

# Water Supply Assessment for Cartecay River Dam No. 1 Gilmer County, Georgia



Prepared for:  
**Georgia State Soil and Water Conservation  
Commission**

Prepared by:  
**Schnabel Engineering  
Jordan Jones and Goulding**

December 31, 2007



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission (GSWCC), in partnership with the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) initiated a study to evaluate whether or not any of the existing watershed dams, designed and constructed under federal laws PL 544 and PL 566, could be modified to serve as water supply reservoirs. The evaluation process went through several iterations, the most recent of which can be found in the Finding Report dated December, 2007 on file with the GSWCC. The Finding Report identified 20 structures that had sufficient potential for relatively high yields with relatively small environmental and infrastructural impacts, when compared to the other projects evaluated. The selected twenty dams were further evaluated to identify project parameters.

The following report summarizes the evaluation of the Cartecay River Dam Number 1 located in Gilmer County, Georgia. For the purposes of this report, the existing normal pool will be raised to impound a water supply pool having a surface area of approximately 181 acres.

For convenience, the following summary lists the major findings of this evaluation. This summary should not be utilized as a separate document or in lieu of reading the entire report, including the Appendix.

- Approximately 307 acres of land will be impacted by the proposed reservoir and dam raising
- Approximately 18 structures will be impacted by the proposed reservoir and dam raising
- Four county roads will be impacted.
- For the modeled conditions, the drought of record in the Cartecay River basin is the period 1986-1988. For a water supply storage of approximately 2,300 million gallons and supplementation of natural reservoir inflow by pumped diversions (maximum 18.6 million gallons per day, mgd) from nearby Cartecay River, the safe yield of the reservoir is estimated to be 8.6 mgd.
- Approximately 5 acres of palustrine wetlands will be impacted by the proposed reservoir and dam raising
- Approximately 10 acres of lacustrine/palustrine open waters will be impacted by the proposed reservoir and dam raising
- Approximately 18,496 linear feet of lower perennial streams will be impacted by the proposed reservoir and dam raising
- Approximately 355 linear feet of intermittent streams will be impacted by the proposed reservoir and dam raising
- Review of available information did not indicate any existing cultural resources or 303(d) / 305(b) listed streams occurring within the maximum reservoir pool limits Cartecay River Dam No. 1.
- Review of available resources indicated that five primary trout streams are located within the maximum reservoir pool limits of Cartecay River 01.
- Review of existing threatened and endangered species information identified twelve federally and state protected species documented from Gilmer County, Georgia and consists of six faunal and six floral species
- Project cost is estimated in 2007 dollars at \$79,000,000.

## **PREFACE**

The results of the analyses presented herein are based in part upon United States Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangle maps and, therefore, should be utilized for planning purposes only. If the subject project is identified as having a possibility of progressing past this analysis, additional studies will be required. These studies will include but not be limited to detailed environmental evaluations, detailed yield analyses, preliminary engineering design, and detailed cost estimating. These additional studies will be required prior to beginning detailed design work and/or land acquisition. The level of study presented herein shall be considered as a screening tool to evaluate the proposed project relative to other projects. Until further studies are performed, actual yield and costs associated with the entire project cannot be readily determined.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
PREFACE	
INTRODUCTION .....	1
BACKGROUND .....	1
NEEDS AND DEMAND EVALUATION .....	3
ENGINEERING FACTORS .....	6
SAFE YIELD ANALYSIS.....	9
RESULTS .....	12
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS .....	15
PROJECT CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE NARRATIVE.....	23
APPENDIX.....	31

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

The project team of Schnabel Engineering South, LLC (Schnabel), Jordan Jones and Golding (JJ&G), Joe Tanner and Associates, and the Law Office of William Thomas Craig were retained by the Georgia State Investment and Financing Commission as the agent for the Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission to evaluate 166 existing flood control structures. The subject structures were originally designed and constructed under Federal laws PL 544 and PL 566 to control storm water runoff (flooding) and collect sediment. The goal of this evaluation was to identify impoundments that could be enlarged to provide a relatively reliable water supply. The results of the evaluation were utilized to select twenty of the dams and reservoirs that had potential for relatively high yields with relatively small environmental and infrastructural impacts, when compared to the other projects evaluated. The selected twenty dams were further evaluated to identify project parameters. The additional evaluation included the following:



- More detailed yield analyses
- More detailed environmental evaluation
- Cost estimation of proposed modifications

The Cartecay River Dam Number 1 in Gilmer County, Georgia was one of the structures selected for further evaluation.


## **BACKGROUND**

The subject dam, Cartecay River Sub-Watershed Coosa River Watershed Dam Number 1 (Cartecay River Dam 01), is located approximately 8 miles east of Ellijay, Georgia in Gilmer County. More specifically, the dam is located just north of Big Creek Road at the confluence of Anderson Creek, Simons Branch, and Rolston Creek.

The existing dam was designed in 1968 and constructed in 1973. As designed, the dam had a crest elevation of 1668.0 feet and impounded a reservoir that had a surface area of approximately 19 acres at a normal pool elevation of 1626.0 feet. The crest of the emergency spillway was designed to be at elevation 1664.0 feet. According to the Soil Conservation Service (SCS), now known as the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), Dam Inventory sheet, the dam was originally designed and constructed as a Class 'A' or low-hazard dam. When designed, the emergency spillway (now referred to as an auxiliary spillway) had a 4 percent chance of operating in any given year. This results in the auxiliary spillway operating during storm events equal to and greater than the 25-year event. The state Safe Dams program classifies the existing dam as a Category 2 structure. Not including engineering, land acquisition, or project administration, the dam was completed for a cost of approximately \$194,000.



**EXISTING SITE PLAN**



© Schnabel Engineering 2007 All Rights Reserved



NRCS WATERSHED DAM ASSESSMENT  
CARTECAY RIVER NO. 1

SITE LOCATION MAP  
PROJECT NO. 07170030.01  
FIGURE 1

## NEEDS AND DEMAND EVALUATION

Population projections for Gilmer County through the year 2015 were obtained from the Office of Planning and Budget's Georgia Population Projections (published in 2005). Projections to 2057 were extrapolated based on the average growth rate that was shown in the Projection publication. These projections can be seen in Table 1.

**Table 1**  
**Population Projection**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Population Projection</b>
2000	23,456
2005	27,335
2010	31,752
2015	36,569
2020*	42,420
2025*	49,207
2030*	57,080
2035*	66,213
2040*	76,807
2045*	89,097
2050*	103,352
2055*	119,888
2057*	127,561

*Data Source: from Georgia Population Projections by the Office of Planning and Budget*

*\*Population Calculated based on yearly % growth from 2005-2015*

Water demand projections were calculated based on population projections and water withdrawal data for Gilmer County in 2000. According to the US Census, the population of Gilmer County was 23,456 in 2000, while the water withdrawal was 5.5 million gallons per day (MGD) based on the document "Water Use in Georgia by County for 2000", (Information Circular 106, Julia Fanning, USGS, Atlanta, 2003). The Gilmer County Water and Sewer Authority currently holds a surface water withdrawal permit from the Cartecay River for 4.0 MGD. Additionally, the City of Ellijay holds a surface water permit for 0.45 MGD from the Ellijay River (all numbers are reported in permitted monthly average).

The overall usage was calculated to be 236 gallons per day (gpd) per person. This number was used as a constant through 2057 to create water withdrawal projections. The water withdrawal projection for 2057 was calculated to be approximately 30 MGD. This figure includes all unaccounted for water (UAW), and the assumption that industrial usage would increase with the increase in Gilmer County population. Water withdrawal projections are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2**  
**Water Withdrawal Projection**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Water Withdrawal Projection (MGD)</b>
2000	5.5
2005	6.4
2010	7.5
2015	8.6
2020	10
2025	12
2030	14
2035	16
2040	18
2045	21
2050	24
2055	28
2057	30

**Proximity to Surface Water Intakes**

Based on the GIS database developed for this project, the closest surface water intake structure is downstream of the dam on the Cartecay River. This structure is operated by the Ellijay – Gilmer County Water Authority. The stream distance to the intake is approximately 19.2 miles. This includes 0.4 miles from the dam along Rolston Creek to the confluence with the Cartecay River. The following figure illustrates the location of the nearest surface water intake to Cartecay River 01.

