

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL WORK SESSION  
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN  
FRANKLIN, TENNESSEE  
CITY HALL BOARDROOM  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2008 – 6:00 P.M.**

**Board Members**

Mayor John Schroer	P	Alderman Dana McLendon	P
Alderman Clyde Barnhill	P	Alderman Ken Moore	P
Alderman Pearl Bransford	<b>A</b>	Alderman Ann Petersen	P
Alderman Beverly Burger	P	Alderman Michael Skinner	P
Alderman Dan Klatt	P		

**Department Directors/Staff**

Russell Truell, Interim City Administrator	P	Shirley Harmon, HR Director	A
Vernon Gerth, ACA Community & Economic Development	P	Mark Hilty, Water/Wastewater Director	P
David Parker, ACA Public Works & Utilities	P	Gary Luffman, Codes Director	A
Shauna Billingsley, Interim City Attorney	A	Planning	---
Rocky Garzarek, Fire Chief	A	Joe York, Streets Director	A
Jackie Moore, Police Chief	A	Becky Caldwell, Assistant Director Solid Waste	A
Fred Banner, MIT Director	A	Lanaii Benne, Assistant City Recorder	A
Lisa Clayton, Parks Director	A	Linda Fulwider, Board Recording Secretary	P
Eric Gardner, Engineering Director	A		

**1. Call to Order**

Mayor John Schroer called to order the Special Work Session of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, City of Franklin, Tennessee, Monday, November 17, 2008 at 6:10 p.m. in the City Hall Boardroom.

Two new studies regarding financial implications are available and have been discussed. Jackson Thornton is revamping some of the numbers in the report as some were in the original report and some were not. The final cost is required to make an intelligent decision. The low head dam and reservoir are the two issues.

**2. Citizen Comments**

None

**3. Consideration of Report on Low Head Dam Removal**

**4. Consideration of Report on Raw Water Reservoir**

**5. Discussion on Water Plant Expansion**

**6. Discussion of Cost of Service Analysis**

**7. Reports on Water/Wastewater Capital Improvements**

**8. Other Business Regarding Water/Wastewater/Effluent**

**Mark Hilty, Water/Wastewater Director**

It was explained a weir is anything that holds water back that is not a legal dam. The low head dam is an official state dam. If six inches were removed, it would no longer be a sanctioned dam.

Mark Hilty referred to the report as part of the withdrawal permit requirement for feasibility studies to see if the dam should be removed. He said it would be necessary to meet with State representatives to review the report and schedule a stakeholders meeting with them as well. He also met with Dorie Bolze of Harpeth River Watershed.

Mayor Schroer referred to Option 5 saying that if the City continues to withdraw from the Harpeth, no dam or weir is possible with that option. Mr. Hilty explained it has to do with debris floating in the river and on the bottom of the river. If the control structure were removed, the City would have to install a filter. This would create an O & M problem because of the unknowns involved with changing filters. The larger the infiltration gallery the more water and frequency of cleaning. This is not suitable option.

The Mayor noted alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 are relatively in the same realm of costs. This was not included in the report. With everything included, the cost is approximately \$11 million. If the City were going to continue to produce water, one of the alternatives would be needed.

Mayor Schroer asked Dorie Bolze to come forward and comment on the low head dam. Ms Bolze said the intake structure should be updated. Cost to remove the dam would be \$280,000. It would improve the water. Two weirs would be better for the fish. She went on to say she has more experts and they had not been asked to participate with a presentation. They do not agree with the findings that there will be no affect on fish and wildlife. Alternative 2 or 3 would be dramatic improvements. One thing not addressed is water efficiency. The City does not have to produce drinking water. She mentioned the sewage treatment plant costs upstream and if discharged upstream, water could not be withdrawn. Use of effluent water was mentioned.

Alderman McLendon believes the cart is before the horse, because if the City decides not to be in the business of creating drinking water, the focus should be a decision regarding the reservoir and it would be simple to pick among the low head dam choices.

Mayor Schroer said the decision that has to be made is whether to take water out of the river or not. This has to be the first decision. There are social and environmental issues, as well as huge economic implications. This information is part of an economic study. Analysis is the next step. They must tell the City what a deliverable gallon of water costs whether produced or gotten from HVUD. If the City stays in the water business the reservoir will be needed for raw water and not effluent. Effluent becomes secondary.

