

**SHOAL CREEK FARMS HOA  
LAKE MEETING MINUTES  
August 26, 2018**

**Attendees:**

Jacque Houston  
Steve Moorman  
Cindy Hickson  
Joy Barrett  
Many neighbors were in attendance

This meeting was to discuss the condition of the lake in regards to sedimentation fill-in and runoff, the research that has been done and the options for repair.

Jacque Houston called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM at 107 Hearthstone Court – The Barn

The following is the information presented ~ Copies were emailed or mailed to all property owners ahead of time.

**SCF Neighborhood - Lake Rejuvenation Meeting**

- \* At the last annual Neighborhood Meeting a Lake Committee was established.
- \* Members: Bob Synk, Asa Boynton, the late Tammy Dailey and Chris Gazlay.
- \* We'd like to thank them for the investment of time and resources taken to research this project.

**Overview:**

The Lake is a total of 5 acres. The HOA only owns a small portion on either side of the dam. We do not own the perimeter of the lake; making this a community issue.

Information has been gathered from the following resources ~ reports from the Lake Committee, Board input and meetings with ACC, UGA Water Quality Lab, and Carter Engineering officials.

- Discussion Topics
- Objectives
- Options
- Costs
- Conclusion

**Primary Concerns and Objectives:**

**Primary Concerns:**

- \* Lake fill-in due to sedimentation and runoff (See Fig. 2 - Lake Report)
- \* Effect on aesthetics overall and for residents on the lake
- \* Effect on future land value and neighborhood appeal

**Objectives:**

- \* Research and propose avenues that will address the concerns above, creating a lake environment that is healthy and has lasting sustainability

**Goals:**

- \* The goal of this meeting is to make a decision regarding the lake based on the options that will be presented.

### **Bottom Line:**

- \* To do something with the lake or to do nothing?

### **Lake Health:**

- \* Since its construction in the late 80's, the lake has received runoff sediment and septic tank discharge from the neighborhood.
- \* Approximately 50 homes discharge storm water or septic tank drain fields into the lake either directly or through perennial streams.
- \* This has caused considerable fill-in especially on the NE side.
- \* Also, leaves, grass clippings, etc. are blown into the lake or stream bed on a regular basis, adding to the sediment levels.

### **Lake Assessment:**

- \* An overall assessment of the lake was done and compared to a 2004, 2013, 2017 study to measure ~
- \* Depth
- \* Water quality (which is rated very high)
- \* Conditions of the riparian barriers
- \* Storm-water runoff

### **Additional Criteria for Assessment:**

- \* The following was taken into consideration while investigating and evaluating the condition of the lake and possible repair solutions:
- \* 1. Security of real estate values in SCF
- \* 2. Protection of homeowner property rights and easements
- \* 3. Minimal initial capital cost
- \* 4. Health and safety of the lake and wildlife
- \* 5. Project schedule
- \* 6. Environment permitting
- \* 7. Timing and magnitude of future capital expenses
- \* 8. Minimal annual maintenance costs
- \* 9. Damage to Millstone roadway
- \* 10. Access to Lake from all lakefront properties
- \* 11. Preservation of the lake's aquatic life

### **Reasons for Condition of the Lake:**

- \* Only 63% of the properties along the NE perennial stream (North Stream) are in compliance with ACC riparian barrier regulation.
- \* Regulation now requires – a 75 ft. wide border of undisturbed vegetation along both sides of all perennial streams. Increased from 25' when houses were built.
- \* Only 44% of the properties bordering the lake are in compliance with GA state riparian border regulations.
- \* Requires a 25 ft. wide border of undisturbed vegetation alongside **ALL** bodies of water. (The dam which is in the ACC right-of-way, does not apply.)
- \* The South Stream is stable and in compliance.

### **Storm Runoff:**

- \* Presents problems for half dozen or more properties in SCF.
- \* Only exhibited during heavy rains
- \* Effect is mostly individual properties, but does have a substantial impact overall on the lake.

## **Solution #1:**

### **Basic Improvement:**

Comprehensive Neighborhood education program to educate property owners of State and County riparian border requirements and encourage compliance. ACC will enforce compliance if needed.

**Cost:** \$3,000.00 – Less than \$50 per home

Neighborhood compliance would decrease the fill-in rate of the lake by approx. half, extending the life of the lake.