**Figure 2**  
**Distance to Nearest Intake**



## ENGINEERING FACTORS

### Proposed Dam

The proposed dam, which will incorporate the existing dam, has a crest elevation of 1720 feet, an auxiliary spillway elevation of 1705 feet, and a normal pool elevation of 1699 feet. The proposed dam will impound a reservoir that has a surface area of approximately 181 acres and storage volume of approximately 2,300 million gallons (MG). A plan view of the proposed reservoir is shown in Figure 3.


Several engineering assumptions were made pertaining to spillway configuration. The spillway system for the proposed dam was assumed to consist of a principal spillway in the form of a 3' by 9' interior dimension reinforced concrete riser with a 36-inch diameter reinforced concrete low-level outlet pipe and an auxiliary spillway in the form of a 180-foot wide reinforced concrete chute spillway with ogee crest. The intent of the proposed principal spillway is to approximate the flows that are being discharged by the current spillway system during the two through 100-year storm events. The size of the auxiliary spillway was approximated by estimating the peak inflow that would occur during the Probable Maximum Precipitation (PMP) event and computing the spillway width that would be required to pass the estimated inflow with a given amount of hydraulic head. The available hydraulic head was determined by comparing the drainage basin area to lake surface area. The structures that had a drainage basin area to lake surface area ratio equal to or in excess of ten were allotted 15 feet of hydraulic head to pass the PMP inflows, while the structures that had a ratio of less than ten were allotted ten feet of hydraulic head to pass the PMP inflows. The assumption that the dam would be required to pass the inflow resulting from the PMP storm event is based on the history of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division Safe Dams Program (Safe Dams) reviewing plans for water supply reservoir dams regardless of classification. As such, the dam would generally be required to comply with the engineering guidelines established by Safe Dams. Based upon the height of the dam (approximately 125 feet), the dam would be required to store and/or pass the inflows from the full PMP event safely. Additionally, the proposed dam would have a relatively high likelihood of being classified as high-hazard or Class 'C' by the NRCS, as well as Safe Dams.

The proposed dam and flood pool will:

- Impact 18 structures
- Require the purchase of 277 acres from 75 parcels
- Require the purchase of 30 acres of easement area for state required buffer
- Impact four local/county roads

Figure 4 displays the proposed reservoir area as well as the buffer and affected parcels. The 18 affected structures were identified from aerial photographs. The types of structures were not identified on the ground and could be houses, barns, trailers, etc. A more detailed ground survey will be required to determine the type of each structure and the corresponding purchase price of each structure.

**Figure 3**  
**Proposed Reservoir Area Map**





## SAFE YIELD ANALYSIS

### Definition

Reservoir safe yield is generally defined as the reliable withdrawal rate of water with acceptable quality that can be provided by reservoir storage through the critical drought period. The critical drought period in the State of Georgia is defined as the drought of record and in any given drainage basin can vary depending on reservoir size and other factors. This study was based on the critical drought period from 1986-1988; however, the current drought could possibly exceed the existing drought of record. If this were to occur, the computed yields detailed herein would be reduced. Safe yield in this study was simulated using a constant average annual demand. The justification for this is that while total water demands after declaration of a drought condition are usually less than normal, this situation is typically offset by higher than average demands prior to declaration of the drought condition. Safe yield is dependent upon the storage and hydrologic (rainfall/runoff/evaporation) characteristics of the source and source facilities, the selected critical drought, upstream and downstream permitted withdrawals, and the minimum in-stream flow requirements.

The proposed reservoir is a “pumped-storage” reservoir, where natural inflow into the reservoir is supplemented with pumped diversions from a nearby larger stream or river. Water is pumped from a larger river when runoff is plentiful, and is stored in the reservoir for times of drought. Pumped diversions increase safe yield, and generally result in fewer environmental impacts compared with reservoirs on main-stem rivers.


### Analysis Method

The Cartecay River near Ellijay gage (USGS 02379500) was preferred for use in this analysis; however its record period only extends from March 1937 to September 1977. Therefore, a correlation of the Cartecay River gage with the Coosawattee River near Ellijay, GA gage (USGS 02380500) was performed, and regression-based adjustment was applied to the Cartecay River gage flows (Figure A-1, Appendix) to lengthen the simulation period. The adjusted flows from the Coosawattee River near Ellijay, GA gage were then used to simulate stream flows in the Cartecay River and Rolston Creek Basins. The record period for the Coosawattee River near Ellijay, gage (adjusted) extends from June 1963 to present and includes two major droughts (1986-88 and 1999-2002), plus the current drought. The diversion pump station was assumed to be located just upstream of the confluence of Rolston Creek and the Cartecay River. The straight line pipe distance between the dam and diversion location was estimated at 0.4 miles. The following drainage areas were used in the analysis:

- Dam Site (Rolston Creek): 9.06 mi<sup>2</sup>
- Diversion (Cartecay River): 57 mi<sup>2</sup>

The pumped diversion location and watershed is shown in Figure 5. The maximum estimated pool level at top of dam was selected during the initial screening phase based on USGS topographic mapping. From that level, a freeboard allowance of 15 feet between the top of dam and the auxiliary spillway was incorporated to pass the spillway design flood (assumed to be the probable maximum flood).

**Figure 5**  
**Watershed Location Map**




Additional depth to maintain existing flood storage volume (1410 Ac-ft, or 460 MG) was subtracted from the auxiliary spillway elevation to compute the water supply pool elevation used in the analysis of safe yield. Note that more detailed topographic mapping would be needed to more closely approximate the safe yield of the proposed reservoir. Table 3 summarizes the various reservoir elevations and approximate storage volumes. Calculation of stage-area and stage-storage curves is presented as Figure A-2 in the Appendix. Figure 6 below is the stage-storage curve for the reservoir.

**Table 3**  
**Summary of Reservoir Data**

Stage	Elevation	Volume (Million Gallons)
Maximum Pool (Top of Dam)	1720	3,800
Flood Pool (Auxiliary Spillway Crest)	1705	2,800
Water Supply Pool	1699	2,300

**Figure 6**  
**Stage-Storage Curve**



A reservoir operations model was developed to incorporate daily gage data from the selected USGS gages and reservoir shape parameters for estimation of evaporation. The following assumptions were incorporated into the analysis for the estimation of safe yield:

**Assumptions:**

1. Dead storage of 20% of gross reservoir storage was incorporated to allow for sediment storage and poor water quality in lower reservoir strata.
2. Usable water supply storage was assumed to be the water supply pool storage

- (calculated as noted above) less dead storage.
3. Pump station diversions were assumed to be from Cartecay River at the location previously described. Diversions were assumed to occur whenever the reservoir level fell below full water supply pool. Pumped diversions were assumed to be bounded by pumping capacity and by flow restrictions on Cartecay River (noted below).
  4. A minimum in-stream flow (MIF) of 30% AAF at the diversion pump station (Cartecay River) was used.
  5. Allowance for downstream withdrawals by Ellijay-Gilmer WSA would reduce available flow in the stream. In addition to the MIF, the model provided for a prorated let-by with the following characteristics:
 

<b>Downstream Withdrawal:</b>	4 mgd
<b>Drainage Area:</b>	135 mi <sup>2</sup>
<b>Prorated Let-by:</b>	1.69 mgd
  6. No upstream withdrawals were identified.
  7. For the dam site, minimum in-stream flow of 30/60/40 percent average annual flow (AAF) was used. This MIF applies as follows: 30% AAF for July through November; 60% AAF for January through April; and 40% AAF for May, June and December.
  8. Return flow from wastewater discharges or septic systems was not considered in the analysis.
  9. Evaporation loss was based upon net historical evaporation rates (maximum average day) for each month as recorded at Allatoona Dam (Station No. 181) in Bartow County. Lake evaporation was assumed to be equal to 70% of pan evaporation during each month. Surface area was approximated by a regression equation relating storage to surface area (Figure A-3, Appendix).
  10. Adjusted streamflow data from the USGS gages was applied in direct proportion of drainage areas to simulate flow into the reservoir and at the diversion location.
  11. Total seepage losses would be less than the MIF requirements and, therefore, did not need to be separately considered.
  12. Safe yield is that quantity of water that can be provided to meet water demands during the critical drought period.

