

COMMISSIONERS OF PUBLIC WORKS
Minutes of October 11, 2007

A regular meeting of the Board of Commissioners of Public Works was held on Thursday, October 11, 2007, at 10:00 a.m., in the Boardroom at 121 West Court Avenue.

In attendance:

Michael G. Monaghan	Steve D. Reeves, Jr.	Vickie Gorham	Jeff Auman
Gene P. Hancock	Denise Ogletree	Ron Lemon	Vicki Knott
Henry O. Watts	Jeff Meredith	Carlos Cometto	Stacia May
	Melinda Bishop	Chris Lindley	Ken Whittle
	Richard Gentry	Brian Ward	Billy Nicholson
		Chris Trainor	

- I. Chairman Watts called the meeting to order and gave the invocation.
- II. Chairman Watts gave the statement of compliance with the notification provision of the Freedom of Information Act.
- III. New Business:
 - A. Chairman Watts began by thanking Chris Trainor for a recent article in *The Index Journal* on the water treatment plant. Chairman Watts asked for guidance on rescheduling the November regular meeting and annual bid opening that would fall on Thanksgiving Day. The Commissioners were in agreement to meet on Thursday, November 29. Manager Reeves then explained that the December meeting would fall on a day that followed a two-day holiday; he noted that the Board had elected to meet only once during December of the previous year. The Commissioners postponed their decision until the next month to determine if two meetings would be necessary.
 - B. Chairman Watts asked Manager Reeves to explain a request for additional uniforms. Manager Reeves stated that currently, every employee gets eleven laundered uniforms. He continued that they have five to wear that are clean, one on their back, and five that are being laundered. He noted that the problem comes when they are on-call for the weekend and wear the uniforms on Saturday and/or on Sunday. If two are used over the weekend that leaves only three for the rest of the work week. He stated that employees are requesting two additional uniforms. He noted this was not an issue in the past when employees were allowed to launder their own uniforms; however, some did a fair job and some did a poor job so they were asked not to launder their own. Manager Reeves recommended

that in lieu of returning to that practice, purchasing the two additional uniforms at a cost of \$7,000. Commissioner Monaghan noted that the new uniforms looked really good, but there were numerous complaints about their being heavy and very hot during the summer and inquired about a way to alleviate that situation. Manager Reeves responded that part of the reason is due to the mandate to have flame retardant uniforms for both the electric and gas departments. He added that the others are heavier simply because they are new and should get a little easier to tolerate as they are worn.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hancock to approve the purchase of two additional uniforms per employee; the motion was seconded by Commissioner Monaghan, and unanimously approved.

- C. Chairman Watts referred to a recommendation regarding impact fees charged to developers and whether to charge that initially or wait until the property is developed and charge per house. Manager Reeves stated that the Board did improve impact fees on the water system; the question arises as to whether that is charged to the developer up front once they make a main line tap, or whether we wait and charge each individual homeowner as they request a meter installation. He referred to a current situation whereby a developer had requested a 6-in. tap for a new subdivision and was charged. Manager Reeves pointed out the importance of avoiding double-charging. He continued that we do not want to charge the developer up front and then charge homeowners at a later time. Manager Reeves stated that the question is with when the impact occurs on the water system; in his mind, the impact is not realized by CPW until the meter is set and the customer begins using the water. He pointed out that there is a financial advantage of collecting from the developer up front, but that was not the intent of the impact fee. He stated that the intent of the impact fee was to cover the impact on the treatment plant once it is impacted, and it is not truly impacted until the customer has a meter. Commissioner Hancock stated that it should be paid for when they are billed; we are trying to encourage customers, and they should pay when they are billed and not have to tie up this money. He continued that the purpose of the impact fee is to add plant, or if the City wants a million gallons of water, we might have to build infrastructure and a trunk line, and those would be the only times that you would need impact fees. Chairman Watts asked if a large quantity of water is used when the initial tap is first made or for any reason during construction. Manager Reeves responded that would not typically be the case during the construction process. He noted that a motion was needed and added

that the rate tariff would also be changed to make the language clear so that the fee is charged upon the setting of a meter with new construction. Manager Reeves noted that the reason this came up to begin with was because Metro charges the developer the impact fee up front and we wanted to be sure the Board was not expecting CPW to do the same.

