

**Planning and Coordination Council Quarterly Meeting (PACC)
November 20, 2008, 3 PM, Byrd Morris Seminar Room
U.Va. Harrison Institute/Small Special Collections Library**

Attendees: Robert Tucker Jr., Dennis S. Rooker, Kenneth C. Boyd, Dave Norris, Gary O'Connell, Leonard Sandridge, Colette Sheehy.

Also in attendance: Sally Thomas, South Fork Rivanna River Reservoir Task Force; Julia Monteith, University of Virginia Office of the Architect; Chris Gensic, City of Charlottesville; David Benish, County of Albemarle.

Call to order – Leonard Sandridge, Chair
Meeting called to order at 3:00 p.m.

May 1 Meeting Minutes approved unanimously.

Mr. Sandridge moved forward with the first agenda item:

1. South Fork Rivanna River Reservoir Stewardship Task Force Update

Sally Thomas gave an overview of the South Fork Rivanna River Reservoir and an update on the stewardship task force, which she said began meeting in August 2008.

Ms. Thomas commenced by showing the names and affiliations of the task force members appointed by the chair of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority, the chair of the Albemarle County Service Authority, chair of the Board of Supervisors and the mayor. (For the complete list of members, see attachment 1). She described and showed pictures of the South Fork Reservoir and provided facts about the dam including construction date, location, current urban water supply storage and characteristics of the hydro-plant.

Ms. Thomas said the task force's charge includes establishing a timeline for the reservoir, studying the effects of the current long-range water supply plan on aesthetics, recreation, ecology, water supply and quality as well as suggesting studies and possible maintenance steps.

She explained that the amount of water in the reservoir is a direct result of the amount of rain that falls within the **watershed**, which results in an average of 209 thousand million gallons of water a year. If the reservoir continues receiving this amount of water **and the sediment that it brings with it**, it will become a narrower, river-like body of water. She showed a slide which illustrates the areas of sediment that have accumulated since 1974 and gave projections for 2057 highlighting a significant increase of sediment in the area near Panorama Farm.

Ms. Thomas said that the water supply **with treatment** is currently high quality, drinkable water and would remain that way whether dredging occurs or not. Dredging could bring a small cost reduction on water treatment chemicals but not nearly enough to pay for the cost of dredging. Experts from Gahagan & Bryant evaluated the water quality and estimated that the sediment would not affect the water supply intake for many years but that dredging **near the dam** would be necessary in 80-90 years to avoid **sediment blocking the intake pipe at** the South Fork Water Treatment Plant.

Ms. Thomas described the concept of a 50 Year Supply Plan, made necessary by the reservoir's decreased storage capacity as a result of sediment and increased water demand. She explained that the proposed plan considers the water source, storage capacity and distribution system. The plan would pump water from the SFRR to the Ragged Mountain Reservoir. A computer model showed that the pumping period from one reservoir to the other would average 20 days per year in order to keep the Ragged Mountain Reservoir full.

Ms. Thomas emphasized the need to have 2,714 million gallons of water by 2055 and noted that an additional 1,726 million gallons of water storage need to be created. If the SFRR is restored with a one-time dredge, 400 million gallons of water would be created but that would not be sufficient; 1,327 million gallons would still be needed. If the Ragged Mountain Dam increases in height 40 feet and it is combined with the SFRR dredge, then the need would be met. However, since the SFRR continues to receive sediment, another SFRR dredge or an increase of 5 feet height at Ragged Mountain is needed to avoid another decrease.

According to this plan, the Rivanna River and SFRR would be the main sources of drinking water for the Observatory Treatment Plan and the SFRR plant. An inter-reservoir pipeline allows each reservoir to act as "back up" for one another. By the year 2055, the SFRR would meet 8% of the needed water storage while the Rivanna River would continue to be the main supplier of drinkable water.

Ms. Thomas described the outcome of possible initiatives being considered by the task force. A one-time dredge is the first option which would create an additional storage capacity of 400 million gallons of water. It would probably cost \$250,000, plus \$50,000-\$250,000 to obtain permits, and two years to do an RFP. Finding a disposal site is crucial to obtain the permits and maintain lower costs; therefore it should be the first issue to be addressed.

Dredging can be performed multiple times or on an on-going basis but the disposal site ownership or leasing conditions, the proximity of the disposal site and its capacity would determine if this is possible since dredging costs are not as high as the cost of fuel and storage area. There are other practical questions that need to be answered to determine whether dredging is feasible, such as the amount of stump litter on the reservoir floor, the feasibility of bringing a dredge to Ivy Creek, and the impact on soil erosion and wetlands.

Possibly the strongest reason to dredge is its impact on recreation. Rowing is currently constricted upstream due to the amount of sediment. In order for two boats to pass **each other up to the area near** Reas Ford Bridge, the channel needs to be 4' deep and at least **100'** wide. In order to stifle the bothersome hydrilla, the channel needs to be at least 10 **meters** deep. Dredging would provide better access to the zone and rowing and fishing activities would benefit.

Ms. Thomas noted that more studies are needed to establish the current condition of the reservoir. Information needed includes what is Ivy Creek's capacity and how much dredging needs to be done in that area and how many tree stumps are in the reservoir. A plan of action needs to be developed to stop sediment from getting into the reservoir upstream.

After Ms. Thomas ended her presentation, Mr. Sandridge asked about the number of public comment hearings held on the issue. Ms. Thomas said there had been one hearing and an online questionnaire returned by more than 300 people with interesting feedback, since the survey contained open-ended questions. Comments centered on dredging, water costs and the need to preserve the reservoir. Mr. Rooker added that the task force had also taken public comment after a number of presentations.