The attainable safe yield during the analyzed period was found by iteration of the daily mass balance equation:

$\text{Ending Storage} = (\text{Beginning Storage}) + (\text{Natural Inflow}) + (\text{Pumped Inflow}) - (\text{Water Supply}) - (\text{Evaporation}) - (\text{MIF})$
---

The trial safe yield value was varied until the reservoir level just reached the dead storage value, and recovery of the reservoir was computed.

## RESULTS

Incorporating the above assumptions, the estimated safe yield of the site was computed. The results of the safe yield analysis are presented in Table 4 and Figure 7. It should be noted that these estimated safe yield values are based on USGS topographic mapping. The estimates could vary significantly based on more detailed mapping, which would be required as part of a final


safe yield analysis. The table below presents the estimated safe yield and refill time for a range of pump capacities.

**Table 4**  
**Safe Yield Summary**

Pump Capacity (MGD)	Estimated Safe Yield (mgd)	Refill Time* (years)
0	2.9	5
2.5	4.7	4
5	5.6	3
10	7	2
15	8.1	2
20	8.8	2
30	9.7	1


\*Refill time is the time from start of drawdown until complete refill to water supply pool

**Figure 7**  
**Estimated Safe Yield vs Pump Capacity**



As can be seen in Figure 7, there is diminishing return (safe yield) with increasing pump capacity (reflecting pump station and pipeline cost). For the purposes of this analysis, an estimated economical safe yield & pump capacity combination were selected from the above graph. The estimated safe yield for this project is approximately 8.6 mgd for a pump capacity of 18 mgd. These values were used to size and cost out the diversion facilities detailed later in this report. The variation of reservoir elevation over time for the above assumed safe yield and pump capacity is reflected in Figure 8.

**Figure 8  
Reservoir Elevation vs. Time**



## ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

### Preliminary Studies

To evaluate the potential environmental impacts, permitting and compensatory mitigation associated with Cartecay River 01, preliminary ecological studies were conducted by JJG. These studies consisted of a desktop survey and wetland approximation field surveys to estimate wetlands and streams occurring within the project area. While this evaluation is not sufficient for Clean Water Act Section 404 permitting, field surveys add increased confidence to the desktop evaluation. All estimates of jurisdictional waters, permitting requirements, and compensatory mitigation requirements/cost estimates presented herein are very general and preliminary in nature. Detailed studies would be necessary to definitively determine permitting requirements.

Prior to conducting field surveys, desktop evaluations were performed with available data resources including the U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-minute topographic maps and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps. JJG ecologists then performed a reconnaissance-level site visit to Cartecay River 01 site to verify and supplement the desktop evaluation. Subsequent to field surveys, observations were transcribed into an ArcView GIS database for analysis. Preliminary estimates of jurisdictional waters (i.e., wetlands, streams, open waters) occurring within the Cartecay River 01 project area are provided below.

### Wetlands

The *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States* (Cowardin Classification System) defines the Palustrine System as all nontidal wetlands dominated by trees, shrubs, persistent emergent vegetation, emergent mosses or lichens, and all such wetlands that occur in tidal areas where salinity is less than 0.5 percent. It also includes wetlands lacking such vegetation, but with all of the following four characteristics: 1) area less than 20-acres; 2) the lack of active wave-formed or bedrock shoreline; 3) water depth in the deepest part of basin less than 6.6 feet at low water; and 4) salinity due to ocean-derived salts less than 0.5 percent.

The Lacustrine System includes wetlands and deepwater habitats with all of the following characteristics: 1) situated in a topographic depression or a dammed river channel; 2) lacking trees, shrubs, persistent emergent vegetation, emergent mosses or lichens with greater than 30-percent areal coverage; and 3) total area exceeds 20 acres. Wetlands and deepwater habitats less than 20-acres are also included in this system if an active wave-formed or bedrock shoreline feature makes up all or part of the boundary, or if the water depth in the deepest part of the basin exceeds 6.6 feet at low water.

Office and field reviews determined that approximately five acres of palustrine wetlands and approximately ten acres of lacustrine/palustrine open waters exist within the Cartecay River 01 project area. These systems are primarily associated with Anderson Creek, Rolston Creek, Oliver Creek, Simons Branch, and one unnamed tributary within the proposed reservoir pool limits. Cowardin classifications of the wetland systems range from palustrine forested to palustrine emergent with hydrologic regimes ranging from saturated to seasonally flooded.

## **Streams**

The Cowardin Classification System defines lower perennial streams as low gradient streams with slow water velocities and substrates comprised mainly of sand and mud. Intermittent streams are defined as streams flowing for only part of the year. When water is not flowing, it may remain in isolated pools or surface water may be absent. Ephemeral streams flow only in direct response to precipitation and do not receive groundwater contributions.

Office and field reviews indicate that approximately 18,496 linear feet of lower perennial streams and approximately 355 linear feet of intermittent streams are located within the maximum reservoir pool limits of Cartecay River 01. Ephemeral streams were not identified due to the preliminary nature of the studies. Refer to Figure 9 for locations of these jurisdictional features.


## **Cultural Resources**

Review of existing cultural resources information did not indicate any identified cultural resources within the maximum reservoir pool limits of Cartecay River 01. It should be noted that the absence of recorded Cultural Resources does not mean that they do not exist; in fact, a Phase I Cultural Resources Survey (conducted to the standards of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act) would be required to determine the presence or absence of Cultural Resources as part of permitting for any proposed reservoir project.

## **Threatened and Endangered Species**

Review of existing threatened and endangered species information identified twelve federally and state protected species documented from Gilmer County, Georgia and consists of six faunal and six floral species. The Georgia Department of Natural Resources – Non-game Conservation Section lists the occurrence of a federally threatened species, the goldline darter (*Percina aurolineata*) and a state endangered species, northern starflower (*Trientalis borealis*) within the maximum reservoir pool limits of Cartecay River 01. Specialized aquatic surveys would be required to definitively determine the presence/absence of goldline darter within the project area. Botanical surveys during the growing season would be required to definitively determine the presence/absence of northern starflower within the project area. Refer to Table 5 for a summary of protected species located in Gilmer County and potential habitat for these species within the maximum reservoir pool limits.

**Figure 9**  
**Jurisdictional Areas Location Map**



**Table 5**  
**Summary of Protected Species for Gilmer County, Georgia**

<b>Scientific Name</b>	<b>Vernacular Name</b>	<b>Federal Status</b>	<b>State Status</b>	<b>Habitat Present (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Preferred Habitat</b>
<b>Faunal</b>					
<i>Cambarus coosawattae</i>	Coosawattee crayfish	NA	E	Yes	riffle habitat in the Coosawattee River system, moderately flowing streams with cobble bottoms
<i>Cambarus speciosus</i>	beautiful crayfish	NA	E	Yes	medium-sized streams with clear to lightly cloudy water flowing swiftly over rocky substrates
<i>Cyprinella caerulea</i>	blue shiner	T	E	Yes	found in pools, backwaters, and areas with moderate current of cool, clear, small to medium-sized rivers with sand, gravel, or cobble substrate
<i>Etheostoma brevirostrum</i>	holiday darter	NA	E	Yes	found in gravel and bedrock pools of cool to warm creeks and small to medium rivers that have clear water and moderate to fast current
<i>Macrhybopsis</i> sp. 1	Coosa chub	NA	E	Yes	swift currents over gravel substrates
<i>Percina aurolineata</i>	goldline darter	T	E	Yes	main channels of small to medium-sized rivers in areas with rapids ≥ three feet; shallow, rocky riffles w/ swift currents in medium-sized rivers
<b>Floral</b>					
<i>Carex manhartii</i>	Manhart's sedge	NA	T	Yes	found growing at moist sites (not associated with limestone), cove hardwoods and other mesic hardwood forests
<i>Hydrastis canadensis</i>	goldenseal	NA	E	Yes	rich, mesic hardwood forests, especially in areas with alkaline soils

