

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 23, 2018

TO: LCADD Regional Water Management Planning Council,
Judges, Mayors, Health Departments, KIA, and Engineers

FROM: Judge Randy Dial, Chairman,
Mrs. Heather Stevenson, Water/Wastewater Coordinator *HKS*

SUBJECT: LCADD Regional Water Management Planning Council Meeting

The next LCADD Regional Water Management Planning Council meeting will be held Thursday, September 6, 2018. The meeting will be held at 10:00 am Central Time in the large conference room of the Area Development District office in Russell Springs, Kentucky. Your attendance is very much appreciated. Lunch will be provided after the meeting.

Our guest speaker will be a representative of Rural Community Assistance Partnership. If you have any new or revised profiles seeking approval, please submit those as soon as possible. The deadline for profiles to be submitted for approval is September 4, 2018. Please notify me as soon as possible if you are not going to be able to meet the deadline.

If you have any questions, please call Heather Stevenson at 270-866-4200.

**Lake Cumberland Area Development District
Regional Water Management Planning Council Meeting
Thursday, September 6, 2018 @ 10:00 a.m. CDT**

Judge Executive Randy Dial called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Central Time in the large conference room of the Lake Cumberland Area Development District in Russell Springs, Kentucky with 26 persons attending. Judge Dial welcomed everyone, then turned the meeting over to Ms. Heather Stevenson.

Ms. Stevenson stated that there were two new Project Profiles to present for approval today. The first project, submitted by Western Pulaski County Water District, consists of water line replacement of approximately 8,300 LF of 3" PVC water line along Beach Grove Road, Todd Road, Shepola Road, Daniella Lane, Sleepy Hollow, Poncho Villa and also 3,500 LF of 4" PVC along Lanetown Road. This will provide major improvements to the district's water distribution system. The project will eliminate several dilapidated waterlines. The purpose of this project is to replace existing water lines that are deteriorating, causing a continuance maintenance problem. The replacement of these lines will eliminate water loss problems associated with these lines along with the pressure problem due to deteriorating water lines. Total estimated cost is around \$711,200 with a 0-2 year start date. Motion was made by Mr. Ed Peretto to approve replacement of existing waterlines. Seconded by Mr. Matthew Dyer. All in Favor. Motion Carried.

The second Project is a Russell County project for the City of Jamestown. Jamestown water meter replacement project will consist of replacing approximately 3,500 water meters in the existing Jamestown water distribution system. These meters were originally installed in 2004. The life of these meters were warranted at 7 years but have lasted nearly double that and are now beginning to fail. Due to the rising water meters failing throughout the system the city would like to replace all the meters at this time rather than continue reactive maintenance of replacing the meters as they fail. Total estimated cost \$1,167,000.00 with a 0-2 year start date. Motion was made by Mr. Eddie Wesley to approve replacement of existing water meters for the City of Jamestown. Seconded by Mr. Ed Peretto. All in Favor. Motion Carried.

Next, Judge Dial introduced Ms. Kimberly Padgett and Ms. Melissa Melton with the Rural Community Assistance Partnership (RCAP). Ms. Padgett and Ms. Melton gave a brief overview of the services RCAP offers. Afterwards, they gave a PowerPoint presentation about Succession Planning.

In other business, Ms. Stevenson provided a handout of LCADD's Project Ranking Methodology. She also provided copies of KRADD's Project Ranking Methodology and pointed out differences. Discussion was had on making changes to LCADD's Ranking Methodology, specifically expanding "Type of Project" and adding automatic points if a project brings the system into compliance with an enforcement action. With much discussion, Mr. John Phelps made a motion to change these sections of the Ranking Methodology. Seconded by Mr. Billy Bartle. All in Favor. Motion Carried.

Ms. Stevenson announced that the next water management planning council meeting will take place on December 6, 2018. Regional project ranking will take place at this time. Ms. Stevenson stated that she will be reaching out to systems beforehand to request their individual project needs. With there being no other business, Judge Dial thanked everyone for coming and asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion to

adjourn was made by Mr. Ed Peretto. Seconded by Mr. Billy Bartle. All in favor. Motion Carried. Meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Those attending the September 6, 2018 meeting of the LCADD Water Management Council:

