

RWSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Minutes of Special Public Outreach Meeting
April 18, 2006

A special meeting of the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority (RWSA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, April 18, 2006, at 7:00 p.m. in the Monticello High School Forum, 1400 Independence Way, Charlottesville, Virginia. The purpose of the meeting was to announce the preferred alternative for the Community Water Supply Plan, provide a general update on the progress of current project activities, and continue to invite public input.

Board Members Present: Mr. Gary Fern, Mr. Michael Gaffney – Presiding, and Ms. Judith Mueller.

Board Members Absent: Mr. Gary O’Connell and Mr. Robert Tucker.

Authority Staff Present: Mr. John Brandt, Mr. Richard Defibaugh, Mr. Bruce Edmonds, Mr. Tom Frederick, Mr. Chuck Kent, Ms. Mary Knowles, Ms. Michelle Simpson, Ms. Andrea Terry, Ms. Jennifer Whitaker, and Dr. Robert Wichser.

Also Present: Ms. Michele DeWitt – Facilitator; Mr. Aaron Keno – Gannett Fleming Vice President and Project Principal; City and County Government Officials; Albemarle County Service Authority, City, and County Staff; 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, April 18, 2006 at 7:15 p.m., and he noted that a quorum was present. He explained that due to the presence of three Board members, legal requirements specified that this public gathering become an official Board meeting. No Board actions would be taken tonight. Minutes would be prepared and submitted for Board approval.

Mr. Gaffney welcomed and thanked the members of the public for their attendance at tonight’s meeting. He noted that a number of the citizens in the audience had attended at least some if not all of the previous public meetings held over the past three years. The Authority appreciated the public’s continued support and participation in this process. He felt it was a great night as we have finally reached this point in the Community Water Supply Plan process.

Mr. Gaffney next commented that he hoped everyone had the opportunity to sign the meeting register as they entered the Forum. If not, he issued the invitation to do so before leaving the meeting. The public was also invited to provide their e-mail addresses on the sign-up sheets, if they had not done so previously, in order to be included on RWSA’s e-mail list for regular updates on the Community Water Supply Plan process.

Mr. Gaffney then provided some background information for the citizens who had not attended a previous Public Outreach Meeting. RWSA and this community had identified a need for increasing the available water supply to meet the future needs of this community. It had previously been determined that an additional 9.9 million gallons per day (MGD) of water supply would be needed over the next 50 years. The process for selecting the preferred project to supply this need was required to meet complex federal and state regulations. RWSA also wanted the selected project to be the consensus of the community. Initially, 32 possible alternatives were developed. After reviewing the regulatory requirements and receiving public comment, the alternatives were methodically screened and the list narrowed as the process moved forward. At the last Public Outreach Meeting in October, the list was down to two alternatives: (1) expanding the Ragged Mountain Reservoir; or (2) building a pipeline to the James River. At that meeting, public feedback overwhelmingly favored the Ragged Mountain option.

Mr. Gaffney further stated that tonight the process had reached the moment that he knew everyone had been looking forward to for several years. A formal announcement on RWSA staff's selection of the single best alternative would be made through a brief PowerPoint presentation. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation was available to the public. For those who did not receive a copy when they entered the Forum, more were available at the sign-in table.

Mr. Gaffney added that following the presentation, the public would be invited to ask questions for clarification first. Members of the audience will then be invited to the microphone located in the center aisle to provide their comments, thoughts, and suggestions regarding the selection of the preferred alternative. RWSA was also accepting written comments from individuals and groups, which will be posted to the Authority's website.

Mr. Gaffney also commented that following the time set aside for public comments, he would make some concluding remarks before the meeting was adjourned. At that time, he would share with the audience the next steps in the plan for seeking the approvals of local boards, the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (Virginia DEQ), and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (the Corps).

Mr. Gaffney noted that the meeting was being videotaped by Charlottesville Public Access TV. He understood that it would take about one week of editing after tonight before it would be ready to be aired on local government cable television. He asked the citizens to check RWSA's website at www.rivanna.org around the middle of next week as to when and on which channel the program would be broadcast.

Mr. Gaffney then introduced Ms. Michele DeWitt, who would be facilitating tonight's meeting. Ms. DeWitt works as a professional facilitator and is a colleague of Ms. Becky Christensen, working for The Clay Christensen Group. She was one of the facilitators at the Public Outreach Meeting in September 2004. Ms. DeWitt currently lives in Williamsburg, Virginia, has an undergraduate degree from the University of Virginia, and a masters degree from Virginia Commonwealth University. Among her successful projects as a facilitator are the development of state economic development plans for two Virginia Governors and a strategic plan for the Virginia Sustainable Building Network.

He then turned the meeting over to Ms. DeWitt for a review of the meeting agenda and requested guidelines for discussion.

Ms. DeWitt thanked Mr. Gaffney and welcomed the members of the public who came to tonight's meeting. She also welcomed the students from a government class who were also in the audience to learn about government and public information meetings.

Ms. DeWitt asked the audience to indicate by show of hands how many had attended at least one previous meeting during this process and then how many were participating for the first time. She noted that both groups were well represented and that RWSA appreciated the input provided by all perspectives in attendance tonight.

Ms. DeWitt informed the audience that she would first review the meeting agenda before proceeding to the presentation and then to the public portions of the meeting. As Mr. Gaffney explained, the formal announcement of RWSA staff's selection of the preferred alternative for the Community Water Supply will be made during tonight's PowerPoint presentation by Mr. Tom Frederick, Executive Director of the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority. After the presentation, the audience will have the opportunity to ask questions for clarification. Once those questions have been addressed, the meeting would proceed to the public comment period when audience would be invited to focus their remarks on the following question: *How does this alternative meet the needs of our community?* Ms. DeWitt asked that anyone wishing to provide comments to first introduce themselves, direct their comments into the microphone located in the center aisle, and limit their remarks to three minutes in order that everyone would have the opportunity to speak tonight. Written comments were also welcomed and could be submitted either at the meeting or e-mailed to RWSA after tonight. Those comments would be posted to the Authority's website. Following the public comment period, Mr. Gaffney would provide the closing remarks during which he would review the next steps of the process. In conclusion, she asked the citizens in attendance if they would fill out the purple evaluation forms before they left the meeting.

Ms. DeWitt then asked Mr. Tom Frederick, RWSA Executive Director, to come forward and begin the staff presentation.

Mr. Frederick thanked Mr. Gaffney, Ms. DeWitt, and the citizens in attendance. He was pleased to be at tonight's meeting. It took a lot of work to get to this point in the process, which included a lot of listening, investigations, and studies. At the October 2005 meeting, the new Ragged Mountain alternative was presented and the citizens were requested to provide input as to what they thought was best for this community. The Authority heard the citizens' voices that night, and he felt that most of the audience would be pleased with the results of RWSA's continued work as presented at this meeting. The Authority would continue to take public comments tonight, which would be given serious consideration. RWSA was proud to be a part of the Charlottesville and Albemarle community. The Authority wanted to work with the community and also be a partner in the aims and goals of the leaders of this community.