Mr. Sandridge asked if the task force would be able to make recommendations by the end of the calendar year and Ms. Thomas said they would.

Mr. Norris said he was surprised there was not a better record of the number of stumps in the reservoir. Mr. Boyd asked if bathymetric studies could show the number of tree stumps but Ms. Thomas answered that they can only be detected by **more detailed** scans.

Mr. Rooker said he was surprised that stumps were such a problem if the dredging was performed from ashore using a vacuum. Ms. Thomas said that the debris is troublesome and that dredging is not usually performed in reservoirs. Ms. Thomas indicated that she knew of only one reservoir that had been **dredged, in** Illinois which was located on flat land where there weren't problems moving or drying the mud.

Mr. Norris asked about the impact of dredging on water quality. Ms. Thomas responded that dredging would not affect the quality of water and noted that a curtain can be established to keep the water clean. The pumps that are used are gasoline powered and need to be placed on private land surrounding the reservoir.

Mr. Norris asked about the number of times that dredging would need to be performed to maintain storage capacities. Ms. Thomas answered that each time dredging is performed, an additional 400 to 500 million gallons of water storage are created, therefore it is estimated that it would need to be dredged a couple of times in the next 50 years. Mr. Rooker added that if dredging is performed only once, any added capacity would be lost again within 30 years.

1. Current Updates on Bicycle System Planning Efforts of Each Agency- David Benish, Albemarle County; Chris Gensic, City of Charlottesville; Julia Monteith, University of Virginia

Ms Monteith began the presentation mentioning that the information had already been shared with PACC Tech and explained that the presentation includes an update of what the University, City and County are doing individually to improve the bicycle system and how these projects are interrelated.

Ms. Monteith described the University's 2006 bicycle plan which calls for implementing various facilities such as bike lanes, racks, signs, and such in new and existing buildings. Ms. Monteith showed a map of the U.Va. LEED certified projects that are currently in construction, design or planning. The map highlighted a large cluster of projects near the U.Va. Hospital and South Lawn construction site. This is the focus of a study completed by students at the School of Architecture this Fall that is planning in intergrated planning of bicycle facilities as these projects are under development. Ms. Monteith mentioned that she is evaluating the course along with Rebecca White, U.Va.'s Director of Parking and Transportation.

Ms. Monteith shared the SMART Transportation Map which includes a map of the bicycle system and the UTS transportation system. The map is designed to promote the use of bikes and buses. In addition, UTS has installed racks on 5 buses and is in the process of installing racks on all 35 buses.

Mr. Rooker asked about the percentage of students that use bicycles as transportation on Grounds. Ms. Monteith answered that she does not know the actual percentage but that Rebecca White may know, based on a survey that was completed in 2008. Mr. Rooker added that during good weather, more bicycles are observed. Ms. Monteith said that the amount had increased lately perhaps due to gas prices and that she had observed increased bus usage, too.

Ms. Monteith shared information about bicycle-sharing programs which are increasing in popularity – and have been installed in Paris and Washington, D.C. Members obtain a card and swipe it to release the bicycle and are charged for the amount of time that they use the bicycle. UVa is reviewing the options for a similar system that may be used here, possible in concert with the City of Charlottesville.

To begin his portion of the presentation, Mr. Benish shared an overview of the projects within the City and County programmed for improvement. He explained that the County works to provide pedestrian and bicycle facilities in new roads and improvement projects. He listed Rio and Hydraulic Roads as examples. He explained that the County also works with VDOT to design roadways and improve roadways, particularly in the urban areas, with bicycle lanes and sidewalks as part of the road system.

He also indicated that the County tries, particularly in large developments, to encourage traffic management plans that include pedestrian and bicycle facilities and the

interconnectivity of neighborhoods. Mr. Benish identified roads that are programmed for bicycle and pedestrian improvements adjacent to the city and the university including Ivy Road and Old Ivy Road, Fontaine Avenue, and Hillsdale Drive.

Mr. Gensic began his portion of the presentation by distributing a City trail map. He stated that the City's bicycle plan was approved in 2003 and that most of the goals from that plan had been reached. He stated that an ongoing issue is the on-street parking vs. bicycle lanes since both cannot coexist.

Mr. Gensic identified projects where the City is working to improve the bicycle and pedestrian system including the Meadow Creek Parkway coming into Rio road, a trail to connect Meadow brook heights and McIntire Park, a bridge to connect both sides of McIntire Park, and a trail to connect the pavilion and city hall to Meade Park.

Other city efforts include installing bicycle racks in parks, schools and the downtown mall and the introduction of bicycle-sensitive traffic lights that give cyclists priority. The City is also working on trails along the Rivanna River, Moore's Creek, and in Biscuit Run and is collaborating with railroad companies to create permanent public pedestrian and bicycle crossings. Other efforts include the construction of bridges over the Rivanna River at Pen-Darden Towe Parks and the Woolen Mills.

Mr. Rooker asked about cost estimates. Mr. Gensic said the McIntire Park bridge was estimated to cost half a million dollars while the Rivanna River crossing was estimated at 3 million dollars a couple of years ago.

Mr. Rooker asked about an initiative to paint the bicycle lanes more heavily to give them higher visibility. Mr. Gensic said that the traffic committee had reviewed the initiative but established that maintenance costs would be very high.

Mr. O'Connell asked about grants for future trails. Mr. Gensic said he was optimistic about the McIntire bridge grant.

After the presentation, Ms. Sheehy reminded the group that the county will host PACC meetings in 2009 with the next meeting scheduled for Feb 19 at 3 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.