**Table 5**  
**Summary of Protected Species for Gilmer County, Georgia**

<b>Scientific Name</b>	<b>Vernacular Name</b>	<b>Federal Status</b>	<b>State Status</b>	<b>Habitat Present (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Preferred Habitat</b>
<i>Isotria medeoloides</i>	small whorled pogonia	T	T	Yes	acidic soils in dry to mesic second growth deciduous or deciduous-coniferous forests; mixed hardwood-pine forests with open understory
<i>Monotropsis odorata</i>	sweet pinesap	NA	T	Yes	upland forests
<i>Sarracenia oreophila</i>	green pitcher plant	E	E	No	wet meadows; upland bogs; open seepy meadows, along sandy flushed banks of streams, and in partially shaded red maple-blackgum low woods or poorly drained oak-pine flatwoods; the known population of this species in Gilmer County has been extirpated
<i>Trientalis borealis</i>	northern star flower	NA	E	Yes	rocky, northern hardwood forests at high elevations

T= threatened, E= endangered, NA= not applicable

### **Trout Streams**

Review of available resources indicated five primary trout streams (Anderson Creek, Rolston Creek, Oliver Creek, Simons Branch, and one unnamed tributary) are located within the maximum reservoir pool limits of Cartecay River 01. According to the Georgia Erosion and Sedimentation Act, as amended (Code Section 12-7- 6(16)), the state of Georgia prohibits land disturbing activities within 50 feet (horizontally measured) of state waters classified as trout waters, unless a variance is obtained from the Director of the Environmental Protection Division. A completed application form is required by the Environmental Protection Division for evaluating requests for such approval. Please refer to *Rules of Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division, Chapter 391-3-7 Erosion and Sediment Control, Section 391-3-7.05, Buffer Variance Procedures and Criteria* for a list of activities that do not require an application to or approval from the Division.

### **303(d) and 305(b) Listed Streams**

Review of available resources did not indicate any 303(d) or 305(b) listed streams within the maximum reservoir pool limits of Cartecay River 01.

### **Section 404/401 Permitting**

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) regulates the discharge of dredged or fill material into the Nation's Waters under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Construction of an impoundment and flooding jurisdictional streams/wetlands is regulated by the USACE. Two types of permits are available through the USACE: Nationwide and Individual Permits. Nationwide Permits (NWP) have been established previously by the Chief of Engineers for projects that have minimal cumulative impacts to the Nation's Waters. Examples of the most commonly used NWPs include site development, minor road crossings, maintenance activities, and utility line discharges. Specific criteria and conditions were established that must be satisfied prior to obtaining authorization of a NWP from the USACE. In addition, the Savannah District of the USACE issued Final Nationwide Permit Regional Conditions effective May 11, 2007.

Individual Permits (IP) are required for projects having more than minimal cumulative adverse impacts on the Nation's waters. The development of a water supply reservoir would typically require an IP. IPs involve significantly more information, documentation, and coordination with regulatory agencies and are considerably more difficult to acquire than a NWP. Prior to coordination with the USACE regarding the construction of an impoundment, required information would consist of, but not be limited to, the following information:

- Justification of Purpose and Need for the project
- Alternatives analysis of other water supply options evaluated to meet the need
- Wetland delineation with surveyed boundaries of USACE jurisdictional waters
- Phase I cultural resources and protected species surveys
- Detailed description of proposed project and proposed impacts to jurisdictional waters
- Detailed analysis of flow releases documented with population analysis and system modeling
- Avoidance and minimization of jurisdictional waters analysis
- Identification of adjacent property owners
- Development of a conceptual compensatory mitigation plan

Following completion of these items, a complex project meeting would typically be scheduled with the USACE Northern Area Section Office (Morrow, GA) to present the proposed project. Subsequent to the meeting, and if a project is tentatively accepted by the regulatory agencies, formal application and preparation of an IP would start. Following submittal of an IP, the application must be advertised for public comment. The USACE prepares the public notice, which includes detailed applicant information such as site location, proposed impacts, cultural resources, protected species, and proposed mitigation. The public notice would be advertised for 30 days and is also submitted to regulatory agencies including the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, adjacent property owners, and to the USACE general mailing list. Applicants will be required to respond to inquiries received

during the public notice process. Public hearings could be required if substantial adverse comments are received from the coordinating agencies or the public. Additional information and permitting required would consist of a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD). This certification must be issued for an IP to be valid. Depending on the level of impacts associated with the proposed reservoir, an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement could be required by the USACE as well. Based on previous project experience, the level of controversy and environmental issues raised during agency and public review, a typical new reservoir project may require permitting times of five years or more.

The expansion of an existing reservoir could potentially facilitate the Section 404 permitting process when compared to the construction of a new impoundment. This is especially true for issues such as alternatives analysis, avoidance and minimization, and aquatic organism passage in that many or most potential impacts have already occurred. However, the steps of the overall Section 404 permitting process would still need to be followed, and historically reservoirs have encountered significant regulatory and public challenges, regardless of the presence/absence of an existing impoundment.

### **Compensatory Mitigation**

To determine the amount mitigation potentially required for jurisdictional impacts within the Cartecay River 01, the USACE's Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for Compensatory Mitigation (March 2004) was utilized. The SOP uses a series of factors such as location, type, existing condition, type of impact, etc. to generate a multiplying "factor." That factor is then multiplied by the impact area (acreage or linear footage) to calculate the required mitigation credits. To determine an average factor for jurisdictional areas associated with the Cartecay River 01, various conditions observed during the field surveys were utilized. *However, it is imperative to note that this document only serves as a guideline if impacts do not exceed 5,000 linear feet of stream or ten acres of wetland impacts.* Potential impacts for the Cartecay River 01 would significantly exceed this threshold and actual compensatory mitigation requirements would likely be substantially different from SOP estimates. Currently, the USACE Savannah District Office is developing a new SOP for large-scale projects focused on reservoirs. It is anticipated that this SOP would be issued mid-2008.

Utilizing the 2004 SOP and the approximated acreage and linear feet of jurisdictional waters located within the Cartecay River 01 project area, an estimate of compensatory mitigation credits can be determined. Multiplying factors used for this analysis include: 6.7 for wetland systems, 5.7 for open waters, 12.7 for lower perennial streams, and 7.6 for intermittent streams. This factor was then multiplied by the acreage/ linear footage to determine an estimated number of mitigation credits required. The number of credits was then multiplied by an average credit price to estimate the final estimated compensatory mitigation cost associated with the Cartecay River 01. Refer to Table 6 in the following section entitled "Project Construction Cost Estimate Narrative" for estimated impacts to jurisdictional waters and an estimate of mitigation credits required and associated costs.

## **Stream Buffer Variance**

The Georgia Erosion and Sedimentation Act of 1975 (GESA), as amended, requires that a 25-foot vegetated buffer be maintained along all state waters. Any land disturbing activities within the buffer would require obtaining a stream buffer variance from the EPD. The local issuing authority is responsible for determining if state waters are on-site and is responsible for determining if a stream buffer variance is required.

The GESA has a number of activities that are considered for stream buffer variances, including public water system reservoirs. Based on current regulations, reservoir construction would likely qualify for a variance. Attendant features such as pipelines and roadways, would likely be exempt from GESA regulations if stream crossings are constructed nearly perpendicular.

## **EPD Water Withdrawal Permit**

Georgia EPD requires a permit for withdrawal of 100,000 gallons per day or more of either surface water or ground water. In addition to justification of need for water for up to 50 years in the future, water withdrawal permits typically require the preparation of water conservation, drought contingency, water supply/watershed protection, and reservoir management plans. A public hearing may be required as part of the withdrawal permitting process. EPD requires that its comments on the component plans be addressed before moving forward with issuing the water withdrawal permit. Based on previous permitting experience, a water withdrawal permit can be obtained within 5 to 7 months, depending on EPD's review time and the extent of their comments.

## **Source Water Protection Plan**

Amendments to the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) have brought about a new approach for ensuring clean and safe drinking water served by public water supplies in the United States. Management of a drinking water source now requires a Source Water Protection Plan. This plan basically defines watershed management strategies for ensuring that the water supply is not compromised by potential pollutant sources. Typically these sources are unmanaged development, but they can also include industrial sources that can potentially contaminate the water supply. The entity that operates this reservoir for water supply would be required to produce and implement the Plan. The Plan should also address any source water from outside the reservoir watershed that would be used to fill the reservoir, i.e., pumped/storage sources. The cost and schedule for producing a Source Water Assessment and the corresponding Source Water Protection Plan have not been included in any of the estimates presented in the report.

