

## James River Alternative

<b>Benefits of this Alternative</b>	<b>Challenges of this Alternative</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lots of water</li> <li>• Could be used as untreated (Send the water up to Charlottesville and treat here) versus treating at the source and then sending up the Charlottesville</li> <li>• Able to use beyond 50 years, so the initial apparent high investment could be applied over say 75-100 years rather than just 50 year planning horizon</li> <li>• Regional potential (could have beneficial impact of lowering alternative overall costs)</li> <li>• Potential cost benefit due to the longevity of use (75-100 years rather than just the 50 years planned for)</li> <li>• Not lots of difference between Buck Mountain cost and the James River alternative cost</li> <li>• Cost avoidance- prevents paying larger cost in the future</li> <li>• Able to recycle water: Taken from and returned back to the James so potentially little environmental impacts on the James.</li> <li>• Helps to ensure economic viability for future generations (This alternative provides for potential future withdrawals beyond the 50 years planned for)</li> <li>• Environmental due to the big stream (Potentially lesser impacts than other alternatives)</li> <li>• Another source of water (Not just tied 100% to reservoirs)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lots of money</li> <li>• Lots of users (Overall environmental accumulative impacts)</li> <li>• Prioritization of users (Who will have the active right to withdrawal: RWSA or another entities requesting or holding withdrawal permits)</li> <li>• Environmental – impact on historic districts and streams</li> <li>• Water quality (Our reservoirs are excellent water quality, the river would not be as pure)</li> <li>• Permitting due to amount of users</li> <li>• All regulators agreeing that this is a need</li> <li>• Reduces the need for protection of Southfork and other watersheds (With the somewhat unlimited James water supply, the community could lose interest in protection of the SFRR)</li> <li>• Proving that this is the least environmental alternative</li> <li>• All regulators recognizing the need to grant approval</li> <li>• Very vulnerable with 1 pipe</li> <li>• Reduces accountability (What happened to conservation to hold demand in place?)</li> <li>• Chesapeake Bay regulations accountability reduced (Potential impacts of a withdrawal on the Ches. Bay)</li> <li>• Impact on County Comprehensive plan and cohesiveness with future growth predications (This alternative would allow for massive potential growth)</li> <li>• Lack of storage capacity (This alternative is either on or off, no storage )</li> <li>• Regional potential creating organizational complexity (Who would have the majority vote during critical times to make critical decisions?)</li> <li>• Cumulative effects ( Many present demands on the river)</li> </ul>

	<p>More Challenges...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Legal battle (Richmond's water rights)</li><li>• Recreational harmony disturbed (Potential impacts of long pipeline and water removal from James)</li><li>• Scary- moving water between watershed</li></ul>
--	---

<b>Breakthrough Ideas</b>
Joint venture with other localities for federal funding
Regional watershed management plan
Using existing asset-Taking advantage of what you have (No new supplies, use existing reservoirs)
Ability to be an early user ( First come, first served)
Investment in the future only if developed in context with maintaining quality of life of community
Creative funding from many sources
Opportunity for dialogue between community, developers and other stakeholders
Create Roman Aqua Duct to create tourism