Commissioner Monaghan made a motion to levy the impact fee on new construction at the time the meter is set; the motion was seconded by Commissioner Hancock, and unanimously approved.

- D. Chairman Watts noted a request from Commissioner Monaghan to discuss membership in the Municipal Association of South Carolina (MASC) and the South Carolina Association of Municipal Power Systems (SCAMPS). Commissioner Monaghan stated that this arose from the displeasure of their lobbying efforts at a recent meeting. He added that in the meantime, the General Manager had provided information of all of the services that we get from MASC, such as health insurance, and SCAMPS provides training and our mutual aid agreement. He noted that his "knee jerk" reaction was to withdraw from both organizations, but maybe they should at least look with a critical eye at those events. He stated that he would like the Board appraised prior to the events so they have a chance to decide whether to participate since some of them are pretty costly. Manager Reeves asked for clarification with whether Commissioner Monaghan was referring to annual meetings and not the individual training events for employees. Commissioner Monaghan responded that he was referring to the annual events and the fact that the last one was not very well planned. He asked that a representatives approach the SCAMPS executive board regarding event planning; the actual planning of what would take place, the speakers, and classes should be set by the SCAMPS executive board. He noted that SCAMPS is supposed to be utility orientated and should not have classes offered about city matters. Chairman Watts added that we do share the cost with the Municipal Association through the City. Commissioner Hancock added that more input is needed into things more specific and beneficial to us. Upon the suggestion of Commissioner Monaghan, the Commissioners directed the General Manager to write a letter to SCAMPS and the Municipal Association expressing the concerns and displeasure of the Board. Manager Reeves noted that Mr. Barnett is on the executive board of SCAMPS and they had discussed the requirements for annual meetings and the input that should come from the executive board. He added that they had left it up to staff in the past to put events together. Everyone was in agreement that it is time for them to dictate their expectations to staff.

E. Manager Reeves stated that there was nothing new with annexation. He noted the receipt of a petition for annexation from Greenwood Presbyterian Church. Chairman Hancock asked if anyone had talked with First Assembly Church about annexation. Manager Reeves responded that Mr. Timms has some connection with them because of an option on the property and they had talked through him in that regard. Anything that goes in there will need sewer and that is where we will have some say. Mr. Gentry stated they would start pushing the gas incentive program a little more with advertising and provided an ad that would run over the next four weeks. He added that another would follow over the following four weeks that speaks more specifically to heat. Mr. Gentry reported working on a presentation with Charlie Barrineau for an upcoming meeting with the local legislative delegation. Manager Reeves reminded the Commissioners of the meeting on October 25 at 12:00 and that it is also the date of the next regular meeting. He suggested they meet at the main office and then move to the COC following the regular meeting. He noted that it was easier for Stacia with the recording device at the main office. The Commissioners were in agreement to meet at the main office and then move to the COC.

IV. Other Business:

1. Manager Reeves congratulated staff on the good results of a courtesy inspection by OSHA. He noted that only a few extremely minor things were revealed. The cost to correct all violations would run around \$60.

Chairman Watts noted the arrival of Mr. Billy Nicholson at this time and that Mr. Nicholson had requested to be placed on the agenda to address the Board regarding a letter dated September 28, 2007. Commissioner Monaghan suggested that any staff who wished to leave at that time could do so.

Mr. Lemon updated the Commissioners on natural gas expectations for the upcoming winter. He noted that warmer than normal weather was being called for and that sometimes having too much of a good thing is not as good as not having enough. He stated that we have the ability to buy the gas at current market prices but right now are continuing to evaluate the weather. He noted two recent opposing views where they came out and said that it would be warmer than normal through November, while according to press releases, gas costs are going to be up for the winter because of greater demand. He noted that the price of gas is down significantly and that was one view point; however, two days ago someone came out and said that we

