



Minutes - Draft

PWI-Public Works & Infrastructure Committee

Tuesday, October 19, 2021

3:30 PM

This meeting will be conducted via teleconference (Zoom). Simultaneous public access to the meeting will be available

(1) via live stream on DCTV's webpage,

(2) on DCTVChannel23.TV

Meeting Started At: 3:33PM

Attendees: Commissioners Cochran-Johnson, Patrick, Terry, Rader, Davis Johnson, Bradshaw

Present 3 - Commissioner Lorraine Cochran-Johnson, Commissioner Robert Patrick, and Commissioner Ted Terry

I. MINUTES

2021-3216 Commission District(s): ALL
Minutes for the October 5, 2021 Public Works and Infrastructure Committee Meeting
MOTION was made by Robert Patrick, seconded by Ted Terry, that this agenda item be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Cochran-Johnson, Commissioner Patrick, and Commissioner Terry

II. AGENDA ITEM

Previously Heard Agenda Items:

2021-3015

Commission District(s): All
RFP - Request for Proposals No. 20-500550 Construction Management Services (Multiyear Contract): for use by the Department of Watershed Management (DWM). Consists of providing on-call construction management services that include pre-construction services, construction inspection, field services, management of meetings, production of progress reports and other related services for water and sewer projects. Recommend award to the two (2) highest scoring proposers: CGA Solutions [Joint Venture of Corporate Environmental Risk Management, LLC (CERM)/Gresham Smith/Atkins North America, Inc.] and Tetra Tech, Inc. Total Amount Not to Exceed \$26,340,300.00.

MOTION was made by Robert Patrick, seconded by Ted Terry, that this agenda item be recommended for approval. to the Board of Commissioners, due back on 10/26/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Cochran-Johnson, Commissioner Patrick, and Commissioner Terry

-LCJ: there will be a substitute coming that takes into account the awarding to one additional vendor. What we're looking at is a savings as a result of the audit?

CPO Horner: that is correct. We do support the award, and as stated in the substitute, the rewarding amount will be \$24,743,700

-Question TT: the original agenda item is a joint venture? So there are teams within teams? Are they all working on one project or will they be divided into different projects?

C Horner: it's my understanding that they are assigned projects.

D Hayes: that is correct; we have a pool of projects; the project manager within DeKalb County will assign projects to prospective contractors.

-Question RP: for COO Williams: staff has worked with something where multiple vendors will be coordinated through?

Z Williams: that's correct; Watershed Management is prepared to manage this

-Motion to approve substitute RP

Second TT

Vote: yes unanimous

2021-2997

Commission District(s): All
United States Geological Survey (USGS) 5-Year Agreement

MOTION was made by Robert Patrick, seconded by Ted Terry, that this agenda item be recommended for deferral to the Board of Commissioners, due back on 10/26/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Cochran-Johnson, Commissioner Patrick, and Commissioner Terry

-item is currently in OIIA audit review

-Question TT: regarding our previous discussion for water quality testing streams, Mr. Williams will we bring that back later for a comprehensive analysis?

Z Williams: yes we will, and we committed to that at the last PWI

LCJ: I will work with COO Williams to set the agenda regarding this

[2021-3209](#)

Commission District(s): 5 and 7

Panola Road Improvements in City of Stonecrest

MOTION was made by Lorraine Cochran-Johnson, seconded by Robert Patrick, that this agenda item be recommended for approval to the Board of Commissioners, due back on 10/26/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Cochran-Johnson, Commissioner Patrick, and Commissioner Terry

-LCJ: this item has some history; it dates back to 2019. There was \$4.8M available through the Federal government at that time for this road improvement. Stonecrest will need to provide money for the right of way. DeKalb County would potentially provide \$7M, \$2M would need to come from Stonecrest, \$4.8M from the Fed; currently the money is not on the table. This item would be to go back and determine if that \$4.8M is available - if so, an IGA would be required to move forward. If money from the county is going to be required, this is a non-committal resolution that is needed here.

-Z Williams: we are seeking to recommit our position to partner with the City of Stonecrest in moving forward on the Panola Road expansion. If so the City of Stonecrest would need to work toward this as well. We are seeking an authorization from the Board of Commissioners and an authorization from the city council of Stonecrest that we work together to seek funding.

-summary information provided by Director Pelton and C Kingsbury

-Question LCJ: during the scoping study would this involve public engagement? Please explain the process

D Pelton: that's correct; there would be a new public involvement process involved. The advantage in doing that is - the City was not involved during the initial development of the scope of the project. They have got their own comprehensive transportation plan. The project as is is not entirely consistent with what's in there. This would be an opportunity to develop a project that would be more consistent with the city's vision.

-Question LCJ: would it be best to allow the City to conduct these scoping studies or is best that we handle these?

