

MINUTES OF MEETING
SHOAL CREEK FARMS SD LAKE ISSUES
FEB. 16, 2017

The meeting was held at Dave Krahl's home (200 Blue Heron Dr.) and began at 6:00 pm.

ATTENDEES:

- Drew Raessler, PE, Director, ACC Transportation and Public Works Dept. (ACC)
- Rani Katrees, Engineering Administrator, ACC Transportation and Public Works Dept. (ACC)
- Clayton Hunnicutt, PE, Associate Project Mgr. Carter Engineering Consultants (CEC)
- Sharyn Dickerson, ACC commissioner
- SCFHOA Board members:
 - Jacquie Houston
 - Cindy Hickson
 - Steve Moorman
 - Ryan Andrews
 - Dave Krahl
 - Vivi Kempf, secretary
 - Joy Barrett, treasurer
- Bob Synk

REFERENCES (handouts):

- Dam Rehabilitation Options for Shoal Creek Farms Dam, prepared by Carter Engineering Consultants, Nov. 15, 2016
- Summary Sheet of Dam Rehabilitation Options (Numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6), revised 12/13/16

REVIEW OF THE STUDY REPORT (option number, brief description, comments and estimated costs - \$ to SCF/\$ to ACC)

ACC noted that the county owns the road over the dam and is responsible for all construction within a 50 ft. right-of-way (ROW). Construction activities outside of the ROW is the responsibility of others (SCF). ACC and CEC then presented their study and summarized the options considered:

1. Option 1 – (4) 12” siphons, with existing aux. spillway
 - a. This is the option recommended by ACC,
 - b. minimum ability to handle a 100 yr. storm
 - c. allows future draining of lake, if necessary
 - d. \$45k/ \$73k
2. Option 2 – slip line existing 30” overflow pipe, replace riser, with existing aux. spillway
 - a. minimum ability to handle a 100 yr. storm
 - b. allows future draining of lake, if necessary
 - c. \$57k/ \$35k
3. Option 3 - (4) 12” siphons, with a new box culvert aux. spillway
 - a. Much better ability to handle a 100 yr. storm

- b. allows future draining of lake, if necessary
 - c. \$62k/ \$132k
- 4. Option 4 - slip line existing 30" overflow pipe, replace riser, with a new box culvert aux. spillway
 - a. Much better ability to handle a 100 yr. storm
 - b. allows future draining of lake, if necessary
 - c. \$70k/ \$131k
- 5. Option 5 - Decommission existing overflow piping and replace entirely with a new box culvert overflow
 - a. Much better ability to handle a 100 yr. storm
 - b. Does not allow future draining of lake, if necessary
 - c. \$93k/ \$103k
- 6. Option 6 - Decommission existing overflow piping and replace entirely with a new concrete chute overflow
 - a. Much better ability to handle a 100 yr. storm
 - b. **REQUIRES THAT THE ROAD BE CUT – NO MORE TRAFFIC OVER THE DAM**
 - c. Does not allow future draining of lake, if necessary
 - d. \$132k/ \$164k

DISCUSSION - QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS TO THE STUDY:

1. The cost estimates include:
 - a. \$40k for utility relocation (for all options except option #5). Note, it is unknown if there are utilities running through the dam.
 - b. Initial surveying, permitting and detailed design (engineering) costs.
 - c. 6% contingency
2. The cost estimates do not include project management expenses (contractor bid solicitation and evaluation, contract preparation, oversight of the construction and handling of payment requests)
3. CEC & ACC can show us some local examples of dam siphons.
4. The siphons incorporated in Options #1 and #3 require an estimated \$400 (in current dollars) annual maintenance expenditure, plus an expenditure of \$2k – \$3k every ten years. Maintenance for the other options is negligible.
5. All options would have a minimum 50 year life.
6. All options require a significant draining of the lake.
7. All options, except #2, require road work and the disruption of traffic across the dam.
8. Option #6 requires the complete and permanent disruption of vehicle traffic across the dam.
9. Cost sharing: ACC and SCF will split the cost of engineering 50 – 50.

10. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) – an extensive, expensive permitting process - will not be required for the permitting of the project, of any of the options, because this work is considered to be maintenance, not a new project. Nonetheless, some permits will be required.
11. CEC recommends that the permitting applications include permitting for future lake dredging, fore bay construction and stream remediation, because the cost and schedule for this permitting will not be much more than if the dam work only were permitted. SCF will be under no obligation to the permitting agencies to proceed with these additional activities if afterwards SCF decides not to do this additional work.
12. The costs estimated in the study do not include any dredging of the lake, fore bay construction or stream improvements.

DISCUSSIONS REGARDING STORMWATER DRAINAGE STREAMS

ACC typically has responsibility for drainage improvements of intermittent streams, although ACC may “make exceptions to current policy”.

1. The State requires a vegetative storm water barrier within 25 ft. of a body of water (including intermittent streams), ACC requires 75 ft. There is no grandfathering of these requirements. All violations are subject to enforcement action by ACC. No mechanical landscape work is permitted within the barriers. ACC noted that they enforce the 75 ft. buffer requirement only for streams and not for lakes.
2. ACC will act upon receiving notices of illicit discharges into bodies of water.
3. ACC recommends that the SCFHOA write to ACC with a formal request for assistance.
4. ACC will, as part of their stream improvement project, assist SCF with remediating the streams feeding the lake – ACC will provide the labor if SCF provides the materials (rip rap, grass seed, etc.)

STEPS FORWARD:

1. ACC will proceed after receiving an expression (letter) of interest from SCF.
2. ACC will draft a memorandum of interest (MOU) confirming the scope and terms of an agreement between ACC and SCF.
3. ACC will prepare a not-to-exceed cost estimate for the project.
4. The ACC mayor and commission (M & C) must then approve the MOU and cost estimate. (approx. 2 months)
5. Detailed engineering. (approx. 2 months)
6. Bid out and contractor selection. (approx. 2 months)
7. The M&C must approve the construction contract and cost. Project then proceeds. (approx. 2 months)
8. Construction (approx. 3 months)
9. Overall, after SCF submits its letter of interest to ACC, a rough estimate of the required schedule is one year for the project to receive all final approvals, and then 3 more months to construct.

FINANCING OPTIONS:

1. Homeowner assessments by the SCFHOA,
2. The creation of a special tax district and the necessary payments made through homeowner property taxes.

The meeting concluded about 8:00 pm.

These minutes were prepared by Bob Synk on Feb. 22, 2017. Amendments and corrections are invited, and if received before March 1, 2017 will be incorporated herein.