

RWSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Minutes of Special Public Meeting
September 21, 2004

A special meeting of the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority (RWSA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, September 21, 2004, at 7:00 p.m. in the Monticello High School Forum, 1400 Independence Way, Charlottesville, Virginia. The purpose of the meeting was to gather public input on the Community Water Supply Plan Update.

Board Members Present: Mr. William Brent, Mr. Michael Gaffney – Presiding, Mr. Gary O’Connell and Mr. Robert Tucker.

Board Member Absent: Mrs. Judith Mueller

Authority Staff Present: Ms. Anne Bedarf, Mr. Bruce Edmonds, Mr. Tom Frederick, Mrs. Mary Knowles, Ms. Jennifer Whitaker, Dr. Robert Wichser and Mr. Lonnie Wood.

Also Present: Breakout Group Facilitators – Mr. Karl Bren, Mr. Henry Cobb, Ms. Michele DeWitt, and Ms. Michele Jones; Ms. Becky Christensen – Meeting Facilitator; City and County public officials and staff; Gannett Fleming and VHB Project Team Members – Ms. Nancy Barker, Mr. Chris DeWitt, Mr. Aaron Keno, and Mr. Tom Pursel; Mr. Kurt Krueger – RWSA Attorney; members of the public and media representatives.

1.0 Call To Order

The special meeting of the RWSA Board of Directors was called to order by Mr. Michael Gaffney on Tuesday, September 21, 2004 at 7:00 p.m., and he noted that a quorum was present.

Mr. Gaffney stated that no Board actions would be taken at this meeting. He explained that due to the number of Board members present, it was required by law that this public gathering become an official Board meeting.

Mr. Gaffney commented that the purpose of this meeting was to exchange information with the public on the Community Water Supply Plan process as it is known to date and to solicit public feedback. He, along with RWSA staff, the RWSA Board of Directors, and the community as a whole, appreciated the members of the public who took time out of their busy schedules to attend today’s meeting in order to gather additional information and provide input on this issue.

Mr. Gaffney reported that at the May 2004 Board meeting, 21 alternatives were presented by RWSA consultants from Gannett Fleming. These alternatives, either

**RWSA Special Board Meeting Minutes Cont.
September 21, 2004**

individually or in combinations with other components, would meet the 50-year horizon of an additional 9.9 MGD of safe yield. Although safe yield directs the required outcome, it is only one of the variables driving the assessment of the alternatives. Other critical variables discussed at the July meeting included impacts to the wetlands, streams, cultural resources, endangered or threatened species, land acquisitions, and estimated costs. As directed by the Board, RWSA staff and its consultants narrowed the 21 alternatives to a "Short List" of five, based on the critical variables presented at the July Board meeting. Options may be combined to meet the additional need of 9.9 MGD in 2055. The presentation to follow would cover those issues.

Mr. Gaffney further stated that the RWSA Board of Directors endorsed an in-depth analysis of the "Short List" to address all regulatory questions from a technical and environmental standpoint which was necessary for the permit approval. Although the regulatory process would determine the time required to complete this phase of the process, the Authority has established a target date to select one of the alternatives with final permit processing and to begin the design by spring 2005.

Mr. Gaffney commented that although the 2002 Community Water Supply Plan was not thought to be easy to implement, the first step of updating the data along with the 2002 drought information presented additional challenges. There are many steps in obtaining final permits, and the regulatory process is not predictable. Just like any construction permit, RWSA and its consultants will work with the government agencies and follow the required steps necessary to obtain the permits.

Mr. Gaffney reiterated that tonight's Public Meeting was being held to provide additional information and to receive public comments in the breakout groups on our Community Water Supply Plan.

Mr. Gaffney then introduced Ms. Becky Clay Christensen of Christensen Management Associates, who was the facilitator for tonight's program. He stated that Ms. Christensen had worked on a number of local projects. A few of those involved: the process, design and facilitation services for planning of a bike, pedestrian, and green belt corridor for the City of Charlottesville; the facilitation services related to the development of Albemarle County's first Master Plan for the Crozet community; and the facilitation services related to the development of the 2001 City of Charlottesville Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Gaffney felt that Ms. Christensen had a great history in Charlottesville, and he looked forward to her work this evening.

