

VIRGINIA:

At a regular meeting of the King George County Service Authority Board of Directors, held on Tuesday, the 2nd day of March, 2021 at 5:30 p.m. in the Revercomb Building Board Room at 10459 Courthouse Drive, King George, Virginia:

PRESENT:

Annie Cupka, Chairman
James Morris, Vice-Chairman
Cathy Binder, Member
Carrie Cleveland, Member
Allen R. Parker, Jr., Member
Jonathon Weakley, General Manager
Larry Hughes, Interim County Administrator
Matt Britton, County Attorney

0:00:04.8 Madam Chair: I hereby call to order this meeting of the King George County Service Authority Board of Directors. Mr. Parker will lead with the invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance by Mr. Weakley. Please stand as you are able.

0:00:22.0 Allen Parker: Heavenly Father, we thank you for allowing us to gather tonight. We ask that you give us the guidance and wisdom to make the best decisions to be possible for the members of the Service Authority as well as the King George County residents in general. We ask this in Jesus' name. Amen.

0:00:41.3 Jonathon Weakley: 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.

0:01:00.2 Madam Chair: Thank you, gentlemen. Are there any amendments to the agenda, Mr. Weakley?

0:01:02.6 J. Weakley: No amendments, Madam Chair.

0:01:04.2 Madam Chair: Very good. We'll move on to 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. Is there anyone here present in the boardroom who wishes to speak? Please come forward, state your name and address. Yes, ma'am, to the podium. Yeah, we switched it up. We're back to normal.

0:01:38.0 Anna Maria Lovell: I'm short. Hi, my name is Anna Maria Lovell. I live in Presidential Lakes. Tonight, I wanted to say that I want to congratulate Mr. Weakley for the job he's doing. The Service Authority is having so many problems for many years and general managers coming and going. Well, I would like to ask the board, the supervisors, if the county can help pay part of the debt. In April 2019, they owe \$30 million plus \$15 million need for repairs. That is \$45 million. I don't understand how they're going to pay, and they get more and more in debt every year. That is my comment.

0:02:35.2 Madam Chair: Thank you, ma'am. Anyone else in the audience? Mr. Dines, do we have anyone waiting online? Very good, thank you. We'll move on to reports of members of the board. Mr. Parker, would you like to start us off, sir?

0:02:51.2 A. Parker: No report, ma'am.

0:02:52.6 Madam Chair: Thank you. Mr. Morris?

0:02:55.7 Jim Morris: No report, ma'am.

0:02:57.2 Madam Chair: Ms. Cleveland?

0:02:58.5 Carrie Cleveland: No report.

0:03:00.5 Madam Chair: Ms. Binder?

0:03:00.8 Cathy Binder: Yes, I wanna thank Mr. Weakley and his staff for having a great discussion last week about the state of the Service Authority and projects on the horizon, and I finally, four years in the making, got to visit Purkins Corner and I appreciated the tour and the staff there and all they do at that facility knowing how challenging it is. So I just wanted to thank everybody in the Service Authority staff.

0:03:25.5 Madam Chair: Thank you, and I wanna thank, also, Mr. Weakley and his staff for recently working with a customer in an attempt to resolve her water quality issues in Potomac Landing over the course of the past week or so, and for keeping the Board of Directors informed regarding the same. And I know from seeing your report that you'll touch on a little more detail later on so, thank you very much for that. Consent agenda, do I have a motion?

0:03:55.7 C. Binder: I'll make a motion to approve the consent agenda as put in the packet.

0:04:03.4 J. Morris: I second.

0:04:05.2 Madam Chair: Any further discussion? All those in favor say, "Aye."

0:04:08.3 C. Binder: Aye.

0:04:08.6 C. Cleveland: Aye.

0:04:09 J. Morris: Aye.

0:04:09 A. Parker: Aye.

0:04:10.2 Madam Chair: Any opposed, sure votes aye? Motion carries. Report from the County Attorney, Mr. Britton.