Mr. Frederick then began the presentation by reviewing the Agenda slide. He stated much of the technical information had already been shared with the public, so tonight's presentation would provide more of a summary. The preferred alternative will be announced at tonight's meeting. An update will also be provided on the progress of the Mitigation Plan. There will be brief remarks on the idea of phasing of the improvements being recommended tonight, although there will be a continuing discussion regarding how to accomplish phasing. RWSA wanted to return to the beginning of the process in the summer of 2004 and "tie-in" the Authority's long-term approach on how it wanted to work with this community. The next steps in the process would also be briefly covered so that the citizens could anticipate future events. The citizens would then have the opportunity to provide comments on what was presented tonight.

Mr. Frederick next remarked that the audience had seen a slide similar to the one currently being displayed related to the goal of this process. He referred to it as a marriage that the Authority sought to build between what this community had shared with RWSA on what it wanted in a water supply and federal regulatory requirements that RWSA was mandated to follow in order to select the best alternative. It had been RWSA's goal throughout this process to select an alternative that would make everyone at the table on all sides "nod favorably." He hoped that tonight both objectives have been achieved.

Mr. Frederick commented that the next slide provided a brief background on the process. He noted that there were more citizens attending a Public Outreach Meeting for the first time than had been anticipated. Mr. Gaffney had in his opening remarks very eloquently summarized some of the background information. Mr. Frederick added that this has been a very long process that has required reviewing a lot of technical information, has called for several public meetings, and has necessitated researching over 30 options since this process kicked-off in 2004. Tonight's meeting was the eighth one held in this setting in the past 1-1/2 years in order to accomplish the selection of the preferred alternative. Many environmental and engineering studies were conducted and geared toward two directions. Some of them have been directed toward public comments and questions that required follow-up information. Other studies were done to satisfy regulatory requirements. There were also a number of regulatory meetings held. Probably the most important meeting was the one held last June 2005 in Richmond where the Chairman of each of the four joint boards was able to meet face to face with all the various regulatory agencies that had an influence in the final decision.

Mr. Frederick then announced that the selected alternative would be shown on the next slide, which he remarked was the "worst kept secret in town." RWSA was proposing for the consideration and approval of the Albemarle County Service Authority Board of Directors, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, the Charlottesville City Council, and the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority Board of Directors the expansion of the Ragged Mountain Reservoir (RMR) as the alternative to meet the water supply needs for this community for the next 50 years. He further commented that the selected alternative entailed two major construction projects. One of the projects involved the construction of a new dam, which would be located immediately below the existing dams, and would allow the pool of water to be raised in the RMR by up to 45 feet over a 50-year period of time. This raise in the pool level would add a significant volume of stored water for Rivanna's system to use during times of drought or times of need. The other major project was the construction of a new pipeline, which would replace

the old pipeline that now exists between the Sugar Hollow Reservoir (SHR) and the RMR. With this project, the pipeline would start at the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir (SFRR) and would connect the two largest supplies of water to meet the community's needs.

Mr. Frederick referenced the next slide that showed an aerial shot of the RMR. As a point of reference, Interstate 64 was at the bottom of the slide with the reservoir situated just west of the Interstate 64 – U.S. 29 interchange. The light blue area is what would be seen if you flew over the reservoir today. The yellowish-orange color that surrounded the blue area encompassed the additional area that would be seen if you flew over the reservoir when the new dam was completed in all phases. The Upper RMR, which was located in the middle of the watershed, was built in 1885 and was the first water storage reservoir for the City of Charlottesville. More than 100 years later, the loop would be connected back with the statement that the reservoir would be the major supply for this community's future.

Mr. Frederick stated that the next graph depicted the pipeline just discussed on the previous slide. The pipeline between the SFRR and the RMR would include a pretreatment facility at the SFRR to remove sediment, as well as remove phosphorus. The cleanest water supply today is at the RMR, and RWSA wanted to keep it that way. The Authority strived to be stewards of the environment and stewards of this community's future by providing the safest and cleanest drinking water supply that was possible. The pipeline followed a lot of publicly-owned land. RWSA tried to minimize the amount of private owners that would be impacted by the pipeline route. On the northern half of the pipeline route, much of the land was owned by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), either in existing street right-of-ways or as a corridor that VDOT purchased in anticipation of building a new highway that has not been built. The southern half of this area, which was basically from Ivy Road South, incorporated land owned by the University of Virginia Foundation. He noted that the organization had been most cooperative and most helpful in our discussions concerning how to build the pipeline, and the Authority was grateful and appreciative for the Foundation's efforts. There was a small amount of private land located near the southern end of the RMR, and Mr. Frederick was happy to report that the Authority had an ongoing constructive dialog with the owners of the land.

Mr. Frederick then discussed the cost estimates associated with this alternative, which were listed on the following slide. It would probably not be a surprise that construction costs were becoming increasingly more expensive. Dams required an extensive amount of construction work, and pipelines were also becoming more expensive. It was disturbing to learn that the price of oil broke an all-time record yesterday, and he hoped that the end of the spiraling costs was near. As everyone was aware, this was a big investment in the community's future. The Authority wanted to make the right decisions, phase the improvements in the right manner, and continue the dialog with the community. He reiterated that this was going to be an expensive project. The estimate of \$130 million included allowances for engineering, financing, and contingency. At this time, RWSA was still dealing with preliminary order of magnitude numbers. The detailed design work had not yet begun, which was the phase when costs became better defined. Many changes in the market could occur between now and when the construction was billed. He also felt it was helpful to understand that this cost gives the community a water supply for 50 years and could be broken down into what it might cost on an

average per year. There was still work to be done to ensure that this alternative met all the needs of this community.

Mr. Frederick next addressed why the RMR alternative was selected. He stated that some of the options listed on the current slide would be quite familiar to those citizens who have attended previous meetings. The first option listed would accomplish two things at one time. Whether or not RWSA proposed to expand the RMR, the Authority was required to address Dam Safety issues by either repairing the structure or building a new dam. The existing dams were very old and required improvements to meet safety requirements imposed by regulatory agencies. In discussions with state agencies, RWSA had requested additional time to complete this study in order to move forward in a way that utilized public funds wisely. This presented the opportunity to solve two problems at once and would also enhance operational flexibility. Having a pipeline between the Authority's two major water treatment plants and its two major water supplies would enable it to function as a two-way pipeline. Today, RWSA can transfer water from the SHR to the RMR but cannot take water from the RMR to anywhere except to the Observatory plant. The added flexibility meant that money could be saved in water treatment plant costs because there would not be the need to build additional water treatment capacity than what was needed by this community. The next option was a very important consideration by the community. The citizens had communicated to the Authority in many ways and many times that they wanted to stay within its watershed where the land use would be controlled by the local officials. This alternative provided the use of existing assets and the local watershed through both the South Fork watershed and Ragged Mountain watershed, which was overwhelmingly supported by this community.