**RWSA Special Board Meeting Minutes Cont.
September 21, 2004**

Ms. Christensen thanked Mr. Gaffney and the members of the public in attendance for their interest in the project and commented that she would briefly lay a context for what would occur this evening. She felt that the meeting would have a different appearance from other public participation events previously conducted by RWSA. RWSA's intent was to engage in an information exchange and not to hold a "talking to you" kind of meeting. The meeting process would involve providing an update on the Community Water Supply Plan and receiving input from the public on the "Short List" alternatives.

Ms. Christensen explained that Mr. Tom Frederick would next provide an overview of the project schedule and the public input process, the background and development of the alternatives, and the "Short List" Alternatives. After his presentation, the public would have an opportunity to provide ideas and input targeting one of the specific alternatives at the different breakout stations set up at the facility. RWSA wanted to hear what the public felt would work or not work and creative ways to approach the various alternatives. She reiterated that this was not a public hearing but rather a process by which data is gathered from the community in a focused, targeted manner. Ms. Christensen again thanked the members of the public who were in attendance at this meeting and asked Mr. Tom Frederick to come forward to give his presentation.

Mr. Gaffney asked if he could make one additional comment at this time. He stated that a number of organizations came to the meeting with prepared statements. The Authority appreciated their input but this was not the appropriate forum to present those statements. The Authority is requesting that these statements be given to Mr. Frederick for posting on the RWSA website. Information on tonight's public meeting and public statements will be placed on a page developed specifically for the Community Water Supply Plan.

Mr. Frederick thanked Mr. Gaffney for his comments and the members of the public in attendance for their interest in this process. He felt that the Community Water Supply Plan study was one of the most important issues facing the public due to its current and future impact on the community.

Mr. Frederick noted that in January 2004, the public expressed to the Board of Directors their desire to be involved throughout the entire planning process. The intent of this meeting is to honor that request by giving the public an opportunity to provide input during this phase of the study. Since the alternatives evaluation process was still in the investigative phase, there might be some questions from the public that RWSA staff and its consultants would not be able to answer at this time.

**RWSA Special Board Meeting Minutes Cont.
September 21, 2004**

Mr. Frederick stated that before the breakout sessions commence, he would be utilizing a slide presentation to provide a brief capsule on the Community Water Supply Plan project. Copies of this presentation are available on the sign-in table.

Mr. Frederick first gave a brief overview of the presentation agenda and stated that he felt a review of the 2002 Community Water Supply Strategy and the factors precipitating a reevaluation of the Strategy would be helpful in understanding the plan's progression to its present status and goal. The "Short List" options and project schedule would also be discussed during his presentation.

Mr. Frederick first gave a brief summary of the basic components of the February 2002 Community Water Supply Strategy as follows:

- Capital Improvements – physical measures needed to capture a greater water supply for this community.
- Water Conservation – concepts adopted in the context that RWSA's two retail customers, the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County Service Authority, who are responsible for the management of water conservation programs and policies.
- Watershed Protection and Environmental Protection – two important issues that are being recognized nationwide as being an integral part of water delivery. From Mr. Frederick's observations, this community is far ahead of other areas in recognizing the importance of these concepts.

Mr. Frederick added that the only component being updated during the current study is the Capital Improvements element. The other policies remain standing.

Mr. Frederick stated that the 2002 Strategy designated Capital Improvements in 30-year and 50-year planning horizons. Included in the 30-year plan were the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir (SFRR) four-foot crest controls, SFRR dredging, restoration of the Mechums River Pump Station, and increased supply in Ragged Mountain. The 50-year plan included the James River and Beaver Creek Reservoir options which are also part of the current study, and identified several other options. The 2002 Strategy did not finalize a 50-year plan.

