

Brown, Craig

From: O'Connell, Gary
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2007 3:30 PM
To: 'Mike Gaffney'; 'tfrederick@rivanna.org'
Cc: 'Gary Fern'; Mueller, Judy; 'Robert W. Tucker Jr.'
Subject: RE: City Council Meeting

All

I don't believe Council changing course, contrary to what you may have heard last night. Much of last night was Mr. Lynch's opinion, who as you know leaves Council Dec. 31. No Council action, nor direction came last night to change course. And no action is scheduled in December. Don't be surprised if Mr. Lynch does not bring it up again, either while on Council, or as he returns to his citizen role.

I have meetings to confirm my view. One I may need Tom to come, but need to have a discussion first.

Mike is right, the cost share is asap "paramount", as is the compensation for city land at ragged mountain. I think we need to look for ways to keeping informing the broader public, and providing information. We need to keep moving this forward.

Gary

Gary O'Connell
 City Manager
 City of Charlottesville
 Charlottesville, Virginia
 434-970-3101
www.charlottesville.org
 The Best Place to Live in America!

From: Mike Gaffney [mailto:Mike@gaffneyhomes.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2007 10:48 AM
To: tfrederick@rivanna.org; O'Connell, Gary
Cc: Gary Fern; Mueller, Judy; Robert W. Tucker Jr.
Subject: RE: City Council Meeting

Tom,

I think you need to meet with Gary and Judy or me with each of the City councilors. I know rehashing the last four years history of the community Water Supply Plan from the drought up until the present over and over might be painful but it's probably the only way to have them get historical perspective. (The noise last night is to be expected in any endeavor that smacks of progress and growth.)

Costshare agreement is paramount and setting a value for the land that will be under water is very important, too. These will take time and much negotiation. Thank godness the RSWA costshare is almost over for a couple of years.

Mike

From: Tom Frederick [mailto:tfrederick@rivanna.org]
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2007 8:32 AM
To: Gary B. O'Connell
Cc: Gary Fern; Judith M. Mueller; Mike Gaffney; Robert W. Tucker Jr.

Subject: City Council Meeting

I appreciate the chance to come and present the discussion of water supply issues to the City Council before their public hearing. I hope that I was able to present the Rivanna Board's decisions in the best light possible under the circumstances.

The way the hearing was structured, with my presentation followed by Q&A from Councilors, then the public hearing, then Council comments, there was no opportunity for me to answer any questions after the public hearing. However, there were a couple of things discussed after I spoke that really need further clarification.

- (1) One Councilor, reacting to Joe Mooney's suggestion that Steve Murray (Panorama Farms) was eager to receive dredged spoil and had an innovative idea to place spoil "on top of pipes", stated publicly that Rivanna staff did not do due diligence by failing to talk with Mr. Murray during our study of dredging. The reality that I was not able to clarify last night is that we did talk to Mr. Murray. I and two other Rivanna staff spent a half day in the fall of 2004 walking the farm with Mr. Murray looking at where spoil could be placed. Mr. Murray made it clear to us at that time that the only places on the farm where he would willingly allow spoil were in several wooded ravines with spring-fed small creeks. Filling in those ravines would require running a culvert the length of the ravine to carry creek flow and would require felling a significant number of trees. We told Mr. Murray at the site that it would not be possible for us to get the Army Corps of Engineers to approve piping the creeks, and filling in ravines with dredged spoil could create difficulties in preventing the spoil from eroding from steep slopes back into the reservoir. During our walk we identified a few plateau areas where we felt spoil could be successfully placed, and Mr. Murray made clear all of those areas were off limits.
- (2) Another Councilor mentioned that in 2002 less than one-third of the water storage was ever used. We have checked our records and in September 2002 available combined useable storage of the urban supply reservoirs reached 51%.

After the public hearing, I reviewed my notes and identified four "big" issues as follows:

- (1) A desire to get another opinion on the cost of dredging
- (2) A desire to know the results of the City-ACSA cost share agreement asap
- (3) A desire for RWSA to compensate City for land at Ragged Mountain
- (4) A desire for "better" public access of water supply information

I'm open to ideas from any Board Member on the best way to proceed from here.