

# **PUBLIC SERVICE COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**AUGUST 18, 2008**

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Reams at 7:01 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mark Reams, Deborah Groat, Dan Fogt

OTHERS PRESENT: Jillian Froment, Brian Palmer, John Mitchell,

CITIZENS PRESENT: Tim Creech

AGENDA:

## 1. Flood Plain Regulations

Mr. Palmer provided maps, existing maps effective from 1986 and a new map. The old flood plain map is on the County's website. Mr. Fogt asked about the houses in the flood plain. Mr. Palmer said if the homes have been there, they are grandfathered in as far as their rate. If the houses are new to the flood plain area, notices were sent telling them they are in the flood plain and their rate would be adjusted accordingly. Hearings were held in December for the people who were being changed. Ms. Groat asked how many people would be affected by the different rates. That number was not known. Ms. Groat asked what the rates are. Mr. Palmer said anyone can buy flood insurance, even those not located in a flood plain. He has heard the rate would be about \$300/year. If you are in the flood plain, cost would be \$900/1000 per year. Difference in rate would be \$30/\$40 month. Mr. Palmer reviewed the code again and did not find anything that really stood out. Most were additions or clarifications. A lot of additions were clarifying the process, clarifying the duties of a Flood Plain Administrator, exemption value for permit for modification going from \$1,000 to \$5,000, etc. What are the impacts to Zoning or Planning code. Mr. Palmer saw nothing that would impact the Code. One of the add-ons for a subdivision is that the buildable area of the lot would have to be naturally outside the flood plain. Mr. Palmer felt this is a good idea in terms of protecting the flood plain and managing the flood plain. Also proposed compensatory storage.

Mr. Reams asked about outside the corporation limit. Mr. Palmer said outside the corporation limit will be with the County regulations. Mr. Reams asked if they were going to adopt something similar. Mr. Palmer said some of them,

but not all. Plain City's maps were updated 2/3 years ago, so the new code has been updated. They have not done the compensatory storage. Mr. Reams asked about upstream from Marysville on Mill Creek. Mr. Palmer said when they adopted their code, it was County-wide. When the maps in Plain City were updated, they had to update their code to regulate it, and it applied county-wide. They just didn't have the updated maps to go with it in terms of how they would manage the flood plain. Mr. Reams asked if fill was permitted in the flood plain. Mr. Palmer said yes, if you meet certain requirements. You cannot impact the floodway or show hydrology impact. You can take storage out of the flood plain, but not the floodway. The floodway is more critical and more highly controlled. A question remains on an appeal board. Ms. Froment will find out and report back.

## 2) Stormwater Utilities

Stormwater Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Summary is printed in its entirety below. Maps were distributed for each of the studies, Town Run Ditch Capacity Study, East Side Stormwater Study and Northwest Stormwater Study.

### **City of Marysville, Ohio Stormwater Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Summary August 15, 2008**

#### **Background**

The City of Marysville, Ohio has conducted a comprehensive stormwater study of the stormwater system in three separate drainage area studies over the past 6 years. The following are the three separate drainage area studies that form this comprehensive study of the Marysville stormwater utility:

- Town Run Ditch Capacity Study, engineering Report, Gannett Fleming, October 11, 2002
- East Side Stormwater Study, Tetra Tech, October, 2007
- Northwest Stormwater Study, Tetra Tech, August, 2008 (pending review and approval of City staff)

Specific details, drainage area delineations and study results are included in each of these reports. This intent of this CIP Summary to prioritize and suggest a comprehensive list of stormwater projects that are required to maintain the city's stormwater utility at an acceptable level of service and physical condition.

## **Cost Estimating and Inflation**

All of the costs in this summary are for construction of proposed capital improvement projects. The following assumptions were used in their original development:

- Construction costs include a 15% contingency (the Town Run Ditch study originally used a 20% contingency - that has been adjusted for this summary)
- Engineering, construction services, bidding and unforeseen conditions are not included in the cost estimates
- For storm sewer systems located in roadways it is assumed that replacement of curbs and gutters is not required (they will be undisturbed and connected to the main storm sewer)
- Right of way acquisition is not required for the projects
- Utility relocation, other than storm sewers, is not included in the construction costs
- Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) bid tabulations were used to develop the construction costs
- Routine and periodic operation and maintenance costs are not included in the following costs estimates.