Mr. Frederick then reviewed the environmental impacts that were listed on the next slide. He emphasized that after clear and considerable study, RWSA felt that it had accomplished its mission of selecting the "least environmentally damaging practicable alternative" based on federal regulations. There were some environmental impacts, but it was impracticable to consider that you could build a water supply without impacting the ecological environment where fish and aquatic organisms lived. All those impacts would be mitigated in kind and in accordance with all federal and state regulations that in the long run improved the overall quality of our environment. It was important to state that the streams and wetlands in areas that would be impacted by raising the pool level of the RMR were cut off from the downstream areas when the first Ragged Mountain Dam was built in 1885. It has been a long time since the current stability had been reached, and implementing this project would not change what has been a part of our environment for well over 100 years.

Mr. Frederick commented that the graph on the next slide illustrated the RMR alternative impacts to streams and wetlands. The areas in the light green color depicted the streams that would be under water when the new dam was built. At the tail of the existing reservoir there was a sliver of fuchsia color that represented 2.6 acres of wetlands. In previous meetings, a larger number of wetlands had been discussed. At that time it was an estimate that had not been confirmed with the Corps and surveyed to obtain the exact measurement. Vanasse Hangen Brustlin (VHB), the Authority's environmental consultant, has now confirmed the wetlands area with the Corp and has completed all the land surveying to calculate the precise acreage, which

was the 2.6 acre figure. The pipeline route was also studied for possible environmental impacts. There were some places where the pipeline would need to cross some very small streams, but there would be no permanent impacts. Any effects to the area by the pipeline work would be immediately and quickly restored.

As previously mentioned, Mr. Frederick stated that since there were some environmental impacts, a Mitigation Plan would need to be developed. As outlined on the next slide, the plan would need to consider both the wetlands and the streams. The Corps' guidelines required that RWSA look not just at the quantity of areas impacted but also the quality. Wetland mitigation site characteristics were highlighted on the following slide. The quality of the wetlands that were associated with the tail area included some forested wetlands, which were high quality wetlands. The Corps required that we mitigate those areas at a higher ratio of 2 to 1. For that reason, RWSA planned to replace the 2.6 acres with 4.1 acres of restored wetlands.

Mr. Frederick further commented that there were several technical factors that needed to be considered in selecting a wetlands area that would gain the approval of the state and federal regulatory agencies. The wetlands area would need to have an adequate source of water to keep the wetland planting roots wet, even during times of drought. Ensuring that there was an adequate source of water limited where favorable sites could be located. Federal agencies preferred that the sites be close to or adjacent to existing natural aquatic systems since they were interested in wetlands building habitats. They were also interested in restoring areas that were once wetlands but perhaps were filled in during times when that appeared to be the land use approach before learning about the sensitivity of the environment. Developing a Mitigation Plan was more complicated than just locating any tract of land and stating that a wetlands area would be placed there. In some cases, that area might be cut off from the habitat and from the rest of the environment that the intent of the federal law was to serve. For cost reasons, RWSA did not want to do a lot of excess grading. The Authority was looking at sites that could be fairly easily and quickly restored to their original state. Mr. Frederick then stated that RWSA was still at this time exploring options and conducting investigations on potential mitigation sites. An announcement would be made to the public closer to the time when the Authority was ready to make some decisions on this issue.

With respect to stream mitigation, Mr. Frederick reported that the Authority solicited and received several ideas from this community last summer. RWSA has reviewed those options, conducted some technical discussions, and narrowed the list to basically two approaches that were still under consideration. He was not able to discuss at this time any specific land areas that were not currently owned by RWSA, but he was able to comment in general about the concepts that were being considered. The first option entailed preserving stream channels that were today still high quality water. Those streams would be preserved for our future by establishing conservation easements and establishing and ensuring retainment by good quality buffers that could filter pollutants that might make their way from upland areas towards the streams. In areas where a buffer would not be adequate in width and were not vegetated sufficiently, trees and other vegetative material would be restored that could act as a filter. The second option involved providing channel and streambank improvements to streams that were already degraded to help restore them to a better quality condition. RWSA is in the process of seeking guidance as to how federal and state regulations influence the selection among the two approaches or if a

combination of the two could be considered. The regulatory agencies would look for overall connectivity to the environment, which meant that too many scattered and isolated sites might not get as strong a reception from federal agencies as a few concentrated areas that were connected to high quality areas of the environment.

Mr. Frederick then briefly discussed some additional benefits to the preservation approach that were outlined on the next slide. He stated that this approach could be used to protect tributaries to the South Fork water supply. The sedimentation issue had been discussed in previous meetings. Although sedimentation could be a huge undertaking, this approach could be a clear step in the right direction in protecting against future sediment erosion. RWSA did own some land in the Buck Mountain Creek areas that could serve as a preservation option. If the preservation approach were selected and if that land were a possibility, it was felt that about 200 feet on each side of the stream would be set aside for conservation purposes. The plan has not dictated how the upland areas of those sites would be used. Within the conservation buffer, additional vegetation would be planted as necessary. Mr. Frederick was willing to discuss this further since the Authority did own the land that could be used for this type of mitigation approach. He added that the RWSA Board of Directors was not in the position tonight to comment on how the upland areas might be used so the discussion would be limited to just the idea of buffers along the individual streams.

Mr. Frederick next moved on to the restoration approach to stream mitigation. The following slide listed the benefits to this option. It could restore effective stream flow characteristics. Sometimes degraded channels meander because of conflicts, such as fallen trees or as a result of some type of human activity, and develop patterns that were adverse to good stream health and promoted sediment erosion. This approach could help restore the more natural stream characteristics and reduce sediment erosion. It was also possible with this option to improve habitat, which federal and state regulatory agencies would require if sites were selected that also accomplished this objective. The approach was also somewhat site dependent. If degraded stream channels were chosen in the higher parts of the watershed area just below high quality water where it was just beginning to degrade, you would get the "biggest bang for the buck." If you selected an area in the middle of a reach of stream where degraded waters were located above and below it, there might be difficulty in maintaining that section of upgraded stream due to the influence of the degraded stream located above it which could restore some of the degraded conditions. For that reason, careful consideration should be given when selecting sites for this approach. Mr. Frederick further stated that this approach was more costly per linear foot of stream because there was a lot more construction activity associated with rebuilding channels and streambanks than placing an area into a conservation easement. The Corps recognized the cost issues in mitigation planning and would expect more feet of stream to be in a preservation option than the amount that might be necessary in the restoration approach. Mr. Frederick added that RWSA would entertain any comments or thoughts tonight on these approaches as the Authority was continuing to work on this particular issue.

Mr. Frederick then moved on to a discussion on phasing of the improvements. He had indicated earlier in his presentation that this was a possible approach with the RMR alternative. The Authority felt it would be feasible to build a dam in two phases. As this issue was considered

further, some thought should also be given to the possibility of building the dam in a single phase. RWSA would recommend no more than two phases, as it would become too costly over time when considering duplication of effort and financing. Although this issue was subject to further discussion, if the dam were to be built in two phases, he envisioned from a conversational perspective a first phase that raised the pool level by approximately 25 feet. The entire new base of the dam would need to be constructed at that time, which meant that costs would be significantly higher during the first phase. An approximately 25-foot raise would provide the community's water supply needs for about 20 years, at which time the other 20 feet would need to be built in order to get the additional 30 years. It was interesting to note that it was the last few feet of the dam height that actually provided the highest quantity of water storage. However, costs worked the opposite as building the dam base was the most expensive part of the project. Although there would be further discussion, he wanted to share the Authority's current thoughts on the phasing issue.

