



WHAT OPTIONS HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED?

OPTION	CONSIDERATIONS/REACTIONS/JUSTIFICATIONS
<p>Do nothing to the ponds and permit nature to take over.</p>	<p>Rejected for concerns for flooding. As the ponds fill with sediment their ability to accommodate heavy rains will lessen. Given the unprecedented occurrence of heavy rains, this becomes a crucial concern.</p> <p>Rejected for expense to control algae and vegetation. As the ponds become shallower the oxygen level in the water decreases, creating the environment for algae (including offensive odors), fish kills and unsightly invasive vegetation. It also becomes more expensive to control this issue.</p> <p>Rejected for legal issues: WFCAs CCRs clearly state the obligation to maintain a high standard of water quality Erosion issues threaten private property Property values decrease if ponds are not maintained.</p>
<p>Develop an underground drainage system</p>	<p>Rejected due to extreme costs, which would include tens of thousands for engineering and design plans, extensive federal, state, and local permitting, hundreds of thousands in construction, utility relocation, labor, and materials. Additional maintenance would be required to ensure water was not blocked at any point.</p>
<p>Fill in the ponds</p>	<p>Rejected for flooding issues. If the ponds are filled with soil, there is no method to divert water away from residential property. Even during typical rainfall, flooding would occur. Given the unprecedented occurrence of heavy rains, this becomes a critical concern and therefore is unacceptable.</p> <div data-bbox="574 1052 1312 1388" data-label="Image"> </div>
<p>This leaves three options that WFCAs has explored</p>	
<p>Renew the ponds</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This Practical Proposal contends that this is the most practical, cost saving and attractive option. The justifications are provided in additional sections.
<p>Convert all ponds to a Stream Channel</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Conceptual Design plan, as well as the Davey's report provides several justifications as to why this is not an attractive option based upon cost and the current condition of ponds #1, #2, #6 and #7. Both reports do not support a total conversion. Over \$90,000 was spent within the last five years to clean ponds #1 and #2. It would be a serious misuse of funds to spend multiple thousands of dollars to redo that work.
<p>Do a hybrid of some ponds and some converted to stream channel</p>	<p>This is one of the options from the Conceptual Design. The recommendation for a stream channel conversion is limited to Pond #3 and Pond #4. Even the Conceptual Design plan indicates that in most instances there will be standing water in what is Pond #4. The cost to convert #3 and #4 will exceed what it will cost to renew both ponds. Any arguments that there will be long-term cost savings in a stream channel conversion is misleading as only pond #3 will serve as a stream.</p>