Mr. Frederick commented that once the 2002 Strategy was adopted and implementation had begun, two issues arose that prompted RWSA to revisit the Capital Improvements component of the Strategy. The first issue was the new "Drought of Record" in 2002. Virginia regulations state that in order to receive a permit to increase water supply, data from the "drought of record" need to be

**RWSA Special Board Meeting Minutes Cont.
September 21, 2004**

incorporated into the plan. The improved techniques used during the updated modeling process revealed that the four-foot crest controls would not yield the water supply initially anticipated and that the dredging project would need further study due to the uncertain costs and yield associated with this option.

Mr. Frederick reported that the more extensive modeling concluded that the existing water supply is adequate until 2008, based on a drought occurring during that time frame. The Beaver Creek Reservoir has a capacity beyond its current and anticipated future usage for Crozet. Use of the Beaver Creek Reservoir in the Urban system during a drought situation could extend the water supply adequacy to 2018. The projected safe yield deficit in 2055 is 9.9 MGD. Half of that figure is attributed to anticipated demand based on the community's growth. The other half is based on less storage in the SFRR due to sedimentation if there is no corrective action taken.

Mr. Frederick referred to the slide listing the "Short List" alternatives. He stated that these options are currently undergoing detailed investigations and are the primary focus of tonight's breakout sessions. They are as follows: James River Option, Ragged Mountain Expansion, SFRR Expansion, SFRR Dredging, and the Beaver Creek Reservoir.

Mr. Frederick also stated that the goal of the Community Water Supply Update process was to obtain a Federal Permit that would technically achieve a 9.9 MGD of added capacity over 50 years. In order to obtain acceptance by regulators, a parallel process was being conducted with multiple State and Federal agencies to address complex regulatory issues. The community's acceptance of the plan is an integral part of this process, and the purpose of tonight's meeting was to address specific concerns and receive input from all sections of the community.

Mr. Frederick noted that the process is driven by Federal and State requirements which mandate that we "identify the least environmentally damaging, practicable alternative taking into account: overall project purposes, feasibility, logistics, and cost." Specific issues that must be addressed include water quality, wetland impacts, stream impacts, stream flows for expanded reservoirs, threatened and endangered species, cultural resources, recreational resources, and highway and bridge issues.

Mr. Frederick noted that the next slide, which listed all the Federal and State agencies involved in the permitting process, was included to illustrate the complex regulatory process. The Federal and State mandated issues listed on the previous slide need to be addressed with these agencies. Mr. Frederick reiterated that RWSA is very interested in the public's issues and concerns, but the

**RWSA Special Board Meeting Minutes Cont.
September 21, 2004**

Authority must also focus on the regulatory process in order to obtain the Federal Permit.

Mr. Frederick then referenced the slide listing the local governing agencies that must approve the Community Water Supply Plan. RWSA is in accord with all the agencies, and it is important to address concerns which emanate from their populace.

Mr. Frederick then addressed the first alternative on the "Short List." He stated that the James River Option is capable of providing all the required 9.9 MGD. It could be done as a RWSA project or as a regional project with other entities, such as Fluvanna and Louisa Counties. This alternative would allow the option of abandoning the Observatory Water Treatment Plant and the transfer from Sugar Hollow Reservoir to the Ragged Mountain Reservoir. The negatives with this option are the high cost and the limited project phasing capability, which would entail a greater impact on water rates.

Mr. Frederick noted that the pictures on the next slide illustrated the James River Option process from the initial withdrawal of water from a flowing river to incorporation into the current distribution system.

Mr. Frederick next discussed the Ragged Mountain Expansion Option. He stated that this alternative could also provide all of the required 9.9 MGD. This would be accomplished by raising the existing Ragged Mountain Dam and creating a larger lake. It combines rehabilitation with expansion of the Dam. Due to the age of the structure, capital improvements would still be needed even if this option was not selected. This alternative might include reactivation of the Mechums Pump Station and would require replacement of the existing pipeline connecting Ragged Mountain Reservoir to the Sugar Hollow Reservoir. RWSA would continue its discussions with VDOT concerning the issues associated with the expanded lake crossing I-64. This option is on the lower end of costs among the alternatives and has phasing capability.

