BERRY CREEK WASTEWATER INTERCEPTOR PROJECT

December 11, 2018

Project Team

City of Georgetown – Owner

Walker Partners – Design Consultant

SWCA – Environmental and Hydrogeology

Cambrian – Geologic Assessment and Karst

Terracon - Geotechnical

Purpose of Appearance at Commissioners Court

Project Purpose

Options Considered and Findings Of Field Investigations

Project Timeline

Parks and Wildlife Code

Discussion and Next Steps

Project Purpose

Find most effective solution to provide wastewater service to a growing area

 Projected ultimate service to 25,000 LUEs in the basin for existing and future customers

Items of consideration

- Environment
- Cultural Resources
- Constructability
- Maintenance
- Operability
- Permitting
- Risk Reduction



Options Considered for Providing Wastewater Service

Option 1: Gravity interceptor following Berry Creek through Berry Springs Park

Option 2: Gravity interceptor following Berry Creek adjacent to Berry Springs Park

Option 3: Lift station, force main & interceptor around Berry Springs Park

Option 4: Wastewater treatment plant upstream from Berry Springs Park

Option 1: Gravity interceptor following Berry Creek through Berry Springs Park



Option 2: Gravity interceptor following Berry Creek adjacent to Berry Springs Park



Option 3: Lift station, force main & interceptor around Berry Springs Park



Option 4: Wastewater treatment plant upstream from Berry Springs Park



Option Comparison

System Component Risk of Failure	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	
Electric Power					
Pump					н
Electric Motor					Ν
Control Panel					Lo
Supervisory Control					
Pressure Pipe					
Automatic Valve					
Operator Error					
Pipeline Collapse					
Pipeline Blockage					
Construction, Operations & Maintenance	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	
Land Available					
Tree Removal					
Park Sewer Connections Available					
Maintenance Access					
Inspection Access					
Total Length of Construction < 10' Deep					
Total Length of Construction 10'-25' Deep					
Total Length of Construction 25'-40' Deep					
Total Length of Construction > 40' Deep					
Total Length of Tunneling					
Greatest Depth					
Total Estimated Cost					
Option 1: Gravity interceptor following Berry C	reek through Be	rry Springs Park			
Option 2: Gravity interceptor following Berry C	reek adjacent to	Berry Springs P	Park		
Option 3: Lift station, force main & interceptor	around Berry S	orings Park			
Option 4: Wastewater treatment plant upstrea	m from Berry Sp	orings Park			

<u>Legend</u> Highest Risk Minor Risk Lowest Risk

Field Investigation Resource Map



Geologic Assessment

Review of previous geologic studies and scientific literature

Field investigation of creeks, springs, faults, topography, etc.

Geotechnical borings and soil sample testing

Piezometer readings of groundwater flow through Georgetown Formation

Edwards Aquifer recharge, flow and discharge





Project Timeline

1989 – Texas Water Development Board funded Wastewater Master Plan identifies need for Berry Creek Interceptor

October 1, 2016 – Fiscal Year 2017 funding for the City includes Berry Creek Interceptor

February 28, 2017 – Citizens to Address the Council

October 24, 2017 – Council Approval – Walker Partners MSA

October 24, 2017 – Council Approval – Terracon – GeoTechnical Engineering

October 24, 2017 – Council Approval – Walker Partners Engineering Design

November 14, 2017 – Initial Presentation to Wilco Commissioner's Court

December 1, 2017 – April 30, 2018 – Right of Entry for Field Investigations

August 27, 2018 – Meeting with Commissioner Long

September 4, 2018 – Meeting with Commissioner Cook

September 4, 2018 – Meeting with Commissioner Madsen

September 5, 2018 – Meeting with Commissioner Covey

October 4, 2018 – Open House at the Parks Administration Meeting Room

November 1, 2018 – Meeting with Judge Gattis

November 16, 2018 – Site Tour with McDaniels Family at Berry Springs Park

December 4, 2018 – Commissioners approved request for a Public Hearing to be held on December 18, 2018

Parks and Wildlife Code

TITLE 3. PARKS CHAPTER 26. PROTECTION OF PUBLIC PARKS AND RECREATIONAL LANDS Sec. 26.001. PROTECTED LAND; NOTICE OF TAKING.

(a) A department, agency, political subdivision, county, or municipality of this state may not approve any program or project that requires the use or taking of any ... park ... unless the department, agency, political subdivision, county, or municipality ... determines that:

(1) there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use or taking of such land; and

(2) the program or project includes all reasonable planning to minimize harm to the land ... resulting from the use or taking.

(b) A finding required by Subsection (a) of this section may be made only after notice and a hearing as required by this chapter.

(c) The governing body or officer shall consider clearly enunciated local preferences, and the provisions of this chapter do not constitute a mandatory prohibition against the use of the area if the findings are made that justify the approval of a program or project.

Are there feasible and prudent alternatives to the use of the park?

Is Option 2, 3 or 4 feasible?

- Options 2 & 3 are feasible, but not prudent.
- Option 4 is not feasible because the extensive private land required for land application of treated effluent is not available.

Why is Option 2 not prudent?

- Clear cuts and removes an additional 10-acres of trees along the creek.
- Tunneling length is almost double Option 1.
- Requires maintenance and inspection access 75-feet below ground.
- No relief for existing and future septic systems.

Why is Option 3 not prudent?

- Requires two lift stations adjacent to creek.
- Risk of mechanical system failure and a discharge of raw sewage to creek is very possible.
- Requires maintenance and inspection access 75-feet below ground.
- No relief for existing and future septic systems.

Feasible and Prudent - Recommended Route Option 1: Gravity interceptor following Berry Creek through Berry Springs Park



What planning is included to protect the Edwards Aquifer and Spring Hydrology?

Minimum 50-meter buffer from all springs to avoid direct impacts

Construction monitoring for sensitive hydrologic features by professional geoscientists

Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to maintain site hydrology (under drains, seep collars, etc.)

Additional BMPs per approved TCEQ Edwards Aquifer Protection Plan

Install pipe with leak-proof joints and water-tight manholes

Conduct internal inspection of pipeline every 5 years





What planning is included to minimize harm to the land?

Preserve all heritage trees and avoid potential damage

Use silt fence to protect creeks from sediment runoff during construction

Collaborate with park supervisor on construction schedule

Provide multiple construction entrances away from park entrance

Use temporary chain link fence to protect pedestrians and wildlife during construction

Limit the length of open trenches and cover/fill trenches over night

Provide temporary trails during construction, and restore trails and replace sidewalks after construction

Place manhole cones and covers level with natural ground

Restore preferred material and vegetation to disturbed areas in cooperation with County and County experts

Discussion and Next Steps

Public Input and Frequently Asked Questions

gus.georgetown.org

Additional County Input

Commissioners' Comments

Next Step - Public Hearing

- December 18, 2018 during Commissioner's Court Meeting
- Finding from Commissioner's Court per Parks and Wildlife Code

Inputs / Comments