In general, these construction cost estimates are feasibility planning level and should be verified with preliminary and detailed engineering, survey data, and utility location services.

Capital construction costs estimated in the Town Run Ditch (October 2002) and the East Side Stormwater (October 2007) Studies were adjusted for inflation to approximate the 2008 pricing used in the recent Northwest Stormwater Study. The estimates were updated using the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Engineer Manual, EM1110-2-1304, and "Civil Works Construction Cost Index System (CWCCIS)" (March 31, 2008). This manual is a comprehensive means of determining construction price indexes and is based on; Office of Management and Budget (OMB) updating factors, Producer Price Indexes (PPI), RS Means Labor Rates for the Construction Industry and Building Construction Cost Data, Engineering News Record (ENR) Quarterly Cost Reports, Bureau of Reclamation Construction Cost Trends, USACE EP1110-1-8 – Construction Equipment Ownership and Operating Expense Schedule, and RS Means Heavy Construction Cost Data.

This manual has various Feature Codes for different civil works project types. The stormwater infrastructure price index is associated with Feature Code #11, "Levees and Floodwalls". We used an index of 535.78 for the 2002 Town Run Ditch Report, 685.57 for the 2007 East Side Stormwater Study and an index of 702.01 for the current 2008 Northwest Stormwater Study (see Appendix A of EM1110-2-1304). These indexes result in a multiplier of approximately 1.310 (702.01/535.78) to convert 2002 capital costs to 2008 costs and a multiplier of 1.024 (702.01/685.57) to convert 2007 capital costs to 2008 dollars.

### **Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Summary**

The CIP Plan has been assembled using the three previous stormwater reports. Projects recommended in these reports are all shown in one of the three priority categories described below. The priorities were determined based on a combination of inspection, hydraulic capacity analysis and meetings with City personnel knowledgeable of the stormwater utility system.

Priority 1 - High Priority Projects. These projects are required to repair infrastructure that exhibits structural distress or has the potential to cause chronic flood damages and possibly impact public safety.

Priority 2 - Medium Priority Projects. These projects are best described as those projects that could create property damage and monetary damages, but are not likely to impact public safety.

Priority 3 - Average Priority Projects. These projects are those where the storm system is undersized, but there are no reports of or observed flood damages.

The projects in this category should be observed closely to see if they warrant an upgrade to Priority 2 or even Priority 1.

In addition to the above priorities the projects will also be internally prioritized by the city based on:

- Award of grant monies, such as the Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC) grant and other monies available for stormwater capital projects
- Pedestrian and vehicular safety concerns in school zones and other areas of potential vehicle/pedestrian conflict
- Availability of in-house resources and ability to complete the capital

projects using in-house resources

The following tables provide a tabulation of the three previous reports and suggested capital improvement projects associated with each priority category. The priority ranking of these projects is subject to change as the systems are observed during storm events and as the systems continue to age.

**\$17,083,540** is the total estimated construction cost of all three Priority Categories.

**Table 1.** Priority 1 - High Priority Projects

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REPORT	ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST
Timberview Detention Basin/London Avenue	TRD	\$628,941
Structure 5. Replace Culvert at Industrial Parkway over Unnamed Ditch	ESSS	\$143,357
Structure 1-6. Industrial Parkway Bridge over	ESSS	\$245,755
Structure Mill-2. replace Culvert at Amarine	NSS	\$150,000
Structure FP-2. Replace Maple Street Culvert South of US-33 over Unnamed Ditch	NSS	\$130,000
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,298,054</b>

Note: TRD — Town Run Ditch Study  
 ESSS — East Side Stormwater Study  
 NSS — Northwest Stormwater Study