would be paying more for heat over the winter. Commissioner Monaghan noted that for some reason, even though the price of fuel oil has nothing to do with gas, if fuel oil prices go up, so does gas. Mr. Lemon noted that if the power is generated by electricity which a lot is during the winter, there will be some incremental demand if in fact it is cold, but right now we are not seeing that. Commissioner Monaghan asked what we are covering percentage wise during December and January. Mr. Lemon responded that in January, we had 40% of what we used last year purchased. He stated he was using last year because the weather pattern is setting up very similarly. He added that they recognize that prices are a little above the market right now, but adding to that is pretty expensive at the current time. He stated that the market is actually trading up today on some technicals, and with the possibility of a hurricane over the weekend, they will continue to reprice it. It is still trading at greater than 10% of our price, about 12%-15% and that is pretty expensive insurance. Commissioner Monaghan asked how we are covered in January. Mr. Lemon stated that there are no puts purchased in January. We have 40% of last year's consumption purchased, which was above the market when we bought, in part because of the hurricane play. He noted that mathematically the feeling is that if they did nothing, the consumer would not be significantly disadvantaged with the price because of the ability to average down. He added that they would continue to look at the puts but to add \$1.25 to that cost may not be in our best interest. He noted a couple of meetings with Mr. Reeves where everyone was comfortable and clear on their direction.

Chairman Watts requested a time to meet with Mr. Commetto and the Commissioners to share information on sewer. The Commissioners agreed to meet following the *Executive Session*.

Chairman Watts acknowledged the receipt of a letter from Mr. Nicholson regarding the Grace Street property and a request to appear before the Board. He asked Mr. Nicholson to limit his comments to ten minutes or less. Mr. Nicholson stated that he wanted to provide a little more recent history to figure out how they got to where they are. He continued that a while back they had discussed mixed use with some residential where the upper pond is and some commercial down on the By-Pass. He stated that he knew Steve had obtained some estimates and that was a little frustrating thing with how much it would cost to fill in the upper pond. Mr. Nicholson stated that was when Steve approached him and said the Commissioners had asked him to draw a line; they drew a line and actually had a plat done with some eight acres taken off down below. He stated that then they got into the question over liability and what would be the conditions of actually deeding over those 44 acres, and is where they had been kind of mired in that disagreement

or dispute for a while. He stated that he knew there was a proposal on the water lines and that he did not have much to say about that other than to say that he had spoken to County Council and talked with members. He stated that he could see some benefit in the water lines for the County, and if they are doing something anyway or would promote fire safety if it would promote economic development, for whatever reason, he would ask them to consider it. Mr. Nicholson added that he just saw it as sort of a closed door and did not see any possibility of organizing some sort of movement to get them to accept that; they didn't seem to be willing to consider that proposal. Mr. Nicholson expressed his belief that that puts us back into dealing with what they could possibly do together with the property. Mr. Nicholson referred to a prior call he had received from Steve, adding that it was not coming from the Commissioners. He stated that in that call, Steve had said, what about this; that is where this letter came from. Mr. Nicholson stated that the Commission had actually had a vote and were trying to see some way to get a park there and maybe satisfy the requirements that CPW put on there that they feel they need some consideration for giving away the property. He continued that they have the property now, and have a feeling they can do what they can with it and not have any problem with rezoning. Mr. Nicholson commented that he did not know how that would work out. He continued that if they come up with a joint plan that preserves some of the parts of the property that are the best for a park, that lets CPW reap some financial gain off the part by the By-Pass on Grace Street, which is the most marketable part of the property and the most valuable, he believed everyone could be a winner. He commented that there is one other thing out there and referred to a conservation fund with the state that tries to preserve green space and the legislative delegation has some say so in that. He stated that Greenwood has not gotten its share of those funds, so there is a possibility that down the road we could come up with some money to pay CPW. He stated that even if they come up with a plan, here they might come up with some money which would compensate CPW equally for what would be made off the commercial development down below. He stated that he could not make that promise now, but that could still come up in the future; that was something they were working toward as a Commission. Chairman Hancock stated that in his honest opinion, he would like to see the whole 54 acres become a park; however, the thing is that the CPW has to get some money from somewhere and that was a good offer they made to the County that would be a win/win situation for Greenwood County, regardless of what they said over there. He continued that they are wanting water in their districts out here; they called the Board to meet with them next Monday about putting water and sewer in out on the lake; another councilman needs \$250,000 worth of water lines; another wants some for a rural fire department,

