

GREELEY AND HANSEN EMPLOYED TO MAKE REVIEW OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS.

MR. JOHNSON AUTHORIZED TO MAKE FORMAL REQUEST TO N. C. STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSION REGARDING
RELOCATION OF NC 191.

MR. JOHNSON EMPOWERED TO OBLIGATE BOARD AND MAKE DECISIONS WHICH COME UP IN HIS LINE OF
WORK AS ENGINEER-MANAGER.

DEFINITE COMMITMENT FOR HEARING OF TEST CASE.

A special meeting of the Metropolitan Sewerage District Board, called by Chairman Peterson, convened in the Board Room, City Building, Asheville, North Carolina, at 2:00 p. m. on January 5, 1965.

Chairman Peterson called the meeting to order and Mrs. Swicegood, Secretary, called the roll with the following members present: Mr. Peterson, Mr. Garrison, Mr. Spicer, Mrs. Swicegood, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Reagan, and Mr. Tandy.

Chairman Peterson stated the meeting was called to consider the proposal of Greeley and Hansen to make an independent review of the plans and specifications and to consider the status of highway negotiations.

The members having received copies of the minutes of the previous meeting, Mr. Dawson moved and Mr. Tandy seconded the motion that they be approved as recorded. This motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Johnson in his communications and progress report read a letter from Mr. Easterling written by Standard and Poor's Corporation regarding Refunding Bonds of Buncombe County and the City of Asheville. He also read a paragraph from a letter written by Mr. Easterling to Mr. Hendon in which he stated that Greeley and Hansen are well known engineers and would be acceptable with him to make an independent review of the plans and specifications. Mr. Johnson stated no other firms had been contacted but that Mr. Donald Newton, representative of Greeley and Hansen, Mr. Hendon and he had been in conference on December 29, 1964, and that he had requested Mr. Newton to put in writing a proposal to the Board. He then read a letter from Greeley and Hansen in which the following proposals were made:

"The consulting services proposed comprise a review of the project, to be made with the knowledge and cooperation of Harry Hendon and Associates, with the objective of providing an independent consultants report to facilitate the sale of bonds.

"Having in mind this general objective, we propose to furnish services as follows:

1. A review of the bases of design including population forecasts, sewage quantities and characteristics, and design parameters for the proposed works.
2. A review of the plans and specifications for the proposed works with specific attention to the arrangement and suitability of processes, equipment and appurtenances for the intended service.
3. A review of the financial aspects of the project, including the construction costs, estimated annual operation and maintenance expense, the estimated revenues and the bases of charges for service.

"It is understood that bids are proposed to be received on a large portion of the project before advertising for the sale of bonds. The results of these bids will be recognized in the final report.

"We would expect to consult the District's fiscal and legal advisors with respect to pertinent aspects of the financing of the project. We note that Mitchell, Pershing, Shetterly and Mitchell are the legal advisors. We have worked on several major revenue bond issues where they were the bond counsel.

"Services of this nature are somewhat indeterminate and we suggest compensation on a per diem and expense basis as follows:

For time of partners	\$210.00 per day
For time of associate	140.00 per day
For time of technical assistants	Actual salary plus 125 percent
Travel and subsistence expense	Actual cost

"We would estimate that the services can be accomplished on the foregoing basis at a cost of about \$10,000. We would suggest that this figure be used for budgeting purposes and agree to keep the District advised of the actual time and expense accumulated to permit budgeting additional amounts if necessary. The above estimate is predicated on the following:

1. That consultation with or assistance to the fiscal and legal advisors will require only a nominal amount of time.
2. That no consultations with the North Carolina State Stream Sanitation Committee or Federal Agencies, and special study time related thereto, will be required.
3. That review of plans and specifications for portions of the project not included in the initial bidding will not be required.

"If desired and requested, we would be pleased to furnish additional services, as required, under these three classifications, on the same basis as outlined above.

"We further understand that compensation for our services is proposed to be made from the proceeds of the bond sale, but that in the event that such sale should not be consummated, the costs incurred will be paid by the District from other funds."

Mr. Johnson recommended that the Board accept the proposal. After discussion and clarification from Mr. Hendon, who was present at the meeting, concerning Mr. Richard Gould's association with the firm of Greeley and Hansen, Mr. Spicer moved that Greeley and Hansen be employed to make an independent review of the plans and specifications. This motion was seconded by Mr. Garrison and the roll call vote was as follows: Mr. Peterson, "Yes"; Mr. Garrison, "Yes"; Mr. Spicer, "Yes"; Mrs. Swicegood, "Yes"; Mr. Dawson, "Yes"; Mr. Reagan, "Yes"; Mr. Tandy, "Yes."

Mr. Johnson reported on a conference with Mr. Cameron Lee, Chief Engineer of N. C. State Highway Commission, regarding the relocation of NC 191. After some discussion Mr. Spicer moved and Mrs. Swicegood seconded that Mr. Johnson be authorized to make a formal request to the N. C. State Highway Commission to have a survey made and plans drawn of the relocation of NC 191. This motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Johnson commented on a letter he received today from Mr. Hubbard in which Mr. Hubbard suggested an early conference in Raleigh between Messrs. Johnson, Hendon, Long, Coburn, and Wright pertaining to the plans and specifications submitted by Mr. Hendon.

Mr. Johnson then commented on the future schedule of events in getting the project on its way and the time element involved in accomplishing these things. When asked, Mr. Hendon stated he thought the job could be let by May. After considerable discussion in which Mr. Redmond pointed out the need for Mr. Johnson to have authority delegated to him to proceed to get the engineering data worked out and get plans and specifications approved by the proper agencies and then come back and let the Board know it had been done, Mr. Tandy moved that Mr. Johnson be empowered to obligate the Board and make any decision which comes up in his line of work as Engineer-Manager. Mr. Spicer seconded this motion and it was carried unanimously.

Mr. Redmond stated he had received a definite commitment from Judge McLean that he will hear the test case on Monday morning, January 25, 1965.

Mr. Peterson expressed his sympathy in the death of Mr. John C. Walker since the last Board meeting. Mr. Spicer moved and Mrs. Swicegood seconded that a letter of condolence be sent to Mrs. Walker expressing the sympathy of the Board in her bereavement. This motion was carried unanimously.

The next regular meeting was postponed until a later date.

Mr. Harry Hendon, Consulting Engineer, was present for the meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:00 p. m.

January 5, 1965

Lemon H. Swicegood
Secretary