, 2020, at 5:30 PM at King George High School.

35:52 Cathy Binder: Do I have a second?

35:53 Allen Parker: Second.

35:54 Cathy Binder: Any discussion? All those in favor?

35:56 All: Aye.

35:58 Cathy Binder: Mr. Morris?

36:00 James Morris: Aye.

36:00 Cathy Binder: Any nays? Chair votes aye. Let me read... This meeting is hereby adjourned to the next regularly scheduled meeting on October 6th, 2020, at 5:30 PM at King George High School. The 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. The King George Board of Supervisors will start in 10 minutes, thank you.