



Meeting Minutes
July 16, 2010 - 8:00 AM
Traffic Operations Conference Room, Franklin City Hall

Attendees:

David Parker, City of Franklin
Mark Hilty, City of Franklin
Eric Stuckey, City of Franklin
Ken Moore, City of Franklin
Leeann Williams, CDM
Zack Daniel, CDM
Kati Bell, CDM
Bo Butler, SSR

The single purpose of this meeting was to evaluate the Performance Measures identified as “qualitative” rather than “quantitative.” The quantitative Performance Measures are included as part of the numerically modeled processes, or can be otherwise given a numeric score. The qualitative Performance Measures cannot be modeled or evaluated numerically, and so must be ranked by another process.

The five Alternatives developed by the Stakeholders in Workshop 3 were provided in a matrix with the ten qualitative Performance Measures. The completed matrix is included with these minutes, although the meeting was started with a blank matrix. The objective for the Steering Committee was to rank to each Performance Measure, and to determine, qualitatively, how well each of the specific five alternatives met each qualitative Performance Measure using the following scale:

1 – Worst 2 – Poor 3 – Neutral 4 – Good 5 – Best

Alternatives were not ranked against each other, but were considered for how well it met each qualitative Performance Measure. For this reason, each Alternative may have scored the same for some or all Performance Measures. Scores were assigned by considering the options included in each Alternative. For example, for the Performance Measure “Change in the 100-year Flood Elevation,” the Alternative “Improve water quality and ecological health of Harpeth River and watershed” received a score of 4, because it contains options that reduce stormwater runoff. However, the same Alternative received a score of 1.5 for “Vulnerability of infrastructure and facilities,” because it depends on a single source for drinking water. All of these scores will be combined with the calculated quantitative results, in the IWRP model, to evaluate each Alternative based on all Performance Measures.

Objectives	Performance Measures	Stakeholder Defined Alternatives				
		Improve water quality and ecological health of Harpeth River and watershed	Provide excellent level of water/wastewater utility services at reasonable cost	Maximize efficiency of water use and value of water resources	Meet current and future demands for water and wastewater reliably	Provide safety and security of water resources systems
Provide safety and security of water resources systems	Change in 100 year flood elevation	4	3	3	3	5
	Vulnerability of infrastructure and facilities	1.5 one water source no redundancy	4	4.5	4	4
	Emerging water quality concerns	4 drinking water quality is not addressed	3.5	5	4	3.5 drinking water quality is not addressed
Maximize efficiency of water use and value of water resources	% reduction in inflow and infiltration	5	4	5	2 doing nothing allows conditions to worsen	5
Improve water quality and ecological health of Harpeth River and watershed	Ecological indicators	4.5	3	4.5	3.5	3
	Negative impacts of stormwater reduced	3.5	3	3	3	3.5
Provide improved access and aesthetics of Harpeth River	Erosion potential	4.5	3	3.5	3	4
	Public accessibility	3	3	3	3	2
Achieve regional acceptance	Likelihood of public acceptance	3	4	3.5	2.5	3
Provide level of services for water resources at reasonable cost	Meet secondary drinking water standards (taste, odor, etc.)	2.5	3.5	5	4	3