

**TOWN OF WEDDINGTON
SPECIAL TOWN COUNCIL MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 11, 2012 - 6:00 P.M.
MINUTES**

The Town Council of the Town of Weddington, North Carolina, met in a Special Session at the Weddington Town Hall, 1924 Weddington Road, Weddington, NC 28104 on June 11, 2012, with Mayor Walker F. Davidson presiding.

Present: Mayor Walker F. Davidson, Mayor Pro Tem Daniel Barry, Councilmembers Werner Thomisser, Pamela Hadley and Barbara Harrison, Town Attorney Anthony Fox and Town Administrator/Clerk Amy S. McCollum

Absent: None

Visitors: Scott Thompson, Genny Reid, Bill Price, Nancy Anderson, John Temple, and Kent Hayes

Item No. 1. Open the Meeting. Mayor Walker F. Davidson called the June 11, 2012 Special Town Council Meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. There was a quorum.

Item No. 2. Presentation by Union County Public Works Director Ed Goscicki on the Most Recent Site Location Study for a Water Tower in Weddington. Mr. Ed Goscicki gave a PowerPoint Presentation to the Town Council. He stated, "We have been here before. Our agenda tonight is to review a little bit of the history, talk to you about the need for the tank and the need to move forward with this project and to talk about the site criteria that we used in the master plan. The criteria have changed a little bit from the previous criteria and older master plans. We applied the criteria in terms of both costs and elevation of the tank from an aesthetic perspective."

Mayor Davidson asked Mr. Goscicki what he wanted from the Town Council at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Goscicki - We have a map that shows areas that are optimum from our perspective in terms of costs and elevation of the tank and we have another area that is suboptimum. Within those areas we have identified what we believe are vacant parcels that are available. We do not know if they are willing sellers but these are vacant parcels and no structure is sitting on them. We are looking for this Board to provide us your local knowledge and your input in terms of what you believe to be acceptable to the community. We are looking for you to either tell us no way that the site we are looking at is not in concert with the Town's plans or these sites over here would be a better site. The more direction and consensus I can get from this board the better. We would still need to come back to this Board through the formal process. One of the things that has changed in your process is that before we could not have held this meeting. You had the quasi-judicial process. We could not have come to you until we had spent a lot of time and energy on a site. We had to go through our own rating and ranking criteria based on engineering and costs standards only and bring that to this group. The history on this goes back more than 10 years in terms of trying to identify a site and meet that need. The need is around two aspects. In previous needs we mostly discussed pressure issues. We have serious pressure issues on the northern part of this service area and our master plan said back then if we do not do something by 2020/2025 we will have serious pressure issues throughout the Weddington and Marvin areas. As part of this master plan it confirmed that same issue. It says right now today if the pump stopped running during the off cycle you have below 30 psi in some areas and below 40 in others. Below 30 psi is unacceptable. In 2005 we evaluated over 18 sites and the ground storage option was considered but rejected by the Board of County Commissioners for both engineering and cost reasons. The need still exists and the options are not that

much different for us than they were five years ago and two years ago. Why is the tank needed? One – for storage issues in the Marvin and Weddington service area. When we went through this master plan we looked at the State’s criteria on how much water storage do you need in the system. The State wants to know that we have sufficient storage in there for normal use to meet our peak hour demands and also if our pump station fails is there enough storage in the tanks to meet our needs in an emergency situation. Under normal situations we need 1.8 million gallons of storage and right now we have 0.2 million gallons. We have one water tank sitting in Indian Trail. During an emergency we should have 5 million gallons and we have 1.2 million gallons. We are way under the State’s criteria in terms of the volume of storage. We went through a much more detailed analysis and modeled our entire water distribution system every couple of 100 feet. On the water model we were able to model what the conditions are today and what they would be under various conditions. The whole stretch along Weddington-Matthews Road from Chestnut down to this area here has low pressure if the pump shuts off. As you look out into the future it just gets worse. The other aspect of it is when we are looking at the modeling south of here we have high pressure problems. We are trying to resolve both of those issues and our solution is to create a new pressure zone in the Weddington/Marvin area. The way you do water distribution particularly in hilly country like we have here is to establish pressure zones. The entire geographic area will all operate under the same pressure.