**Table 2.** Priority 2 - Medium Priority Projects

<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>REPORT</b>	<b>ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST</b>
Airport Park Detention Basin and Walnut	TRD	\$1,305,323
Street Storm Sewer Improvements		
Marvsville School Detention Basin and Avenue Culvert Replacement	TRD	\$532,330
Walnut Street 12' x 3.5' Culvert	TRD	\$192,932
London Avenue/South Park Storm Sewer	TRD	\$359,677
Structure 3-4. Replace Industrial Parkway	ESSS	\$194,556
Culvert over North Fork of Crosses Run		
Structure 3-3. Replace Culvert at	ESSS	\$215,036
Road over North Fork of Crosses Run		
Beach Open Drain Storm Sewer	ESSS	\$51,199
Improvements		
Structure 4 - Columbus Road over Ophile	ESSS	\$35,839
Ditch		
Structure Oak-2. Oakdale Cemetary Drive	NSS	\$150,000
over Unnamed Ditch		
Structure Oak-3. Oakdale Cemetary Drive	NSS	\$82,500
over Unnamed Ditch		
Structure FP-1. Replace Main Street	NSS	\$95,000
South of US-33 over Unnamed Ditch		

**TOTAL      \$3,214,392**

Note: TRD — Town Run Ditch Study  
 ESSS — East Side Stormwater  
 Study NSS — Northwest  
 Stormwater Study

**Table 3. Priority 3 - Average Priority Projects**

<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>REPORT</b>	<b>ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST</b>
Cherry Basin Storm Sewer Improvements	ESSS	\$286,714
Wagon Wheel Basin Storm Sewer Improvements	ESSS	\$153,597
Mill Creek Basin Storm Sewer	ESSS	\$655,347
Oak Basin Storm Sewer Improvements	ESSS	\$235,515
Allenby Basin Storm Sewer	ESSS	\$225,276
Surrey Basin Storm Sewer Improvements	ESSS	\$66,559
Structure Mill-1. Replace Bikepath over Unnamed Ditch at Mill Creek Park	NSS	\$40,000
Fifth Street Basin Storm Sewer	NSS	\$960,000
Maple Street Basin Storm Sewer Improvements	NSS	\$5,680,000
Mill Valley Basin Storm Sewer	NSS	\$205,000
Town Run Ditch - Relief Culvert	TRD	\$4,063,086
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$12,571,095</b>

Note: TRD — Town Run Ditch Study  
 ESSS — East Side Stormwater Study  
 NSS — Northwest Stormwater Study

Ms. Froment noted that Priority 2 projects are those projects that could create property damage and monetary damages, but are not likely to impact public safety. She pointed out even Priority 3 projects at any point could evolve into being a Priority 2 or Priority 1 and they need to be considering all these projects in discussions, not just the ones that have immediate impact. City wants to be in a position where we never have a project that's threatening public safety.

Ms. Froment noted that Priority 1 projects were estimated to be \$1.3M. Mr. Reams asked if that was 2008 and 2009 dollars. Ms. Froment said 2008 dollars, but they included a 15% contingency for possible price increase over next year. Priority 2 is \$3.2M and Priority 3 is \$12.5M.

Mr. Fogt said he has major disagreements with the Town Run Study, as well as info in this document. There is no way that he is going to agree to any of this. Some improvements have been done already. Have those improvements been taken into consideration? Mr. Palmer noted the Greenwood Park improvements. Those were not taken into consideration. This improvement eliminated the retention of \_\_\_\_\_ by that pond, but it just moved it on down. Still trying to figure that out with the limited houses on Weaver Road. There has been some flooding in one yard. Mr. Fogt said that has flooded for 30 years.

Ms. Groat asked Mr. Fogt what he would like to see done. Mr. Fogt noted the detention pond is supposed to be at the airport park, which is at the approach to the runway. The FAA does not like a detention or retention pond in the approach to the runway. Mr. Reams thought that the FAA had approved it. Mr. Fogt said the County Commissioners never gave the final okay.

Ms. Froment feels this is part of the process of identifying some of the issues and then going forward and having discussion on them. Changes may be needed. The intent of these reports was to say these are the primary issues. The consultants have said this is where they think they would do it, but they wouldn't have the knowledge of boundaries that the City must deal with, etc. She expressed concern that the costs would increase from what's in the report as City tries to accommodate unforeseen circumstances.

Mr. Fogt said some improvements have been made. Also two retention ponds were put in behind Timberview, and those ponds have reduced the amount of water, plus some other drainage improvements have been made along London Avenue.

Mr. Mitchell suggested leaving those on the list until they can verify that the problem is corrected or build a lesser of a detention basin at that time, then look into it when those come up to be programmed in. Mr. Fogt said the priority should be significantly lowered, depending on what you find out.