1. Melissa Melton, RCAP
2. Eddie Wesley, East Casey County Water District
3. Randy Dial, Casey County Judge Exedutive
4. Josh Pedigo, Green-Taylor Water District
5. Johnny Carter, Cumberland County Water District
6. Matthew Dyer, Cumberland County Water District
7. Randy Walters, City of Jamestown
8. Ed Peretto, Burkesville Water & Sewer
9. J.C. New, Bronston Water Association
10. Neal Cundiff, LCADD
11. Dana Whitis, City of Somerset
12. Tony Claunch, City of Somerset
13. Chris Early, Bronston Water Association
14. Brendan Welch, Kenvirons, Inc.
15. Robert Lawson, City of Burnside
16. Bill Bartle, City of Liberty
17. Millie Ramsey, City of Campbellsville
18. John A. Phelps, Jr., Cumberland County Judge Executive
19. Chari Bennett, LCADD
20. Heather Stevenson, LCADD
21. Darryl McGaha, LCADD
22. Nick Hazel, LCADD
23. Ronda Abrell, LCADD
24. Adam Scott, CannTech
25. Kimberly Padgett, RCAP
26. Mark Givens, USDA-RD

LCADD Regional Water Management Planning Council

September 6, 2018

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

Name	Representing	E-Mail Address
1 Melissa A Melton	RCAP	mam@copky.org
2 EDDIE WESLEY	EAST CASEY CO. WATER DIST	EDWARDSLESLEY@hotmail.com
3 Randy Dial	Casey Co.	Randy.dial@windstream.net
4 Josh Rediso	Green-Taylor Water	josh.rediso@greentaylorwater@hotmail.com
5 Johnny Coeater	Carroll County Water	
6 Matthew Dyer	Cumb. Co. Water Dist.	Cwateroffice@yahoo.com
7 Randy Watters	City of Jamestown	rwatters13@yahoo.com
8 Ed Parrell	Burlington	burlingtonwater@gmail.com
9 K. New	Bronston Water	Bronstonwater@gmail.com
10 MRC Gouff	LCADD	
11 DMcWHITS	City of Somerset	dwhits@cityofsomerset.com
12 Tony Claunch	City of Somerset	telaunch@cityofsomerset.com
13 Chris Early	Bronston Water Assoc.	Bronstonwater@gmail.com
14 Brenda Weld	Kenivons	bweld@kenivons.com
15 BJ BART LAWSON	City of Bakersfield	mayer@bakersfieldwater.com

LCADD Regional Water Management Planning Council
 September 6, 2018
 PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

Name	Representing	E-Mail Address
Bin Banzie	CITY OF LIBERTY	LIBERTY WATER WORKS @ gmail.com
Millie Ramsey	Campbellville water	millie.ramsey @ Campbellville.us
John A. Phelps Jr.	Cumberland County	ccje @ duo-county.com
Charci Bennett	LCADD	chari @ lcadd.org
Heather Stenson	LCADD	
Darryl McGaha	LCADD	
Nite Hazel	LCADD	
Ponda Abrell	LCADD	
Adawn Scott	Cann Zuck	
Kimberly Padgett	RCAP	
Mark Givens	MSDA - PD	

Lake Cumberland Regional Water Management Planning Council

September 6, 2018

AGENDA

Welcome/Opening Remarks.....	Chairman Randy Dial Casey County Judge Executive
Project Profile Review & Approval.....	Heather Stevenson Water/Wastewater Coordinator
Rural Community Assistance Partnership (RCAP).....	Kim Padgett, RCAP State Director Melissa Melton, Technical Assistance Provider
Other Business.....	Heather Stevenson Water/Wastewater Coordinator
Adjournment.....	Chairman Randy Dial Casey County Judge Executive

Projects submitted for approval 09-06-18:

Pulaski County

Western Pulaski County Water District

- **New Project– WX21199130 – Water Line Replacement Project**

Project consists of approximately 8,300 LF of 3-inch PVC water line replacement along Beech Grove Road, Todd Road, Shepola Road, Daniella Lane, Sleepy Hollow Road, Poncho Villa Road, and 3,500 LF of 4-inch PVC water line replacement along Lanetown Road.

This project will provide major improvements to the District's water distribution system. Project will eliminate several dilapidated water lines. The purpose of this project is to replace existing water lines that are deteriorating, causing a continuous maintenance problem. The replacement of these water lines will eliminate water loss problem associated with these lines, along with a pressure problem due to deteriorating water lines.

Total Estimated Costs: \$711,200 0-2 years start date.