One of the criteria that we look for in siting a tank is that it should be somewhere near the center of the pressure zone so as to help eliminate water quality issues that can occur when it is placed on one side of the pressure zone. We need the tank to be near the center so the water flows in and the water flows out in all directions and you are getting turnover in that tank and you are maintaining water quality. We are looking at multiple additional water storage tanks in Union County over the next 10 years. You are not alone. It is part of the water distribution system. Every part of our system is going to require more storage and new tanks to meet that storage requirement. We are looking for a higher elevation for this tank where before we were looking at 860 feet we are now looking at 880. That means another 20 feet added to the height of the tank wherever we put it. We are looking at ground elevations greater than 680 feet to minimize the tank height. We said we were not going to build a tank more than 200 feet tall. We want it central to the pressure zone which is Weddington and Marvin. We want to keep it close to our 24-inch water main. Our water main runs up Providence, makes a left here at Town Hall and heads down 84. We have a smaller 16-inch line that runs up Weddington-Matthews Road here and we were hopeful we may be able to go further up that road and still be able to use that pipe but when we ran the hydraulics it just does not work without paralleling that pipe. We can go up in that direction but when you start going further the price keeps going up and up because we have to run more and more pipes so it becomes a more expensive alternative. If the tower is over 200 feet we would have to have lighting. We have not talked about using it for cell tower usage. That may be something we want to talk about to the public in the future. We need at least a four-acre parcel. We want to find a parcel that is reasonably priced.

Mr. Goscicki reviewed a map. He stated, “Anything in color shown on the map would be a viable location. It would meet our base criteria. Yellow is a much more optimum site because it is closer to our 24-inch water main. The green and blue areas get more expensive. The dark shaded areas represent the areas where the tank could be less than 175 feet which would shrink the height of the tank which is going to reduce the costs a little bit but certainly improve the aesthetics. We then looked at which of these sites are vacant. We did not attempt to contact property owners at this point. Then we overlaid the map and the pink areas we think are available. Our map shows basically the same cast of characters that we have been talking about for the last five years.”

Mr. Goscicki discussed parcels that were available according to the map such as the Pittenger property on Rea Road, school site off of Rea Road, across the street from Pittenger and a vacant parcel just north of it, the parcel across from Town Hall and a parcel off of Weddington Church Road. He stated, “Our ideal location is the Town center. It is in the yellow. The only ones that are in the yellow areas are the Town

center property, the Pittenger property and the site across the street from the Pittenger property and the one other parcel here which is butting up to a residential property. We have about seven to eight parcels that we think are optimum. Once you get past Beulah Church Road it gets too expensive to run a water line. After a certain point the cost is too high and you run into water quality issues.”

Council discussed the sites. Councilwoman Harrison expressed that she did not want a water tower in a residential area.

Mr. Goscicki advised that in his opinion the parcel across from Town Hall was the ideal location for the water tower.

Councilwoman Hadley – You said central to Weddington and Marvin but we are looking bull’s eye in the center of Weddington. Does the tower have to be placed in the center of the parcel? Could it be placed right or left to allow a possible road to come in? I am a firm believer that we need a tower and it should be in the commercial area.

Mr. Goscicki - The challenge is the elevation. Going towards Marvin the ground is lower. We will start approaching property owners and seeing if we can lock down a parcel for formal consideration. The tower does not have to be placed in the center of the property.

Mayor Davidson - I think the King property is the obvious choice given what we have been through with the neighborhoods. We can give you a vote of confidence but we will have to go through the public hearing process and there could be information that comes out during that hearing.

Mr. Goscicki - It appears that the King property is a property that the Board can support. I appreciate the input and it gives us enough to approach property owners and see what we can make happen. If you are planning any type of road improvements, we would like to know before we work on any engineering work. We will approach several property owners simultaneously.

Item No. 3. Adjournment. Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to adjourn the June 11, 2012 Special Town Council Meeting. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES:	Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry
NAYS:	None

The meeting adjourned at 6:57 p.m.

Walker F. Davidson, Mayor

Attest:

Amy S. McCollum, Town Clerk