but they don't want to come to the table. Commissioner Hancock continued that the City residents would pay for bonding just like the County would, but everybody would have a piece of it. If you live in the City you would pay a piece of it, if you live in the County you would pay a piece of it. He continued that right now, only the City customers own that. Commissioner Hancock stated that he never went to the Attorney General because he did not need it because he had two reliable opinions saying that we had to have compensation. CPW was offered over \$4 million for the property but would probably not have to get \$4 million if the County would come to the table. He noted that one of them over there is running for state senate; three of them are running for reelection, and don't tell him that the CPW Commissioners, the Parks Commission, and all the rural fire departments cannot put pressure on County Council to come to the table and work with us. He continued that bonds could be floated over thirty years and would cost around \$1.50 per year. He stated that Dee's computations were wrong; look at these computations that are a win/win situation for everybody. Mr. Nicholson responded that his public statement had been that he was in favor. Commissioner Hancock responded that they are not pushing the County. He added that he and Mike had sat there and they had never, ever said they would take care of anything. He continued that he went and took pictures and they finally did cut the grass in front of the property at a county development where the grass was over the sign and you could hardly see it. He stated that the County did not want to accept that; they never told you all they would take care of it either. He stated that he was dumbfounded with what they were saying at a meeting over there, because they had never told them that. Commissioner Hancock stated his belief that it is still a win/win situation for Greenwood County for all of them to come together, but you cannot go over there and start shooting at each other. CPW will bring water anywhere if someone will pay for it so that it won't impact our fees. He noted that CPW was fourteenth up from the bottom out of 247 with the cheapest water rates and had never made a dime on water. He continued that every time we expand something, then the rates have to go up. Mr. Nicholson stated that he could see the obvious benefit for economic development in commercial areas and for fire safety and fire stations and could argue that with them, it's just that he has enough of a problem presenting parks issues. Commissioner Monaghan pointed out that one benefit to the people from the new water lines is that their fire insurance would go down. Mr. Nicholson stated that they were not there to argue that issue, and that the only problem he could see is if you start running it one spot, somebody would ask why they did not get it. Commissioner Hancock responded that they would let them decide where they want the water. Each of those representatives over there could decide where to run it. Mr. Nicholson stated that if you want it in

areas not simply based on economics of running it there for CPW, then there could be a lot of decision making as to where to put it. Who or what particular neighborhood are you going to benefit and who would be chosen out of all that want it. Commissioner Hancock referred to signs in the past saying that Greenwood grows where water goes and noted that as being the truth. No growth happens without water and sewer; and you don't get sewer there until you get water there because they have to go in tandem with each other. Mr. Nicholson asked if it was worth setting up a joint meeting. Commissioner Monaghan stated that there should be a joint meeting between managers. Commissioner Hancock stated that this Board wants to cooperate but has to have money somehow for the property to overcome the two legal opinions. Mr. Nicholson stated that he hoped the interpretation of their letter was that they are trying to cooperate. Commissioner Hancock responded no, the way he took it and the interpretation is that they are telling CPW what they have got to do. He continued that they are actually putting limitations on what CPW can do as a Board. The Commissioners are elected officials and they cannot dictate to them. Commissioner Hancock stated that he works for the 23,000 in the City. Mr. Nicholson asked Commissioner Hancock if he was saying that the interpretation of his letter was they were dictating to him. Commissioner Hancock responded part of it was interpreted that way. He pointed out that in the letter they want a driveway right here, this entrance here, and so forth, and those things are dictating. Mr. Nicholson stated that he told Steve that they were not inflexible on any of those and expressed belief that it would be a mutual benefit. He explained the reason for the proposals as being that the commercial area would benefit from having some mixed use in there to have the people from the park flow into those areas. He continued that a mutual parking lot would be beneficial, and a mutual entrance could also be beneficial. Commissioner Monaghan interjected that they would be better served by pushing the County water thing; that way they would get the whole thing and could do what they wanted with it. Commissioner Hancock added that then there would be all of the green space there, and referred to another small lot still owned by CPW across the By-Pass. Mr. Nicholson asked for clarification with what was being proposed so far as a meeting of the managers. Commissioner Monaghan stated that the last meeting held was not beneficial and it would be better if you want something done to have the managers or the Chairmen sit down together and work out something, but not like the last time. Commissioner Hancock stated that they are in the process of getting the property rezoned commercial and added that was not what they really want. He stated that what they really want is the money for that property, or some portion to overcome the legal opinions, plus if they do that, the matriculation fee is gone and cleared clean. Commissioner Monaghan expressed a belief that the constituents of the