Mr. Frederick pointed out that this option is illustrated on the next two slides. The first slide depicts the current Ragged Mountain Reservoir with the proposed expansion area. The second slide shows the Ragged Mountain Reservoir Expansion with Pump Storage.

Mr. Frederick next described the SFRR Expansion Alternative. He stated that the height of the dam is raised by installing four foot crest controls. Bridges located on secondary roads might be impacted, and detailed surveys are being conducted as part of the current investigations to confirm with VDOT if bridge replacements would be required. There are moderate costs associated with this option, and it

**RWSA Special Board Meeting Minutes Cont.
September 21, 2004**

also has phasing capability. Results of measured wetland and stream impacts will be critical in determining feasibility of moving this alternative forward.

Mr. Frederick stated the next slide illustrated the expanded areas of the SFRR. It also included pictures of the Sugar Hollow Dam with its bladder and examples of an inflated and deflated bladder.

Mr. Frederick then discussed the SFRR Dredging Option. He stated that it could provide a maximum of approximately 5 MGD and must be combined with other alternatives to obtain the required 9.9 MGD. Based on current calculations, the volume of dredged spoil is significant. The July Board report suggested that over a 50-year time frame, the accumulated dredged spoil would require the equivalent of a 200-acre disposal site. The environmental impacts would depend on the disposal site raised 10 feet. He pointed out that disposal could occur at more than one site. The location of the site(s) could also impact transportation costs. Costs for this option have not yet been quantified and are still being investigated. Long-term maintenance would be required and sustainability is uncertain. Some dredging options are pictured on the next slide.

Mr. Frederick stated that the last alternative on the "Short List" was the Beaver Creek Reservoir Option. It was previously discussed in the context of being used as an interim solution as part of the Drought Management Plan. RWSA is also examining whether additional water would be available on a long-term basis for the Urban system. The first condition is that it must take into consideration the water needs of Crozet. The use of an existing reservoir lowers the implementation cost. Since it would not capture the entire 9.9 MGD, it must be combined with other options. The costs of the other alternatives are reduced when combined with the Beaver Creek Option.

Mr. Frederick stated that the Beaver Creek Reservoir as it currently exists is pictured on the next slide. He noted that there are no significant construction costs associated with this option since an available water system would be utilized.

Mr. Frederick next briefly discussed the Project Schedule. He began with a historical review of the update process. In January 2004, the more sophisticated modeling generated the updated the Safe Yield Analysis. In May 2004, the 21 alternatives were identified and narrowed down to the "Short List" in July 2004. The evaluation of the "Short List" and discussions with regulators were initiated in August 2004.

Mr. Frederick stated that that all public comments and statements generated from tonight's Public Meeting would be reviewed and posted on the RWSA website. It

**RWSA Special Board Meeting Minutes Cont.
September 21, 2004**

is anticipated that another Public Meeting would be held later in the fall. RWSA will be compiling an electronic mailing list to inform the public of future public meetings on this study. Those in attendance who wanted to be included on that list were asked to provide their e-mail address on the sheets located at the sign-in table.

Mr. Frederick noted that by winter 2005, it is anticipated that the selected alternative or a combination of alternatives from the "Short List" would be submitted for RWSA Board approval. It was also projected that by Spring 2005, the selected alternative would have obtained local Board approvals and a Federal Permit application submitted. The schedule is subject to change depending on negotiations with Federal and State regulators.

Mr. Frederick thanked those in attendance for their time and attention during his presentation.

Ms. Christensen stated that Mr. Frederick would be back shortly to entertain some quick questions from the public for clarification purposes. She added that the public would have the opportunity to ask additional questions on the alternatives in the upcoming breakout sessions.