Mr. Frederick then talked briefly about the Observatory Water Treatment Plant, which was the oldest of RWSA's treatment facilities. The plant needed to be rehabilitated within the next ten years in order to assure the public that RWSA had reliable systems to meet the drinking water needs of this community. The Authority did not need a lot of extra treatment capacity in the next 20 years, but it was felt that if what needed additional treatment capacity was incorporated into the same project at Observatory it would make the overall plan more cost effective. The other water treatment upgrades, which included expanding the South Fork Treatment Plant, could take place at a later time after RWSA paid for the number of upfront improvements that needed to be done first.

Mr. Frederick next commented that the new SFRR to RMR pipeline was located in the middle of the phasing list. RWSA wanted to build the pipeline as early as possible, but it was also the most expensive element of this entire plan. It would take some careful discussions and coordination with elected officials and appointed boards with respect to what would be to the best way of financing this improvement so that the pipeline could be built in the most economical and expedient manner. The Authority's current thinking was that the first four items on the list would be constructed in the first 15 years of the 50-year plan. The Observatory to RMR pipeline would probably need to be done in the 15- to 20-year window. The water treatment plant upgrades, with the exception of the Observatory plant, could go beyond the 20-year plan. The phasing schedule was based on the current growth projections and what the Authority needed to do in order to meet the needs of this community on a consistent basis.

Mr. Frederick further stated that he wanted to conclude his presentation by "finishing the circle" as he reviewed RWSA's long-term strategy. When RWSA began this process in September 2004, there were many people in this community who had "bought into" a number of very good and very important concepts that had come out of earlier studies of water supply, particularly the changing focus on sensitivity to the environment and to the watershed. The Authority communicated to the public at that time that it was in agreement with those objectives, but there were some elements of the earlier plans from an engineering and regulatory standpoint that no longer worked with the new information obtained from the 2002 drought. RWSA focused a lot

of its efforts on engineering, capital improvements, and environmental studies associated with making physical improvements.

Mr. Frederick then took a moment to “tie back in” an overall philosophy of this organization. At the outset he had mentioned that RWSA wanted to be a part of this community and take into consideration the objectives of the community and elected officials in a balanced fashion. The Authority also wanted the best management practices and would be attuned to what professionals in this field advocated were the best ways to provide treatment, water supply, watershed protection, and sensitivity to the environment. RWSA would be advocating a lot of local collaboration, and he hoped that many in the audience had already seen that taking place in a significant way. The development of the plan that was presented tonight was not done in a vacuum. It took many conversations and communications with various agencies in this community, which he felt was a building block that was critical to this community’s future. The Authority would continue with that approach, as evidenced by the collaborative effort during the development of a Drought Management Plan. The Drought Management Plan would be introduced to the community next week and public discussions would follow shortly thereafter.

Mr. Frederick added that RWSA wanted to take a balanced and sustainable approach and not the traditional way of doing things in the fastest and easiest manner. The Authority would look at all elements of the plan, including the need to provide quality customer service as well as balance those issues with our local environment and natural resources. The Authority also desired to be a strong advocate for watershed protection.

Mr. Frederick next reported that Mr. Gaffney would address the next steps in the process during his closing remarks, so he would only briefly comment on the schedule. RWSA would be entertaining public comments tonight on the preferred alternative and then complete the engineering reports engineering reports to the public and to RWSA’s Board of Directors in May 2006, present the preferred alternative to the joint boards for approvals in June 2006, and then submit a Permit Application to the Corps by July 4, 2006. During that process, work would continue on developing a Mitigation Plan as well as invite public comments.

Mr. Frederick then turned the meeting back over to Ms. DeWitt public questions and comments.

Ms. DeWitt first asked if there were any questions for clarification concerning the information presented by Mr. Frederick. She asked that anyone having questions or comments to first introduce themselves and then speak into the microphone so that they could be recorded into the meeting minutes.

Mr. Bob Hodous, Charlottesville City resident: “One of the things I noticed was that there were no permanent impacts to the buried pipeline. Was that typically the case with buried pipelines that could be engineered so that there was no permanent environmental impact?”

Mr. Frederick responded in the affirmative and added that the key word was “engineered.” RWSA had conducted field surveys of the area along the proposed pipeline route. Part of the process was a careful selection of the pipeline route so that you would stay away from environmentally sensitive areas.

Follow-up question by Mr. Bob Hodous: “But it is possible generally with buried pipelines to engineer it in such a way that you have no permanent impacts?”

Mr. Frederick replied that his statement was correct.

Mr. Kevin Lynch, Charlottesville City resident and Vice Mayor: “I have a question about our current demand for water generated by the community. I was looking on the website at the request of a constituent. The latest numbers I could find were from 2004. At 2002 we were at 12 million, dropped to 8, and back up around 10. I am curious where we are now and is that something that could be updated on a regular basis or perhaps it was already up there and I couldn’t find it?”

Mr. Frederick responded that the Authority had an e-mail list that anyone could join where you would receive an e-mail from RWSA on a daily basis on what the demand was for the previous day and also the reservoir levels. He invited anyone who wanted that information to contact Ms. Knowles or send an e-mail request at info@rivanna.org, to have your name added to the list to receive that information on a regular basis. RWSA was not updating the Safe Yield Study and the Water Demand Projections that were done in January 2004 for the Permit Application. The regulatory agencies have reviewed this document extensively already and have signed off on the study. The Authority wanted to keep the Permit Application process as simple for the regulatory agencies as possible, which RWSA felt was an important key. This did not mean that the Authority did not conduct an analysis of its data on a regular basis. He noted that it was important to understand that there was a direct connection between how much water was used and demanded from the Authority’s water treatment plants and current dry conditions. It suggested to him that this community needed a strong emphasis on the best ways for the individual consumers to use water for landscaping needs.

Follow-up question by Mr. Lynch: “Was it possible to get the daily water demand information on the website along with the reservoir levels?”

Mr. Frederick stated that the information would be posted to Rivanna’s website.

Mr. John Via, Charlottesville City resident: “I noticed that when we were talking about going to the James River, we had all these impacts on streams and so forth. I never saw the first figure on how many stream impacts we would have with the 9-mile pipeline.”

Mr. Frederick replied that the 9-1/2 mile pipeline would have very minor temporary impacts, but no permanent impacts on wetlands or streams. The pipeline would be buried, covered up, and the streambanks restored.

Follow-up question by Mr. Via: “Wouldn’t that be the same thing going to the James?”

Mr. Frederick responded that the Authority did find some areas on the pipeline route to the James River that would require wetlands that were unavoidable without extensive re-routing. If you looked on a map, the area of the pipeline between SFRR and RMR ran very close to the ridge between the Ivy Creek watershed and the Meadow Creek watershed and to the south the Moores

Creek watershed. Pipeline routes that would run close to the ridge would cross streams that were very small in area. That was not necessarily the case when installing a long 20-mile pipeline that would cross the Hardware River for instance, so there was a difference.

