

**South Fork Rivanna Reservoir Stewardship Task Force
DRAFT Minutes of Task Force Members Meeting
November 19, 2008**

A meeting of the members of the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir (SFRR) Stewardship Task Force was held on Monday, November 19, 2008, at 6:00 p.m. in Room 241 of the Albemarle County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA.

SFRR Stewardship Task Force Members Present: Ms. Holly Edwards ó Charlottesville City Council, Mr. Mark Fletcher ó citizen from University of Virginia (UVA) representing recreational interests on the SFRR, Mr. Michael Gaffney ó Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority Board of Directors, Mr. Thomas Jones ó citizen representing property owners along SFRR, Ms. Karen Joyner ó Ivy Creek Foundation, Mr. Chris Lee ó Charlottesville Regional Chamber of Commerce, Mr. John Martin ó Rivanna River Basin Commission, Ms. Wren Olivier ó Sierra Club, Dr. Liz Palmer ó Albemarle County Service Authority Board of Directors, Mr. Ridge Schuyler ó The Nature Conservancy, Ms. Dede Smith ó Citizens for Sustainable Water Supply, and Ms. Sally Thomas ó Chair, member of the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors and representing the League of Women Voters.

SFRR Stewardship Task Force Members Absent: None

Also Present: Ms. Tamara Ambler ó RWSA Water Resources Manager, Mr. Tom Frederick ó RWSA Executive Director, Dr. Robert Wichser ó RWSA Water & Wastewater Director, members of the public, and media representatives.

1.0 Call to Order

The meeting of the SFRR Stewardship Task Force was called to order by Ms. Thomas on Monday, November 19, 2008 at 6:00 p.m.

2.0 Schedule of Meetings

After some discussion, task force members agreed to meet again on Monday, December 8th at 7:00 p.m., and on Thursday, December 18th at 6:00 p.m..

3.0 PowerPoint Presentation

Ms. Thomas said that she organized the presentation based on the charge given from the four chairs, stating that she shortened the charge to “establish a timeline for the reservoir that follows its present course.” She noted that the group has now received Greg Harper’s aerial photographs, Stephen Bowler’s report, and Bob Wichser’s discussion of water treatment.

Ms. Smith noted that "river-like state" would be a dammed river, not a natural river. She also said that this presentation includes data that has not been talked about at the task force meetings.

Ms. Thomas responded that she has incorporated Mr. Schuyler's modeling information.

Ms. Smith said that there are quite a few slides that reflect new information and she found it "very disconcerting" that this doesn't sound like a report from the task force, but instead seems like a report from someone else.

Mr. Jones commented that he is a little concerned about the process, as it seems there are two aspects to the report back to the charging bodies – a discussion of what the task force has heard and concluded, and recommendations. He said that some of the reporting bears on the recommendations, and some is just background information. "I'd like to make sure there's a healthy discussion of the recommendations themselves, the conclusions..."

Ms. Thomas said that she'd like to not get too focused on words, but hopefully come to some consensus on the concepts. She also stated that it might be helpful to follow Mr. Jones's suggestions regarding establishing some recommendations.

Mr. Fletcher commented that he has had a chance to read through the slides, but hasn't had time to see what's in them compared to what's presented here. "I'm trying to think about the end product and how – if I [were] one of the four board chairs – if this is what we wanted to see, how we would develop from that." He added that the group should also project how it needs to look two, four, six years from now, and they should include references to those who have presented to the task force.

Ms. Thomas replied, "This is a discussion piece."

Mr. Schuyler suggested that they include the minutes as an appendix, to have it all self contained.

Ms. Thomas added that the timeline of no maintenance shows impacts on several different things: ecology, recreation, access, etc.

Ms. Smith reiterated that some of the information included here seemed "kind of random."

Other task force members indicated that a lot of the information was revealed in presentations by Greg Harper and others.

Mr. Schuyler said that to be helpful to the Board chairs, it would be prudent for the task force to verify the facts that are included with the goal of providing a full report to them. "We're not prohibited from getting more information, we're just trying to capture what we know [and fill gaps]."

Mr. Fletcher pointed out that at the last meeting, they did hear specific information about the presence of trees at Ivy Creek and the resulting loss of capacity.

Mr. Jones said that most of the changes that are occurring are not seen by the public as they have not been to the reservoir, but clearly the changes are seen by fishermen, rowers, neighbors, and in some cases by those who cross bridges.

Dr. Palmer stated that it might be advisable to take the position that people need to be aware, as it doesn't really matter whether or not people have seen the degradation first hand.