0:04:16.5 Matt Britton: No report, Madam Chair.

0:04:16.7 Madam Chair: Thank you, sir. Seeing we have no presentations and reports nor action nor discussion items, we will move on to the General Manager's report, Mr. Weakley.

0:04:32.5 J. Weakley: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Dines will get that loaded up. Okay. Forgive me, I thought I had to go to the meeting, loaded here so I can see it, so I'm gonna kinda pivot a little bit up. Forgive me. Next slide, please. As Ms. Cupka just touched on, we received a few dirty water calls. Majority of those have been within the last 24 hours. Fairview Beach and Potomac Landing is an interconnected system so when you hear her say, Fairview Beach, Potomac Landing, it's all in the same with the water system.

So we have scheduled a distribution system flushing tomorrow that will start at 9:00 AM I had planned on doing that Thursday but there were two or three additional phone calls that came in plus the one prior. So now, it's time to go ahead and flush. We'll start at Fairview Beach and pull that water all the way through Potomac Landing. I will be going back to review the as-built drawings on this system because some of the side roads within the development, particularly Fairview Beach side, may not have the adequate blow-offs that are needed. And when you do a distribution system flushing, sometimes, pulling the meter at a home is not sufficient when you're pulling a dead-end line so... That's outside of tomorrow's event, but for future planning you should have proper blow offs and/or flushing hydrants to pull the water through it. So uniform flushing patterns. You don't wanna just pull one area and leave those side streets, because they'll have discolored water.

Second, I mentioned the annual Consumer Confidence Report, also that acronym known as CCR. That's an annual requirement from the Virginia Department of Health. We're required to send that report to customers. It must be in their hand by July 1st. Our water manager actually submitted the draft to VDH. VDH offers a review period. We believe it's smart to go ahead and let them review that and make any suggestions or comments before finalized, because ultimately they will get the final version. So VDH received that today. We'll start to review once we have their approval. If there are no any additional things to add we will send that out. We will utilize, most importantly, the electronic distribution method that we did last year, if you may recall. And Chris, thank you for those efforts. There's a link that will be loaded on the website that will take you to your particular CCR report. What folks will get is a simple postcard mailing like they did last year. The only thing VDH requires, if there were folks that required hard copies we had to take names and addresses. And from moving forward, those folks would automatically get a mailed CCR. So we always have hard copies at the office as well, but I'm happy to report we're tracking well ahead of July 1st. Our water audit was actually submitted yesterday. This takes a look at the well production in your sales. And ideally they should be very close, is what you want. But you have to account for other things, like backwashing your filters in your system. Maybe there was some water use within fire suppression, and so forth. So I will be issuing that at a later time, to give you some summary, to fit that into today or even tomorrow... Excuse me, next joint meeting, I think, will be a tall order for the business we have. But I will report initially that we are trending down from the last report from 2018, which is where you wanna be. And I think that's due to the billing software we switched to, plus staff efforts in tracking those things, such as backwash another thing.

Next slide please. The top item here I reported on at a prior meeting. But reason why this is a

carryover item, plus the new second bullet point, any time you exceed a permit limit you get notification from DEQ. There's generally a two-month lag time from when we submit that monthly operation report, send a cover letter. And then in two months they send you a letter and you respond to it. So what we did is, not only did we respond with a letter, DEQ wanted to talk about the pending consent order. As you may recall, I believe back in October they had talked about a potential superseding consent order. And essentially they would look to close out items that are already satisfied. So we took the opportunity to explain those two events, although they already had letters. We believe we provided sufficient information that they found acceptable, but as always I bring awareness to the board when we receive that. Dahlgren, the last couple months treatment is back performing. As I reported, we believe that was a hydraulic loading issue, primarily due to the clarify rehab work. Oakland Park, we went back through our data and believe we missed the dissolve zinc number by having insufficient amount of alkalinity. And going back, that was something we did not have a Standard Operating Procedure for, which is what an SOP stands for. We've put that in place. We feel confident that if we meet that target benchmark number for alkalinity it should be a non-issue. But we did receive a notice for that as well.

