

Bob Tucker

From: Tom Frederick [tfrederick@rivanna.org]
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2008 11:00 AM
To: 'O'Connell, Gary'; 'Mueller, Judy'
Cc: Gary Fern; Michael Gaffney ; Bob Tucker; Bob Wichser; Jennifer Whitaker
Subject: RE: Dam

"If" the community had discovered that its long-term water supply plan were something different from Ragged Mountain, there are ways to repair the existing dams at the current reservoir height to comply with dam safety. The water group continues to refer to a study several years old (performed in 2003 when RWSA and the community were heading toward crest gates at SFRR) that presented some options, the lowest in cost of which was estimated at a *construction cost* of about \$3 million (note that *construction costs* are less than *total project costs with contingencies*). Given inflation in the construction industry since that report was published, and adding the costs of engineering, financing, etc. along with contingency to form a total budgeted cost, we would expect that option now to be in the range of \$6 million to \$7 million as a preliminary estimate of *total project cost*.

Since the community (and the regulators) did select expanding Ragged Mountain for the future water supply, and has taken steps to permit and design that plan, there are now other significant disadvantages to going back to a plan to repair the old dams, including:

- (1) The proposed plan to raise the RM Reservoir up to 45 feet requires a new dam; the existing dams can not structurally support this plan. Further, it is proposed that the old dams be breached when the new dam is completed. Why would we want to put \$6 to \$7 million into structures that we plan to breach?
- (2) To go back now to a plan to repair the old dams, we would have to develop new environmental studies and a new permit application through public input because the old dam repair project would have its own stream and wetland impacts. That means a new permit application to DEQ and the Corps, and because of the time required for these permits, it means we miss the 2011 deadline with Virginia Dam Safety. Missing the deadline could put us at the mercy of the Virginia Soil & Water Conservation Board (citizen board that directs DCR and Dam Safety) who could choose to take enforcement actions against us.

Our staff have been communicating with Dam Safety staff on the progress of the design of the new dam, but not regarding the water group's proposal.

There will be an agenda item under Other Business for the June 23 RWSA Board to address the recent Council and BoS resolutions to study maintenance dredging. As of this morning, this is still a work in progress, and I am very open to comments or ideas.

From: O'Connell, Gary [mailto:oconnell@charlottesville.org]
Sent: Sunday, June 15, 2008 9:46 PM
To: tfrederick@rivanna.org; Mueller, Judy
Cc: O'Connell, Gary
Subject: Dam

I heard from Council that the water group now is directed at challenging the need to replace the dam....that a \$3 million repair will take care of it ??

Is there any document that would allow a repair versus a replacement?
What would be the basis for what they saying ?

Have our consultants and lawyer discussed our status with the state dam safety staff recently? We need to be focused on that now

Also is a "copy" resolution on Water on our agenda for next week's board meeting - to follow city and county ?

Gary O'Connell
City Manager
City of Charlottesville , Virginia
434-970-3101
www.charlottesville.org
A World Class City

7/15/2008