Ms. Smith asked if aluminum sulfate should be mentioned as that's the major chemical used in water treatment ó the difference between Observatory and South Fork.

Ms. Thomas responded that citizens didn't mention that.

Mr. Lee said that in terms of a "more pristine" water source, it has been indicated that there is no impact on water quality by dredging, and that is the task force's second charge to address.

Dr. Palmer commented that that's another example of something that could be interpreted in two different ways, as this is comparing the water at the South Fork Rivanna to that at Ragged Mountain, rather than water quality improvement at South Fork if dredging is done.

Ms. Thomas that they have received much citizen input, both through the written surveys and through public hearings.

Ms. Smith noted that some of that input was "pretty dramatic," and should be "fleshed out" in this report.

Ms. Thomas said that water is pumped up to the water treatment plant, and is pumped again through one of four pumps to get it into the distribution system. She asked Mr. Schuyler to explain the "20-day" reference related to pumping.

Mr. Schuyler explained that he asked the modeler of Hydrologics to provide some sense as to how often a pipeline connecting the South Fork to Ragged Mountain would have to operate to fill up "that bowl." He said that based on current operating rules ó where the South Fork is drawn down first ó the number on average that the pipeline would operate is fewer than 20 days per year because the "bowl" is not being drawn down very far when there isn't a drought. Mr. Schuyler added that there are days when following the drought you need to refill the bucket, and the worst-case scenario of back-to-back droughts, pumping would need to happen about 140 days to fill the "bowl back up."

Mr. Jones asked from where the water is coming.

Mr. Schuyler replied that the majority of the water would come from where it comes from now, where you have a run of the river intake at the South Fork which supplies the water most of the time for the city.

Mr. Jones said that he thought they were only going to pump out of South Fork when water was [inaudible].

Mr. Schuyler said that the pipeline being discussed here fills up Ragged Mountain, and there is a whole separate set of pipelines that provide water on a usual day, when most of that water comes from the South Fork. He explained that the separate set of pipelines would continue even with the new water supply plan; the South Fork essentially serves as both a water storage facility and as the supply of water for normal purposes like drinking. Mr. Schuyler said that the South Fork as a supply would continue as a main source of water for the community, but that is different than its use as a storage facility, with capacity being continuously reduced over time due to sedimentation. "The idea is to build a storage facility that doesn't fill up with sediment which is Ragged Mountain and so there are two separate questions here. Where do you get your regular supply of water, and where do you store water for use during times of drought." He emphasized that the pipeline is designed to fill that reservoir for use during times of drought, but it could be decided to use Ragged Mountain and not draw down South Fork as much.

He explained that right now the three reservoirs used to fill up the "bowl" are Sugar Hollow, Ragged Mountain, and South Fork; it was observed in August that South Fork can be greatly impacted and with the new plan Ragged Mountain will be drawn down in times of drought because it has more water in it. "One question is where should our storage be, and the next question is how you should fill up that storage." He added that the water supply plan indicates that the source of storage should be Ragged Mountain because it holds enough water to meet needs and doesn't fill with sediment; the pipeline fills the storage facility.

Mr. Fletcher commented that means the South Fork is always part of the water supply plan.

Task force members agreed, and Mr. Schuyler said that it is the main source of the water most of the time.

Mr. Fletcher said that the question then is where water is stored.

Dr. Palmer responded, "We are just moving the storage facility."

Mr. Schuyler said that the South Fork is the bigger drainage area, so it makes sense most of the time to take advantage of all that water and use it to supply the city with water. But, he added, when that flow subsides and the community has to rely on storage, the storage facility is over at Ragged Mountain because it doesn't fill up with sediment and is a big enough "bowl" to meet water supply needs.

Ms. Olivier commented that if the South Fork Rivanna was taken care of, it could serve that purpose.

Mr. Schuyler replied, "It's not big enough."

Ms. Olivier said that if the community were expanding at a sustainable rate it might be big enough.

Mr. Martin asked if perhaps her suggested strategy is to build a smaller water supply to discourage growth.

Ms. Olivier responded that she did not mean to imply that.

Dr. Palmer said that this task force has never really discussed the water supply plan.

Mr. Martin stated that during a severe drought there are two ways the water is drawn down by the Observatory Hill treatment plant, and perhaps sending water back down the pipeline to the South Fork Rivanna Treatment Plant. "It's a two-way pipe" and that's part of the absolute beauty of that concept."