The third item... And I kinda mentioned when I was on the phone call with the DEQ, they wanted an update of our five year pump station plan. As you know, that was segmented into three priority task. So we are operating under priority task one, which had to be completed by mid-April. We are tracking very well, so we took the opportunity to let them know. They actually were asking did we need more time, because as they look to wrap up the other consent order items, if they put something in writing that has to do with our five-year plan, they wanna make sure that it's adequate. So we know COVID and other things have disturbed funding, has disturbed timeline. Right now, I have nothing that would lend us to say we won't meet our priority one benchmarks. When we move into priority two we have 24 months. Priority one had 12 months by design. Those were alarm stations, we can knock those out quickly. But priority two and priority three projects, they have 24 months tied to each priority to give us the funding maneuverability in the timeline to complete those. So two items to mention are past non-compliance, we've responded to that. And then an update on conversations with DEQ.

Next slide, please. So the WIP3 update... And Mr Britton and I have had some conversations around this. As you recall, the watershed implementation plan phase three, that's for that... I'm sorry for all the acronyms. That was gonna have a negative effect on King George County. There are two treatment plans, for example, that have... I don't wanna say we enjoy, but we benefit from higher nitrogen levels, for example, in our permits, Oakland Park and Perkins Corner. The WIP 3, as it was originally proposed, had significant lower limits that would be more aligned with our Dahlgren permit limits, which means there's no way those treatment plants, as they exist, could meet those limits. So, we've had conversations with Chris Pomeroy, who represented us on this original case when we essentially challenged the state. We had a favorable result, meaning that they moved away, they dropped their efforts to look to enforce that past proposed plan. And instead, they created what they called a "floating cap." But I don't wanna spend too much time on that 'cause the floating cap, as I've outlined, pertains to other areas in the state, other utilities such as Hampton Roads Sanitation District. And the closest project that will have to comply is Massaponax. They're looking to do, I believe, some interconnecting of systems and have a closure of a facility there, so no negative impact on King George.

However, and I don't always like to bring doom and gloom. Last in that sentence, we will keep an eye. There's new ammonia limits that will be coming out. DEQ is working on those right now and we're hearing anything of half of your existing limit, meaning they will lower it, so that we could be facing similar challenges with those two facilities, Perkins and Oakland Park, that we escaped WIP 3, but we're gonna have to pay close attention on the ammonia part. So I wanted to make mention of

that.

Next slide, please. Other information, just wanna make mention, and this is worth... Because we are a part of some of the service and contracts that the county participates in. So recently, an RFP was issued for annual engineering services. Mr. Parker, received your feedback and duly noted, sir. So mainly, the way we do it is we've had annual service agreements, been one-stop shop, larger engineering firms. But when you get into things, whether it's geo-technical services, or surveying, or other examples, are there other service providers that are local or do we really need the larger one-stop shop firms?

So, Mr. Quesenberry added an addendum, and that doesn't need board approval, but it's for mentioning tonight. And I just put in bold print, that's what was added today. So you can see qualification requirements for most projects anticipated to be awarded under the annual agreement, may include but not be limited to. So, however, certain projects may require specialized services, so lead, monitoring wetland, geo-tech services. So those firms will be able to submit under the RFP with his addendum, so we've had some good conversation earlier, but I thought it was worth mentioning and moving forward. Even though if there is a service that is... Or a contract, it's gonna be primarily county we're a part of, I'll make sure that that's in a report. So, although an RFP, you're sending out final decisions made, that is at your level, a heads up on any of these other service agreements that we may be a part of, so you have adequate time to provide feedback. Any questions on that before I move on? Okay. Thank you.

