MANAGER'S BRIEFING SESSION
HIGH POINT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
JUNE 6, 2016 – 4:00 P.M.
3RD FLOOR LOBBY CONFERENCE ROOM

MEETING MINUTES

Present:
Mayor William S. Bencini, Jr.; Mayor Pro Tem Golden (Ward 1); and Council Members Latimer Alexander (At-Large), Cynthia Davis (At-Large), Christopher Williams (Ward 2), Alyce Hill (Ward 3), Council Members James Davis (Ward 5), Jay Wagner (Ward 4), and Council Member Jason Ewing (Ward 6)

Staff Present:
Greg Demko, City Manager; Randy McCaslin, Deputy City Manager; Randy Hemann, Assistant City Manager; Eric Olmedo, Budget and Performance Manager; Rosyln McNeil, Budget Analyst; Jeron Hollis, Communications & Public Engagement Director; Lee Burnette, Director of Planning and Development; Lee Tillery, Parks & Recreation Director; Bill Frazier, Laboratory Manager; Wendell Pickett, Water Plant Superintendent; Robby Stone, Public Services Assistant Director; Terry Houk, Director of Public Services; Loren Hill, Economic Development Director; and Maria Smith, Deputy City Clerk

Others Present:
Trevor Clements & Kimberly Brewer, Tetra Tech; Tammy Nagem, High Point Market Authority; and Melody Burnett, High Point Convention & Visitors Bureau

News Media:
Pat Kimbrough, High Point Enterprise

Handouts:

- *Water Shortage Response Plan*
- *Buffer Management Recommendations – Executive Summary*
- *Water Supply Watershed Protection Plan Update – Buffer Management Recommendations*

Note: These handouts will be incorporated and attached as a permanent part of these proceedings.

Presentation on Water Shortage Response Plan
Mr. Houk explained that he would have two presentations:
(1) Water Shortage Response Plan
(2) Watershed Update Plan (will be taken to the public after Council approval)

DRAFT

He introduced the people that helped assemble these two plans: Mr. Clements, Tetra Tech; Kimberly Brewer, Tetra Tech; Lee Tillery, Parks & Recreation Director; Wendell Pickett, Water Plant Superintendent; and Bill Frazier, Laboratory Manager.

He advised that these plans protect the natural resources particularly the water supply and water distribution system. He reported at the time this was started in 2011-2012, it was through the Department of Environmental and Natural Resources, but it is now the Department of Environmental Quality. After review of the drafts, DEQ approved the Water Shortage Response Plan in 2013, which was supposed to come to Council in 2013 for review and ultimately a 30-day comment period. He advised that due to some changes and restructuring within the Public Services Department and because of the restructuring and the ice storm that occurred during that time, this got lost and was not done. He explained during the ice storm it became apparent that the Watershed Plan needed to be reevaluated and at that time Tetra Tech to assist with an update. Another lesson learned was that you cannot do a watershed plan update, approval or adoption until a Water Shortage Response Plan is adopted and/or approved by Council.

Mr. Houk noted the second presentation would be conducted by Trevor Clements, with Tetra Tech, a renowned environmental engineering firm.

Mr. Houk then reviewed the Water Shortage Plan. He explained that a Water Shortage Response Plan is a requirement of the local Water Shortage Supply Plan that defines different phases of water shortage and the appropriate response to each phases. All local governments that supply water to 1,000 or more connections or serving more than 3,000 people in North Carolina, which is required by statute. It is necessary because it establishes a contingency plan to maintain the water supply and looks at current and future water supply demands and allows local control at the lowest level. .

Mr. Houk reviewed the five levels of the Water Shortage Supply Plan:

Stage 1. Voluntary Restrictions
Stage 2. Mandatory Restrictions I
Stage 3. Mandatory Restrictions II
Stage 4. Emergency Reductions
Stage 5. Water Rationing

He recalled that the city was under Mandatory Restrictions one time and that was for six hours. He noted the stages are based on usable storage available in Oak Hollow Lake and Arnold Koonce (basically a combined total of the lakes).