Z Williams: when we brought this forward we were looking to pick up where we left off. There may be some challenges to doing that. I think a cooperation agreement between the County and city that permits a scoping agreement together, and/or seeking funds as a result of this study. Committing that we are still interested; not committing that we would come up with money, but this is a worthy project to work on if we are all interested. If there are sources from the Fed that are available, we may explore. At this point we're not prepared to provide whether the County or city should take over management.

LCJ: thank you for that.

-Question TT: Mr. Pelton you mentioned the City of Stonecrest has Panola Road on their comprehensive transportation plan. Is that different than the scope we originally sought in this project?

D Pelton: we have a bike lane and sidewalk currently; they have a multi-use trail instead. If we were to pick up where we left off, we would need to make that significant change to the plan.

-Question TT: is the significant part of the plan because the multi-use trail is more expensive than a sidewalk and bike lane?

D Pelton: it could change the limits of the right-of-way and easement over several miles.

TT: if each jurisdiction, city, and county have their own SPLOST allocations it may be effective that we look at continuity. Is it possible that we would do work on Panola for the parts that are unincorporated, Stonecrest does work in a larger project between city and county so that we're building a contiguous project rather than sidewalks to nowhere.

-C Kingsbury: the road lies entirely in the City of Stonecrest, substantially east of the border. The pieces in Unincorporated DeKalb are not in need of improvement. Prior to the forming of the city, the County improved Panola and north of I-20 to Covington Highway. We could provide a map of that later for everyone's benefit.

-Question TT: Stonecrest wants to do the multi-use trail concept, we don't have that on our side though?

C Kingsbury: the whole road is now in the City of Stonecrest

-MDJ: this project was established after the creation of the City of Stonecrest. A majority of the council has contacted me about this project because of their interest. Many constituents have also contacted me about the traffic issues. For us to move forward would expediate the project and hopefully we can do something about the project we are forced to live with in our districts.

-LCJ: we are determining how to move forward, rather than start over. The option that was available is no longer available. So now we have to do a different process that will require a scope and study. Could you clarify Mr. Pelton?

D Pelton: it's not a requirement to do a scope and study, however there are advantages to a scope and study. Namely the project could be potentially broken up in more readily fundable ways. The other main benefit will be that the immediate financial commitment from whoever would fund the match for the scoping study is going to be pretty small; it's in the \$100,000 range probably. Whereas if we're trying to move forward with the project as is, and we apply for funds through the TIP solicitation process, someone is going to be committed to potentially \$10 million or more match. So the advantage is that, in the limited frame for this to go in, it would probably be easier to accomplish a minimal match involved.

-LCJ: what you're saying is that the scoping study requires a minimal investment, because it would cost the county around \$100,000. But if we move forward in a different manner or what was already in place, then we move forward with a commitment of several million?

Z Williams: Notwithstanding where we were, because the \$4.8M has been taken off the table; my thinking is that if we were able to go back and seek that funding request to reinstate those funds, and if we need to modify the existing study we'd try to pursue that path in conjunction with the city without having to commit millions of dollars. We would be negotiating with the

city to negotiate the lion's share of the match.

D Pelton: that's correct, and the match will be much smaller in the immediate future; maybe \$100,000

-JR: Mr. Pelton has suggested the project must begin again with a scoping study, which is the beginning point for projects, not only in Stonecrest but all throughout the County. Stonecrest has an engineering and city administration consultant in Jacobs Engineering that has the capacity for this project. Stonecrest has the capacity if they so desire to sponsor and manage this project. This would be an anomalous thing for us to begin the scoping of a project entirely within municipal boundaries. Stonecrest also has a CTP that is in variance with our prior work on this, and Stonecrest has taken no action in the past 2 years; it seems that this is not a priority for the city. And Stonecrest currently carries a balance in their SPLOST fund of substantially half of what they've collected thus far in their SPLOST, and has made few capital improvements in the City. There are many needs in unincorporated DeKalb that require our attention and federal partnership. If we're going to participate in and fund projects in unincorporated DeKalb there is a major interchange rebuild at North Druid Hills at I-85 that is a bottleneck that we also ought to consider financially supporting and participating in. I don't recommend that, I think that Brookhaven is capable of managing that in their own jurisdiction. I think we ought to be investing money across unincorporated DeKalb, particularly in less developed areas. I do think this city has the capacity to move this project forward if they so choose. It makes sense to me give them the all the rights and privileges due to a sovereign city in the state of Georgia and allow them to be the project sponsor and its financial backer.

-TT: it makes sense that we would seek to connect trail networks and multi-use sidewalks between city and county. It would be great to get feedback from Stonecrest city leaders regarding their comprehensive transportation plan so that we can align them.