Mr. Reams pointed out that you have high priority projects first, but on the other hand, the more expensive items are the average priority. That means inflation on those will be a bigger factor and if put off, those will cost a lot more.

Mr. Palmer noted on the Industrial Parkway projects, Structure 5, Structure 1-6 and Structure 4 were pulled out and done as a separate application for OPWC funding. Will hold those for the paving program.

Mr. Fogt asked if the leftover tile from the sewer project could be used to go under Industrial Parkway. Mr. Palmer said it could be if it's the right size. It depends on how deep they are buried. The tile will work on some of the projects. Using the tile will save money. Ms. Froment said we need to work on updating some of the areas that have been identified and have a reevaluation done over the next few months, which may adjust some of the numbers. It may remove or add, maybe both. There are two more recent studies that City is confident in that haven't been changed in that time period.

Ms. Groat said she didn't want to apply for and receive a grant to service a low priority project. Ms. Froment said some of the higher priority projects do not qualify for a grant. You go down the list of high priority projects to see what projects do qualify for the grant.

Mr. Palmer said bridge culvert replacements score better, because they go through as road projects. Their life expectancy is longer so they score more points.

Mr. Reams would like to see a rough schedule/timeframe for the project. Mr. Mitchell said it is directly related to funding and what you can afford. Typically, you look at 20-25 years for a program. Ms. Froment said a schedule will be presented at the next meeting. Ms. Groat would like to see what projects could be done in-house for a more cost-effective approach.

### 3) Sewer Rates – Commercial, Residential, Summer Credit

One issue was brought forward by a resident who moved to town, built a home and laid and watered sod in March and could not receive a credit because the code does not allow the credit in March.

Another issue was from Walgreens, who waters their landscaping, but receives no credit, because the Code does not allow credit to commercial customers; only residential customers receive credit.

Mr. Tim Creech of Walgreens addressed the Committee. Walgreens is asking the Committee to consider including commercial businesses in the summer sewage reduction Code. Mr. Creech handed out a copy of their August bill, which includes sewer charges. He explained that Walgreens maintains their landscaping regularly, there are rain guards on the roof, not on the side of the building. If it's not dead dry, they're not using water. None of that water enters into the sewer system; it all goes back into the ground. There is no treatment cost incurred in irrigating. They typically use 7500 cu. ft. of water on a non-24 hour store, which is what Marysville store is. Several people have checked their system to make sure there are no leaks. Everything is working properly. Sewer charge for August was almost \$1,000. Normal sewer on 7500 cu. ft. is usually \$360, and that's without a deduct meter. That's an average across the board based on a Columbus and New Albany store. With a deduct meter, sewer charge would be around \$100. June bill for the Marysville store was \$865 for the sewage. June was the wettest month so far this year.

Mr. Mitchell said staff has discussed deduct meters for residential use. A couple residents came before the Utility Appeal Board asking for an extension into March and April. Current Code is May through September. Staff has discussed the possibility of extending the time frame or include secondary or deduct meters or irrigation meters. There are pros and cons to both. Also discussed whether or not to include non-residential customers. Research from Finance shows that sewer revenue would go down and water revenue would go up, so it would balance itself out. Staff can make a recommendation to the Committee. There are three options to consider. 1) Extend the months, 2) leave it for residential only, adding a secondary or deduct or irrigation type meter for residential and 3) look at including commercial. Ms. Froment added that would mean eliminating the monthly average and instead replace it with deduct meters for residential and expansion to commercial. It would not be all three items.

Mr. Reams asked if there is something that could be done for people who build new homes that lay and water sod. Those people don't have a winter bill to compare to. Can those individuals come in for an adjustment at the end of the next winter billing cycle. He felt it might be easier to handle just those few cases.

Mr. John Green of the Finance Department did a survey of surrounding communities. Most places do authorize deduct meters for both residential and commercial. Issuing a summer credit after someone reaches a certain amount of usage, which is what Marysville does, is not done in other communities.

Mr. Morehart said after talking with Mr. Mitchell, the deduct meter is the purest way of identifying the water flow treated vs. non-treated, so probably the deduct meter is a preferred choice. There would be costs involved as far as installation, infrastructure, etc. In July, of the residential accounts, City had about 1/3 qualify for some sort for credit. He doesn't feel if deduct meters were used, that 1/3 would qualify or even be involved in investing in a deduct meter.