Mr. Jacob Christopher, student and Albemarle County resident: “I thought that the new dam at the RMR was going to be built downstream. Looking at the map, it doesn’t really make sense. I was just curious as to where that was going to be constructed. Was it going to be where the lower dam is or is it further down? If it were further down, it is going to have half the water impacts?”

Mr. Frederick thanked him for his question and for his interest in attending the meeting. He pointed out on the map the location of the existing lower dam. He stated that the new dam would be built far enough below the existing dam that would allow construction without damaging the existing dam. RWSA could also continue to use the water supply as the new dam was built, which was another key advantage of this project. When the new dam was completed, the old dam could be breached and the water would back up against the new dam.

Follow-up question by Mr. Christopher: “With the new pipeline to connect the two reservoirs, did RWSA have a back-up plan if the pipeline were to go down for a leak or a break to keep everything in service while repairs are made?”

Mr. Frederick replied in the affirmative and added that the key purpose of the pipeline was to allow the refilling of the RMR after it was extensively drawn down during a drought period. If the pipeline were to break, it could be repaired in as little as 8 hours to maybe as long as 48 hours depending on the location and the extent of the damage. During that time, the valves on the pipeline would be shut off to isolate the area where the repair was needed. RMR could still supply water to the Observatory Water Plant and SFRR could still supply water to the South Fork Water Plant. The water plants would continue to operate and function to meet the needs of the community as planned.

Follow-up question by Mr. Christopher: “The estimated \$130 million ... where was this money coming from to pay for this project?”

Mr. Frederick responded that this was a “million dollar question that we are still working on.” He asked Mr. Christopher to keep in mind that this was a 50-year plan, so they would not need to have the total amount right away. Significant discussions and financial planning would need to occur in order to determine the best way to build the revenue, possibly through reserves when there was not a lot of construction taking place in order to meet debt service demands during periods of intense capital construction. If there were a “pot of money” out there, the Authority should try to obtain that funding. Realistically, RWSA would probably need to find the best way locally to finance a good portion of these improvements.

Mr. Neil Williamson, who represented the Free Enterprise Forum: “This is really a clarification that takes a step back in the process unfortunately. I understand that there has been a permit issued to Fluvanna and Louisa to draw water from the James River. I am curious after hearing

the concept of pipelines not having permanent environmental impacts possibly engineered in a certain way, what level of discussions was held between Rivanna and the permitting agencies as well as what level of engineering has been performed – I know that puts us back about six meetings ago – but the question came up today in a meeting that I was at, and I didn't have a good answer and I thought this would be an excellent opportunity for you to clarify that situation.”

Mr. Frederick replied that his question did take the process back a few months. Probably over a year ago now, the Authority had some extensive discussions with Fluvanna and Louisa Counties and did look at some options for a pipeline that proved to be longer and crossed more locations of streams and environmentally sensitive areas than the pipeline from the Scottsville area. The Authority did not look at this option extensively because it was not required due to the interest of this community to stay within its own watershed. The Corps could not require RWSA to conduct joint projects with other agencies. It was up to the locality whether it chose a regional approach or cooperation with other agencies. The community was able to establish its own needs and project purpose. For that reason, extensive evaluations were not done related to what the impacts would be to the James River. RWSA did talk about impacts with respect to a pipeline from Scottsville and also received feedback from the regulatory agencies. Because of the significance of the 9.9 million gallons as compared to the smaller volume that Fluvanna and Louisa had requested, the regulatory agencies would require more extensive studies of the impacts on the James River if RWSA were to move in that direction. RWSA would not be required to conduct that study as long as the Authority could demonstrate that the RMR alternative was the “least environmentally damaging” option. At this point, RWSA was not recommending that the effort or money be spent on such a study.

Mr. Pat Punch, Charlottesville City resident: “I think you said that you had about a 15-year timeline for the dam construction, the wetlands and streams mitigation, and the upgrade of the Observatory plant. Does that mean that it will be 15 years before there would be any net increase in our water supply?”

Mr. Frederick asked for the opportunity to clarify the question as he might not have explained that fully when he discussed phasing during his presentation. He mentioned that a group of items at the top of the list were projects that needed to be done in 15 years. Because of the safety issues with the existing RMR, construction of the dam had to be the first project undertaken. RWSA has already publicly presented, and the RWSA Board of Directors has already supported, a schedule that had been submitted to the Department of Conservation and Recreation, who provided the Dam Safety regulations in Virginia, that outlined the Authority's endeavor to have at least the first phase of the dam built by 2011. The group of projects mentioned in his presentation that were in the 15-year window included the Observatory Water Plant. It was felt that due to the current condition of that plant, it would need to be refurbished within the next 10 years. Beyond that, RWSA would need to discuss how to finance the other improvements. The pipeline was extremely important to this community, and it was also a very expensive project.

Mr. Mitch King, Albemarle County resident: “You referred to a 200-foot buffer on either side of the stream in the Buck Mountain area currently owned by RWSA. My question is what is the

current use of that land area and is there really a net mitigation if you set 200 aside or are you just promising not to do damage to what was already there?"

Mr. Frederick asked Mr. King to keep in mind that it was only an option, and it might not be the option that was selected for mitigation. It certainly merited public discussion. The concept behind the option was to place into conservation 200 feet on each side of the stream. Conservation means that it could not be built upon in ways that damaged the integrity of the vegetative buffer. It would act as a permanent filter for water that was running down the hill towards the streams and protected the high quality of the water in the stream.

Mr. Jeff Werner, Charlottesville City resident and who was with the Piedmont Environmental Council: "I am going to ask a question because the media is here and it is televised, and it is an opportunity for you to explain to the larger public an issue that I am getting a lot of questions about and I know you are ... We are running out of water. If I recall from the Gannett Fleming study which showed the safe yield if we had the worst drought on record and the current projected population growth in use, with a release from Beaver Creek we could make it to 2018 or 2020. I am going to ask you to explain that to people that we are not running out of water at least according to the information that I have read in the Gannett Fleming report."

Mr. Frederick responded that he wanted to take a moment to explain and maybe add a little clarification to the issue. He first stated that the improvements RWSA committed to make to the Beaver Creek Reservoir two years ago in order to make the release of water from the Beaver Creek Reservoir to the SFRR an available option during drought situations were to the point now that the option could be utilized when needed. He mentioned again for the record that the Beaver Creek Reservoir was designed to and would be reserved for the needs of the Crozet community first in all cases. To the extent that there was excess water available and not needed in a given year or season for the Crozet community, it could be released to the Urban Water supply. Some graphs concerning projected safe yield and future water supply needs were presented at previous meetings that showed the intersecting lines if Beaver Creek Reservoir were utilized in the area of 2018. He then mentioned a few caveats related to this issue. Gannett Fleming prepared those estimates in large part on how they proposed that our total water system, including its distribution, should behave. There were two projects in RWSA's current Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan that have not yet been built and would need to be built to fully take advantage of that safe yield. One was connecting the North Fork and South Fork systems through a new treated water pipeline approximately along the U.S. 29 corridor. The second project entailed completing the Southern Loop so there was a way without boosting pressures in the internal parts of the City system to get water back and forth between the tank in the Pantops area and tank in the Avon Street area.