## **PROJECT CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE NARRATIVE**

### **Dam and Reservoir**

The construction cost estimate for the proposed dam was based upon the general description provided in the background section of the report. Additionally, the following assumptions were made regarding the geometry of the dam.

- Upstream slope of 3H to 1V
- Downstream slope of 3H to 1V
- Upstream slope wave action protection in the form of riprap from 30 feet below the crest of the dam to 5 feet below the crest of the dam. Riprap supported by a berm located 30 feet below top of dam.
- Downstream slope having nearly horizontal 12-foot wide berms at 30-foot vertical intervals to control surface water runoff and erosion
- Crest of dam having a width of 25-feet

In addition to the above geometric considerations, the following internal drainage configurations were also considered in the estimation of construction costs.

- Chimney drain located at the downstream edge of the crest
- Trench drain located at 1/3 the distance from the downstream toe to the crest

A plan view and cross section of the proposed dam is provided in Figures 10 and 11.

Contained below are the items estimated to develop the construction cost estimate. We caution that the quantities and associated prices are based upon limited engineering evaluation and will likely change as the project proceeds into detailed evaluation and design.

#### Mobilization and Demobilization


Mobilization and demobilization is a lump sum item estimated at 6 percent of the unit rate sum of the construction items.

#### Erosion and Sedimentation Control

Erosion and sedimentation control is a lump sum item estimated at 2 percent of the sum of unit rate construction items.


#### Control of Water

Control of water is a lump sum item estimated at 3 percent of the sum of unit rate construction items. This item includes the control of both surface water and groundwater and will likely consist of stream diversion, cofferdam construction and maintenance, pumping, and well points, as well as any other means of controlling water during construction.



NRCS WATERSHED DAM ASSESSMENT  
CARTECAY RIVER NO. 1

PROPOSED PLAN VIEW  
PROJECT NO. 07170030.01  
FIGURE 10



© Schnabel Engineering 2007 All Rights Reserved

	<p>NRCS WATERSHED DAM ASSESSMENT CARTECAY RIVER NO. 1</p>	<p>TYPICAL SECTION</p>
<p>PROJECT NO. 07170030.01 FIGURE 11</p>		

### Clearing

Clearing is a unit rate item measured in acres associated with the removal of trees and other vegetation from the reservoir. The estimated area of clearing was assumed to be equal to the surface area of the reservoir at the normal pool elevation.

### Clearing and Grubbing

Clearing and grubbing is a unit rate item measured in acres associated with the removal of trees, other vegetation, and associated root mats in the areas to receive structural fill or concrete. The estimated area of clearing and grubbing was assumed to be equal to the footprint of the proposed dam plus an additional 50-foot perimeter around the proposed dam.

### Earth Fill

Earth Fill is a unit rate item measured in cubic yards. The computed volume of earth fill represents the estimated quantity required to construct the dam as described herein. The estimated quantity was computed using an AutoCad Civil 3D computer model based on the proposed grading and existing topography. In addition to the proposed embankment earth fill, foundation excavation backfill was calculated (see Excavation, Common for details) and added to the embankment earth fill to determine the total quantity of earth fill.

### Drain Fill

Drain Fill is a unit rate item measured in cubic yards. The computed volume of drain fill represents the estimated quantity of fine and coarse-grained drain material required to construct the internal drainage system as described herein. For the purposes of this study, no differentiation was made between fine and coarse drain fill. In addition, the quantity for the trench drain was assumed to be equal to half of the chimney drain quantity. The chimney drain was assumed to have a top elevation equal to the proposed normal pool elevation and a bottom elevation approximated at the limits of the foundation excavation. The chimney drain was assumed to have a width of three feet and run the length of the dam from one abutment, into the floodplain, and up the other abutment tying into residual soils.

### Excavation, Common

Excavation, Common is a unit rate item measured in cubic yards associated with the removal of unsuitable material (soils) within and adjacent to the footprint of the proposed dam. The volume of common excavation was calculated by approximating the surface area of the floodplain within the limits of clearing and grubbing as well as the depth of excavation within the same area. The surface area of the floodplain was approximated using available topographic maps. The depth of excavation was estimated from the boring data included in the design plans for the existing dam.

### Riprap

Riprap is a unit rate item measured in tons. The computed weight of riprap represents the estimated quantity required to construct the wave-action berm as described herein. Riprap was assumed to be placed on the upstream slope of the dam. The section of riprap was assumed to extend 30 vertical feet, have a thickness of about 2-¾ feet, and traverse the length of the proposed dam.

### Permanent Turf Establishment

Permanent Turf Establishment is a unit rate item measured in acres associated with the establishment of a permanent turf at the conclusion of construction activities for the proposed dam. The estimated area of permanent turf establishment was assumed to be equal to the estimated area of clearing and grubbing.

### Concrete, Class 4000

Concrete, Class 4000 is a unit rate item measured in cubic yards associated with the construction of the reinforced concrete auxiliary chute spillway. The volume of concrete was estimated by comparing the proposed auxiliary spillway drop in elevation and width to the drops in elevation and widths of constructed reinforced concrete chute spillways. A relationship was developed between the drop in elevation and width of the constructed spillways and the required quantity of concrete. This relationship was applied to the proposed dam to estimate the quantity of concrete.

### Principal Spillway Reinforced Concrete Pressure Pipe

Reinforced Concrete Pressure Pipe (RCPP) is a unit rate item measured in feet. The computed length of RCPP represents the estimated quantity required to construct the principal spillway conduit described herein. The RCPP was assumed to be placed through the base of the proposed dam from the upstream toe to the downstream toe. The diameter of the pipe was assumed to be equal to the diameter of the pipe in the existing dam.

### Concrete, Class 3000 (mass)

Concrete, Class 3000 is a unit rate item measured in cubic yards associated with the construction of the concrete cradle beneath the principal spillway pipe. The concrete cradle was assumed to be designed as a Soil Conservation Service Type A2 cradle and run the length of the principal spillway pipe minus ten feet.

### Reinforced Concrete Riser

The Reinforced Concrete Riser is a lump sum item associated with the construction of the reinforced concrete principal spillway structure. The cost was estimated by comparing the proposed principal spillway riser height to the heights of constructed reinforced concrete riser structures. A relationship was developed between the height of the constructed spillways and the cost to construct them. This relationship was utilized to estimate the cost of the proposed riser structure.

## **Land Acquisition**

The costs associated with land acquisitions are unit rate items based upon the number of acres that will need to be purchased at the top-of-dam elevation, the number of acres that will need to be managed for a 150-foot buffer around the normal pool, and the number of houses that will need to be purchased. For the purposes of the buffer management, only the portions of the buffer above top-of-dam elevation were considered. The costs to purchase the land were estimated based upon available records of recent land sales. The cost to manage the buffer was assumed to be 60 percent of the land purchase cost. The cost of each structure impacted was assumed to be \$200,000.

## **Roadway Relocation**


To construct the proposed project, four roads will be impacted. These roads may need to be raised, relocated, or modified to accommodate the new reservoir; however, no consideration was given to the relocation of the roads in this study. A more detailed evaluation would need to be performed to evaluate the impact on existing roadways and the associated cost.

## **Pump Station and Pipeline Cost Estimation**

The pump storage location for Cartecay River 01 is located at the beginning of the Cartecay River at the confluence of Rolston and Tickanetley creeks. The reservoir is located along Rolston Creek, approximately 0.45 miles upstream of the confluence with the Cartecay River. With a water supply pool elevation of 1699 feet, Reservoir 01 has an average day yield of approximately 8.5 MGD. A 36-inch ductile iron pipe (DIP) was selected to carry water from the pump storage location to the reservoir. This pipeline is approximately 1.75 miles in length and will pump water from the storage location elevation of 1590 feet, to the 1699 feet height of the reservoir water surface. A cascading structure will need to be constructed where the pipe comes into the reservoir to provide aeration and erosion control.