-LJ: this is more than a city project; this is I-20; it connects I-285, I-675. I-20 is a major corridor from Augusta to Birmingham; the traffic in this will enhance what we should have done 10-20 years ago whether this was a city or not. This part is an economic and regional piece, as opposed to just a city piece. requests more clarity on the scoping study

D Pelton: if we try to move forward with the existing project, we're going to have to almost go back to the beginning, and look at the entire concept of the whole project. Depending on the changes in that process, there are potentially major changes to the plan in the current process.

-LJ: I'm just trying to wait on doing the scoping study, as opposed to trying to move forward and get the right-of-way and some acquisitions done, instead of kicking the project down the road.

-LCJ: as it relates to Commissioner Johnson's statements, Mr. Williams it would be great to know where Stonecrest stands on the project itself

Z Williams: our intent in my conversation with the City is to move this document forward. It could be a sequencing thing. We will find out in the coming weeks whether the city will modify this, vote it up or vote it down. The County is calling the plays here; if we chose to wait for their vote that would be fine.

-RP: if we were to look at this at a regional traffic and transit perspective, Panola Road turns into Stone Mountain route, which then ties into the city of Stone Mountain. This could be a phenomenal tourist generator, almost like another beltline within DeKalb County. There would be the potential of connectivity to the city of Lithonia. Is there a way to do the scoping study as well as do the right-of-way under the initial plan, and come back with a plan from two different angles of something that is passable and efficient?

D Pelton: I don't believe we would be able to get funding from the ARC for both of those options; it would be one or the other. If we were to continue the current project, we would have to go through the design process, it could take a year or so.

-Question RP: how long is the scoping study?

D Pelton: Typically it's about a year or less timeframe.

-Question RP: What would be the timeline if we started today?

D Pelton: my thought would be at least five years if all went well

C Kingsbury: if we would start today, we would reevaluate the document. There's a high probability you're looking at 18 months to start where we left off at 2 years ago to be in a position to be authorized to buy right-of-way, using federal funds.

-Question JR: further on the agenda there is a call for projects in which we could address a lot of these trail issues that is a focus for commissioners. This could help address some of these cross-jurisdictional issues. If we want to talk about trails that could be a way to do it.

-MDJ: the governing authority in Stonecrest has changed; positions have also changed. I don't feel that Brookhaven can be compared to Stonecrest with that change. Regarding our community, we have been left out many times to start over. That is why we have lacked economic success in parts of the county vs. others. I'm going to fight for this ask of looking into an intergovernmental agreement because it's in my district; I shop, pray, play in this District. We should continue to lead and move this forward.

-TT: the city of Stonecrest has a different transportation plan for this road than when we set out years ago. At the very least I would expect some sort of resolution or representation from someone at Stonecrest to provide information on this.

-LCJ: I would like to propose a course of action here, because this was noncommittal.

-LCJ: what needs to happen is we need to give our COO the authority to begin the conversation to work alongside Mr. Kingsbury and Mr. Pelton to determine the best course of action, and to work alongside Stonecrest and have the necessary conversations to determine how to move forward with the project. COO Williams I trust you to come back to us after you've had those necessary conversations.

-LCJ: Motion to give COO Williams the authority to craft an IGA with the City of Stonecrest, and have conversations to determine the best course of action, while working alongside Stonecrest to determine how to move forward with the project. COO Williams please come to us after you've had those conversations, developing an IGA of where the money will come from, the funding sources, whether it's in our best interest to go forward with the scoping study, whether we pick up where we left off, as well as the level of commitment from the City of Stonecrest.

Second RP

Z Williams: what you're suggesting is that I go and negotiate the cooperation agreement, not knowing at this time what that looks like, as that is yet to be determined.

LCJ: absolutely. You will also need to determine what the investment will be from the City of Stonecrest

Z Williams: we will provide updates

LCJ: I'm not making this motion with a timeline; I will expect to hear from you as to when this will be placed back on the agenda.

Vote: yes unanimous

New Agenda Items:

2021-3072

Commission District(s): All

LB - Invitation No. 21-101424 Sanitary Sewer Chemical Root Control (Three (3) Year Multiyear Contract): for use by the Department of Watershed Management (DWM). Consists of treating portions of the County's gravity sewer system with a chemical root control herbicide.

Recommend award to the sole responsive and responsible bidder: Duke's Root Control, Inc. Amount Not To Exceed: \$6,644,550.00.

MOTION was made by Ted Terry, seconded by Robert Patrick, that this agenda item be recommended for deferral to the Board of Commissioners, due back on 10/26/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Cochran-Johnson, Commissioner Patrick, and Commissioner Terry

[2021-3088](#)

Commission District(s): 2 and 6

LB - Invitation No. 21-101333 Reindeer Drive Water Main Replacement (Multiyear Contract): for use by the Department of Watershed Management (DWM). Consists of the removal of existing galvanized pipe and asbestos cement watermains; abandonment of a steel main; construction and installation of ductile iron pipe (DIP) watermains; and removal and replacement of fire hydrants.