Next slide, please. Fairview Beach. I thought it was worth mentioning, Travis and I were talking today and it's my understanding, I believe the Board of Supervisors may look to take action tonight about this project. So while it's not a Service Authority project, there is some benefit for us. So I just, one, wanna thank county officials and all the stakeholders who came together. I know there's grants, there's a lot of stuff, but I don't wanna assume that everybody knows that we have sanitary sewer lines that run right along that area. And as that bank or that shoreline continues to erode, that's not a good thing for sanitary sewer. You don't want that, and because there becomes fixing it and mitigation and all that involved. What we did prior to this project was we put what is known as Closed Circuit TV Inspection, CCTV. We had a company perform a sewer inspection, so they send a little rover down, they take a picture so you can see the integrity of your infrastructure, all that checked out well.

But I just wanted to take the opportunity to thank those involved that made that possible. I realized that may be getting ready to be awarded and start soon. But that has a major effect on us, so thank you. Last... Davenport was here at the last meeting and we said we would report back to you. I don't have anything in writing yet other than what Kyle mentioned to me, there were two loans, Fairview Beach and Dahlgren. One was a water loan, the other was a sewer loan, and they had interest rates of 2.9% and roughly 2.4%. An email from Kyle has said he has spoken with VDH and DEQ. They both were in agreement of a rate reset, that's what these loans are looking to do. You're not adding the years to your term, you're looking to do a rate reset. And right now, you don't have it in writing, he's projecting about a 1.05% interest rate. So that's good. That will result in annual savings, but the documentation is now being worked up so it can be sent to us for legal and all proper review, and then ultimately brought up to the board for approval. So he thinks maybe late March, early April, somewhere in that timeframe. Next slide. I think... Oh, okay. That's all of my general manager report. Any questions or comments?

0:18:47.5 Madam Chair: Thank you, Mr. Weakley. Mr. Parker, any questions or comments?

0:18:52.6 A. Parker: No comments.

0:18:53.5 Madam Chair: Thank you. Mr. Morris?

0:18:56.2 J. Morris: The notice of violation we received for Dahlgren, that's just a written notice, there's no fine or anything assessed with that?

0:19:07.0 J. Weakley: There's no fine. What DEQ does, they look at the, I'll say incident, but the violation, they assess points. Obviously, any kind of upset or exceedings we have with our history, they have concerns, they will look back. And is there anything they need to look to maybe keep in our existing consent order or move away. But no fines. The conversation we had on the phone was, "We received your letter that went through the timeline." So how this works, you'll have initial letter sent in with your DMR submittal, that'll cover it, but when they send you this additional follow-up, you send another letter. Well, I didn't wait on this, I figured it would come because I know there's a two-month lag time. So I went back and really did a thorough breakdown of, "Okay, what happened? What dates? When the failure was? What led up to this?" And provided that very high level detail. So we discussed that on the phone, so what they told me on the phone was, "Look, we're issuing it and it'll be... We take under consideration, what you have, we're not saying any civil penalties would be applied in this case, but our concern is, as we go through the consent order, we're closing out items, are there items we need to include." So there are no penalties that they have levied or mentioned that will be coming at this time.

0:20:41.7 J. Morris: Great, thank you.

0:20:42.5 J. Weakley: Yes, sir.

0:20:43.9 Madam Chair: Miss Cleveland.

0:20:45.9 C. Cleveland: When you were talking about the ammonia levels being checked, what's the time frame you think, on that?

0:20:54.9 J. Weakley: Internally, DEQ would like to roll that out quickly, but internally, in their discussions with the various departments that they have in DEQ, they realize there needs to be what is normal of a public comment period where you can give. So I think if I had to put an estimate on it, two years, maybe a year to two years. I think anything less than one year would be insufficient for you to make an adjustment, because you have to basically realize, "Can you meet those limits? Are you gonna have to upgrade? What will you do?" So the conversation I have with DEQ staff is, they're primarily looking at drafting, so they can get that out for review, but putting the emphasis on giving proper time to review and make comments. So I would estimate between 12 months to 24 months.