County Council without water do not think that the offer is silly, foolish, or not worth talking about. Commissioner Hancock added that he would like to introduce another idea and referred to the 700-acre city pond property owned by the CPW and the plans that are already in place to run sewer for development. He stated that the County puts not a dime into it, but they will reap the benefits of the taxes. He then referred to all of the utilities put in by CPW at Grand Harbor where the County contributed nothing but still gets the tax money. They went out to the lake and floated a million dollars worth of bonds to help with the sewer line at the development at Blazer's because of the tax revenues that will come back from that property. He commented that they would probably get more return back from the water lines here than they get back from that, while we are actually developing the property for them to get the tax revenue. It makes no sense that they do not want to help us. Commissioner Hancock asked Mr. Nicholson if he would tell that to any of them. Mr. Nicholson responded that what they have now is that CPW is proceeding with a zoning request which will be a public meeting that will probably rival what was seen at City Hall the other day. Commissioner Hancock responded that would be alright. Mr. Nicholson expressed that he thought that was what they were trying to avoid. Commissioner Hancock responded that he was not trying to avoid it because it makes no difference one way or the other. If it does not go that way, then it has to come to the City, and then the City can make their choice as to what they want to do with it. Then if it does not go that way, then go as a PDD and they would have a heck of a time legally stopping us on a PDD because we have the land. Mr. Nicholson responded that he did not know if he was hearing the voices of all three Commissioners, but he was interpreting what Commissioner Hancock was saying as being that he did not want to work with the Parks Commission on any plan other than the proposal they had put forth on the water lines. Commissioner Hancock stated that he did not say that. He continued that the best win/win situation is with the water lines because that is good for every citizen of Greenwood County. Mr. Nicholson responded that he was not saying that it is not, but he just did not know that he had the ability to do anything. Commissioner Hancock stated that they were going to develop and sell a commercial property to get our money back for that property. Chairman Watts expressed the Board's concern with the conditions stated in the letter. He continued that the CPW needs to be trusted as a Board to make the right decision on rezoning and the property and what to do with it, and do not need to be told by a Parks Commission that we can not do this or that with the property that is owned by CPW. Mr. Nicholson stated that he was not trying to dictate anything. Chairman Watts asked Mr. Nicholson if by putting in conditions, are they not telling us, okay, you can give us these 40 acres of land, but this is what you've got to do with the 14 acres that you