The numbers from Jackson Thornton should be available prior to the December meeting to allow a decision by BOMA. The Mayor would like feedback, if any, on the reservoir and dam. The reservoir has a big impact on operation of the water plant.

Alderman Burger mentioned restrictions of 10 CFS. The City cannot draw water in the summer. Financially must decide if money should be invested in a water plant that may not operate every month of the year. If the reservoir is used for effluent, it may have to be increased.

Mayor Schroer stated this is a very complicated decision and some decisions are needed that will influence other decisions. Is the City going to be in the water business or not? That is the decision to be made. Nevertheless, there will be no decision until the financials are complete.

David Parker explained the City previously looked at different locations for a bigger reservoir, but it was not environmentally or economically feasible anywhere they looked. In answer to questions about capacity, Goose Creek, and zero discharge, many questions will not be answered until the design is finished. Other questions regarding effluent, pharmaceuticals in the

water, dilution, etc. will be addressed through the design process.

Alderman Burger asked Ms Bolze about putting water back into the Harpeth. Ms Bolze said she did not advise putting drinking water back in the Harpeth. She encourages effluent. The River does not meet dissolved oxygen standards.

There was discussion on the usage in the Goose Creek area in summer. What are the costs of other alternatives to improve the reservoir for effluent? Alderman McLendon mentioned a low head dam could be constructed in wetlands or flood plains. There are other alternatives and some things can be done for effluent storage that cannot be done for raw water.

Mayor Schroer stated a long-range plan for water, including conservation, must be developed for the City. He reiterated the need to make the decision if the City is going to produce water.

Alderman Klatt asked about new standard requirements at the water treatment plant for chlorination and said the treatment plant must be upgraded one way or another. His concern is the City is in the sewer business and capabilities for treating wastewater will be expanded. He believes that requires the most significant discussion. The City is also getting in the business of providing wastewater treatment because of failed septic systems as the City annexes more existing areas in the UGB with septic systems. A regional plan for wastewater is needed and that will affect the Harpeth because of the discharge. Once that is determined then a decision can be made about water treatment. The City will be in a position to continue withdrawal. A decision should be made about effluent or discharge before deciding about withdrawal. Then address capacity or capability issues about withdrawal and ability to treat. The City does not have to be in the water business.

Mayor Schroer said the upgrade decision is imminent. Until someone says the City cannot withdraw the City will keep withdrawing. If the only option is a zero discharge plant upstream, does that change the TDEC permit? That is unknown. Is there a plan if everything has to be sent back into the Harpeth? Have to start dealing regionally. At what point does the City need to look at a grander scale?

Alderman Burger said regional issues haven't been looked at and it is wrong to not partner with these entities. The City has the responsibility to take charge of the UGB. These are bigger picture issues rather than the antiquated plant on Lewisburg Pike.

Mark Hilty said there is concern regarding the process of wastewater treatment. He mentioned looking at a watershed. Effluent reuse water, if going to expand that program, there will be a demand on that system as with water and it will be seasonal. How far out is the City going to go serving systems. Staff desire is to go with the most cost effective and safest chlorine treatment. There are new technologies to do that.

Alderman Petersen thought consideration should be giving to having an adequate water supply right now. Mr. Hilty responded that some measures have been taken with other fixes to come. Nothing will be in place by this summer even if a decision is made now.

Discussion ensued on the significant loss of water from the reservoir this year (2 MGD) and the reservoir drying up. Mr. Hilty reviewed all the projects in the works to remedy the situation. Also discussed potential build out point for the City water system and the other water utilities that want to use the City sewer system. There was further discussion on the use of effluent. Mr. Hilty stated almost everything for the economic analysis is in.

Dorie Bolze commented that it is difficult to get reports as they are not always aware when reports are available. Reports should be available to everyone. Mayor Schroer responded that he would see that reports are available in digital form.

The Economic Analysis will be on the agenda for the December 9 work session.

## **ADJOURN**

Work Session adjourned 7:27 p.m.

---

Mayor John C. Schroer

Minutes prepared by: Linda Fulwider, Board Recording Secretary, City Administrator's Office - 1/16/2009 3:25 PM