0:21:47.9 C. Cleveland: And my understanding, you saying that if this was implemented, those areas wouldn't be able to give that reading.

0:22:00.3 J. Weakley: It would be challenging to be consistent. And let me back up a little bit. So not all of our sites have an existing ammonia limit, so what DEQ said was, for those facilities that don't have one, maybe you have a TKN, which is part of nitrogen, maybe we remove that or reduce the frequency you sample for that, but we're gonna give you an ammonia. And they look at different criteria, primarily your stream, not only the wastewater loading you have coming to your plant, because you'll have a certain amount coming to your plant you have to convert, but they look at the

criteria in the stream, the receiving stream that you would discharge to, and that's how they come together and formulate what is an adequate limit that they would look to issue in your permit. So it would make it challenging. We just don't know what those limits would be at this time.

0:22:53.8 C. Cleveland: Thank you.

0:22:54.4 J. Weakley: Yes, ma'am.

0:22:55.6 Madam Chair: Ms. Binder?

0:22:57.3 C. Binder: I don't have anything.

0:22:58.9 Madam Chair: And I don't have any questions either. Thank you, as always, Mr. Weekly. Alright, would note information items, members, please note the schedule for the budget work sessions. And with that, I'll entertain a motion for a closed session.

0:23:16.7 J. Morris: I move that the King George County Service Authority Board of Directors convene in a closed session, pursuant to state code Section 2.2-3711, Section A, 5, 6 and 8, for discussion concerning a prospective business, or industry, or the expansion of an existing business or industry where no previous announcement has been made of the business or the industry's interest in locating or expanding its facility in the community. Discussion or consideration of the investment of public funds where competition or bargaining is involved, where if made publicly... Public initially, the financial interests of the governmental unit would be adversely affected, and consultation with legal counsel employed or retained by the public body, regarding specific legal matters requiring the provisions of a legal advice by such council.

0:24:24.5 C. Binder: Second.

0:24:25.5 Madam Chair: Any further discussion? All those in favor, say aye.

0:24:28.3 C. Binder: Aye.

0:24:28.6 C. Cleveland: Aye.

0:24:29 J. Morris: Aye.

0:24:29 A. Parker: Aye.

0:24:30.2 Madam Chair: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. We are in closed session.

[Pause]

Very good, I'll entertain a motion.

0:24:43.0 J. Morris: I move that King George County Service Authority, Board of Directors, return to the public meeting and certify that only public business matters lawfully exempt from open meeting requirements by Virginia law, and only such public business matters were identified in the motion, convening the closed session were heard, discussed or considered during the closed

meeting.

0:25:10.7 C. Binder: Second.

0:25:12.4 Madam Chair: Thank you. All those... I'm sorry, can we have each member certify, please. Mr. Parker?

0:25:22.4 A. Parker: Allen Parker, I so certify.

0:25:24.5 Madam Chair: Mr. Morris?

0:25:25.5 J. Morris: James Morris, I certify.

0:25:27.1 Madam Chair: Ms. Cleveland?

0:25:27.7 C. Cleveland: Carrie Cleveland. I certify.

0:25:30.3 Madam Chair: Ms. Binder?

0:25:31.3 C. Binder: Cathy Binder. I so certify.

0:25:33.6 Madam Chair: And Ann C. Cupka. So certify. Alright. Do we have another motion?

0:25:42.6 C. Binder: I guess I get to do it again. I don't have the information in front of me, but just help me out here. I move that we close to our next meeting in March 4th. At 5:30, at Company one.

0:26:00.1 J. Morris: I second.

0:26:02.8 Madam Chair: Any further discussion? All those in favor, say aye.

0:26:07 C. Binder: Aye.

0:26:07 C. Cleveland: Aye.

0:26:07 J. Morris: Aye.

0:26:07 A. Parker: Aye.

0:26:07.3 Cupka: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. We are adjourned.