keep. Mr. Nicholson responded that the consideration is that the Parks Commission is going to get beyond CPW's effort to rezone; they were going to ask the Zoning Commission to approve it. Chairman Watts pointed out that all of the other adjoining properties are commercial on both sides of the road and down the road. Manager Reeves referred to a zoning map showing residential property across the By-Pass and at Woodcrest. He noted that there is already a two-acre piece on this piece that is currently for sale and is already zoned commercial. Chairman Watts asked why there should be an issue about CPW's property being rezoned commercial; he continued that it is because the Parks Commission wants to dictate to CPW what to do with it. Mr. Nicholson responded that his proposal is to have some city designer/architect of sorts come up with a design that would benefit both the park and the commercial development of the property. Commissioner Monaghan pointed out that CPW put out a design at the meeting before and it was torn up and thrown into the air. Chairman Watts noted that it became like a circus, and they were not going through that again. Mr. Nicholson stated they did not want to go through a circus. Commissioner Monaghan asked why they wanted to hire another design firm when we had already hired two design firms. Mr. Nicholson responded that if you look at the proposal there it was taking almost all of the wooded area and putting it into a residential development. Chairman Watts asked Mr. Nicholson if he agreed that the proper way to deal with the situation was to sit down and discuss it. Mr. Nicholson responded that was what he was doing right now. Chairman Watts pointed out to Mr. Nicholson that now they have come up with their conditions. Mr. Nicholson responded that it was a proposal. Chairman Watts stated his disagreement that it was just a proposal, and added that a couple of sentences were really threats. He referred to one statement that basically said that if you don't do what we say, you are going to have a difficult time with rezoning. Mr. Nicholson stated that he believed they would have a difficult time with rezoning; he stated that there are a lot of people in this town who believe that that property should be a park and that there have been promises made in the past. Mr. Nicholson stated that based on the number of people who showed up at City Hall, people are going to object to the zoning change. He stated that he was not trying to make a threat and he was not saying that they have to have all of those requirements; what he is saying is that would be commercially beneficial to both the park and CPW and would be an aesthetically pleasing way to design the park. Chairman Watts stated that hopefully the Parks Commission people would be in support of the rezoning. Mr. Nicholson responded that they would and clarified that he was saying they would support the rezoning, but they needed to come up with a design that everybody is in favor of and they would support it. Commissioner Hancock stated that they have to get a return on the acreage that they are

trying to get rezoned to have enough value there; they still do not know how much it will cost for offsite drainage so they can get out of the floodplain. When that is done, they still do not know if they will have enough value there to clear out that land so that they can even afford to give whatever amount of acreage is left to the Parks Commission. Chairman Watts stated that CPW never said they did not support a park on part of this property, but they do not want to be told specifically what they can do with the portion they retain. Mr. Nicholson stated that he was proposing coming up with a design that tries to maximize the commercial return for the CPW. Chairman Watts stated that CPW would look out for that themselves. Mr. Nicholson stated that if they are telling them just to go to hell, just tell them to go to hell. The Commissioners responded that was not what they were telling them. Mr. Nicholson continued that he was making a proposal to try to work together to have a park and to have CPW make money off it, to get consideration for the transfer of this land. He expressed belief that the consideration is working together on a plan that everyone can support; they go to the zoning board and say that this is what the Parks people want and this is what CPW wants. He continued that it involves three things which are a designer looking at it; it involves developers looking at it to see how to maximize the profit; and it involves construction people saying what it will cost to fill in. Commissioner Monaghan commented on his failure to understand why the Parks Commission is so reluctant to go to County Council. Mr. Nicholson responded that he had talked with council members. Commissioner Monaghan asked about the rest of the Parks Commission and if he had written them a letter. He stated that in his view, they are making no effort at all to try to get County Council to negotiate this water line so they would have the whole 54 acres. He asked Mr. Nicholson if that was not attractive to them. Mr. Nicholson responded that he had stated publicly that it seemed attractive. Commissioner Monaghan stated that it was not attractive enough to push it; not attractive enough to go to their meetings; not attractive enough to write them letters. Commissioner Hancock stated that *The Index Journal* was sitting right there, and if they would show how much return the CPW gives the County, tax revenues that they get because of what CPW does by putting in utilities, they are not giving us back anything. CPW is trying to give back to the County and then referred to the need for another industrial park where utilities would have to be put in. He continued that CPW does those types of things and contributes to economic development when lines are put there. We have eighty to ninety percent of Greenwood County covered with water now, and these water lines would get part of the rest of it. He continued that there are three rural fire departments without water and \$4 million would put in 28 miles of 12-in. line. Somebody needs to tell the County that CPW is raising their tax base. Chairman Watts pointed out that if all of the people