He proceeded to review the following stages:

Stage	Usable Storage (Capacity)
1	80% (voluntary)
2	70% (mandatory)
3	60% (mandatory)
4	50% (mandatory)
5	40% (mandatory)

He noted that the usable capacity is the point in which the intakes can still draw water into the system and reminded Council that High Point is very versatile with a wide, large watershed and does not take a lot of water to keep our lakes operating. He reviewed stage 2 which is mandatory (70% total capacity); Stage 3 (60% capacity); Stage 4 (50% capacity); and Stage 5 is critical with 40% total volume. Mr. Houk shared that this does not take into account the water we can get from Piedmont Triad Regional Water Authority. Currently the city can get 2.28 million, with the capability of the line pumping 3.2 million.

Council Member Alexander asked how mandatory minimum releases factor into this. Mr. Houk deferred the question to Bill Frazier. Mr. Frazier replied that the city does not have any minimum release factors. He shared when Arnold Koonce Lake gets low, they release water from Oak Hollow into that lake to keep the water quality up. Mr. Houk added that we also try to keep it 18 inches down from the dam. He pointed out ultimately High Point's watershed is good where there are no issues, but we are required to do this as part of the local Water Management Plan.

Mr. Houk reviewed the various Stages:

- **Stage 1** – Voluntarily reductions, all water users are required to reduce by 5 percent. They would give you suggestions such as: wash your clothes in the washing machine with a full load or dish washer, or do not water the lawn (voluntary).
- **Stage 2** – (70% capacity) Expected to reduce water by 10 percent in comparison to the previous month's bill and encourage voluntary reductions. Some of the restrictions are: only allowed to irrigate at night between 8 p.m. – 8 a.m. during the week and only available to half inch per week. Outdoor use of drinking water for washing on impervious surfaces is prohibited. All testing and training purposes requiring drinking water (i.e. fire department training) would be limited.
- **Stage 3** – (more serious) Mandatory reductions, Part 2. Continue to reduce actions with all previous requirements and further reduce water use by 20 percent compared to the previous month's water bill. All non-essential uses of drinking water are banned and garden and landscape irrigation must be reduced to a minimum amount necessary for survival. Additionally, in Stage 3 they will do a drought surcharge 1.5 times the normal rate to encourage conservation and reduction.
- **Stage 4** – Emergency reductions. Must continue to follow the reductions in the previous phases. Reduce water by another 25 percent. A ban of all use of drinking water except to protect public health, safety and drought surcharges to be increased to two times the normal limit.

Mr. Houk reviewed the water rationing below:

Water Shortage Level	First Violation	Second Violation	Third Violation
Voluntary Reductions	N/A	N/A	**N/A**
Mandatory Reductions (Stages 2 and 3)	Warning	$250	**Discontinuation of Service**
Emergency Reductions	$250	Discontinuation of Service	**Discontinuation of Service**
Water Rationing	**$500**	**Discontinuation of Service**	**Discontinuation of Service**

At this stage, the city is at 40% of total capacity and only providing drinking water to protect the public health. All customers are permitted to water at a minimum required for public health protection only with firefighting being the only allowable outdoor water use activity. At this stage a drought surcharge is five times the normal rate due to the critical nature of it. Enforcement is handled by Public Services with assistance from the Police Department. He advised that mechanisms are in place where they can look at variances based on requirements for certain individuals and/or companies. He further explained that each time the water level rises up, the stages will change and requirements also change. The long term aspect might have to be viewed to make sure it is where it should be.

Public Services is recommending moving forward with Council's approval to the 30-day comment period to see what the results are, then address the comments as they come in. He then advised that we may have to come back to Council to discuss the comments and changes to the Water Shortage Response Plan would have to be resubmitted for

Mr. Demko reiterated the drought conditions were in a mandatory condition only time for six hours in the last 25 years and this was based on staff's recollection.

Council Member Alexander mentioned that the city has 24 million gallons a day of output at the Ward Water Plant and another 2 million and asked why the city was not encouraging water consumption/irrigation. Mr. Houk replied that irrigation is a small component of the overall revenue was not sure there would be a big increase in the consumption. Council Member Alexander commented in the commodity business, the lower the consumption the higher O & M costs and higher capital costs per unit. He felt the city needs to find industries that need water because of the volume that the city has available.

Council Member Alexander commented that customers that already have irrigation systems question why they have to pay 1 ½ times the rate because it is not going in the sewer and they have already had to pay for a tap. Mr. Houk explained his argument that the water is not coming back through the sewer system and they are paying the full price of the total treatment process, but it is a Council decision. Council Member Alexander questioned why the city is charging premium rates to water their lawns. He reiterated that since water is such a commodity, the more units the city can sell could result in lowering costs to the customers.

