

## Approved 4/20/09

### Minutes of Special Meeting (Work Session) of Tuesday, January 13, 2009, at 11:00 a.m.

The Union County Board of Commissioners met in a special meeting on Tuesday, January 13, 2009, at 11:00 a.m. in the Personnel Training Room, Room 131, First Floor, Union County Government Center, 500 North Main Street, Monroe, North Carolina. The purpose of the special meeting was to hold a work session: 1) to discuss the possible establishment of a County Representation Committee to study government representation in Union County; 2) to hear a presentation on the results of the Eastern Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report; and 3) to receive an update on the Water Allocation Policy. The following were

PRESENT: Chairman Lanny Openshaw, Vice Chair Kim Rogers, Commissioner Allan Baucom, Commissioner Tracy Kuehler, and Commissioner A. Parker Mills, Jr.

ABSENT: None

ALSO PRESENT: Al Greene, County Manager, Lynn G. West, Clerk to the Board of Commissioners, Matthew Delk, Assistant County Manager, Jeff Crook, Senior Staff Attorney, H. Ligon Bundy, Interim County Attorney, members of the press, and interested citizens

At approximately 11:10 a.m., the Chairman called the special meeting to order.

#### **County Representation Committee:**

The first item discussed was the establishment of a County Representation Committee to study government representation in Union County. The Chairman said that there had been discussion about the possibility of establishing a group of people to study this issue to see if there is a consensus for district representation in Union County. He said that he would like to see the issue studied if that is the Board's wishes.

The Chairman stated that the remaining two issues on today's agenda were placed on the work session by the manager, and they would be addressed today, if time permits, and, if not, those items could be discussed at the regular meeting on Tuesday, January 20, 2009.

Commissioner Mills said that he thought it was a good idea to have these work sessions, but he thought if the Board was going to do it right, the work sessions needed to be televised in the Board Room. He stated that these issues are important and, if the Board wants open and transparent government, the work sessions need to be televised.

The Chairman responded that this is a work session and is supposed to be informal. He stressed that this Board already has done more to have open government than has probably ever been done in this County. He stated that he did not see having to extend that to the Board's work sessions, which are basically the Board's time to get together and discuss issues. He said that he did not see the need to televise the work sessions.

Commissioner Mills reiterated that he thought if the meetings were going to be open, then they should be televised.

The Chairman stated that he had presented his opinion and Commissioner Mills had presented his opinion. He then asked for comments from the remaining Board members.

Commissioner Kuehler stated that her concern was the difference of what she perceived the work sessions to be which are round table discussions. She said that when the Board is sitting in the Board Room, then the members are supposed to be recognized, and while the Board would not have to do that in a work session in the Board Room, her fear is that if both orders of business are being conducted in the same room, they are going to overlap. She said that the work sessions are much more informal. She said she did not know if there was an alternative to holding the work sessions so that they could be televised.

Vice Chair Rogers questioned whether the work sessions will be taped. Mrs. West responded that she was taping the work sessions, and Vice Chair Rogers stated that the Board might look at providing the audio tapes for the web site. She said she had the same concerns, as does Commissioner Kuehler. She stated that the purposes of the work sessions are so the Board members can roll up their sleeves and talk and get the issues on the table. She stressed that she was not trying to hide anything but suggested that a compromise might be to have the audiotapes on the website.

Commissioner Baucom stated that he had made a request that the work session be televised. He asked if there was an opportunity to set up tables in the Board Room at which the Board could sit rather than sitting behind the nameplates. Mr. Greene responded that the meetings could be televised from the Personnel Training Room or from any location that the Board wanted to hold its work sessions although the quality might not be as good as the Board Room.

Chairman Openshaw agreed with the comments of Vice Chair Rogers and Commissioner Kuehler. He stated that the work sessions were a time for the Board to deal with work sessions in a different way. He said that the regular Board meetings and the joint meetings with the municipalities are being televised as well as the Planning Board's meetings and the Board of Adjustments' meetings. He explained that he did not believe it is necessary to televise the work sessions. He said that he would like to hold the work sessions at a smaller table. He stated that if the work sessions are being held and lunch is being served during that time, he did not believe the public needed to watch the Board eating lunch. He said that it is the same rationale as going on retreats, and added that he is not in favor of going out of the County for a retreat this year.