Mr. Frederick also noted that no one knows if water were released in Beaver Creek through the Mechums River to the SFRR how much of that water would actually reach the SFRR. Further, you would not want to release water from Beaver Creek Reservoir while the SFRR was spilling since you would be sending the water below SFRR instead of reserving it for your supply. The Authority felt that early in a drought phase when the SFRR stopped spilling, the release would need to take place. The longer you waited and the drier the conditions, the greater the risk that

you might not receive all the water at the SFRR. If it were required to release water from the Beaver Creek Reservoir this year, the amount of water would be measured for future reference.

Mr. Frederick then stated that from a Dam Safety and water supply standpoint, it made sense for the Authority to move forward as expediently as possible to reach that 2011 deadline for the dam, which would enable RWSA to store a larger pool of water and move us toward a better water supply.

Ms. Liz Palmer, Albemarle County resident: "I'm concerned about what is going to happen in the years in-between the dam construction and the raising of the level of the Ragged Mountain Dam and actually getting the pipeline in from the SFRR to the RMR. Is there going to be any attempt to fill the RMR with SHR water and are you going to increase the flow to the SHR? What is your intention with regards to that? Because I understand that there may be five-six years or more possibly."

Mr. Frederick replied that he wished he had a real easy simple answer to her question. Realistically, the way the Authority's system was configured today our options were limited. To the extent that there were options, RWSA would exercise them. For example, last fall it was very dry. Many citizens might not have realized because it was not made a public issue that the water supply storage pool in the SHR dropped below 80 percent. It actually bottomed out at 76 percent before it rained. RWSA staff had permission from the RWSA Board of Directors that when the pool level dropped below 80 percent it could cut off the 400,000 gallons per day release. Instead of exercising that "right," the Authority decided to model the ongoing conditions in the watershed in order to establish the probability as to whether or not all of the reservoirs would be refilled by April 1, 2006. The Authority found that the probability was in excess of 99 percent that RWSA could keep the downstream release and still refill all of the reservoirs. The Authority decided to keep the release going even though the pool level was below 80 percent.

Mr. Frederick then returned to the question of continuing to use the SFRR transfer to RMR. He stated that the unfortunate reality was that if there were a severe drought and the pool level at RMR was pulled down, RWSA had no other option but to refill from SHR until the new pipeline was built. The Authority still had the responsibility to this community to maintain an adequate water supply. Those issues would be balanced in an appropriate way. Where there were options, the citizens would see improvements over the way things were managed in the past. Mr. Frederick then summarized his answer by stating that the long-term answer to Ms. Palmer's concerns regarding the Moormans River would be to build the new pipeline.

Ms. Dede Smith, Charlottesville City resident: "I'm just wondering in determining the 50-year need, what was the population growth number that you were basing that on? How many people would it serve or how many gallons per day were estimated would be needed per person?"

Mr. Frederick asked Mr. Aaron Keno to address that question. Mr. Keno stated that it was estimated that it would provide 90 to 100 gallons per capita.

Follow-up question by Ms. Smith: "I'm still curious as to what growth projection number was used."

Mr. Frederick replied that although they had that information on file, it was not directly in front of them at this meeting. RWSA would provide that number to her after tonight's meeting.

Follow-up question from Ms. Smith: "Were the water demand projections available on the website?"

Ms DeWitt stated that the numbers and study could be accessed on RWSA's website. Mr. Frederick added that the projections could be found in the "Water Demand Study."

Mr. Mitch King, Albemarle County resident: "Mr. Frederick mentioned something about SHR. I put the pieces together, and it was not clear to me what's the plan ... you said the pipeline from the SHR to the RMR ... would not be replaced. What was the fate of the water in SHR and for that matter the reservoir after the pipeline is no longer used?"

Mr. Frederick answered that the pipeline between the SHR and the RMR would need to continue to operate until the new pipeline between the SFRR and RMR was built. Once the new pipeline was operational, the Authority did not plan to use the old pipeline and it would be abandoned.

Follow-up question by Mr. King: "What happens to the management of the SHR?"

Mr. Frederick replied that the Authority would still need the storage capacity of the SHR during severe drought conditions. In almost all cases, the SHR would stay full. When it was full, what came in from the top end would be essentially the same amount that went out, which mimicked the natural conditions in the Moormans River. The only exception would be in severe drought conditions when the storage in the SHR would need to be used. During the drought, RWSA would release water from the Sugar Hollow Dam into the Moormans River, which would actually augment the supply of the Moormans River during a drought. After the drought, the SHR would be allowed to refill at a calculated rate that maintained flow in the Moormans River. Those types of droughts have only occurred on record four or five times during the past 80 years. For a large percentage of the time, the Moorman River below the Sugar Hollow Dam would flow like it did under natural conditions.

Ms. DeWitt then stated that the meeting would now proceed to the public comment period. She again requested that the speakers introduce themselves and limit their comments to three minutes, as written comments could be submitted to RWSA after this meeting.

Mr. John Martin, Albemarle County resident; "I just want to say that I think that this plan is an outstanding plan that could serve as a model for other communities. Quite frankly, it makes me proud to say that I live here."

Ms. Tatyanna Patten, Charlottesville City resident and also representing the Rivanna Conservation Society: "I would like to thank RWSA for all the hard work that you put it in on this plan. We are very proud and need to see this move forward. It is something we have supported from the beginning. It would be most helpful to see it come to fruition. We thank you for all of your hard work."

Mr. Kevin Lynch, Charlottesville City resident: “Like the other two speakers, I think it’s a very solid plan and look forward to seeing it implemented. I do think there were a couple of opportunities and considerations that we would have going forward. 1.) On the issue of mitigation, I think it ought to be a great opportunity for this community to look at some of the areas, particularly in our urban area, of streams and wetlands that we have right in our community that we can improve as part of the mitigation strategy of Rivanna. I hope that that’s the tact that Rivanna will take. Building on the comments that Mr. King made earlier, I’m a little skeptical that improving or putting pristine streams that we have at Buck Mountain into conservation easements really accomplishes that much in terms of net environmental benefit. I think it will accomplish some things, and that’s positive. But where we get the real bang for both water quality and for the community’s enjoyment is when we look at some of the impaired streams and even the rivers that we have right here in the urban area. By that I mean Moores Creek, Meadow Creek, Rivanna River, and even parts of Powell’s Creek. All these creeks are pretty seriously impaired, and by working on them not only do we get our water quality in better shape but we also create some opportunities for residents in the urban area to enjoy some human habitat as well as the animal habitat. Finally, by cleaning up our urban water and making that water better, we are doing better for the communities that are downstream from us. We have to think about Fluvanna as well as ourselves. So for all of those reasons I think we should look to the urban area for remediation as much as possible. I’ve been talking to local landowners that own a lot of that stream. I am pretty confident that we could easily put half of that or 13,000 feet of stream into remediation if not all, and we can find that locally within the urban area, which is where all the ratepayers live. In answer to the gentlemen who asked how we were going to pay for it. Well we are, you are, the ratepayers. When you pay your water bill, you are going to pay for that.