Dr. Palmer said that the community is incredibly lucky to have a natural bowl like Ragged Mountain, and it is a "perfect storage facility."

Ms. Smith asked about the process of filling that "bowl."

Mr. Schuyler said that initially it would fill via the existing 81-year-old pipeline from Sugar Hollow.

Mr. Martin added that as it fills the in-stream flow to the Moormans River will have to increase as well, as the release is 0.4 million gallons per day into the Moormans until the reservoir reaches the 1/3-full level; then the in-stream flow ramps up to 1 mgd; at 2/3 it's 2 mgd.

Ms. Smith commented that if the pipeline is never built Ragged Mountain could fill up from Sugar Hollow.

Mr. Schuyler responded that as demand increases, it can't fill it up fast enough to counter back-to-back droughts. He said that the plan is to slow the amount of flow into Ragged Mountain so the benefits of that water can be shared with the Moormans River to try to restore its health. "You'd get it filled a third as quickly as possible, and then you'd fill the remaining two-thirds more slowly because that remaining two-thirds is not necessary right now."

Dr. Palmer also added that the 81-year-old line from Sugar Hollow "is not the best thing for this community to be relying on right now."

Ms. Smith said that expanded capacity of South Fork would back up the supply from Sugar Hollow and perhaps that would negate the need for a new pipeline.

Dr. Palmer said, "We have to have a pipeline built. It's either going to be a line from the Moormans River, it's going to be a line from the South Fork River, or it's going to be a line from the James River."

Ms. Olivier stated that water conservation is never talked about, but other task force members strongly disagreed.

Mr. Martin said that water consumption declined considerably during the last drought, but Ms. Olivier discounted publicity as a reason for that.

Mr. Martin said that water conservation and water supply planning have been talked about a great deal over the last ten years or so.

Ms. Thomas emphasized that this group can't rewrite the water supply plan, but it is a good and relevant point as to whether the goal should be greater than 5% conservation and 12% drought management. "I think it's certainly something we can put on as an addendum that reminds everybody of the value of water conservation."

Ms. Smith noted that the figure used should be about a billion gallons from the South Fork because the 600 million that will be lost without dredging needs to be considered. "I would like it to recognize that to dredge and to continue to dredge the South Fork would buy you a billion gallons."

Mr. Jones asked for clarification of the "Impact on Water Storage" slide title.

Ms. Thomas explained that the reference is to the impact and expected life cycle of the reservoir.

Ms. Smith added, "So we've lost 400 million gallons, and we will lose another 600 million out of the South Fork if we do nothing."

Mr. Schuyler said that the previous slide says the original useable storage of 1,250 million gallons (MG) would drop down to 200 MG, with a loss of a billion gallons of storage if sedimentation continues as anticipated.

Ms. Smith said that 1/3 of the water being stored at Ragged Mountain is to compensate for the future loss of water at South Fork. She also said that it needs to be clarified that this is background information, not in presentations at these meetings.

Mr. Schuyler responded that this was in the dredging report.

Mr. Jones commented that he is uncomfortable having a task force conclusion be based on information not formally presented to them at their meetings.

Dr. Palmer said that the reference could be made to the Gannett Fleming study.

Mr. Schuyler noted that the charge includes language related to using expert materials and facts.

Mr. Fletcher said the task force's work is the recommendations, and this information is background material that everybody has had the opportunity to review.

Mr. Jones emphasized that he just wants to make sure that there is differentiation made between receiving information and having a discussion about specific pieces of it.

Ms. Joyner commented that there may have been time to discuss the information, but the political tension and public attention to the issues sort of sidetracked the process. She suggested that there should be a session on this to make sure all the facts are understood.

Ms. Smith reiterated that it's important to state that it's not only 400 million gallons lost without dredging, it's 1 billion.

Mr. Fletcher stated that it's fair in the recommendations to suggest that "based on the charge" there was a lack of the opportunity for this group to discuss the water supply plan and all options. "The charge wasn't to do that."

Ms. Thomas responded that there needs to be recognition that there were facts presented to the task force.

Dr. Palmer commented that it's nice to have this information in the report because it speaks to why dredging is needed, how much needs to be taken out, etc., and this gives an idea of quantity to be removed, disposal processes and associated costs.

Mr. Schuyler emphasized that the task force is charged with answering the questions asked by the "four chairs," and the task force was not asked whether dredging should occur for the purpose of increasing water supply capacity "because that decision was made." He added that doesn't mean that expanding capacity for other reasons isn't a by-product of what the group determines. "We can certainly say back to them that would be the effect of maintenance on the water supply; if we were to keep sediment out than that's found capacity."