The Chair said that if Commissioner Baucom wanted to vote on televising the work sessions, he would be glad for the Board to vote on the request. Commissioner Baucom responded no, that it was the Chairman's call on whether or not to televise the work sessions. Chairman Openshaw reiterated that he is not in favor of televising the Board's work sessions. He said that he wanted to adhere to the schedule for the work sessions as originally established, which is from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. He stated that there have been e-mails with the Manager, that if the Board wanted to make the work sessions longer, the work sessions should begin at an earlier time. He stated that if that were the consensus of the Board, he would be glad to amend the time schedule.

Commissioner Baucom stated that he was unclear if today's work session would be extended past 1:00 p.m. Vice Chair Rogers said that 1:30 p.m. was the latest that she could attend today and Commissioner Kuehler said that 2:00 p.m. was the latest that she could attend today. The Chairman said that he also had a busy day as he was going out of town for three days, and he would like to adhere to the 11:00 a.m to 1:00 p.m. timeframe for today's meeting.

Chairman Openshaw redirected the discussion to the subject of whether to have Commissioners elected by districts, expanding the board, or doing nothing. He said that Commissioner Kuehler had prepared a draft document entitled "The Union County Commissioners Governance Advisory Committee" which she distributed to the Board.

Commissioner Kuehler provided the Board with an overview regarding where the idea of a Governance Advisory Committee originated. She said that the goal of the committee is to make sure that everyone in Union County is represented. She stated that this

was similar to how the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO) and the Land Use Steering Committee (LUSC) were done, both of which she thought had worked well. She said that her concern is that everyone needs to feel that they have a voice in this issue and that would be the point of including the various memberships on the committee. She stated the purpose of the committee would be to basically find out what other counties similar in demographics, population, and growth to Union County are doing about this issue.

She said that she has done some research and in the year 2000 there were 10 counties out of 100 that had district representation and the remaining counties were either at large or had residency requirements. She stated that it would be interesting to see if this number has changed. She shared that the numbers she had used were from the School of Government. She noted that the draft document she had presented contained consideration for the census that would be taking place in 2010.

Commissioner Kuehler said that she had heard a number of people suggesting it and during the election she had supported increasing the number of the Board to seven because of the workload. She stated that now that she is on the Board, while she understands that mindset, she is the kind of person who wants to make sure she does her own homework and that she is up to speed, and having seven or nine people on the Board would not reduce her workload. She said that the meetings of the Committee would be open and would allow public input with periodic responses to the Board of Commissioners; ultimately resulting in proposals. She stressed that this proposal is a working draft and said that she would be interested in hearing comments from other Board members.

Commissioner Mills addressed the requirement for audio minutes as contained in the proposal. He said that if the meetings fluctuate from location to location, someone would have to take recording equipment to the meetings. He said that this may or may not be an issue and questioned who that person would be.

Commissioner Kuehler said that the proposal includes a non-voting Commissioner to serve on the committee and said that responsibility could be assigned to that person or his/her representative. Vice Chair Rogers suggested checking with Dr. Davis of the schools, because they have recording equipment used for school board meetings that they can set up and take down.

Commissioner Mills suggested using the Board room for the meetings, since it is located in the center of the County and the recording equipment is available instead of moving the meetings each time. Vice Chair Rogers said that she liked the idea of moving the meetings around because it gets more public involvement.

Vice Chair Rogers referred to Page 3 under "Recommendations" that the Committee would provide to the Board of Commissioners at least two or more recommendations. She asked if the Committee should decide strongly that it only wants one

recommendation, would the Committee be required to provide two recommendations. Commissioner Kuehler responded that the purpose of at least two or more recommendations was to give the ability to have input. She said it could be one recommendation or it could be two recommendations.

Vice Chair Rogers pointed out that whatever recommendation or recommendations made would list all of the pros, cons, statistical data, etc., and an explanation as to how the recommendations were determined.

Commissioner Mills added that he thought the Committee would need to be realistic, because he thought Union County operates under the Voting Rights Act. He stated that as long as the Committee realizes that even with all of its work and due diligence in making its recommendations, the end result is that the Justice Department will have the ultimate decision.

Mr. Bundy stated that the Justice Department would have to approve the proposed referendum.

Vice Chair Rogers said that the General Statutes states that the Board determines the makeup of the Board of Commissioners, and the Department of Justice approves what the Board places on the ballot. Mr. Crook stated that the Statute is clear. He said that the pre-clearance by the Department of Justice is whether or not there is compliance and the Department of Justice could come in and state the different things it wanted to see if it were different than what is being proposed.