Ms. Groat asked what the cost is for a deduct meter and who would pay for that meter. Mr. Mitchell said the cost of the meter would be passed on to the individual using the meter. Cost for a residential deduct meter would be \$500 to \$1,000, depending on their plumbing, space, if they do it themselves or hire a plumber to do it. The meter alone is about \$100. Labor and piping makes up the remainder of the cost. There is an annual fee for a back-flow prevention device, which is \$75 to \$125. For a business with a 1-1/2" to 2" service, it will be in the \$1000 to \$2000 range.

Mr. Fogt asked if the computer system was set up so commercial sites could have deduct meters and residential could go with the summer credit. Can a new facility put in a deduct meter and not receive the summer credit, but an older business that doesn't want a deduct meter, let them have the summer credit. Ms. Froment said City can probably differentiate between commercial and residential. If commercial is authorized, there will be a loss in revenue. There is an automatic loss of revenue for homeowners.

Mr. Reams said he would not be in favor of extending the months, but would be in favor of writing something in the code for the few people who lay and water sod in April or October.

Mr. Mitchell said the deduct meter is the best way to solve the problems. If you are going to extend it to residential side with deduct meters, now is the time to do it. As City continues to grow, the longer you wait, the more headaches City will have down the road. People may have issues if City does away with automatic credit, but then offer deduct meter and say this is how it's done throughout the country. It's the safest and most equitable way to do it.

Ms. Groat said plenty of advance notice would have to be given and possibly a reduction in rates because summer credit would cease.

Mr. Fogt is in favor of allowing deduct meters for commercial and continue summer credits for residential.

Ms. Groat would like something added to the code to allow a degree of flexibility, when proof could be provided by invoice, that there was sod watering that did not fit within the specified months. She does not object to deduct meters for commercial and she doesn't object to the 130%.

Mr. Reams would like to know how revenue would be affected. Mr. Morehart said that would be hard to do. You look at both funds and if that credit is available and on the short term, the sewer fund would be covered and then it would be decreased. On the other side, the water revenue would go up. Potentially, the commercial accounts would feel that if their getting that credit, they'll use more water.

Mr. Creech said Walgreens store managers/employees have no control over the irrigation system. The rain sensor on the satellite \_\_\_\_\_ controls the irrigation system. It's all done by computer.

Ms. Froment doesn't feel City will make the money back by selling more water. She doesn't feel that the City should be charging people for sewer that they're not actually using. She does not object to Mr. Creech's request. If we were go across the board, deduct meters for residential and commercial, she feels we would come out even in the end because there wouldn't be enough residential that would apply for deduct meters, but commercials would. That would all even out.

Mr. Reams asked for an explanation of the credit, the 130%. Mr. Morehart said the credit is based on the lesser of the actual use during the time period of May thru September, or 130% of the average use during the winter months. Anything beyond 130% would be credited back if that's the lesser of the actual use. This credit was enacted in 1989. Ms. Froment said one option is to increase that percentage. This could be done in conjunction with the deduct meters for residential, and then phase it out in 5-10 years. In the meantime, authorize deduct meters immediately for both residential and commercial.

Administration will prepare a draft proposal and bring it back to the next Public Service Committee Meeting. Will look at flexibility to give credits. Will also try

to break out the 1/3 of residents who went over water usage to see what kind of credits we're talking about.

Mr. Reams asked Mr. Morehart to look at some commercial uses and see what kind of seasonal patterns there might be from some of the larger customers. Mr. Mitchell said he's seen some industrial applications have a deduct meter to use for cooling. The water is continually cooled and evaporated so it doesn't go into the sewage.

Ms. Froment distributed a draft of sustainability and conservation policy for review. Brief overview of policy. A policy about quality services, not only fiscal responsibility, but sustainability and conservation. Would like to see City of Marysville complete the US Environmental Protection Agency Green Community Five-Step Plan, where you do a needs assessment; where are we, where do we need to go, how do we want to get there. Draft includes a plan for City infrastructure, facility room temperature, insulation, lighting, water consumption and future building designs and guidelines in doing those items. Talk about vehicles and equipment, both usage and maintenance, and acquisition guidance for the future, parks & green spaces and streets and traffic control, materials & supplies and recycling, involvement with the community. Try to encourage conservation sustainability with the city. Look at programs that are being done nationwide. Would like to have something in place by the time summer is over.