Russell County

City of Jamestown

- **New Project– WX21207026 – Jamestown Water Meter Replacement**

The project will consist of replacing approximately 3,500 water meters in the existing Jamestown water distribution system.

The existing water meters in the Jamestown water distribution system were originally installed in 2004. The original life on these meters was warranted at 7 years, but have lasted nearly double that and are now beginning to fail. Due to the rise in water meters failing throughout the system, the City would like to replace all meters at this time rather than continue the reactive maintenance of replacing the meters as they fail.

Total Estimated Costs: \$ 1,167,000 0-2 years start date.

LCADD Ranking Methodology

The Lake Cumberland Regional Water Management Council uses a point based ranking system to rank the needs of the area. Each local system was asked to submit their most needed projects to the Council for ranking. Projects were scored on a series of criteria including Type of Project, Regionalism, Shovel Readiness, Funding Status, and Local Need. Additional bonus points were assigned at the discretion of the Council for projects deemed most deserving. In the event of a tie, the project's Cost per Connection was used as the deciding factor. The following point criterion was approved by the Lake Cumberland Regional Water Management Council on September 3, 2015 and will be used to rank projects on December 1, 2016:

Type of Project (up to 20 points assigned)

Unserved – Points based on number of households served per mile

Average 9 or greater households per mile - 20

Average 5-6 households per mile - 18

Average 3-4 households per mile - 15

Average 1-2 households per mile - 10

Average of less than 1 household per mile – 5

Underserved – Points based on percentage of total customer base impacted

80-100% of total customer base impacted - 20

60-79% of total customer base impacted - 19

40-59% of total customer base impacted - 18

20-39% of total customer base impacted- 15

10-19% of total customer base impacted - 10

Less than 10% of total customer base impacted - 5

Industrial/Commercial – Points based on number of jobs created/retained

100 or more new jobs created or jobs retained - 20

75-99 new jobs created or jobs retained - 19

50-74 new jobs created or jobs retained - 18

20-49 new jobs created or jobs retained - 15

10-19 new jobs created or jobs retained - 10

Less than 10 new jobs created or jobs retained - 5

Other – 3 points assigned for projects not meeting the above types

Combination – Most favorable listed category plus an additional 3 points

Project Delivery (up to 20 points assigned)

Regional - 20 points

Non-Regional – 5 points

Project Status (up to 20 points assigned)

Engineering Plans and specs submitted to DOW - 20 points

Preliminary Engineering Report completed - 15 points

Engineering procurement completed – 10 points

Preliminary planning by system - 5 points

Funding Status (up to 20 points assigned)

Projects with estimated costs greater than \$100,000
Funding committed for 50% or more - 20 points
Funding committed for 25-49% or more - 15 points
Funding committed for 1-24% - 10 points
Pending applications - 3 points
Projects with estimated costs of \$100,000 or less - 10 points

Local Need (up to 20 points assigned)

Points assigned based on the planning unit ranking

1st – 20 points
2nd – 16 points
3rd – 13 points
4th – 11 points
5th – 9 points
6th – 7 points
7th – 6 points
8th – 5 points
9th – 4 points
10th – 3 points
11th – 2 points
12th – 1 points
13th or higher – 0 points

Council Input (up to 10 points assigned)

Council assigns 10 bonus points to 15% of projects
Special consideration is given to any project that addresses an agreed order, tap-on-ban, NOV, or other specific violation from the Kentucky Division of Water.

Tie Breaker (no points assigned)

Cost per connection - only used to break point based ties
Lowest cost per connection is ranked highest

The KRADD Water Management Council meets annually to prioritize projects. The area's utility managers and chief executives begin the ranking by first reviewing the previous year's prioritization and then pair off by county to discuss their current projects. Each county is given a list of the profiles they have in the WRIS and then they rank their basic needs during this portion of the meeting. The Council votes to approve the County Rankings before proceeding to the Regional rankings.

While the county ranking is based on consensus by the systems in that county, the regional process uses a quantitative point system to determine the importance of the top three ranked projects in each county. There are eight (8) possible categories for projects to acquire points, however not all projects will necessarily qualify in each of these categories. The categories include: Project Type, Compliance, Economic Stimulation, Financial/Funding Status, Project Status, County Ranking, Water Loss, and Regional Importance/Project Delivery.