Chairman Openshaw suggested that one of the first issues that the Committee should research is the Voting Rights Act in order to get a clear understanding of its impact. Vice Chair Rogers said that the Committee should be given a copy of the Statute that sets out the various formats that can be followed.

Mr. Crook commented that it seems what the Committee would look at first would be what the citizens would like to see. He stated that he was unsure if the Board would want the Committee looking into legal issues.

Commissioner Kuehler questioned that if it were decided that district representation is what is desired, who would be responsible for drawing the districts. Mr. Bundy responded that the Board would probably want to commission someone such as the Centralina Council of Governments to assist. Commissioner Baucom added that if the Committee wanted to have input on drawing the lines, he could see that as being a part of the recommendation. Vice Chair Rogers stated that she would not want the citizens to become bogged down with drawing lines.

Chairman Openshaw stated that he was in between on what Commissioner Baucom and Vice Chair Rogers were saying and that it would all go back to the Voting Rights Act. He stated that the reason he believed district representation failed last time is because the residents did not feel they had input into it, so he thought they should have input but whether or not districts are viable is a separate issue.

Chairman Openshaw said that he was in favor of having multiple recommendations. He said if the Board is going to make decisions based on the recommendations, he wanted to know the various positions for the recommendations.

Vice Chair Rogers said that her fear is that the Committee will get bogged down on where a line should be drawn. She stated that in her opinion that was not the purpose of that committee.

Commissioner Kuehler asked if there were any magic number at large where districts tend to be looked at by some other entity than the Board. Chairman Openshaw said that he had been told that if there is any expansion of the Board, it becomes under review. Mr. Crook commented that every time there is any election regardless of how innocuous it is, it has to go through clearance with the Department of Justice.

Vice Chair Rogers said that she would be curious to know if there are 10 out of 100 counties that have district representation, how many times did the Department of Justice tell those 10 counties "no."

Commissioner Kuehler said that if the Committee's recommendation is not district representation but at large, the Committee needs to be aware if it is adamant about it being at large and the Board goes ahead with that, the County might be districted unintentionally.

Mr. Greene suggested that at one of the initial meetings of the Committee that the County Attorney or Staff Attorney could give the Committee an overview of the state law, available options under state law, and also an overview of the pre-clearance process and what the Department of Justice might have required in other situations. He said that he did not think the Board would know what the position of the Department of Justice would be until a proposal is sent to it for review.

Mr. Bundy interjected that he has made some submissions under the Voting Rights Act and every County Attorney and Municipal Attorney are charged with that obligation any time there is an annexation or anything that basically changes the way officials are elected. He said that insofar as predicting the way the Justice Department may look at an issue, it would require a degree

of expertise which is greater than either he or Mr. Crook would have; therefore, he suggested that they would need to consult with someone who specializes in that area.

Vice Chair Rogers said that gets to her point of hamstringing the Committee and bogging them down too much. She said that she preferred to have a free flow of information and recommendations based on what they believe their constituents want based on what they are hearing.

Commissioner Kuehler reiterated that she believed it was important for the Committee to realize that what it might want and what it actually gets in the end might be different.

Vice Chair Rogers expressed appreciation to Commissioner Kuehler for her work on the draft information on the Governance Committee. She said that she thought it was a great starting point.

Commissioner Baucom asked if the Chairman were looking for a motion to move the establishment of the Committee forward. The Chair responded that he would like the opportunity to review the draft further. He said that he would not take the recommended action on something that he has not read.

Vice Chair Rogers suggested that the Board take a five-minute recess to allow the Chairman time to review the document.

Commissioner Baucom suggested that the Board receive the information today and place the item on the agenda for the regular meeting on Tuesday, January 20, 2009, for discussion. The Chairman agreed to recess the meeting at this time (11:55 a.m.) to allow him time to review the information.

At 12:20 p.m., the Chairman reconvened the recessed meeting.

Chairman Openshaw stated that if a decision is made to place the issue on the election ballot, it would be for the 2010 ballot. He said that if there were an expansion of the Board, that the terms of the majority of the Board would expire in 2010.

The Chairman reviewed the following portions of the proposal:

1. Proposal includes having a facilitator;

2. Monroe is basically the center for the meetings where information is assembled and perhaps key presentations. He agreed for the other meetings to be conducted in various locations was a good idea.