Ms. Groat asked about the City not bidding for fuel for vehicles. She understands the one gas station being used was suggested by a previous mayor and has never been rebid. Ms. Froment said the one station they are paying is currently on a state term contract, which may be why it's not bid, because state terms have already been bid. Ms. Froment will check into it. Ms. Groat said the station that is being used has significantly higher rates than others in the City. Ms. Froment said Administration is currently reviewing a separate procurement policy. Mr. Mitchell said if gas is on the state bidding policy, City is not paying the posted price. Also, there are two different taxes, state and federal. The City does not have to pay one of those; he was not sure which one. City might get better prices if they had their own storage tank, pumps and equipment, but that means an investment.

Mr. Reams talked with Mr. Bill Kelley from DP&L about street lighting technology. He asked him about the possibility of doing a pilot program and partnering with DP&L. The new lighting is not available until early next year. He received some information on a pilot that was done with LED lighting in Grand

Rapids. They installed them and took them out after six months because they weren't happy with the results. The information from GE looks a lot more promising. It reduces the light pollution in terms of keeping the light down and not up. That is a good benefit. Grand Rapids replaced all their traffic lights with LED and is saving a significant amount of money just from the traffic lights having LED's. Mr. Mitchell said City has started changing the lights and are about 80-90% complete. The smaller 8" signal heads have not been done yet. May not do those before we replace the signals. Pedestrian crosswalks have not been changed yet, but plan to do those this year or next year. Pricing on LED lights have come down in price over the years. The savings are significant with LED's. A typical intersection light, such as Maple at 5th St. is costing the city \$125/month, LED's would cost \$12 a month. Mr. Reams would like to do a pilot program and partner with DP&L/Miami Lighting or URE to share the cost.

#### 4) Project Updates

- Sanitary Projects

- Water Reclamation Facility – Kokosing is on schedule or a little ahead of schedule. A progress meeting is scheduled for this week. Project is going very well.

- Crossroad pump station – Kirk Bros. is a little behind schedule. They are asking for a claim of 21 days due to weather. City did give Kokosing 10 days for June only. Kirk Bros. claim is still under review. They had some extenuating circumstances due to a trunk that kept flooding them out. They are working 4 ten hours days, plus 8 hours on Friday and some Saturday's to make up some time.

- Trunk interceptor – Super Excavators – ahead of schedule and going well. Will cross the creek this week.

- Reservoir projects – First contract with H & K for restoration of grass areas is complete. Waiting for City crews to do some of the seeding.

Elite Construction – Bike path grading.

Contract 3 – Beaver Construction – Doing actual construction of the reservoir. About 60-70% complete. Looking at getting a price from the engineering firm to add a bike/walking path around the top or base. Base might be difficult because it's close to existing property lines.

City owns the property across the street for the Water Plant, and they would connect to the path going up along Mill Creek to the parks.

Costs would be minimal and could be an investment in the future. Mr. Fogt questioned recreation, fishing, at the reservoir. Mr. Reams said City is not discouraging fishing, but City was not able to purchase

additional land for parking and we don't boats with motors on the reservoir. Mr. Fogt said the grant application he completed indicated this would not be used for recreational purposes. Ms. Froment will check into it, but it's her impression that it was the water base itself, versus not the land around it. It's in the concept stage right now. Mr. Fogt said he is all for it as long as money isn't jeopardized.

Mr. Reams asked for the completion date of the pump station at Mill Valley Central. Mr. Mitchell said around the first of the year.

- Paving projects.
  - Project starts 8/25. Milling first, then paving.
  - Collins Ave. project begins on 8/20. School has been notified of the work.
  
- Traffic Study
  - Outside firm is still working on the study. A technical meeting has been scheduled to go over the Thoroughfare Plan.

Mr. Reams ask for the next meeting to be held at the Water Reclamation Facility. Date for the next meeting is September 15<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 p.m. A tour will be conducted prior to the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.