“This gets me to my next point, which is about phasing. ... I applaud the idea that this could be done in phasing, as I think it makes a lot of sense because if we tried to accommodate the \$130 million with the rate right now, we’d probably be seeing a \$40 to \$50 increase on everybody’s water bill. There was some discussion when the Ragged Mountain was first mentioned as a potential opportunity; that the dam could be built to 15 feet originally at the base and that 15-foot extension could be built from the existing SHR. With some improvements to the Moormans River, we could keep it still at 15 feet and that would give us about another 15 years worth of water. Given the fact that we are already at 2018, I think that makes a lot of sense if you built that dam as soon as possible, but built it at 15 feet or 20 feet. That should be all we have to do for some time until we can analyze what our water supply and what our water usage really is. Is our demand going up as fast as we projected it was? I think that is to be determined as well as are there better sources, either conservation or supply. Thirty years down the road, if we need to, that’s when we should dig deeper into our pockets for that pipeline for finishing up the dam.”

Ms. Jerry McCormick-Ray, Albemarle County resident: “I want to add too that we greatly appreciate the efforts and the positive approaches that you are taking to protecting our watershed and our water for future usage. One of the things that I would like to add though besides just restoration would be prevention of errors in handling the landscape, because a lot of so much has happened because of errors of not considering the role that nature and the environment plays in protecting our water in our reservoirs and our streams. I hope that a great effort will go into preserving the forests that shade the water so it is not evaporated and that will stabilize the

hillsides and keep the sediment stable in those development areas that we have already designated growth areas so that we don't make mistakes that are going to create downstream problems for us for a long time in the future.

Mr. Steve Phipps, current Mayor of Scottsville: "We in town and also the southern part of the County want to thank you all for your diligence. We know it hasn't been easy at times with some of the public meetings, as Tom will attest to, but we thank you. We applaud your choice."

Mr. Matt Rosefsky, Charlottesville City resident and who also represented several groups: "First as Executive Director of Rivanna Conservation Society – On behalf of our staff, I want to thank RWSA for listening very closely to our community and working hard to make our preference become your choice.

"Secondly, I would like to speak as the Manager of Outdoor Venture Social Club and as a member of the Ivy Creek Foundation – As you know, Ragged Mountain natural area is a public park with a system of beautiful trails, wonderfully close to the center of Charlottesville. I have two questions. I don't know if these are clarifications from prior things and maybe I should have spoken earlier but anyhow ... Is the Ragged Mountain area large enough to still have beautiful hiking trails all the way around the reservoir after the dam is raised 45 feet? What is the plan to remediate the loss of hiking trails at the Ragged Mountain natural area?"

Mr. Frederick responded that as stated previously, the plan was that any trails that were lost as a result of raising the reservoir would be replaced. RWSA would like to be able to state the trails could go completely round the reservoir, but he could not honestly state that the Authority has worked that out. There was an issue related to an Interstate highway crossing through the area, which has not been resolved at this time. It was important to state that whether the trails form a complete loop or not, the trails that were lost would all be replaced in kind.

Mr. Bill Emory, Charlottesville City resident: "I just want to say thank you very much to RWSA. I am so proud to be a Charlottesville resident ... I just wanted to second Kevin's suggestions regarding wetlands and stream mitigation. Living in the east side of Charlottesville under Monticello's view shed, there was really quite a lot of land that should be the subject of that plan. Right now there was quite a lot of TMDL, Total Maximum Daily Load, from those barnyard animals. Goats ... They are real cute; I like goats. If we could go on ahead and just return that to a more natural state, I think that it would really help with the e-coli problems from the livestock in there and also we could get that into the required mitigation as well. Plus, it's so close to the home base for RWSA that it would be easy to make sure that everything was being kept in good order."

Mr. Bill Ross, Albemarle County resident: "The comment a minute ago prompted me to step up. The loss of the trails suggested to me that maybe some trail activity could be placed in the right-of-ways in the future pipeline. Now that may be long down the way, but has that been considered or is that feasible?"

Mr. Frederick replied that RWSA would welcome the opportunity to put on the table in appropriate areas along the pipeline the idea of advancing trails. What the Authority did not

want to do was to make that a specific requirement at this point, because he thought when they actually began acquiring right-of-ways it was important to listen to the property owners with an open mind. He would suggest that if RWSA encountered any places where there was a willingness to consider that kind of idea, the Authority would welcome further consideration of that matter. The Authority had already met with staff at both the City and the County about that issue. The pipeline itself would be in the County area, and discussions have been held with Mr. Dan Mahon on the Albemarle County Planning staff as to how that concept could be implemented. Mr. Frederick felt that agreements with property owners permitting the trails would probably need to be done on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Jeff Werner, Charlottesville City resident and who was with the Piedmont Environmental Council: “A quick kind of official statement I guess from the Piedmont Environmental Council. We applaud this decision, and we are just tickled to death with this solution in our local watershed. I think this is a real testament to the folks in this community that they got involved, all of you listened, were willing to work with us, and really embraced that. It has been a positive experience. I got to work with nine or ten organizations and with the Mayor of Scottsville and their group down there. Folks in Fluvanna got involved in this. Folks like John Martin and Liz Palmer who live in the Northwest part of the County focused on what was going on with the Moormans River. This has really brought a broad group of folks together. I’m proud to be involved with that. I wanted to let people know that Ridge Schuyler was here from The Nature Conservancy, and I know Ridge has been very involved in what’s going on with the stream monitoring and understanding some of the environmental impacts. I’ve actually been getting a lot of phone calls saying why aren’t you more involved in what they are going to do in mitigation. I said Ridge has got that covered, and he hasn’t called me with any concerns. Hats off to The Nature Conservancy as well, and I hope you get to know how much Ridge has been doing behind the scenes.

“All these various groups and individuals have a couple of things that I was asked to talk about. One was to encourage you all to continue to consider the maintenance dredging of the SFRR. I think that was critical. I still think there were sod farms that would want the dirt and have ways to actually make it actually financially beneficial. The second thing echoed what Bill said to consider the path of that pipeline between the SFRR and RMR for trails like paths. A third item ... I know that there is a small hydroelectric turbine in the South Fork Dam. Even if for no other reason than a demonstration project of sustainability, it would be great to incorporate that into both the new dam and to renovate the existing one and really show the world what this community can do.

“Finally, thank you for all of your hard work, Tom ... the engineers ... Mike, thanks for still being friends after all this emotion. Just wanted to assure all of you that if you need the environmental community as you proceed through this regulatory steps, we are ready to do whatever you need to be activists for this solution. We are here and ready to help.”