He referred to the appointment of five members to the Committee from unincorporated Union County by the Board of Commissioners. He questioned whether five members proportionately or adequately represent the population of unincorporated Union County. He said that this could either be discussed today or on Tuesday.

Commissioner Mills asked if it were assumed that the Mayors' designees would be from the municipalities. Commissioner Kuehler responded that this was not dictated in the proposal but agreed this would be an assumption. Chairman Openshaw said that this could be spelled out in the proposal, if the Board wished to do so. There was discussion about the appointment of ten members to the Committee by the Board of Commissioners from unincorporated Union County with each Commissioner having two appointments. Chairman Openshaw said he was fine with placing this item on the agenda for Tuesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>.

Vice Chair Rogers stated that she would rather the majority of the discussion on this item take place during the work session and not during the regular meeting.

Commissioner Baucom said that he was comfortable with what has been presented today with the change in the number of members appointed by the Board from five to ten members.

Vice Chair Rogers suggested that perhaps the number of members appointed by the Board should be 11 to have an odd number. The Chairman stated that it would be nice to know what the number is in proportion to the population in the municipalities versus unincorporated Union County. There was discussion about including minority representation on the Governance Advisory Board. By consensus, it was agreed that this item would be placed on the agenda for Tuesday's meeting, and staff was requested to provide the demographic information requested by the Board prior to Tuesday's meeting.

*Results of Preliminary Engineering Report on the Eastern Water Supply:*

Mr. Greene introduced Kevin Mosteller and Pete D'Adamo of HDR Engineering. He stated that Mr. D'Adamo would be reviewing with the Board the results of the Preliminary Engineering Report on the Eastern Water Supply. He said that if time allowed today, Mr. Mosteller would be updating the Board on water allocation issues.



Mr. D'Adamo explained that HDR had been tasked in the study to update water demand projections throughout the County and look at those according to basin boundaries and also to evaluate the feasibility of expanding the Anson Water Treatment Plant and sending potable water to Union County versus sending raw water from the Anson Plant at Blewitt Falls to a new plant either in Union County or near the Union County border. He said that if time permits today they would also discuss the preliminary results and conclusions from the Board's motion on December 4 related to the Water Allocation Policy and then to discuss some directives.

He said that the interbasin transfers are driving a lot of planning and policy throughout the State. He explained that there are 18 major river basins and 38 sub-basins that have been identified by the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) which have a lot of impact in terms of not only water supply and water treatment but also wastewater treatment and disposal and reuse. He reviewed the County's current water sources, demand in growth areas, and gave examples in connection with interbasin transfers.

Mr. D'Adamo stated that currently Union County has an agreement with Anson County which was signed in 1992. He explained that currently there are infrastructure limits on Union County's side of the boundary. He said that the pump station can only deliver about 1.9 million gallons per day (mgd) even though Anson County could deliver 4 mgd.

He said that the County staff has been working with Anson County's staff on water quality issues associated with the water that is coming to Union County which are particularly related to disinfection byproducts. He explained that the water travels a long distance to reach Union County and there are not a lot of customers for the length of the pipeline, so the water sets in the pipeline for a long time which can form disinfection byproducts. He stated that the County is in compliance currently with the EPA requirements for disinfection byproducts; however, he pointed out that there is a new regulation that will become effective in 2012 to which the County will be bound that changes where the byproducts are sampled and changes on how to average the byproducts. Mr. D'Adamo said that based on the current treatment process used prior to this study, the County would be in violation. He stated that Anson County has made changes to its treatment process to help with that situation.

Mr. D'Adamo said that the Anson 4.0 mgd improvement project is in the final stages of design and it involves two booster pump stations, 36,000 feet of pipeline and a redrawn service area. He stated that this would expand the service area to the west and result in an estimated average demand of 2.4 mgd and a peak day demand of 4.0 mgd as well. He estimated the project completion date of 2010-2011. He stated that these estimates were done with the assumption that Pilgrim's Pride would have an expansion.

He stated that in 2004 the Board commissioned a consultant to do the Rocky River Supply Feasibility Study related to the eastern water supply. He said that the recommendations at that time were that the maximum capacity of the Catawba River Treatment Plant would be 27 mgd. He said that the County has recently hired consultants to expand and upgrade that plant so that Union County's portion of the plant would be 27 mgd. He said a shortfall of approximately 52 mgd in 2035 was predicted and based on a yield in the Rocky River, they were looking at a water plant on the Rocky River intake of approximately 21 mgd per day being available. He said that the shortfall from the Rocky River would have to be made up from the Yadkin Pee Dee River. Mr. D'Adamo said the consultants proposed a long-term plan of 50 mgd on the Rocky River with a couple of expansion phases in 2010 and 2020. He stated that it is now 2009, and none of this has happened. He said that one of the goals of the recommendation was to reduce interbasin transfers.