Two 10-MGD pumps and one 8-MGD pumps were selected at the pump storage location to pump water to the reservoir. This gives a firm pumping capacity of 18-MGD, which is roughly twice the daily yield of the reservoir, the standard assumption for pump capacity. This pumping capacity will allow the reservoir to remain stable during times of peak water demand, as well as give redundancy in the case of failure in one of the pumps. An access road will need to be constructed in order to construct and maintain the pumping station on the Cartecay River. This road, shown on Figure 12, will run approximately 400 feet from Greenwood Ford Road. The cost opinion for these components is found in the appendix.

Figure 12  
Project Location Map



## Compensatory Mitigation

The simplest mitigation option is typically purchasing credits from a bank. Compensatory mitigation credits may be purchased from an approved mitigation bank or through the Georgia Land Trust Service Center if a bank is not available within the project area. Based on recent projects, wetland credits range from \$7,000-\$10,000 per credit and stream credits range from \$70-\$110 per credit. An option to purchasing credits is to obtain credits by conducting on-site restoration or preservation of jurisdictional waters.

**Table 6**  
**Cartecay River 01 Estimated Impacts and Overall Mitigation Banking Cost Analysis**

<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Estimated Impact Acres/Linear Feet</b>	<b>Projected Credits Needed</b>	<b>Projected Cost* \$90/stream credit \$7,500/wetland credit</b>
Wetland	5.45 A	37	\$277,500
Intermittent Stream	355 l.f.	2,698	\$242,820
Lower Perennial Stream	18,496 l.f.	234,900	\$21,141,000
Open Water	10.30 A	59	\$442,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>15.75 acres / 18,851 lf</b>	<b>96 wetland / 237,598 stream**</b>	<b>\$22,103,820</b>

\*Cost is based on recent quotes from banks within the Coosawatee Basin. Actual banking price may be higher or lower than estimated depending on the date of purchase and credit availability. \*\*Total required credits calculated using the March 2004 Standard Operating Procedure mitigating guidelines established by the US Army Corps of Engineers.

## Estimated Project Construction Cost

The total project cost is estimated at \$79,000,000. Table A-5, located in the appendix, shows an itemized breakdown of the costs associated with enlarging the existing dam and reservoir. These costs are estimates and are based on multiple assumptions.

## **APPENDIX**

### **FIGURES**

Figure A-1	Gage Station Flows – Regression Analysis
Figure A-2	Stage Storage / Stage Area Curves
Figure A-3	Regression Equations for Area to Storage and Depth to Storage
Figure A-4	Storage vs. Time and Elevation vs. Time for Assumed Safe Yield

### **TABLES**

Table A-1	Summary of Opinion of Probable Construction Costs for Pumping Facilities and Pipelines
Table A-2	Opinion of Probable Construction Costs – River Intake and Pump Station
Table A-3	Opinion of Probable Construction Costs – 30-inch Raw Water Line
Table A-4	Opinion of Probable Construction Costs – Reservoir Inlet Structure
Table A-5	Total Project Opinion of Cost

Cartecay River near Ellijay (USGS 02379500)  
vs  
Coosawattee River near Ellijay (USGS 02380500)

Figure A-1











Figure A-2

Cartecay River 01  
Area and Storage Curves

Elev.	Area Acres	Area mg/in	Inc. Vol. A-FT	Cumulative Vol	
				A-FT	M Gal.
1603	0.0	0	0	0	0
1626	12.2	0	140	140	46
1640	34.0	1	324	464	151
1680	127.2	3	3225	3689	1202
1720	273.9	7	8022	11711	3817







**WATERSHED DAM ASSESSMENT - CARTECAY RIVER 01**

Gilmer County, Georgia (7194-001)

**OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE - CONCEPTUAL LEVEL**

TABLE A-1

Summary by Division

Division	01 - River Intake and Pump Station and Access Road	02 - 36 - inch Raw Water Force Main and Venturi Vault	03 - Reservoir Inlet Structure	TOTAL	% of Total	
1	\$0.49	\$0.18	\$0.05	\$0.72	8.73%	<b>CARTECAY RIVER 01:</b>
2	\$0.65	\$0.00	\$0.04	\$0.69	8.38%	
3	\$0.67	\$0.02	\$0.27	\$0.96	11.66%	
4	\$0.06	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.06	0.74%	
5	\$0.02	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.02	0.27%	
6	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
7	\$0.01	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.01	0.15%	
8	\$0.03	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.03	0.37%	
9	\$0.05	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.05	0.61%	
10	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
11	\$0.92	\$0.00	\$0.06	\$0.98	11.87%	
12	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
13	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
14	\$0.09	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.09	1.11%	
15	\$0.39	\$1.78	\$0.01	\$2.18	26.53%	
16	\$0.58	\$0.07	\$0.00	\$0.65	7.83%	
17	\$0.15	\$0.03	\$0.00	\$0.17	2.08%	
Structure Contingency	\$0.41	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.41	4.99%	
Markup	\$0.77	\$0.35	\$0.09	\$1.21	14.68%	
<b>Structure Total (without Contingency)</b>	<b>\$5.29</b>	<b>\$2.42</b>	<b>\$0.53</b>	<b>\$8.23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	
<b>Project Contingency</b>	<b>\$1.59</b>	<b>\$0.73</b>	<b>\$0.16</b>	<b>\$2.47</b>	<b>30.00%</b>	
<b>Structure Total (with Contingency)</b>	<b>\$6.88</b>	<b>\$3.14</b>	<b>\$0.68</b>			
<b>All Figures are in Millions</b>	<b>PROJECT TOTAL</b>			<b>\$10.70 M</b>		

**WATERSHED DAM ASSESSMENT - CARTECAY RIVER 01**  
**Gilmer County, Georgia (7194-001)**  
**OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE - CONCEPTUAL LEVEL**  
 01 - River Intake and PS