Recommend award to the lowest, responsive and responsible bidder: GS Construction, Inc. Amount Not To Exceed \$10,682,365.00.

MOTION was made by Robert Patrick, seconded by Ted Terry, that this agenda item be recommended for deferral to the Board of Commissioners, due back on 10/26/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Cochran-Johnson, Commissioner Patrick, and Commissioner Terry

[2021-3094](#)

Commission District(s): All

SS - Innovyze Water Distribution and Sewer System Modeling Software Upgrades and Subscriptions, Maintenance, and Training (Sole Source): for use by the Department of Watershed Management (DWM). Consists of proprietary software for water distribution and sewer system modeling subscriptions, maintenance and training used by DWM engineering, operations and maintenance; and in completion of consent decree projects. Awarded to Innovyze, Inc. Amount Not To Exceed: \$561,383.82

MOTION was made by Robert Patrick, seconded by Ted Terry, that this agenda item be recommended for approval. to the Board of Commissioners, due back on 10/26/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Cochran-Johnson, Commissioner Patrick, and Commissioner Terry

-no additional information requested

[2021-3096](#)

Commission District(s): All
REN - Hauling Services (Annual Contract - 1st Renewal of 2 Options to Renew): Contract No. 1264488 for use by the Department of Watershed Management (DWM) and Public Works - Roads & Drainage (R&D). Consists of providing hauling services. Awarded to Brown Management Services Enterprises, Inc. Amount Not To Exceed: \$180,000.00.

MOTION was made by Robert Patrick, seconded by Ted Terry, that this agenda item be recommended for approval. to the Board of Commissioners, due back on 10/26/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Cochran-Johnson, Commissioner Patrick, and Commissioner Terry

-no additional information requested

[2021-3138](#)

Commission District(s): All
LB - Invitation No. 21-101356 SPLOST Phase II Road Resurfacing Project (365 Day Contract): for use by Public Works - Roads & Drainage (R&D). Consists of patching, milling and resurfacing of County Roads. Awarded to HEH Paving, Inc. and E. R. Snell Contractor, Inc. CORRECTION TO AWARD.

MOTION was made by Robert Patrick, seconded by Ted Terry, that this agenda item be recommended for approval. to the Board of Commissioners, due back on 10/26/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Cochran-Johnson, Commissioner Patrick, and Commissioner Terry

-there is a clerical correction on the item, as this item requires a substitute -information provided by CPO Horner

[2021-3139](#) Commission District(s): All
CA - Cooperative Agreement for Rental Uniforms and Laundry Services: for use by the Department of Watershed Management (DWM). This contract consists of piggybacking off the competitively let Gwinnett County Contract No. PA020-20 to provide uniform garments to various Watershed facilities located throughout DeKalb County. Awarded to Cintas Corporation No. 2. Amount Not To Exceed: \$220,320.00

MOTION was made by Ted Terry, seconded by Robert Patrick, that this agenda item be recommended for approval. to the Board of Commissioners, due back on 10/26/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Cochran-Johnson, Commissioner Patrick, and Commissioner Terry

-information provided by CPO Horner

[2021-3144](#) Commission District(s): All
REN - Pump Repair Services (Annual Contract - 1st Renewal of 2 Options to Renew): Contract Nos. 1235993 and 1235999 for use by the Department of Watershed Management (DWM). The contracts consist of the purchase of pump repair services for various wastewater treatment plants. Awarded to Cole Technology, Inc. and GoForth Williamson, Inc. Total Amount Not To Exceed: \$1,200,000.00.

MOTION was made by Robert Patrick, seconded by Ted Terry, that this agenda item be recommended for approval. to the Board of Commissioners, due back on 10/26/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Cochran-Johnson, Commissioner Patrick, and Commissioner Terry

-no additional information requested

Additional Comments:

-JR: staff had responded with a list of projects under consideration for the TIP call for projects. All the projects on that list are scoping studies. It reflects the aspiration for the future but also underscores the degree to which we don't have projects ready for construction funding in some aspects. I would appreciate, given the discussion of trail master planning, is that we consider a scoping study or a trail master plan as a project for ARC to consider funding. Perhaps we could bring that as well as a presentation at the next committee meeting

-LCJ: let's make it an official discussion; we will add it to the next agenda so that we can make it a discussion.

Meeting Ended At: 5:15PM

MOTION was made by Ted Terry, seconded by Robert Patrick, that this agenda item be adjourned meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Cochran-Johnson, Commissioner Patrick, and Commissioner Terry

Barbara H. Sanders-Norwood CCC, CMC