He reviewed the 2005 master plan update with the recommendation to expand the Catawba River Treatment Plant and a new northern Rocky River Water Treatment Plant to serve only the eastern part of Union County. He said that because of the water treatment issues from Anson County, it is recommended that a small treatment plant be constructed near the County line. He stated that again the goal was to reduce interbasin transfers.

Mr. D'Adamo said that in 2007, the Public Works Advisory Board had looked at several different alternatives for a long-range water supply. He stated that at the time of that discussion, it was strictly for Union County's water customers. He said that five alternatives were developed and Alternate Two, which was for a water treatment, plant at Blewitt Falls with potable water transmission to Union County or raw water to Union County. He stated that at the time of the discussions it was looked at with phased operation with the initial capacity of approximately 7 mgd and 2030 capacity of approximately 25 mgd. He stated that this alternative made the most sense from an interbasin transfer standpoint. He said that this was the alternative that led to the study that is being presented today.

He said that one of the focuses of the study is the interbasin transfer and a long-term strategy. He stated that the County needs to focus on a water supply on the eastern and western sides, wastewater treatment and disposal on the eastern and western sides and to be able to manage the interbasin transfers. Mr. D'Adamo said that a long-term planning study for an eastern water supply looks at moving the boundary for the eastern to the west and ultimately further to the west closer to the ridgeline to manage the interbasin transfers.

In response to a question by Commissioner Mills regarding mixing of waters in the basins, Mr. D'Adamo stated that there is a problem with mixing water supplies because of water quality and also pressure issues in different locations.

Mr. D'Adamo further explained the new regulations for disinfection byproduct levels and how the byproduct levels are calculated. He said that the Catawba River Water Treatment Plant will need to look at different treatment options or it will be in violation of the new regulations that will become effective in 2012.

Chairman Openshaw asked about the status of the discussions in North Carolina regarding the interbasin transfer. Mr. D'Adamo said that he and Scott Huneycutt of Public Works met with representatives of DENR and were basically told that if making application for an interbasin transfer certificate, which is over and above the grandfathered amount, to figure on it taking five years and costing a million dollars, and then the certificate might or might not be granted.

Mr. D'Adamo said that either by expanding the Monroe Wastewater Treatment Plant or if the northern Union County plant occurs and the wastewater discharge is returned to the Rocky River, it will flow into the Yadkin Pee Dee and past the point where the raw water was taken out, which is called a cork rule. He stated that this was an easier certificate to obtain, and this would be one of the benefits of looking at a long-term supply from Blewitt Falls as opposed to going to Albemarle or Badin Lake.

He said that HDR had been requested to update the water supply demand projections, which included confirming the current water demands and calculating unit flow factors. Mr. D'Adamo stated that in order to do future planning, there are certain assumptions based on the zoning and the Comprehensive Planning. He said that the current usage which lumps in commercial and industrial is 1,900 gallons per day per acre, which is skewed by a couple of large customers.

Chairman Openshaw said that he thought that Pilgrim's Pride uses 750,000 gallons per day. Mr. D'Adamo responded that the usage varies from half a million gallons per day to close to 750,000 gallons per day. Chairman Openshaw said that the County's total usage in that basin on a daily average is just under a million, so Pilgrim's Pride is essentially using half of all of the water that is currently brought into Union County from Anson County. Mr. D'Adamo explained that this is one of the reasons why there is a high water age in the pipeline, because there are a number of pipes not delivering much water beyond Pilgrim's Pride.

Mr. D'Adamo said they had developed future projections for 2010 and 2030 by looking at two methodologies. He stated they had looked at historical building data over the prior three-year period. He said that at the time this process began, residential units were approximately 3,400 units per year (300 units per month) and now that amount is less than 24 units per month. He further said they had looked at a regional GIS (geographical information system) based method which uses transportation analysis zone (TAZ) data which is tied to the 2000 census and updated in 2004 and 2006. He explained that this is a GIS layer that sets up polygons

throughout the county and establishes growth projections on a 10-year basis and is tied to zoning, comprehensive planning, etc. For example, he stated that there might be a polygon in the western part of the county with a growth rate of 7 to 8 percent and another polygon in the eastern part of the county with a growth rate of 2 percent. He said that it is not a growth rate applied throughout the county but is specific to areas.