01  
 DECEMBER 2007  
 TABLE A-2

No.	Spec. Sect.	Description	Unit	Qty	Labor \$\$		Material \$\$		Equipment \$\$		Subcontractor \$\$		Total
					Unit	Total	Unit	Total	Unit	Total	Unit	Total	
<b>01 - Cartecay River 01: River Intake and Pump Station</b>					<b>3 - Channel Intake Pump Station</b>				<b>Pump Station Firm Capacity is 18MGD</b>				
<b>Div 1</b>													
1	1000	General Conditions	LS	1		\$174,000		\$137,800		\$174,100		\$0	\$485,900
<b>Div 2</b>													
2	2200	Earth Work	LS	1	\$13,600.00	\$13,600	\$8,400.00	\$8,400	\$3,479.00	\$3,480	\$252,800.00	\$252,800	\$278,280
3		Access Road	LF	400		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$110.00	\$44,000	\$44,000
4		Creek Crossing	EA	2		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$50,000.00	\$100,000	\$100,000
5	2831	10' Galv. Chain Link Fence	LF	800		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$30.00	\$24,000	\$24,000
6	2831	Dewatering / Pre-Excavation Preparation	LS	1	\$50,000.00	\$50,000	\$20,000.00	\$20,000	\$100,000.00	\$100,000	\$30,000.00	\$30,000	\$200,000
<b>Div 3</b>													
7	3250	Water Stop	LF	500	\$1.25	\$630	\$2.00	\$1,000		\$0		\$0	\$1,630
8	3300	Concrete Bridge	SF		\$2.00	\$0		\$0	\$3.50	\$0	\$20.00	\$0	\$0
9	3300	Concrete	LS	1	\$212,885.00	\$212,890	\$394,527.00	\$394,530	\$65,650.00	\$65,650	\$0.00	\$0	\$673,070
<b>Div 4</b>													
10	4210	Brick Veneer	SF	2800		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$14.50	\$40,600	\$40,600
11	4220	Concrete Masonry Unit - Reinforced	SF	2800		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$7.25	\$20,300	\$20,300
<b>Div 5</b>													
10	5524	Aluminum Handrail	LF	200	\$6.00	\$1,200	\$35.00	\$7,000	\$2.90	\$580		\$0	\$8,780
11		Ladder	VF	20	\$50.00	\$1,000	\$150.00	\$3,000	\$15.00	\$300		\$0	\$4,300
12	5530	Aluminum Grating Landing	SF	32	\$10.00	\$320	\$45.00	\$1,440	\$10.00	\$320		\$0	\$2,080
13	5530	Aluminum Grating	SF	240	\$10.00	\$2,400	\$20.00	\$4,800		\$0		\$0	\$7,200
<b>Div 6</b>													
<b>Div 7</b>													
14		Membrane Roofing	SF	1225		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$5.00	\$6,130	\$6,130
15		Dampproofing - Walls	SF	2800		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$0.56	\$1,570	\$1,570
16		1" Rigid Insulation - Walls	SF	2800		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$1.07	\$3,000	\$3,000
17	7210	Walls - Core Fill Foam Insulation (12" CMU)	SF	2800		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$0.61	\$1,710	\$1,710
<b>Div 8</b>													
18	8120	Hollow Metal Doors, Hardware, and Frames - Single	EA	10	\$150.00	\$1,500	\$400.00	\$4,000		\$0		\$0	\$5,500
19	8120	Hollow Metal Doors, Hardware, and Frames - Double	EA	2	\$150.00	\$300	\$800.00	\$1,600		\$0		\$0	\$1,900
20		Windows	LS	1	\$3,000.00	\$3,000	\$8,000.00	\$8,000	\$1,000.00	\$1,000		\$0	\$12,000
21	8331	Roll Up Aluminum Door (10'x12')	EA	2	\$800.00	\$1,600	\$4,500.00	\$9,000	\$50.00	\$100		\$0	\$10,700
<b>Div 9</b>													
22	9900	Painting	LS	1		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$50,000.00	\$50,000	\$50,000
<b>Div 10</b>													
<b>Div 11</b>													
23		Screens	EA	3	\$3,500.00	\$10,500	\$200,000.00	\$600,000	\$500.00	\$1,500		\$0	\$612,000
24		Eductors	EA	20	\$200.00	\$4,000	\$2,500.00	\$50,000	\$50.00	\$1,000		\$0	\$55,000
25		Pumps (10 MGD, 30 Feet Static Head)	EA	2	\$3,500.00	\$7,000	\$90,000.00	\$180,000	\$1,000.00	\$2,000		\$0	\$189,000
26		Pumps (8 MGD, 30 Feet Static Head)	EA	1	\$3,500.00	\$3,500	\$60,000.00	\$60,000	\$1,000.00	\$1,000		\$0	\$64,500
<b>Div 12</b>													
<b>Div 13</b>													
<b>Div 14</b>													
27		Bridge Crane	LS	1	\$5,000.00	\$5,000	\$85,000.00	\$85,000	\$1,500.00	\$1,500		\$0	\$91,500
<b>Div 15</b>													
28	15062	Ductile Iron Pipe	LS	1	\$11,195.00	\$11,200	\$197,359.83	\$197,360	\$2,840.00	\$2,840	\$0.00	\$0	\$211,400
29		PVC Piping	LS	1	\$1,250.00	\$1,250	\$8,000.00	\$8,000	\$750.00	\$750		\$0	\$10,000
30		Valves	LS	1	\$10,000.00	\$10,000	\$100,000.00	\$100,000	\$2,000.00	\$2,000	\$0.00	\$0	\$112,000
31		HVAC and Plumbing	LS	1		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$60,000.00	\$60,000	\$60,000
<b>Div 16</b>													
32	16000	Electrical	LS	1		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$430,000.00	\$430,000	\$430,000
33		CCTV Allowance	LS	0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$0
34		Ductbank	LF	1000		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$150.00	\$150,000	\$150,000
<b>Div 17</b>													
35	17000	Instrumentation	LS	1		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$145,000.00	\$145,000	\$145,000
		Contingency	LS	10%		\$51,000		\$188,000		\$36,000		\$136,000	\$411,000
		Subtotals				\$565,890		\$2,068,930		\$394,120		\$1,495,110	\$4,524,050

<b>Assumptions:</b>			
Sales Tax @	7.0%	\$144,800	Assumes that EPD will allow withdrawal from this source
Labor Burden @	30.0%	\$169,800	15 foot wide Asphalt access road with 10-foot high fence
Bonds On Subs @	1.5%	\$22,400	Pump Station firm capacity is 18MGD
Subtotal		\$4,861,050	Pump Station has a 3 channel intake
Fee @	7.0%	\$340,300	Pump Station footprint is approximately 100 feet by 40 feet
Insurance & Bonds @	1.7%	\$88,400	Pump Station main building footprint is approximately 35 feet by 35 feet
			Pump Station main building also houses the electrical room and is made of brick and block
			A Transformer is being provided by the Utility Company at the access road entrance
<b>Estimated Construction Cost</b>		<b>\$5,289,750</b>	Estimate DOES NOT include easements acquisitions, land acquisitions, withdrawal permits or mitigations required to build the pump station

**WATERSHED DAM ASSESSMENT - (7194-001)  
CARTECAY RIVER 01**

02  
DECEMBER 2007

**OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE - CONCEPTUAL LEVEL**

TABLE A-3

02 - 36-inch Raw Water Line

No.	Spec. Sect.	Description	Unit	Qty	Labor \$\$		Material \$\$		Equipment \$\$		Subcontractor \$\$		Total
					Unit	Total	Unit	Total	Unit	Total	Unit	Total	
<b>02 - 36-inch Raw Water Line with Venturi Vault</b>													
<b>Div 1</b>													
1	1000	General Conditions	LS	1		\$67,000		\$48,400		\$67,000		\$0	\$182,400
<b>Div 2</b>													
2	2125	Erosion and Sedimentation Control Maintenance - with Unit Bid	MTH			\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$0
3		Dewatering	LS			\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$0
4	2510	Asphalt Concrete Pavement - with Unit Bid	LS			\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$0
5	2523	Concrete Sidewalk and Curbs - with Unit Bid	LS			\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$0
<b>Div 3</b>													
6	3300	Miscellaneous Concrete (Venturi Vault)	LS	1	\$1,500.00	\$1,500	\$12,500.00	\$12,500	\$1,000.00	\$1,000	\$0.00	\$0	\$15,000
<b>Div 4</b>													
<b>Div 5</b>													
<b>Div 6</b>													
<b>Div 7</b>													
<b>Div 8</b>													
<b>Div 9</b>													
<b>Div 10</b>													
<b>Div 11</b>													
<b>Div 12</b>													
<b>Div 13</b>													
<b>Div 14</b>													
<b>Div 15</b>													
7		<b>36" DIP</b>	<b>Depth</b>	<b>7</b>			<b>Depth of Cover</b>	<b>4</b>					
8		36" Pipe Excavation - Earth (compacted volume)	CY	10733	\$0.75	\$8,050		\$0	\$3.00	\$32,200		\$0	\$40,250
9		36" Pipe Excavation - Trench Rock (compacted volume)	CY	3578		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$35.00	\$125,222	\$125,222
10		Trench Box	LF	9200		\$0	\$1.00	\$9,200		\$0		\$0	\$9,200
11		36" DIP Pressure Class 200	LF	6950	\$9.17	\$63,704	\$108.68	\$755,350	\$2.50	\$17,375		\$0	\$836,429
12		36" Pipe Bedding (compacted volume)	CY	2044	\$1.00	\$2,044	\$13.00	\$26,578	\$1.00	\$2,044		\$0	\$30,667
13		36" Pipe Backfill (compacted volume)	CY	9858	\$1.00	\$9,858		\$0	\$4.00	\$39,432		\$0	\$49,291
14		Import Backfill Materials (loose volume, assume 10% swell)	CY	963		\$0	\$13.00	\$12,516		\$0		\$0	\$12,516
15		Haul off Rock (assume 15% swell) - with Unit Bid	CY	4114		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$15.00	\$61,717	\$61,717
16		36" 90-degree Bend	EA	1	\$227.60	\$228	\$7,576.20	\$7,576	\$50.00	\$50		\$0	\$7,854
17		36" 45-degree Bend	EA	2	\$227.60	\$455	\$5,845.68	\$11,691	\$50.00	\$100		\$0	\$12,247
18		36" 22.5-degree Bend	EA	8	\$227.60	\$1,821	\$5,129.47	\$41,036	\$50.00	\$400		\$0	\$43,257
19		36" 11.25-degree Bend	EA	4	\$227.60	\$910	\$4,529.16	\$18,117	\$50.00	\$200		\$0	\$19,227
20		36" DIP Pressure Class 200 RJ	LF	2250	\$9.17	\$20,624	\$149.08	\$335,420	\$2.50	\$5,625		\$0	\$361,668
21													
22		Earthwork Calculations				\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$0
23		Pipe Excavation - Total Compacted Volume	CY	14311		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$0
24		Rock - Total Compacted Volume (assume 25% of excavation)	CY	3578		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$37.00	\$132,378	\$132,378
25		Pipe Bedding - Total Compacted Volume	CY	2044		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$0
26		Pipe Backfill - Total Compacted Volume Needed	CY	9858		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$0
27		On-Site Backfill Material Available - Compacted Volume	CY	10733		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$0
28		Materials for Disposal - Compacted Volume	CY	875	\$5.00	\$4,376		\$0	\$5.00	\$4,376		\$0	\$8,752
29													
30		Air Release Valve and Manhole (3 each)	LS	1	\$2,200.00	\$2,200	\$26,400.00	\$26,400	\$1,800.00	\$1,800	\$0.00	\$0	\$30,400
31													
<b>Div 16</b>													
32	16000	Electrical	LS	1		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$65,000.00	\$65,000	\$65,000
<b>Div 17</b>													
33	17000	Venturi Meter	LS	1	\$1,250.00	\$1,250	\$12,500.00	\$12,500	\$500.00	\$500		\$0	\$14,250
34	17000	Instrumentation	LS	1		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$12,000.00	\$12,000	\$12,000
		Contingency	LS	0%		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$0
		Subtotals				\$184,020		\$1,317,284		\$172,103		\$396,317	\$2,069,723