Ms. Christensen asked those in attendance tonight to indicate by show of hands their involvement in the 2002 planning process. She expressed her appreciation for their attendance and stated it would be helpful for tonight's process to have their institutional history. She then asked how many were new to the planning process. She expressed appreciation for the fresh perspective they could bring to the alternatives evaluation process. Ms. Christensen then inquired as to how many were in attendance due to a specific geographic interest that was important to them, and finally how many were present due to a specific issue. Several hands were raised in response to the last question. She stated that for whatever your reasons for attending tonight's meeting, there would be an opportunity for everyone to express themselves in the breakout sessions. Before moving forward, Mr. Frederick would be answering a few questions from the public in attendance tonight for project clarity.

Ms. Christensen recognized Mr. John Martin. Mr. Martin stated that "the list of regulatory agencies that was posted there did not include Albemarle County. Albemarle County government is responsible for land use and is responsible to citizens for land use in this County. Do you consider Albemarle County government a regulator? If not, what role do you see for the government we elect?"

**RWSA Special Board Meeting Minutes Cont.
September 21, 2004**

Mr. Frederick responded that Albemarle County is considered a regulatory agency, and RWSA recognizes that it must comply with the terms of Albemarle County's Comprehensive Plan. He further clarified that all the regulatory agencies were categorized on the slides as either "State and Federal Agencies" or "Local Agencies." Albemarle County was listed as a Local Agency.

Ms. Christensen added, "And certainly would be a key stakeholder as all regulatory agencies would be."

Ms. Christensen then recognized an unidentified member of the public who stated that "it's an opportunity to educate myself. Back in the 70's and early 80's, the County purchased some land in Free Union for a reservoir. The reservoir has never been built. I've heard a variety of different reasons why, but I'd like to get a straight answer about that. Also, if that reservoir is never built for whatever reasons, is the County planning to continue to stockpile that very valuable land?"

Ms. Christensen clarified that this was a property that was not on the "Short List." She added that it might be an issue that would need to be explored further.

Mr. Frederick commented that he assumed the reference was to Buck Mountain. He was not here at that time, and what he has learned has come from conversations on that subject. It is his understanding that the project was proposed by the local community about 15 years ago, but it could not obtain a Federal permit. Buck Mountain was identified as one of the 21 alternatives recently reviewed by RWSA. The Authority needed to consider the least environmentally damaging alternatives, and five were selected that met that criterion. RWSA consultants examined wetlands, stream impacts, threatened and endangered species issues from available literature and determined that there were other alternatives, besides Buck Mountain, that were less environmentally damaging. This was the litmus test that must be proven to the federal regulators. Mr. Frederick also commented that for strategic reasons, RWSA does not propose to take any action regarding this property until the Community Water Supply Plan process has been completed.

Ms. Christensen recognized another unidentified member of the public who stated that he had a question concerning capacity. He referred to a County process where consultants helped define what areas of the County would be provided water and sewer and would be designated for growth. He then asked, "So, are your 9 million gallons based on the facts from these County consultants showing you what water you would need for the area that is served? If that's the case, that's fine, I can look at the five [alternatives]. When you say after 2015 the plan says the growth areas will be built up by 2020, I didn't want to pay for too much

**RWSA Special Board Meeting Minutes Cont.
September 21, 2004**

capacity that's not going to be used. I wonder if you could address how system capacity is dependent on the equipment that you are going to use.”

Ms. Christensen recognized Mr. Aaron Keno from the engineering firm of Gannett Fleming and Principal Engineer on this project, to respond to the question.

Mr. Keno stated that a variety of methods were utilized during the update of the water demand projections, including the County's Comprehensive Plan. One of the charts included in the slide presentation tonight, which illustrated supply decreasing and demand increasing, was based on input from the County. He noted for those involved in the earlier water supply planning process, that these revised projections resulted from an update of the water demand study that was done and used for the work established previously. The same methodology was employed, but data available since completion of the 1996 study was incorporated into this update.

Ms. Christensen stated that they would entertain a few more questions from the public before the breakout sessions get underway.

An unidentified person commented: “I just wondered if the 50-year horizon assumes, of course, that demand will keep going up and the water supply isn't. There must be some point where there is a limit to water and a limit to the area. Has anyone ever tried to figure that one?”