Mr. Lee commented that the information states that dredging now could provide 400 million gallons and dredging in the future would have to be done to maintain storage capacity.

Mr. Schuyler said that if 100 million gallons could be "found," then perhaps the water supply plan could be altered to reflect that "such as lowering the height of the dam."

Ms. Smith commented that a study would address some of those questions.

Mr. Schuyler said that the point is to get factual information back to the decision-makers, and if there is a question about the validity of the information, then that should be addressed by this group. "If it is factual then I think we ought to send it to them."

Mr. Jones said that it could be noted in the report that certain pieces were not discussed by the Task Force, and Gannett Fleming's recommendations should be referenced.

Dr. Palmer mentioned that she is not aware of concern about numbers put forward about how much to dredge to restore original capacity, but the question is how to dispose of it and the cost of that.

Mr. Jones acknowledged that he may be just subconsciously trying to resolve whether the dredging is going to happen or not, and he's "less uncomfortable" with the information provided on the rate of siltation at about 1% per year. He said he doesn't have any basis to validate the information presented on projected storage capacity, adding that the 20 days per year for pumping figure Mr. Schuyler presented does surprise him. "I was always assuming that the source of the water supply was going to be Ragged Mountain and the reason for having the dam there was to provide a suction point to fill up [the reservoir]."

Dr. Palmer said that the 20 days surprised her as well, as she thought it would be two to three months per year. She stated further that one of the beauties of having that suggested height of the dam is that in the year 2055, there would be adequate stream flows in the river below the South Fork dam. "The height of the dam was designed to provide those stream flows."

Mr. Jones asked if the South Fork would be a reservoir.

Mr. Schuyler replied that it would be a supply and a reservoir.

Mr. Jones said that it's hard for him to imagine a 250-million gallon reservoir could supply the water.

Mr. Schuyler responded that you're not drawing out of the reservoir, you're drawing out of the river.

Mr. Martin explained that if it's not flowing over the top of the dam, water is going to the hydroplant. "There is abundant flow; it is a valuable water supply."

Mr. Schuyler said that the South Fork River is a supply of water during normal times, but when you hit a drought, you're looking at the South Fork River Reservoir as well as other reservoirs as a storage facility. He stated that what's happening with the water supply plan is shifting storage but not shifting supply, so even when the South Fork is down to a 200-million gallon per day storage facility, it's still supplying 96% of the water that most people drink most of the time. Mr. Schuyler reiterated that it's only when the

drought hits that “you turn to your reservoir and start drawing that down, and you’re shifting the storage” proportion to smaller in the South Fork and bigger in the Ragged Mountain. He added that the question for Mr. Frederick is how to manage the balance of the reservoirs.

Dr. Palmer said that right now Observatory Hill must be used but those pipes are old and brittle and trying to get water from the South Fork into the city could damage those pipes, as it would require extremely high pressure. “O Hill is definitely not going to be shut down, it’s going to be enlarged.”

Mr. Schuyler said that water could be drawn down for 40 days and filled up in a two-day transfer. “The number of days it’s being transferred is not the same as the days it’s being used” .current operating rules were factored in.” He added that it doesn’t have to be operated that way, and if the policy were to keep South Fork full all the time, then perhaps Ragged Mountain would be drawn down more often. Mr. Schuyler said under the current operating rules, you draw down for 20 days.

Dr. Palmer added that the pipeline from South Fork to Ragged Mountain provides a lot more flexibility, especially during drought, because flow can go both ways.

Ms. Smith noted that there would be [inaudible] gallons per year that would be transferred from the South Fork to Ragged Mountain, according to the model.

Mr. Schuyler said that it could be less depending on the process for transfer.

Mr. Martin stated that this group’s starting assumption should be that given the approved water supply plan, dredging does not have to happen in order to meet water supply plans for 2055. “That’s a fact we should assume for purposes of our plan.” He added that the question should be “given that fact” is “do we want to dredge anyway and why.”

Ms. Thomas said that she thinks it’s a very important discussion to have, as there is a lot of effort put into the water supply remaining in the county and the Rivanna will remain the water supply under this plan. “It will continue to be a very important river.”

Ms. Thomas presented a slide with expected outcomes of initiatives relative to community expectations starting with doing nothing and including other maintenance initiatives “such as dredging” “incorporating some of the information from Chris Gibson last week.

