

May 30, 2017

A Special Board meeting of the Electric and Water Plant Board of the City of Frankfort, Kentucky, was held at the Frankfort Plant Board Administration Building, located at 151 Flynn Avenue, Frankfort, Kentucky, on Tuesday, May 30, 2017 at 5:00 p.m.

**ATTENDANCE:**

Walt Baldwin, Vice Chair  
Dr. Scott Green, Secretary/Treasurer  
John Cubine, Board Member  
James Liebman, Board Attorney  
Herbbie Bannister, General Manager  
David Billings, Water Engineer  
Sharmista Dutta, Water Engineer  
Vent Foster, Asst. GM Operations/Chief Electric Engineer  
Adam Hellard, Broadband/Security Manager  
Ryan Henry, Asst. IT Director  
John Higginbotham, Asst. GM Cable/Telecommunications  
Cathy Lindsey, Public Information Coordinator  
Kathy Poe, Executive Assistant  
Hance Price, Staff Attorney/Asst. GM Administration  
Alan Smith, Water Dist. Superintendent  
Jeremy Blackburn, Cable 10 Videographer  
Alfred Miller, State Journal  
Adam Webber, Strand Engineering

**AGENDA**

The Agenda for the Board Meeting was received and entered into the Minute Book as follows:

**May 30, 2017 BOARD MEETING AGENDA**

1. **Informational Item:** Discuss and Present 3-D Renderings of Reservoir and Cost Implications of Different Construction Options.
2. **Informational Item:** Discuss and Present Headend/Reservoir Property Site Survey Drawing, Fence Options, and Cost Implications of Different Fence Options.

**BOARD ACTION**

Mr. Baldwin called the meeting to order.

1. **Informational Item:** Discuss and Present 3-D Renderings of Reservoir and Cost Implications of Different Construction Options.

Mr. Billings introduced Adam Webber with Strand Engineering. Mr. Webber explained the format of the 3D renderings and explained the manner in which they can be manipulated to show all views and features. Mr. Webber stated that due to software limitations the tower and the satellite dishes were not exactly to scale.

Mr. Webber stated that he did not have renderings with both tanks. Ms. Gray stated that she had requested renderings with both tanks. He stated that all other aspects of the drawings were to scale.

Mr. Billings stated that there were six different models, one with each of the three roof types, with and without a retaining wall, which would be reviewed and made available to the public.

In discussion, Mr. Webber stated that some of the trees in the renderings are existing trees. Mr. Billings stated that the trees were conceptual at this time. He explained that the design was not far enough in process to decide on landscaping but that the number and placement of trees would depend on the species of the trees and root structures/requirements as well as the tank manufacturer.

Mr. Baldwin stated that the trees were there for general appearance and the Board did not feel there was anything to preclude the general appearance with the finished product. Mr. Billings stated that these should be considered artists renderings. Members of the public stated that they were not comfortable that these renderings were representative.

In response to Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Bannister stated that the site utility drawing would give some indication of where trees could be planted. He further stated that the site utility drawing was coming from the civil section of GRW and then the landscaping division could review that and give some idea of where and what type of landscaping could be accomplished. Mr. Bannister stated that the site utility drawing would be completed within a week and that the landscaping division would need to be engaged to review the drawings at that point. Mr. Nickerson stated that once the utility map is complete and a decision on the fence type is finalized that a landscaping decision could be made relatively quickly. Mr. Nickerson advised that an idea of preliminary placement of trees could be developed by reviewing the placement of the underground and overhead utilities.

In response to Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Nickerson stated that preliminary landscape drawings previously provided to the City a year or so ago gave some idea of the type of landscaping that could be done initially in that area. Mr. Nickerson added that it was difficult to discuss specifics without the utility drawing and without discussions with the tank manufacturer and stated that trees would likely need to be 15-20 feet away from the tank and would depend on the location of utility lines but that overall much of that area would allow for substantial trees. Public comments made where that the initial landscaping plan was rejected by the Tanglewood Neighborhood Association.

Mr. Billings stated that substantial more green space would be available at the site than what is available now, which should extend the opportunity to offer more landscaping than what it there now. He further explained how the new tank would offer more green space for planting and landscaping.

Mr. Billings explained that if and when a second tank is built it would be a twin to the tank being discussed at this time. He further added that a second tank would be 35-50 years in the future.