He stated that demand projections were developed for the Catawba River Basin Service Area. He explained that the projections were tied to a schedule of when a long-term eastern water supply source could be implemented and the eastern boundary would be expanded to the west closer to the ridge line. Mr. D'Adamo discussed the average day and peak day demands based on a peak factor of 1.6 mgd and a peak day demand based on a peak factor of 2 mgd, which is what occurs currently a few days a year. He said that the difference of 5 to 8 mgd per day depending on the peak factor has a large impact on the infrastructure and the infrastructure costs. He said that as the County plans forward when looking at the issues related to water allocation, conservation rates, conservation plans, reuse water, etc., it is important to consider the peak factor in the analysis and how it could impact the future costs.

He said that based on the TAZ data, the 2030 demand at a peak factor of 2 mgd is approximately 23 mgd and a peak factor of 1.6 mgd is slightly under 20 mgd. He said that the expansion of the Catawba River Water Treatment Plant is about to begin which will take the County's portion to 27 mgd, and based on these projections, the County is doing okay based on where it is going on those projections.

Mr. D'Adamo reviewed the Rocky River/Yadkin River Service Area demand projections based on the TAZ data, and those are increasing over time. He said that the assumption is that the eastern supply becomes the County's primary water supply and will actually serve more population and a larger geographic area. He stated that in 2030 the peak day demand at a peak factor of 1.6 mgd is approximately 29 mgd and at a peak factor of 2 mgd, it is about 36 to 37 mgd. He said that as the County works through its water needs in the future, the various elements such as policies that could impact the peak factor should be considered because there are costs associated with them.

He said that they had projected the demands for the Rocky River Basin Service Area to 2050 which showed an average day demand of approximately 30 mgd and a peak day demand of close to 50 mgd.

Mr. D'Adamo said that there has been a great deal of discussion over the last couple of months between County staff and other municipalities and there has been interest in participating in a long-term eastern water supply, including Monroe and Lancaster County.

Chairman Openshaw said that Commissioner Baucom has been involved and has said that the group includes more entities than Lancaster and Monroe, including Mecklenburg, Concord and Kannapolis, Cabarrus, and Stanly County. He said that the bottom line numbers will be dramatically different. He stated that he thought he had seen that the State was looking at the environmental impacts of taking 100 mgd out of the Yadkin Pee Dee. He said that this all begs the question of what is the ultimate amount of water that can be taken out of the Yadkin per day. He asked without knowing this number, how realistic is it to be able to get the amount of water from the Yadkin Pee Dee that is projected to be needed. Mr. D'Adamo responded that one of the recommendations of the preliminary engineering study on the eastern water supply is another study to firm up who the actual players are and complete a financial analysis and begin some of the initial permitting which would also address the state yield issues associated with the Yadkin Pee River. He agreed that once this information is known, then the feasibility could be reviewed for the supply for the number of players and volume.

Chairman Openshaw stated that his concern with this preliminary report is making cost estimates which are significant expenditures, but the good news is with an increased number of players, the County's share of the costs would be lower. He said that one of the big questions he had was "What could the County really afford to do?" He stated that with all of the projects that the County has going on, he did not believe the County could afford to do everything that it wants to do.

Mr. Greene commented that the Chairman's concerns were the same as the staff's. He pointed out the report is a preliminary report that indicates what the best long-term solution for Union County and its immediate neighbors might be. He said that the Yadkin Pee Dee group is so large, that it could not reasonably foresee some members of the group using this potential project as a source for their water. He stated that there would be other major intakes along the Yadkin Pee Dee. He said that it is difficult to determine who the players are and what the ultimate demand is going to be. He stated that there are prospects for phasing over time that will help, but it will be an evolving situation.

The Chairman added that the problem is without all of the partners, the lowest cost estimate in the report is \$206 million, and there would be fewer partners to share the burden with the County. He said that in reviewing the numbers for the enterprise fund, he could not see how it would work. He asked what would be the ramifications such as dramatic price increases. He said that if he

remembered correctly Mr. Nelson had given a presentation to the Board regarding priorities. He stated that what he thought Mr. Nelson had said was an accurate message, because the County could not do everything in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Mr. Greene responded that he thought at this point in any major long-term initiative such as this, the numbers are not going to match. He said that he thought the best that could be done is to understand what the future demands are and what the best solution appears to be based on the available information and then move in that direction.