Mr. Frederick replied that the 50-year time frame is part of the federal and state regulatory permit process. He added that it was his personal opinion only that the reason for the 50-year requirement was to ensure that localities were looking at the big picture and not just planning for the next five to ten years. Mr. Frederick further stated that the update process has taken into account the growth projections for the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County. He noted that Albemarle County has designated growth areas and designated preservation areas. The updated urban demand figures refer to the areas already designated for future growth.

The next question was from Dr. Richard Collins. He asked, “Is it your view that we should only provide the least environmentally damaging option that would only produce 8 MGD, because this would not be permissible under volume. Or, are you saying that under our analysis putting things together, we only may be able to get at best 9.9 MGD and maybe that option should be presented?”

**RWSA Special Board Meeting Minutes Cont.
September 21, 2004**

Mr. Collins further clarified his question by stating, “We’re taking 9.9 MGD as a given if we can’t hope flexibility on the demand side. I’m wondering if you could argue that it’s a matter of law or a matter of choice.”

Mr. Frederick replied that growth in the community is a matter of choice for the community. RWSA’s mission is not to plan growth of the community. The 9.9 MGD figure is the projected amount needed to ensure that the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County have adequate water to meet the growth each is currently planning for.

Mr. John Via next questioned whether 9.9 MGD could be provided by the James River Option. Dr. Robert Wichser, Director of Water and Wastewater Operations, responded that the average seven-day low flow that occurs every 10 years in the James River was 350 MGD, so there would be more than enough water to implement this option.

Ms. Christensen stated that any additional questions could be addressed in the breakout sessions. Authority staff and technical consultants will be available after the breakout sessions if further clarification is needed.

Ms. Christensen commented that she would like to move the agenda forward at this time and discuss the public’s opportunity to provide input. Each of the five alternatives has been assigned to a specific breakout station. The five breakout stations will provide three opportunities to give feedback on their designated alternative. Of the five, you can select three breakout stations to visit. An opportunity would also be provided to submit feedback on the alternatives after tonight’s meeting.

Ms. Christensen further elaborated on the breakout session process. She stated that five breakout stations have been set up, and the participants will be rotated three times. Three questions will be asked at each breakout session: What are the benefits of this alternative? What are the Challenges of this alternative? Where are there breakthrough ideas in how to approach this alternative? Teams composed of facilitators and resource persons have been assigned to each of the stations. Four stations are located in the cafeteria area. The South Fork Rivanna Reservoir Dredging Option is the only station located in the Forum. She then introduced the facilitators and project team resource personnel for each breakout station as follows:

- South Fork Rivanna Reservoir Dredging – Becky Christensen, Chris DeWitt, and Aaron Keno
- James River – Michele Jones and Bob Wichser
- Ragged Mountain Reservoir Expansion – Henry Cobb and Tom Pursel

**RWSA Special Board Meeting Minutes Cont.
September 21, 2004**

- South Fork Rivanna Reservoir Expansion – Michele DeWitt and Nancy Barker
- Beaver Creek Reservoir – Karl Bren and Jennifer Whitaker

Ms. Christensen explained that at the conclusion of the breakout sessions, everyone will return to the Forum for a brief report out from each breakout station.

As there were no further questions on the process, the breakout sessions began around 7:45 p.m.

At 9:00 p.m., the public input process had concluded and the meeting participants returned to the Forum.

Ms. Christensen thanked everyone for their participation in the breakout sessions. She stated that there would be brief reports on some of the breakthrough ideas provided by the public for each of the five alternatives. All of the data from the breakout sessions will be prepared in a full report and placed on the RWSA website. Common themes and/or concerns will be identified and used as a baseline for future discussions during this update process.

Ms. Christensen asked for the public's assistance in completing the blue "Meeting Evaluation" forms. She stated that it would be a valuable resource in planning future public meetings.

Ms. Christensen asked that Ms. Michele Jones come forward at this time to report out on the James River Alternative.