At this point in the meeting Mr. Webber reviewed renderings of the 1/10<sup>th</sup> dome and the 1/16<sup>th</sup> dome. He reviewed perspectives from Tanglewood Road, Hay Avenue and Reservoir Road with the retaining wall and without the retaining wall. Mr. Webber discussed specifics of the retaining wall. He stated that it was likely that nothing substantial would be planted on the retaining wall. Mr. Billings stated that the side slopes would remain the same and that he did not believe the retaining wall would have any effect on the convenience of mowing.

In response to the public, Mr. Bannister stated that it was possible to paint the headend to blend in with the landscape. Mr. Billings added that dark colors needed to be avoided on the reservoir tank but there should be no issue with color choice for the retaining wall. Mr. Nickerson stated that the headend could be painted but that it was best not to for longevity purposes. He stated that painting would cause the brick to lose its ability to wick out moisture and would increase maintenance expense.

Mr. Cubine requested that Staff follow up and provide the amount of water used by a distillery used per day. Mr. Billings added that the tank size would be indicative of weather and peak demands. He stated that a commercial user like a distillery would likely be running three shifts per day and not adding to peak demands. Mr. Cubine stated that Staff should answer how much capacity would a new distillery utilize as well as how close large trees can be planted to this tank.

Mr. Webber continued manipulating renderings to show them without trees from various angles. Mr. Billings explained approximate height of the various new tank options and the height of the existing reservoir. Mr. Webber presented and reviewed a cross section of the current reservoir and the new tank options, and discussed the differences in the height of each compared to what exists today.

In response to the public, Mr. Billings stated that there will be no blasting at the site and that hoe ramming will be utilized to get through the rock if necessary. Mr. Billings stated that the construction estimate was approximately nine (9) months. In response to Mr. Cubine, Mr. Billings explained the sequence of construction beginning with installation of the liner in the North basin, removal of the earthen structure of the South basin likely requiring a track hoe and a few dump trucks, which could take several weeks. He continued stating that he could put together a breakdown of the construction sequences to be provided at a later date.

Mr. Billings added that once the new tank was completed that demolition of the North basin would begin. He advised that the hope was that all could be accomplished in the nine (9) month timeframe but that any number of issues could affect the construction timeline. It would take longer to build a flat roof or the lower dome. Additional construction time would be needed if a retaining wall was added to the scope of the project.

In response to Commissioner Roach, Mr. Billings reiterated that there was no additional cost for the full dome roof, the half dome roof was an additional \$500,000 and that the flat roof was an additional \$1.75 million. He further advised that it should be noted that whatever is done for this tank would need to be done for the second tank if and when it was built. Mr. Webber added that the retaining wall would cost an additional \$320,000 to \$350,000 as well.

Mr. Billings stated that presentation to planning and zoning was being discussed and that the design process would need to continue and be completed before going to planning and zoning. He reiterated that the purpose of the meeting was to review renderings and site lines. He further stated that the planning and zoning process was an unknown as far as the timeline is concerned.

In response to the public, Mr. Cubine stated that the goal tonight was to get the information to the public and comments back to the Board in order for the Board to make a decision on roof options. Mr. Cubine stated that a discussion on planning and zoning could happen until the design phase is complete. He stated that the Board and Staff were attempting to get through this one piece at a time.

At this point in the meeting there was additional discussion regarding the size of the tanks and capacity needed. Mr. Billings stated that building two smaller 4.5 million gallon tanks had been discussed with the public at previous meeting and explained the cost estimates. He further reiterated that two smaller tanks would not allow for expansion later.

In response to Ms. Gray, Mr. Baldwin stated that the 3D renderings would all be placed online for the public to view at their convenience. Mr. Billings further explained how to download and view. Mr. Cubine stated that hard copies could be made available as requested.

Mr. Baldwin stated that Staff would gather water usage data as requested.

2. **Informational Item: Discuss and Present Headend/Reservoir Property Site Survey Drawing, Fence Options, and Cost Implications of Different Fence Options.**

Mr. Nickerson reviewed and explained a presentation of fencing options at the headend property and costs related to each option.