## **Solution #2: Cut and Fill (1):**

**Objective:** To restore the depth of 1.1 acres in the NE end of the Lake which is currently 6" deep.

### **Pros:**

- \* Done by **pushing** 3' of sediment from the NE end into a deeper part of the Lake.
- \* Remove the existing, non-functional, undersized fore-bay to provide lake access to residents bordering the NE end of the lake.
- \* **Permitting – Complex due to impact to aquatic life.**

Total cost to all homeowners: **\*\$36,000/71 homes = \$507 ea.**

### **Cons:**

- \* Lake bed needs to dry out before equipment can be brought in
- \* Landowners need to allow access where needed
- \* Significant impact to lake ecology/wildlife
- \* New fore-bay, storm water damage repair or NE Stream bed repair not included
- \* Must be redone every 5 years because all of the contributing problems have not been addressed

## **Solution #3 – Cut and Fill (2):**

**Objective:** To restore the depth of 1.1 acres in the NE end of the Lake which is currently 6" deep.

### **Pros:**

- \* Done by **pushing** 3' of lake bottom sediment from the NE end to around the edges of the lake and securing it with mesh.
- \* Remove the existing, non-functional, undersized fore-bay to provide lake access to residents bordering the NE end of the lake.
- \* Permitting – Less Complex
- \* More eco-friendly

Total cost to all homeowners: **\$60,000/71 homes = \$850 ea.**

### **Cons:**

- \* No public access. Landowners need to allow access where needed for heavy equipment.
- \* No compensation to damage done on private property
- \* Moderate impact to lake ecology/wildlife
- \* Must be repeated every 5 years.
- \* New fore-bay, storm water damage repair or NE Stream bed repair not included

## **Solution #4 – Comprehensive Repair ~ (Partial Dredge, Storm water Drainage Improvements, NE Streambed Repairs):**

### **What's included:**

- \* Comprehensive Neighborhood Re-education and compliance - \$3000
- \* Dredge lake removing 3' of lake bottom sediment \$110,000 in the NE end – 1.1 acres only
- \* Building a new fore-bay is discouraged due to difficulty in permitting, cost and continued maintenance
- \* Repair storm water damage - \$50,000

- \* Streambank erosion repair - \$11,000
- \* Permitting – very complex

Total cost to all homeowners: **\$174,000 + /71 homes = \$2,450 ea.**

#### **Cons:**

- \* No public access. Landowners need to allow access where needed for heavy equipment.
- \* No compensation to damage done on private property
- \* 400+ truck loads required for removal
- \* Roadway damage to Millstone. County will not repair.
- \* Moderate impact to lake ecology/wildlife
- \* Must be repeated every 5 years or at least part of it

#### **Summary:**

- \* The ideal time to complete any of these options is in concert with the Dam repair when the lake water level is down.
- \* Prices presented are based on 2018 estimates while the dam is being repaired.
- \* Regardless of option choice, \$\$ will be required upfront and in full to the contractor chosen to provide the work.
- \* Bank financing may be possible. Further investigation needed.
- \* Lake fill-in is eminent. The cost of doing nothing is the potential loss of property values in the future.

#### **Steps Moving Forward:**

- \* A number of companies were interviewed to gather this information and these are just proposals based on current information.
- \* The best, most eco-friendly solution is for every property owner to comply to the riparian border guidelines of ACC and the State of Georgia. This will go a long way to ensure that the lake doesn't continue to fill in. Bottom Line: Its up to each property owner to comply.
- \* Petition the county to repair or install more water run off solutions in our neighborhood.
- \* Ultimately, it's up to each neighbor to maintain their own property for the better good of our entire division.

#### **Recommendations:**

- \* Initiate neighborhood education program as the first course of action and make compliance mandatory.
- \* Let's vote!

#### **Future Considerations:**

- \* Continuing to look at other options. These may require some additional monies to pursue
- \* 1. Mudcat

#### **Conclusion:**

- \* Thank you
- \* Questions from the floor

Ballots were handed out and there was a majority vote to start with Solution #1 and the Board will pursue this option. Additional options will continue to be researched and presented. This is just the beginning.

Solution #1:

#### **Basic Improvement:**

Comprehensive Neighborhood education program to educate property owners of State and County riparian border requirements and encourage compliance. ACC will enforce compliance if needed.

**Cost:** \$3,000.00 – Less than \$50 per home

Neighborhood compliance would decrease the fill-in rate of the lake by approx. half, extending the life of the lake.

For all that attended the meeting – thank you!