Ms. Jones reported that some of the ideas generated from her group included the following:

- Opportunity for investment in a recommended future
- Take advantage of existing assets
- Allow for "first come, first served"
- Create a dialogue between community and developers
- Provide an opportunity for a regional watershed management plan
- Opportunity for joint venture with other localities
- Opportunity for creative financing from many sources – private and public
- Opportunity to build a Roman Aqueduct

**RWSA Special Board Meeting Minutes Cont.
September 21, 2004**

Mr. Henry Cobb next reported on the Ragged Mountain Alternative. He stated that breakthrough ideas included:

- Possibility for more recreational opportunities
- Agree to a release rate on Sugar Hollow
- Dual system/grey water reuse possibilities
- Integrated water management with Mechums

Mr. Cobb added that after examining the benefits and challenges, it appeared that this option had more benefits than the others.

Ms. Michele DeWitt reported on the South Fork Rivanna River Expansion Alternative. She stated that breakthrough ideas included:

- Use creative compensation, instead of cash, to purchase property (tax incentives, tax credits, etc.)
- Increase public access and expand the river's recreational use
- Build replacement bridges high enough to prepare for possible future expansion (8' bladder)
- Opportunity for greater watershed planning by addressing land use issues
- Combine dredging with this option

Ms. Becky Christensen gave the report for the South Fork Rivanna River Dredging Alternative. She commented that it was a two-part discussion. The consensus of all three groups was that the dredging needed to happen anyway since the reservoir was a community asset and had recreational value. The second issue concerned silt and the need for a more proactive approach to silt control and prevention. The public's need for more information on what entrepreneurial opportunities were available with this option was also expressed during these sessions.

Mr. Karl Bren gave the report for the Beaver Creek Reservoir Alternative. He stated that breakthrough ideas included:

- Opportunity to educate about the preciousness of water and develop a real plan to respond to a drought.
- Chance to promote cisterns, gray water use and other innovative water use and conservation.

Ms. Christensen thanked the public for its participation. For those who wanted to participate in all five breakout session groups, she apologized for not being able to create that opportunity tonight. The public is encouraged to submit comments not shared during tonight's breakout sessions and any additional feedback to RWSA. She then asked Mr. Gaffney to discuss the next steps in the project.

**RWSA Special Board Meeting Minutes Cont.
September 21, 2004**

Mr. Gaffney again thanked everyone who attended tonight's public meeting. He commented that only a few members of the public regularly attend the monthly RWSA Board meetings. He felt that it was important to increase the community's knowledge of this topic. It was great to see the room full at the start of the meeting and still half-full at this time. He also thanked those in attendance for their participation and interest by signing up for inclusion on RWSA's electronic mailing list. Mr. Gaffney hoped that everyone came away with not only a greater understanding of the challenges we face but also a thirst for additional information in order to assist RWSA and help others in the community better understand what needs to be accomplished in order to effect a solid water supply for the next 50 years.

Mr. Gaffney stated that the following initiatives would occur to facilitate this process:

- A new page on the RWSA website will be dedicated to the Community Water Supply Plan that would be continually updated to reflect new developments and events.
- Local government and network media would be utilized to broadcast public service announcements.
- RWSA will develop a speakers' bureau, consisting of RWSA staff and Board members, who would be willing upon request to speak on the Community Water Supply Plan to community groups and organizations.
- All members of the public are invited to attend the regular RWSA Board of Directors meetings, which are held on the fourth Monday of each month at 2:00 p.m.
- RWSA plans to hold focus group discussions later in the fall in order to gather more input.
- Another public meeting will be held in early 2005. Mr. Gaffney added that the feedback obtained from the completed Evaluation Forms would provide a valuable resource in planning for the next public meeting.
- Community Water Supply Plan updates will be sent to the electronic mailing list. Additions to this list can be made after tonight's meeting by going to the RWSA website and clicking on the link created for that purpose.

Mr. Gaffney adjourned the special meeting of the RWSA Board of Directors at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mr. Robert Tucker
Secretary - Treasurer