The Chairman said he did not want to leave anyone under the illusion that the County can complete all that is included in the report and that it is going to happen necessarily within the timeframe outlined. He stressed that this is preliminary information and is not cast in stone. Commissioner Baucom said that he agreed with Chairman Openshaw's points but it begs the need that the conservation challenge becomes increasingly important, not only from the water usage aspect but the cost aspect.

Mr. D'Adamo said that in terms of this phase of planning, the major goal was to update the demand projections and the water demand projections in the context of the interbasin transfer issue. He questioned if it makes more sense to expand the Anson Plant and send potable water to Union County or to take raw water and send it to a plant on either side of the county line.

The Chairman said it does not make any sense to expand the Anson Service area with the water age issues. He said if there are aging issues with the water now, then how would that be improved by expanding the service area. Mr. D'Adamo responded that the numbers are not as difficult because Anson is using chloramines now, but it is essential to consider the distribution system and what will be served by the facility so that the water quality is maintained. He said that Union County is much like many North Carolina municipalities in managing the disinfection byproduct issue because of the new regulations.

Mr. D'Adamo said that identifying the players is important because it helps with the costs and creates a larger cork rule interbasin transfer, and all of the parties have to be signatories through the interbasin transfer certificates.

He said that he had discussed the issue of the raw water supply from Blewitt Falls. He stated that it is good quality but its nature is that the organic matter is going to create disinfection byproducts, which on the eastern side has created pockets of water age in the past.

He reviewed the water treatment options contained in the report:

1. Expanding the Anson Plant or building a new plant on either side of the Anson and Union County boundary. He said they had looked at expanding the Anson County Plant. He stated that it was a tough site on a knoll with a lot of old treatment systems and processes that would have to be rerated through some modifications that would have to be approved by the State. He added that with more players, it becomes a total impossibility to complete the expansion cost effectively. He reviewed the option of building a plant on either side of the line to generate potable water.

He said they had also looked at several transmission routes, whether it is raw water or potable water, to different locations and developed a cost basis of comparisons. He stated that there are different easements that could be considered to paralleling a transmission main. He said that going along Highway 74 is problematic based on discussions with the Department of Transportation. He stated that the approach would be to look at a treatment plant site in Anson County or near the boundary. He reviewed the sites previously considered in Union County in the 2004 study. He said that the potable water conveyance option is basically the same route. He stated the cost in the report to get to this point but explained the report does not reflect the cost of getting the water to the customers.

The Chairman said that in looking at the report, he does not believe there is enough water for Union County, as some people think. He asked if the water could be supplemented with water from the Rocky River. Mr. D'Adamo responded that it was a potential and there had been a meeting with several representatives from DENR some time ago and the different alternatives were presented. He said that DENR's biggest concern is that in taking water from the Rocky River or the main stem of the Pee Dee, a low-crested dam would have to be constructed across the river to be able to pull the water into the intake, and from an environmental standpoint, they were very negative on being able to do that.

Chairman Openshaw said that one of the State's initiatives is that the General Assembly is looking at possible ways of helping to facilitate development reservoirs. Mr. D'Adamo stated that this was correct as well as facilitating development of regional water supplies.

Commissioner Baucom asked if there was any validity financially for Union County having a reservoir from the Rocky River. Mr. D'Adamo stated that in looking at that scenario, Union County would become more self-contained in addressing its short-term needs. He said that it needed to be recognized, based on the previous study, that it was estimated that the yield of the Rocky River would be 21 mgd which would not allow for the water to be spread very far with a large number of partners. He said that another issue that needed to be recognized is that a good part of the 21-mgd is dependent on wastewater discharges upstream, so the yield could decrease depending on everyone's participation, reuse, and other factors.

Mr. D'Adamo said that the two alternatives: 1) to convey raw water to Blewitt Falls and then to a treatment site on either side of the County line and depending on the transmission route would be \$255 million. He stated that 35 percent of this number is escalation predicting construction to mid point of construction; or 2) to expand the water treatment plant in Anson. He said that in looking at trying to phase this alternative, it would include constructing an intake at Blewitt Falls, expanding or adding a raw water pump station, constructing a smaller transmission main (which would require the construction of a second parallel transmission main) and constructing a 40 mgd plant on either side of the boundary line. He said that cost was estimated at approximately \$200 million.