Sales Tax @	7.0%	\$92,200
Labor Burden @	30.0%	\$55,200
Bonds On Subs @	1.5%	\$5,900
Subtotal		\$2,223,023
Fee @	7.0%	\$155,600
Insurance & Bonds @	1.7%	\$40,400
<b>Estimated Construction Cost</b>		<b>\$2,419,023</b>

**Assumptions:**  
Estimate DOES NOT include easements acquisitions, land acquisitions or mitigations required to build the pump station  
Assumed 25% of the excavated material is rock

\$263 per LF

**WATERSHED DAM ASSESSMENT - (7194-001)**  
**CARTECAY RIVER 01**  
**OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST - CONCEPTUAL LEVEL**  
 03 - Reservoir Inlet Structure

03  
 DECEMBER 2007

TABLE A-4

No.	Spec. Sect.	Description	Unit	Qty	Labor \$\$		Material \$\$		Equipment \$\$		Subcontractor \$\$		Total
					Unit	Total	Unit	Total	Unit	Total	Unit	Total	
<b>03 - Reservoir Inlet Structure</b>													
Div 1													
1	1000	General Conditions	LS	1		\$18,000		\$14,500		\$18,300		\$0	\$50,800
Div 2													
2	2200	Earth Work	LS	1	\$5,000.00	\$5,000	\$2,639.00	\$2,640	\$4,926.00	\$4,930	\$31,300.00	\$31,300	\$43,870
Div 3													
3	3250	Water Stop	LF	500	\$1.25	\$630	\$2.00	\$1,000		\$0		\$0	\$1,630
4	3300	Concrete	LS	1	\$82,952.00	\$82,950	\$159,839.00	\$159,840	\$26,200.00	\$26,200	\$0.00	\$0	\$268,990
Div 4													
Div 5													
7	5524	Aluminum Handrail	LF			\$6.00	\$0	\$35.00	\$0	\$2.90	\$0	\$0	\$0
8		Ladder	VF			\$50.00	\$0	\$150.00	\$0	\$15.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
9	5530	Aluminum Grating Landing	SF			\$10.00	\$0	\$45.00	\$0	\$10.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
10	5530	Aluminum Grating	SF			\$10.00	\$0	\$20.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Div 6													
Div 7													
Div 8													
Div 9													
10	9900	Painting	LS			\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$0
Div 10													
Div 11													
11		Sluice Gates and Operators	EA	2	\$2,500.00	\$5,000	\$25,000.00	\$50,000	\$1,000.00	\$2,000		\$0	\$57,000
Div 12													
Div 13													
Div 14													
Div 15													
12	15062	Ductile Iron Pipe	LS	1	\$1,000.00	\$1,000	\$8,500.00	\$8,500	\$500.00	\$500		\$0	\$10,000
Div 16													
13	16000	Electrical	LS			\$0		\$0		\$0	\$70,000.00	\$0	\$0
Div 17													
14	17000	Instrumentation	LS			\$0		\$0		\$0	\$25,000.00	\$0	\$0
		Contingency	LS	0%		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	\$0
Subtotals						\$112,580		\$236,480		\$51,930		\$31,300	\$432,290
Sales Tax @					7.0%	\$16,600							
Labor Burden @					30.0%	\$33,800							
Bonds On Subs @					1.5%	\$500							
Subtotal						\$483,190							
Fee @					7.0%	\$33,800							
Insurance & Bonds @					1.7%	\$8,800							
<b>Estimated Construction Cost</b>						<b>\$525,790</b>							

Table A-5

**Cartecay River Dam No. 1****TOTAL PROJECT OPINION OF COST**

<b><u>Item No.</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>	<b><u>Estimated Quantity</u></b>	<b><u>Unit</u></b>	<b><u>Unit Price</u></b>	<b><u>Amount</u></b>
1.	Mobilization and Demobilization	1	Job	Lump Sum	\$967,141
2.	Erosion & Sediment Control	1	Job	Lump Sum	\$322,380
3.	Control of Water	1	Job	Lump Sum	\$483,571
4.	Clearing	181	Ac	\$2,500	\$452,500
5.	Clearing & Grubbing	21	Ac	\$5,000	\$105,000
6.	Earth Fill	1,067,047	Cu-Yd	\$4	\$4,268,188
7.	Drain Fill	14,281	Cu-Yd	\$75	\$1,071,075
8.	Excavation, Common	32,907	Cu-Yd	\$5	\$164,535
9.	Riprap	15,619	Ton	\$75	\$1,171,425
10.	Permanent Turf Establishment	21	Ac	\$2,000	\$42,000
11.	Concrete, Class 4000 (reinforced)	9,510	Cu-Yd	\$850	\$8,083,500
12.	Concrete, Class 3000 (mass)	232	Cu-Yd	\$400	\$92,800
13.	36-Inch RCP	940	Feet	\$450	\$423,000
14.	Principal Spillway Riser	1	Lump Sum	\$245,000	\$245,000
<b><u>Dam Construction Cost Estimate</u></b>					<b>\$17,892,116</b>
15.	36-Inch Pipeline	1	Lump Sum	\$2,420,000	\$2,420,000
16.	Cascading Structure	1	Lump Sum	\$530,000	\$530,000
17.	Pumping Station (Including Raw Water Pumps and Access Road)	1	Lump Sum	\$5,290,000	\$5,290,000

**Pump Station and Pipeline Cost Estimate**

**\$8,240,000**

18.	Land Acquisition	277	Ac	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$4,155,000</u>
19.	Easement Acquisition	30	Ac	<u>\$9,000</u>	<u>\$270,000</u>
20.	Building Acquisition	18	Buildings	<u>\$200,000</u>	<u>\$3,600,000</u>

**Land Acquisition Cost Estimate**

**\$8,025,000**

21.	Wetland	37	Credits	<u>\$7,500</u>	<u>\$277,500</u>
22.	Intermittent Stream	2,698	Credits	<u>\$90</u>	<u>\$242,820</u>
23.	Lower Perennial Stream	234,900	Credits	<u>\$90</u>	<u>\$21,141,000</u>
24.	Open Water	59	Credits	<u>\$7,500</u>	<u>\$442,500</u>

**Impacts and Overall Mitigation Cost Estimate**

**\$22,103,820**

**Construction, Land Acquisition, Mitigation Estimate**

**\$56,260,936**

**Contingency at 25%**

**\$14,065,234**

**Professional Services at 15% \***

**\$8,439,140**

**Total Project Estimate**

**\$78,765,310**

**Suggested Project Estimate**

**\$79,000,000**

\*Professional services include but are not limited to engineering, construction management legal, appraisals, and environmental consulting.