

Michael B. Georgeson

October 18, 2002

Page 2 of 2

According to Carollo [Engineers, Inc.] all homes in the area would have fire flow of at least 1,300 g.p.m. with a residual of 20 psi with this one home that is over 3,600 square feet being covered with 1,500 g.p.m. The fire department feels that with the installation of an eight-inch line, the system would be in compliance with the State of Utah and Salt Lake County regulations concerning the fire codes.

Rand Andrus, Fire Marshall, Salt Lake County

In my opinion, the Fire Marshall clearly implies that if the Carollo Engineers' representations are assumed to be accurate, then the subject project is in compliance. If you have inferred that the Fire Marshall has reviewed or verified the Carollo Engineers' representations, then your understanding of the situation is different from mine.

My application of engineering principles to review of the Carollo Engineers' representations leads me to a conclusion different from yours. That is, I remain unconvinced that the 8" waterline design complies with ***R309-510-9 Distribution System Sizing***. I also remain unconvinced that the 8" waterline design will not result in danger to the public in the event of a fire emergency in the Emigration Improvement District.

I will not jeopardize my Utah Professional Engineer license by preparing an approval letter for the subject project under these circumstances. If you believe that approval of the subject project is appropriate, you will have to assign the task of approval letter preparation to someone other than myself.

The record of the subject project shows that the consultant, Carollo Engineers, has stridently protested my repeated recommendations that the 8" waterlines be upgraded to 10" waterlines at a cost that I have estimated to be \$119,000. The record also shows that I have concluded that the design storage tank capacity of 1 million gallons is preposterously oversized beyond the 300,000 gallon capacity that would fulfill the requirements of ***R309-545-5 Size of Tank(s)*** and ***R309-510-8 Storage Sizing***. The consultant's refusal to consider the \$500,000 cost savings associated with construction of a more appropriately sized tank – an amount more than four times that necessary to upsize the 8" waterlines to 10" – defies all logic. Also, the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 prohibit the use of State Revolving Fund (SRF) monies for construction of water system infrastructure for future growth.

I previously communicated to you that an allegation has been made by a citizen of the Emigration Improvement District that there is a secret agenda to construct excess water storage capacity in Emigration Canyon. This is allegedly for the benefit of developers who wish to promote growth in the Canyon. I have no opinion on this allegation but I am certainly curious over the construction of a 1 million gallon storage tank that would provide E.I.D. with the water storage capacity sufficient to double its present number of service connections in the Canyon.