He stated that as a long-term supply source, the County should look at conveying raw water to a plant on either side of the Anson/Union Counties line and not expanding the Anson Plant.

He said that some of the next steps to be made is to initiate more hard core preliminary engineering and environmental documentation of permitting, conduct a financial feasibility analysis including finalizing who the partners are and look at cost sharing. He said that if the option chosen is a plant in Anson County, discussions need to be ongoing with Anson County concerning joint ownership and operation of the proposed facility. He stated that the concern is that this would ultimately be a very large facility, costs would be high, and trying to fund the project might be more difficult for Anson County in terms of bonding capacity. He said that this option is taking treatment to a different level and it would be a similar situation to the one that the County has with Lancaster County.

Mr. D'Adamo said, as mentioned, all of this ties into water, sewer, reuse and its management. He stated this year it is scheduled on the CIP to update the master water plan and the master sewer plan. He said that it is suggested to have one integrated master plan to address all of these issues as opposed to having the individual documents that might not speak to one another.

He reviewed a schedule showing the process moving forward. He said that if the Board were going to approve an alternative to move forward to the next level of analysis, it would be to approve raw water and a water plant on one side or the other of the County line as opposed to expanding the Anson Plant and potable water and then move forward to the next levels of analysis.

Mr. Greene stated that if the Board is in agreement with the concept of continuing to move in the direction of raw water with treatment somewhere in eastern Union County or western Anson County, it would take two weeks off that time schedule. He said that the Chairman's comments during the presentation tells him that the Chairman clearly understands the challenges which are huge. He stated that this is addressing the eastern water supply long-term, and when it comes to utility treatment, there are three other huge



challenges: 1) western water supply; 2) eastern sewer; and 3) western sewer. He said that in addition there are growth management issues. He stressed that the County must get on top of growth management issues. He said there are stormwater issues as well as transportation issues. He stated that there are tremendous opportunities and challenges.

The Manager stated that he has been in Union County seven months and during those seven months, the Legal Staff, the County Manager's Office, the Public Works staff and other County departments have been almost completely consumed with day to day administration. He said that he believed this makes the challenges even more monumental. He asked how the Board and staff were going to come together and choose the priorities and then focus on moving forward. He said that to him that is the immediate challenge of how to deal with these issues. He stated that it could not be done the way that the County is currently operating.

The Chairman responded that what he has realized in dealing with these matters is that the Board of Commissioners needs its own staff to move forward with the issues and to do some preliminary research which would have less impact on the County staff. He said that he understood that it is an issue and it would become a bigger issue real soon. He stated that priorities are going to be tough and perhaps everyone needed to sit down and talk about the Board's priorities.

Chairman Openshaw said that the Water Allocation Policy would be taken up on Tuesday night. He said that the Mayor of Stallings has asked to be on the agenda for Tuesday night to request the County's of the Town's resolution related to a proposed sewer rate increase.

Mr. Greene requested that the Board consider holding a workshop to address the Water Allocation Policy as opposed to having it on the agenda for the Tuesday night meeting. He stressed that the staff was covered up in work.

The Chairman said that when the Water Allocation Policy was initially discussed, he had a number of questions that were not even addressed. He said that his concern was that he did not feel comfortable with the numbers and did not like the assumptions on which the policy was based. He said the policy does not adequately address from his perspective an end product. He stated that he has given it a lot of thought and would like to address the issue and have it discussed as soon as possible.

Mr. Greene stated that he understood that Chairman Openshaw had issues and knew that other Commissioners also had issues. He said that staff wanted to hear those issues and work through them. He stated that to be honest, he was unsure of how productive having the item placed on the agenda Tuesday night would be. He said that this matter could require a couple of hours. He assured that the staff would handle it however the Board wanted.

The Chairman said that he had not seen Tuesday night's agenda at this time but would like to review it and would make his decision from there on the water allocation policy. Commissioner Mills said that he understood the Chairman's concerns, but he wanted to make sure that when the policy is discussed, that sufficient time is allowed to do justice to the discussion. Commissioner Baucom agreed that time need to be given to absorb the policy.

Chairman Openshaw said that he had taken a lot of notes at the time the policy was adopted, and he wanted to go back and review those notes.

With there being no further discussion, at approximately 1:35 p.m., the Chairman moved to adjourn the special meeting. The motion was passed unanimously.