that appeared at the meeting before were to appear at a County Council meeting, they could get something done with County Council, but they choose not to meet with them. Mr. Nicholson stated that getting people motivated over water lines is one step removed. Commissioner Monaghan responded that he thought they were motivated over having the park. He added that the people without water are being motivated. Chairman Watts redirected discussion back to the proposal in the letter. He stated that when they came back to the table, it should have been without any conditions, but the Parks Commission came back with their conditions. Mr. Nicholson responded that he knew they would be in favor of taking, whether it is twelve or fifteen acres, including a big box building with a bunch of asphalt right on the By-Pass, it would be unsightly to the rest of the green space areas. He added that he was not trying to say there has to be this many or that many trees, but the whole time they had talked about similar conditions to these with every proposal that had ever come up in the past. Commissioner Monaghan asked Mr. Nicholson if it would not be better to have the whole 54 acres to do whatever they wanted and pursue that. Commissioner Hancock stated that he would help them call. Commissioner Monaghan stated that as he understood it, and Mr. Nicholson could tell him if he was right or wrong, but most of the Parks Commission people do not live in the City. Commissioner Hancock stated that was correct. Commissioner Monaghan continued that they live in the County; they are constituents of County Council people, so why don't they call them up and say I want that 54 acres, why don't you negotiate about the water lines. Mr. Nicholson stated that he was willing to make that attempt again, but it had been a shut door to him before. He continued that he would have to get into County politics and what they need to spend money on. Commissioner Monaghan responded that it is a thirty-year bond issue. Mr. Nicholson asked about the economic and social benefit of water lines adding that he guessed he was just not schooled on that. Commissioner Monaghan responded that your house would not burn down if it caught on fire because you were too far from a fire hydrant. Commissioner Hancock referred to a recent article in the paper about an instance when the pump would not work on the truck where they go pump out of ponds, and they had to borrow a tanker from somewhere else; the structure had already burned down before they got the water on it. Mr. Nicholson stated that if he was going to argue before any public board, he needed to be educated on the different benefits of water lines, the county budget and that type thing. Commissioner Monaghan responded that might be a better activity than coming here and giving them hell. Mr. Nicholson responded that he did not think he was giving them hell; he came with a proposal in hand to try to work together. Commissioner Monaghan stated that the way to work together was to lobby County Council. Mr. Nicholson

responded that was their recommendation; while at the same time, they are moving to rezone the property. Commissioner Hancock stated that did not mean anything; you can rezone it to anything. It could sit there for forty or fifty years rezoned; it should have been zoned to start with. There were people sitting on the Board and he sat on the Board himself for ten years, who said well, this ought to be for parks, and that is all that it was, because of some green space there. Mr. Nicholson asked if a date had been set for the rezoning request. Manager Reeves responded that it was currently set for October 23. Mr. Nicholson asked if a sign was up; Manager Reeves responded that there were two signs there. Chairman Watts asked Mr. Nicholson for support of the Parks Commission with rezoning the commercial part of the property. Mr. Nicholson responded that if they had an agreement as to design; but the Parks people cannot support rezoning for just general commercial purposes to put whatever down there. Chairman Watts responded that they have to get the best bang for their buck; if they are going to give away forty acres of property to the City, they are going to have to get something for it. Mr. Nicholson stated that the biggest bang for the buck is going to be the ugliest possible thing that could go in there. Chairman Watts noted that they would still get forty acres for a park, and right now they have nothing. Commissioner Hancock stated that they wanted help from the Parks Commission with a 21-acre park going in at the lower end at Mathews at the old depot. He continued that CPW told the City we would help with the park there. Commissioner Hancock added that CPW also plans to develop over 700 acres at the city pond that would likely have commercial, some walking trails and parks. He noted that the County would get all of the tax money; CPW gets nothing back but our rates. Chairman Watts thanked Mr. Nicholson for coming. Commissioner Hancock stated that he had plenty of time and offered to help talk with them; he stated that the County residents and fire departments needed to come into it too. He pointed out that space to publicize it in the Index could be bought. He commented that the editor notifies them of everything that goes on, and referred to an e-mail about a meeting where CPW was to discuss the park and everybody flooded in.

V. Executive Session

A motion was made by Commissioner Monaghan, seconded by Commissioner Hancock, and unanimously approved to go into *Executive Session* to discuss a contractual matter pertaining to a gas line extension.

VI. With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved: _____, 2007

Secretary