Mr. Demko suggested putting the Water Shortage Response Plan out for a 30-day review, get comments back and revisit with Council since it should have been done back in 2013.

Presentation on a Revised Watershed Management Plan for City Lake and Oak Hollow Lake

Trevor Clements, Tetra Tech, noted they would be looking at updating the city's existing Watershed Plan and reviewed the reasons for the update. He shared that when staff contacted him, they expressed concerns about the following:

1) The original plan was developed back in the 1980s. He pointed out that several portions of the plan have now been superseded by other things that the City had done with policies and watershed ordinance updates. The State is recognizing the existing plan and making the assumption that it is being implemented as it stands for water supply protection, but there are certain portions of it that are not applicable presently so it would have to be brought up to the level where it would be in compliance with the State's requirements.

2) There were some things within the operations of the city's various departments that needed clarification, particularly on the side of enforcement of some of the requirements that are in the Tier 1 protection zones.

Tetra Tech was asked to help look at what would be an appropriate level of recommendations. The staff wanted Mr. Clements to convey the importance of having a source water protection program.

Mr. Clements shared a photo of the supply on Mountain Island Lake in Charlotte. He explained there are a lot of different things that could be problematic which could be detrimental from a treatment. He pointed out once sediment begins to settle, the nutrients are carried in with the sediment are taken up by a particular algae called blue/green algae which can have toxins.

He noted that the City of High Point has had a Watershed Protection Plan since the 1980s with certain components of that plan being very effective. In an effort to keep the plan updated and protect the water supply, the city's staff is working on a two-phase process.

- **Phase 1 -** Focus on clarification: What in the water supply protection zone is needed to make sure it meets the requirements and is enforceable.
    - Adopted ordinances and compliance with State water supply protection
    - Dark green is Tier 1, Critical / City-owned conservation land (no development allowed); city owned land in park zones (uses such as golf course, marinas with restrictions and best management practices); and privately owned property (no new development allowed).
- **Phase 2 –** Focus on wider watershed management issues for source water protection.

Mr. Clements shared the working group consisted of the Parks & Recreation Department, Public Works and Planning looking at how to address these needs. They identified 15 management recommendations

(**Clarifying the Lake Buffer Area and Associated Regulations)**
Recommendation 1: *Revise Existing City Watershed Protection Ordinance to Clarify "Buffer"*
Recommendation 2: *Revise Parks & Recreation Department Rules and Regulations*
Recommendation 3: *Post the Boundary of City-owned Property Adjacent to the Lakes*
Recommendation 4: *Provide Easy to Use GIS Link Reservoir Boundaries*

(City-Owned Conservation Land)
Recommendation 5: *Adopt Policy Regarding Citizen Allowed Activities*
Recommendation 6: *Adopt City Policy and Procedures Regarding Maintenance*
Recommendation 7: *Reforest Cleared Land In Conservation Area*
Recommendation 8: *Adopt Inspections Procedures*
Recommendation 9: *Adopt Inspections/Maintenance Access Protocols*

(City-Owned Park Land)
Recommendation 10: *Implement the Audubon International Environmental Management Practices for Golf Courses*
Recommendation 11: *Implement Best Management Practices for Marina Operations*

(**Regulations Governing Private Property in the Reservoir Protection Zone)**
Recommendation 12: *Clarify Key Ordinances that Govern Disturbance of the Reservoir Protection Zone*
Recommendation 13: *Clearly Communicate Property Owners' Responsibilities*
Recommendation 14: *Implement Multi-Faceted Outreach Program*

Recommendation 15: *Communicate with Adjacent Jurisdictions*

Council Member J. Davis asked about enforcement for the non-conforming homes around Oak Hollow Lake. Ms. Brewer noted these would be grandfathered. Mr. Burnette explained there is a variance process in the ordinance to allow certain new construction which is reviewed by TRC to ensure that the best management practices are put in place, erosion control plans are required during the construction, etc….