Ms. Smith emphasized that she would like to have it include that continued dredging and maintenance dredging yields another 600 million gallons.

Ms. Thomas commented that the aspects of dredging that vary the greatest is what you do with the dredged spoils, how expensive that process is, and how far away the disposal sites are.

Ms. Smith suggested that the issues Ms. Thomas just raised should be framed as part of what would be determined from a study.

Ms. Thomas reported that she did ask one of the local firms interested in dredging if they had an idea of how to get it into Ivy Creek and they didn't, but indicated that perhaps they could use the same access point as fishermen do now. She added that the information the task force has received about what would be needed for a staging site might negate that as a possibility.

Ms. Smith mentioned that the original dam design includes the stipulation of land being clear-cut and grubbed, and Kevin Lynch provided her with that information.

Ms. Thomas said that the information people have been looking for and haven't been able to find. She noted that with Lake Monticello, grubbing was not done because it was determined that was important fish habitat.

Ms. Smith commented that she thinks the city may have the information Mr. Lynch provided.

Mr. Fletcher said that there was information presented on the difference between design and as-built.

Mr. Schuyler indicated that the original dam design would be helpful, as it would also include topographical maps.

Ms. Thomas stated that it was her understanding the RWSA didn't have original contour information.

Mr. Frederick said that he would check with Jennifer Whitaker at the RWSA, as he has not personally reviewed those files.

Ms. Thomas presented information on two ways to catch future sediment, including a fore-bay plan which comes from a written answer from the RWSA and the catchment hold plan that was generated by Gahagan & Bryant suggesting an area can be dredged deeper than the original contour, providing an area that can be dredged repeatedly in the future. She added that under that scenario, provided such a hole is feasible, there would need to be a continuing commitment to dredge the hole.

Ms. Thomas presented information on other maintenance options, such as reducing upstream source of sediment or a recommendation of the Rivanna River Basin Commission Technical Advisory Committee.

Ms. Smith mentioned that has also been a goal of the Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District, and they have offered via letter their services to help in this regard. She noted that there were two attachments with that letter, and she agreed to share them with Ms. Thomas.

Ms. Thomas mentioned that there are many people in the community working hard on preserving streams, and a slide she is presenting reflected participation by the many agencies, including the RWSA, Stream Watch, The Nature Conservancy, the Rivanna Conservation Society, Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission, the Thomas Jefferson Soil & Water Conservation District, and Albemarle County staff.

Mr. Frederick suggested adding the City of Charlottesville to that list.

Ms. Edwards said that discussions of the water supply should include a focus on the health of the river and restoration to a natural flow.

Ms. Thomas mentioned that dams out west are being moved in an effort to get salmon back, noting that the Sandy River returned to its natural state just two years after a dam was removed.

Mr. Schuyler explained that in that case, there was a dam on a river about the size of Rivanna that was removed to re-establish salmon fish passage. He said that they took the dam down without first dredging silt behind the dam and "hoped for the best." Mr. Schuyler stated that those involved with that project were amazed at how quickly the river absorbed the sediment downstream.

Ms. Thomas mentioned that the Sandy River river was flowing into the Columbia River, and then into the Pacific.

Ms. Smith asked that if dredging needs to be done prior to removing the dam.

Mr. Schuyler said that removing a dam drops the level of the river, so the possibility of resulting erosion would need to be evaluated.

Mr. Jones indicated that he had understood that turbidity was not a serious concern with dredging, and leaving the impression with the public that dredging would negatively impact water quality would not be consistent with what he has heard.

Ms. Thomas noted that last week Bob Wichser mentioned concern about plumes from the pipes.

Mr. Schuyler suggested that the language should indicate that a negative effect is "unlikely."

Dr. Palmer said that she heard something different last week, and perhaps that needs a fact check.

Mr. Jones mentioned that one of the conclusions was that with a big storm event you get sudden increases in turbidity.

Ms. Thomas said that she would put that under the category of "unlikely," but it should be fact-checked.

Mr. Fletcher said that there hasn't been much discussion about the impact of hydrilla on water treatment as far as the quantity of chemicals being used, clogging in filters, etc., because the hydrilla doesn't always stay in one place.

Dr. Palmer asked about how wide it would need to be for two boats to pass at Rea's Ford.

Mr. Jones replied that the width would probably need to be at least 50 feet.

Ms. Thomas mentioned that hydrilla has been found to grow as deep as 15 feet, definitely at least 10 feet.