Project Type (30)

- A. Elimination of Public Water System (PWS) through a merger
30
- B. Elimination of a water treatment plant through an interconnection.
30
- C. Construction of a new water treatment plant for regional provider.
30
- D. Construction of a regional interconnection.
30
- E. Construction of a supplemental potable/raw water supply
22
- F. Rehabilitation and/or replacement of aging infrastructure or for hydraulic necessity
20
- G. Construction of a new water treatment plant or expansion
20
- H. Construction of a new water storage tank
15
- I. Extension of Service to Unserved Households
 - a. 9+ households per mile
25
 - b. 7-8 households per mile
24
 - c. 6 households per mile
23
 - d. Less than 5 households per mile
20

Compliance with Enforcement Action (10)

Is the project necessary to achieve full or partial compliance with a court order, agreed order, or a judicial or administrative consent decree?

10

Economic Stimulation (10)

- A. Project creates/retains more than 100 jobs
10
- B. Project creates/retains 50-100 jobs
8
- C. Project creates/retains 20-49 jobs
5
- D. Project creates/retains 1-19 jobs
3

Financial/Funding Status (15)

- A. Documented financing plan in Project Profile and Current Financials/Audits
10
- B. Utility service area has a MHI less than \$41,197
5

Project Status (15)

- A. Preliminary planning by system 5
- B. PE Procured and/or engineer cost estimate provided 5
- C. PER completed 10
- D. Plans and Specs completed 15

County Ranking (10)

- A. Number one ranked project 10
- B. Number two ranked project 8
- C. Number three ranked project 6

Water Loss (10)

- A. Utility has a water loss percentage less than 17% 10
- B. Utility has a water loss percentage greater than 17% and the project addresses the water loss 10

Regional Importance/Project Delivery (10)

A project can be awarded points at the discretion of the regional water management council.

No more than ten points can be awarded by the council to water projects in the regional ranking.

The KRADD Water Management Council meets annually to prioritize projects. The area's utility managers and chief executives begin the ranking by first reviewing the previous year's prioritization and then pair off by county to discuss their current projects. Each county is given a list of the profiles they have in the WRIS and then they rank their basic needs during this portion of the meeting. The Council votes to approve the County Rankings before proceeding to the Regional rankings.

While the county ranking is based on consensus by the systems in that county, the regional process uses a quantitative point system to determine the importance of the top three ranked projects in each county. There are eight (8) possible categories for projects to acquire points, however not all projects will necessarily qualify in each of the categories. The categories include: Project Type, Compliance, Economic Stimulation, Financial/Funding Status, Project Status, County Ranking, Inflow and Infiltration, and Regional Importance/Project Delivery.

Project Type (30)

- J. Will this project provide or continue regionalization and/or consolidation of wastewater treatment systems? Proposed project reduces the number of NPDES discharges by regionalization.
30
- K. Public wastewater system absorbs private package treatment plant
30
- L. Elimination of sewage treatment plant through an interconnection.
30
- M. Construction of a new wastewater treatment plant for a regional provider.
30
- N. Replacement and/or rehabilitation of aging infrastructure
25
- O. New Treatment Plant/Expanding Existing Plant
20
- P. Extension of Service to Unserved Households
 - a. 9+ households per mile
25
 - b. 7-8 households per mile
24
 - c. 6 households per mile
23
 - d. Less than 5 households per mile
20

Compliance with Enforcement Action (10)

Is the project necessary to achieve full or partial compliance with a court order, agreed order, or a judicial or administrative consent decree?

10

Economic Stimulation (10)

- E. Project creates/retains more than 100 jobs
10
- F. Project creates/retains 50-100 jobs
8
- G. Project creates/retains 20-49 jobs
5
- H. Project creates/retains 1-19 jobs
3

Financial/Funding Status (15)

- C. Documented financing plan in Project Profile and Current Financials/Audits
10
- D. Utility service area has a MHI less than \$41,197
5

Project Status (15)

- E. Preliminary planning by system 5
- F. PE Procured and/or engineer cost estimate provided 5
- G. PER completed 10
- H. Plans and Specs completed 15

County Ranking (10)

- D. Number one ranked project 10
- E. Number two ranked project 8
- F. Number three ranked project 6

Inflow and Infiltration (10)

- C. Does the project reduce or combat inflow and infiltration in the designated project area? 10

Regional Importance/Project Delivery (10)

A project can be awarded points at the discretion of the regional water management council.

No more than ten points can be awarded by the council to wastewater projects in the regional ranking.