Ms. Gray discussed timeline of events from June 2016 to present. Mr. Bannister further explained information on the spreadsheet presented. He explained design work and stated that FPB was not aware the footing would be an issue until design work was complete. He discussed drawings and photographs presented to members of TNAi in March 2017 showing property lines and existing utilities. Mr. Bannister advised that the survey crews had just completed work at the site and were in the process of organizing data and finalizing maps for TNAi to review as requested. Mr. Cubine added that other options considered repositioning the fence to avoid utilities and explained issues with those options.

Mr. Nickerson explained property grading. He further advised that the footing size was based on fence height and wind load for the brick wall and fence. He further explained that underground utilities would be an issue in different areas all the way around the property line.

Mr. Nickerson continued the review of fence options and cost estimates for each. Mr. Bannister discussed cost changes due to design. Mr. Nickerson and Mr. Cubine further explained cost estimates and changes as well as budget numbers the Board voted on in November.

Mr. Nickerson continued to explain fence options and cost estimates as well as dimensions of existing fencing. He further advised that cost estimates could change up or down depending on timing and construction climate at the time of bidding. Mr. Nickerson also discussed the option to add privacy slats and the cost estimates. Mr. Nickerson further review photos of the various fence and base options.

In discussion, Mr. Nickerson explained how the site survey and utility location drawings would be utilized to determine options available in order to avoid underground utilities. He further explained some of those options. Mr. Cubine explained that brick columns would allow for additional options. Mr. Nickerson continued with the discussion of fencing options and reiterated the residents' options to add privacy slats.

In response Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Nickerson discussed acoustic of the privacy slats as well as landscaping options depending on the fence choice. He discussed making changes to the landscaping plans depending on the area or the needs of the residents.

Mr. Nickerson discussed placement of the fence foundation and potential options based on property lines and underground utilities. Mr. Nickerson advised that growing vines on the fence would come down to a manufacturers' warranty issue. He stated that depending on the manufacturer the warranty could be voided or reduced if vines were grown on the fence. He noted that these fence options typically carried a 25-year warranty on the finish and 7-10 year warranty on the structure. In response to Mr. Cubine, Mr. Nickerson further explained the typically most complaints were for finish wear. He stated that vines would increase the wind load on the structure but that engineering had accounted for that in design.

Mr. Bannister stated that operationally there would be no issues if the residents wanted to grow vines as long as the Board understands that it could cause warranty issues.

In discussion, Mr. Nickerson explained that it was feasible to place columns but there could be issues on placement and uniformity. He further stated that he believed he could have a drawing with column locations with a week.

Ms. Gray stated that the Tanglewood Neighborhood would like to see a map with the location of the pillars but that FPB also needed to make their case that an actual conflict does exist with the brick base and underground utilities.

In response to Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Nickerson stated that it was reasonable to have a map showing the feasibility of the fence with only pillars as well as a map showing the feasibility of the walled fence by Friday, June 9. He further explained what the maps would show and explained additional issues with the masonry wall profile due to the grade of the property.

Ms. Gray stated that residents were concerned about maintenance, weed eating, pets getting underneath fence on grade, and FPB maintenance of the headend and reservoir property. Mr. Nickerson explained options to address those issues.

In discussion, Mr. Nickerson reviewed photos of fence and columns, discussed 10-foot fence and columns, ornamental options, comparison photos of the various options, and the costs difference of the 7-foot and the 10-foot fence options. Mr. Nickerson stated that the goal is to keep all construction on FPB property.

In response to Mr. Cubine, Mr. Nickerson explained the sequence of events and construction. He stated it was likely that demolition would happen first and would likely be the parking structure and fencing at the same time. He stated the demolition would likely take 30 to 45 days. He stated construction time on the fence would depend on what type of fence and whether a masonry base or pillars were installed. He advised that just the fence would likely take approximately one month to install. Mr. Nickerson further explained demolition, erosion control and maintenance to protect residents' property. He stated that there would be additional discussion between parties on those issues.

In discussion, Mr. Nickerson stated that the current fence is not on the property line and that there were some areas where residents have less property than they thought. He further stated that the new maps would have existing fence, property line and proposed new fence. Mr. Baldwin further stated that the property line is just another data point. Mr. Cubine confirmed that no one was looking to take property from Tanglewood residents.

It was agreed that FPB would provide TNAi maps and data by the 9<sup>th</sup> of June and follow up could be done the week of June 26.

With no further business to discuss, Dr. Green moved to adjourn. Mr. Cubine seconded. Mr. Baldwin called for the vote. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**ATTEST:**