Regarding the "why dredge" question, Mr. Jones said that the slide provides valuable information, but none of the task force members have suggested that a valid reason to dredge was to go into the fill-producing business. He added that no one has said that the reason to dredge is providing the fill for the airport.

Ms. Thomas responded that in casual conversations she has had with people, the airport has been mentioned.

Dr. Palmer agreed that references have been made to the airport, and it has been viewed by some as a great opportunity.

Mr. Lee asked if there is any potential that the dredging for fill could be a commercial enterprise.

Task force members responded that it would depend on the quality of the material, and an in-depth study would help determine that.

Ms. Thomas reported that in the written comments, it came out that it is symbolic for communities to care for infrastructure.

Mr. Jones said that he didn't care for the word symbolic, and Mr. Schuyler suggested using emblematic instead.

Ms. Thomas commented that it is a major problem in this community that we have let our infrastructure deteriorate.

Ms. Joyner said that this isn't something to be pinned solely on the SFRR Task Force.

Ms. Thomas responded that it's fair to ask what piece of infrastructure most needs to be taken care of.

Dr. Palmer stated that the question of what happens to the reservoir without maintenance needs to be answered, and the infrastructure maintained to preserve water storage needs to be prioritized.

Ms. Smith said that she objects a little bit to editorializing, and said that the task force needs to be straightforward in their recommendations.

Dr. Palmer responded that infrastructure either needs to be replaced or abandoned.

Mr. Schuyler stated that he is uncomfortable stating priorities to decision-makers, but what does need to be said is here is one infrastructure that needs attention. "It is one of many infrastructure needs."

Dr. Palmer said that 50% of the water supply plan is replacing aging infrastructure.

Mr. Jones said that he didn't really want to include all of these examples, as they weren't discussed at task force meetings.

Mr. Schuyler emphasized that people did say they want to maintain infrastructure, but how that's presented to decision-makers is "a little bit dicey."

Ms. Joyner suggested that perhaps what could be said is that the community has indicated they do care about sustainability.

Ms. Thomas presented a concern that has been a focus of Mr. Rooker's protecting the water supply from an I-64 accident or another disaster at Ragged Mountain by having larger storage area at SFRR.

Ms. Thomas mentioned that Mr. Lee had expressed concern about dam failure with additional sediment build-up.

Mr. Lee clarified that pressure from water is more severe than that of sediment. He said that building up sediment would actually reduce the water pressure on a dam. Mr. Lee explained that as heavy sediment is washed down it builds on itself whereas the same amount of water just increases pressure. "Even though rock weighs more than water, when it's stacked it does not exert more horizontal pressure."

Mr. Jones commented that this slide does not constitute a reason to dredge.

Ms. Thomas said that certainly is an idea that has been raised by public.

Mr. Jones said that he would rather say that the task force found no evidence that this happens, rather than say "here's the reason to do it" and "here's an opposing opinion." He added that perhaps there should be a section that dispels some of the "myths" surrounding what will happen if dredging is not done.

Ms. Thomas noted that they had been meeting for two hours and had not gotten through all of the slides.

Mr. Jones distributed a page that he had compiled of "suggested recommendations," which included a recommendation to proceed with a comprehensive professional study of dredging along the lines suggested by Gahagan & Bryant. He emphasized that the question that they have deemed critically important to be answered is why dredge. Mr. Jones noted that Gannett Fleming seemed to have assumed worst-case estimates. He added that part of the reason for doing this study now is there clearly are uncertainties about the ultimate cost of the Ragged Mountain plan.

Mr. Jones said, "I don't make a statement that that's due to any incompetence or malfeasance or errors on anybody's part. I think that just comes with the territory of engineering studies." He added that every engineering project he's been involved in has had surprises, new data, permitting uncertainties etc., that impact dollars or schedule, or both.

Ms. Edwards presented a sample of sludge from the reservoir, and asked if anyone would like to visit the landfill.

Several task force members indicated their interest in going.

Ms. Smith asked if the next meeting could include some time for survey responses.

Ms. Thomas agreed, adding that it needs to be noted that it was not a scientifically valid survey.

Mr. Jones responded that it isn't statistically representative, but responses still could be summarized.

Ms. Smith mentioned that another issue the group hasn't discussed in-depth is a proposal from Blue Ridge Sand, noting that Mitch King of that company would be willing to come in and present to the task force.

Mr. Schuyler asked how the group should proceed with the slides presented today.

Ms. Thomas responded that task force members should continue to look at the slides and provide input, and this would serve as the basic outline for their report.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m.