Mr. Neil Williamson, with the Free Enterprise Forum: “We want to be very clear that while the Free Enterprise Forum applauds the very public process in every possible manner in which this has progressed, we also wished to ask Rivanna to continue to focus on the 50-year solution. While there have been comments with regard to phasing, which I think are logical and made

sense, no one knows what is going to happen the further out the projection goes. This is a 50-year solution, and we should modify it as needed at 30 if necessary. As long as we solve the 50-year problem that has been identified, I think that this will be a success.”

Mr. John Via, Charlottesville City resident: “I’ve been watching this water situation ever since the late 1970’s early 80’s in what has been hundreds of thousands of dollars, and maybe millions of dollars in studies, and so forth. I’ll be a thorn in the side. Even though I know you guys have done a lot of great work, it is my personal opinion that if you had your personal opinion on the table it wouldn’t be this particular one. You are pleasing the so-called groups, which have gotten behind it trying to control growth and talking about the environmental impacts. Well, we had so many environmental impacts going to the James River, and where we had hardly anything that we can’t control in the 9-1/2 mile pipeline. I’m rather disappointed in the way it turned out, but it’s a workable solution for the short term. It seems like the short term was 15 years from now until we really have it going. Only a few years ago we were talking about having a chance to grow within the water system because of the drought, and they haven’t done anything since the Buck Mountain was purchased. Maybe we could get something going so that in my lifetime I won’t have to worry about it.”

Mr. Rick Parrish, Charlottesville City resident and on staff at the Environmental Law Center: “Wanted to add my voice to those who have expressed their appreciation for Tom and Mike and RWSA’s exercise of a sincere and credible public process. It’s really amazing to those of us who go through these processes time and again to have government officials actually listen. We do appreciate that very sincerely. I just want to describe one incident, which reinforces the determination to keep our future water supply local and at least somewhat under our control. Just about a year ago the City of Lynchburg’s sewage treatment plant had a bit of an accident. During that accident, they released almost a ton of chlorine gas into the air. Now, chlorine as everybody knows is a highly poisonous, highly toxic substance. Were that released into the water, we certainly wouldn’t want to be drinking anything downstream from that. Perhaps just as troubling as the fact that the accident occurred was that the City wastewater treatment plant officials failed to report that to the federal environmental officials, as they were required to do, for over 36 hours. For that, they were being fined over \$50,000 by the Environmental Protection Agency. I think the lesson there was simply that there was real legitimate reasons to keep our water supply local, and we certainly appreciate the fact that you are doing that.”

Ms. Laura Covert, Charlottesville City resident: “I also wanted to thank you for doing such a great job and for considering so much the environmental impacts of what is going on. I am very excited about some of the ideas of mitigating some of the streams within the City. The one thing that I haven’t heard anything about tonight and was very interested in as a resident of the Woolen Mills neighborhood was the other end of this whole process. By increasing our water supply by so many millions of gallons per day, the other end of that was the water treatment issue. Living on that end of the City and smelling that end of the City quite a bit, I’m very interested in knowing how these extra gallons of water get processed and how that ends up for not just my neighborhood but other neighborhoods with the offensive odor that would take place.”

Mr. Ridge Schuyler, Charlottesville City resident and also Director of the Piedmont Program for The Nature Conservancy in Virginia: “The Nature Conservancy was a global conservation

organization, and we have identified the Rivanna watershed as one of the last great places on earth and one of the finest piedmont river system left. We've been obviously very interested in this water supply plan because of the effect that a water supply plan could have on an aquatic community. We are extremely pleased with the solution that RWSA has selected. It is a rare circumstance that you can do a water supply plan and perhaps end up with a net benefit to the ecological community and that is what we may be facing here. As Tom has mentioned, by doing this alternative we are taking the stress off the headwaters of the system by not taking water out of the headwaters of the Moormans River, but instead taking water out from lower down in the watershed. That would restore the health of the Moormans River and the functioning of that river system, which I think is crucial, and would provide a net benefit to the community.

"I would also like to say that as a national conservation organization, we see water fights all the time and they can be incredibly nasty. In fact, water wars often turn into civil wars where neighbor is pitted against neighbor and the conservation community is pitted against the development community. This was not happening in this case, and I think that was because the RWSA replaced civil war with civil dialog and meetings just like this one that kept people in the loop and understanding what was happening. Much credit goes to RWSA for that. There was at the beginning of this process an idea that they had a preconceived alternative in mind, and they were just going to march toward it. I think the fact that they were open minded enough to select this alternative is proof that they were open to the thoughts of this community. In that way I think RWSA is a reflection of the entire Charlottesville-Albemarle community. It is an open-minded, thoughtful and mature community, and this decision reflects that kind of thoughtfulness."

As there were no further public comments, Ms. Dewitt thanked everyone who expressed their views and also thanked RWSA staff for all their work with this civil dialog. As previously mentioned by Mr. Frederick, she was here in September 2004 and it was great to see how far the plan has progressed since that time. She then turned the meeting over to Mr. Gaffney.

Mr. Gaffney thanked the citizens who attended tonight's meeting. He stated that it had been a long but successful process. He then especially thanked the RWSA staff for their hard work during the many months that have turned into years, following the community's wishes, and leading us to the current solution. He also thanked Ms. DeWitt for her excellent facilitation assistance, and thanked the elected officials and the Board members of both the ACSA and RWSA who were in attendance. He especially thanked the citizens of this community who have attended these public meetings on a regular basis and have given us their feedback, their concerns and sometimes very impassioned pleas to listen to all of the dialog and not have any particular focus. Just as was stated by Mr. Ridge Schuyler, the Authority did not have a desired alternative when the process began. Speaking for the Board, he stated that we now have the best alternative.

Mr. Gaffney next commented on the plan for mitigating the wetlands and the streams. He knew that this community would not stop at what RWSA would be including in this plan. This community would get behind a lot more stream and wetland mitigation in the years to come. He would like to focus on getting the water supply plan through the regulatory permitting process and then start tackling additional, more complex mitigation.

Mr. Gaffney then thanked RWSA's consultant, Gannett Fleming, who would be finalizing the engineering report within the next month and formally submitting it at the RWSA Board meeting and to the public on May 22, 2006. The Authority would encourage everyone's attendance at that meeting. The report would document the years of study in a format that met federal agency requirements. The Authority further anticipated that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, the Charlottesville City Council, and the Albemarle County Service Authority Board of Directors would act on the preferred alternative in June. RWSA was presently hoping to submit the federal and state Permit Applications before the July 4th holiday.

Mr. Gaffney further stated that the Authority continued to offer an opportunity to civic and community organizations to learn more about RWSA through the use of its speakers' bureau. The public was asked to contact Ms. Mary Knowles, who would schedule a time for one of the staff to deliver a report specific to your organization.

Mr. Gaffney added that RWSA would appreciate citizens taking a few minutes to complete a meeting evaluation form to let Rivanna know whether tonight's session had been worthwhile and how future meetings could better serve the community.

Mr. Gaffney next wished everyone a safe trip home and again thanked everyone for coming to this meeting.

2.0 Adjournment

Mr. Gaffney then formally adjourned the special meeting of the RWSA Board of Directors at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mr. Robert Tucker
Secretary - Treasurer