Council Member Alexander mentioned core cables that are used for identifying boundaries for lake properties and he was not sure how the city could empower the citizens while giving the city clear enforcement should any problems occur. Ms. Brewer emphasized it was clear to them in talking with city staff that they are unsure of where the city owned property begins and most of the property owners do not know either. She pointed out one of the recommendations is posting the land.

Council Member C. Davis asked about selling homes that are grandfathered that might be in the watershed management area. Ms. Brewer replied these properties could be sold and noted one of the recommendations is that there would be a required notification process for selling land in the protection zone next to the lake would require notification to the buyer of the requirements/regulations to make the subsequent owner aware that they are buying into a watershed protection zone.

Mr. Clements noted one of the big parts of this is communication because so many people are not aware and if they are they may not pass that information along. Ms. Brewer noted they want them to use best management practices with land clearing, following sedimentation, erosion control. Council Member C. Davis mentioned that so many people were under the impression that if the City owned any property within the watershed area that we could not sell those properties because they are in the watershed areas. Ms. Brewer advised that she could not speak as to the city-owned property, she was speaking more as a private piece of property. She further advised that if a piece of property was purchased for the express purpose of conservation land around the lake, the purpose would be tied to the land and could not be sold without a legal mechanism.

Council Member C. Davis then inquired about fertilization of the golf course and asked if it funnels back in. Staff replied that they follow best management practices to limit nutrients going back into the lake.

A discussion followed regarding downed trees. Council Member J. Davis asked if we cut trees down during the ice storm or if we leave it up to the homeowners. Mr. McCaslin advised that the city did cut some down and left them on the ground which caused some problems and confirmed that the city generally cuts and drops them.

Council Member C. Davis mentioned the dead trees that might be growing into the property line and felt removal of these would make sense. Mr. Houk explained in the short term, they had legal draft up an emergency access agreement in areas that Lee Tillery defined were a hazard to the homeowner that gave us permission to cross their land so we could remove the trees due to safety concerns. Ms. Brewer noted recommended not using heavy machinery that could turn up the sediment and create erosion and advised there are good practices for taking down trees. Mr. Clements pointed out these recommendations reflect best practices, clarification and transparency and outreach to make sure people are aware of them. He noted their request to Council is to allow them to go out with the drafts and preliminary recommendations in order to get some feedback from the stakeholders.

DRAFT

Council Member Alexander asked how they propose to monitor the shoreline and mentioned that Duke Power and others do a flyover monitoring and then they lay a map over it to see what is different. Mr. Clements reported they are actually looking at different monitoring programs, anything from boat surveys and new technologies with remote sensing are so good that would help to develop programs like that. Ms. Brewer also mentioned other programs such as satellite imagery, using free access data that would not have to be purchased, citizen reports, boat controls, etc… Council Member Alexander felt it is important to communicate to the citizens that this is something that we are going to monitor and use these tools in order to do this.

Council Member J. Davis asked who the stakeholders would be and if any Jamestown residents would be included. Mr. Clements noted this was really a policy decision that Council needs to make. Ms. Brewer noted they want to talk to some property owners around the lake, marina users, golf course users, etc… focusing a lot on the area within 200 feet of the lake or adjacent to it. Mr. Clements reiterated these are some of the things they would like to get some feedback on before coming back to Council with an actual plan update.

Mr. Demko asked if Council was in agreement to put this out to the public in order to receive comment. Council Member C. Davis noted that although she has not read the document, but felt it certainly would not hurt. No objections were voiced. Mr. Houk believes the results would be back sometime in August/September.

Update on the High Point Market Authority Annual Budget

Eric Olmedo, Budget and Performance Manager advised that the main increase is the $500,000 increase for the grant they are receiving from the North Carolina Department of Commerce.

Update on High Point Convention and Visitor Bureau Annual Budget

Mr. Olmedo gave a brief update for the High Point Convention and Visitor Bureau Annual Budget (CVB) and noted it was relatively flat from last year, increasing some of their fund balance to pay back some of the construction they did a few years ago. He pointed out there is also a contract associated with the CVB Budget that will need Council's approval.

Staff has reviewed these budgets/contract and recommend approval.

Mr. Demko advised if there were any questions that Tammy Nagem with High Point Market Authority and Melody Burnette with the CVB were present to address them.

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m. upon motion duly made and seconded.

Respectfully Submitted,

_____

Maria A. Smith
Deputy City Clerk

DRAFT