

**Appendix A-6:  
Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG)**

---

**Membership List**

---



# ALCOSAN Wet Weather Planning Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Membership List

---

1. **Kim Amey**, Project Manager, Carnegie Science Center
2. **Rebecca Bradley**, Manager, Wilkins Township (Turtle Creek/Thompson Run Basin)
3. **Donald Burke, MD**, Dean, University of Pittsburgh School of Public Health
4. **Darla Cravotta**, Special Projects Coordinator, Office of County Executive Dan Onorato
5. **Danielle Crumrine**, Executive Director, Tree Pittsburgh
6. **Harry Dilmore**, Manager, Avalon & Kilbuck (Lower Ohio/Girty's Run Basin)
7. **Patrick Dowd**, Councilman, City of Pittsburgh (Main Rivers Basin)
8. **Chuck Duritsa**, Pennsylvania Commissioner to Ohio River Valley Sanitation Commission (ORSANCO)
9. **Denise Edwards**, Former Wilkinsburg Councilwoman, Borough of Wilkinsburg
10. **Aftyn Giles**, Sustainability Coordinator, City of Pittsburgh, Office of Mayor Luke Ravenstahl
11. **Jim Hannan**, Councilperson, Municipality of Bethel Park (Upper Monongahela Basin)
12. **Tom Hoffman**, Western PA Director, Clean Water Action
13. **Brian Jensen**, Senior Vice President, Civic Policy, Allegheny Conference on Community Development
14. **Stan Kabala, Ph.D.**, Associate Director, Duquesne University Bayer School of Natural and Environmental Sciences
15. **Daniel Keller**, Former ALCOSAN Board Member, City of Pittsburgh Resident (Brighton Heights)
16. **Roy Kraynyk**, Executive Director, Allegheny Land Trust
17. **James McCarville**, Executive Director, Port of Pittsburgh
18. **Dave McMillen**, Board Member, Montour Watershed Association
19. **Evelyn O'Brien**, Former ALCOSAN Board Member, City of Pittsburgh Resident (Brighton Heights)
20. **Barney Oursler**, Executive Director, Pittsburgh UNITED
21. **Edward Patton**, Director of Capital Projects, Riverlife
22. **Kathy Risko**, Associate Director, Congress of Neighboring Communities Center for Metropolitan Studies (CONNECT)
23. **Doug Sample**, Manager, Bellevue (Lower Ohio/Girty's Run Basin)
24. **Diane Selvaggio**, Executive Director, Turtle Creek Watershed Association
25. **Howard "Bud" Schubel**, Construction Manager, Allegheny County Economic Development
26. **Tim Schumann**, President, Peters Creek Watershed Association
27. **Brenda Smith**, Executive Director, Nine Mile Run Watershed Association
28. **Matthew Smuts**, Sustainable Design Coordinator, Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh (URA)
29. **Michael Terrick**, Executive Director, Munhall Sewer Authority (Upper Monongahela Basin)
30. **Charles Vogel**, Council Member, O'Hara Township (Upper Allegheny/Pine Creek Basin)
31. **Davitt Woodwell**, Senior Vice President, Western Region, The Pennsylvania Environmental Council

**Meeting Agendas**

---



# ALCOSAN Regional Stakeholder Group

## Meeting Agenda

**Meeting Purpose / Number: RSG Meeting Number 1**

**Date / Time: Wednesday, March 11, 2008, 10:30 am**

**Location: William F. Trefz Board Room**

---

*Welcome & Introductions*

**Arletta Scott Williams**

ALCOSAN Executive Director

*Overview of ALCOSAN Organization*

**Nancy Barylak**

ALCOSAN Manager of Public Relations

*Consent Decree Requirements*

**Arthur Tamilia, Esq.**

ALCOSAN Deputy Executive Director &

Director of Environmental Compliance

*Program Update:*

**Wet Weather Program Overview**

**Colleen Hughes, Ph. D., P.E.**

Program Manager CDM

**Regional Wet Weather Plan Development**

**David Borneman, P.E.**

ALCOSAN Director of Engineering & Construction

**Public Participation**

**Nancy Barylak**

ALCOSAN Manager of Public Relations

*Roles and Responsibilities:*

**Janai Williams**

Ebony Holdings

**Organizational Overview**

**CMAC**

**Basin Planning Committee**

*Questions & Next Steps*

**Jim Protin**

AECOM



# ALCOSAN Regional Stakeholder Group Meeting Agenda

**Meeting Purpose / Number:** RSG Meeting Number 2

**Date / Time:** Thursday, May 14, 2009, 10:30 am

**Location:** William C. Trefz Boardroom

---

**Welcome**

**Arletta Scott Williams**, Executive Director

**Program Updates**

**Colleen Hughes**, CDM

**Public Participation**

**Nancy Barylak**, Manager of Public Relations

**Roles, Responsibilities, and Protocols**

**Jim Protin**, AECOM

**Roundtable Session**

**Jim Protin**, AECOM

**Questions & Next Steps**

**Jim Protin**, AECOM

## **Handouts**

1. Meeting # 2 agenda
2. Meeting # 2 presentation
3. Regional Stakeholder Group calendar
4. Regional Stakeholder Group draft by-laws
5. Regional Stakeholder Group directory
6. Draft of the Basin Quarterly Activity Report



# ALCOSAN Basin Facilities Planning Meeting Agenda

**Meeting Purpose / Number:** RSG Meeting Number 3

**Date / Time:** Tuesday, July 14, 2009, 10:30 am

**Location:** William C. Trefz Boardroom

---

## **Welcome**

**Arletta Scott Williams**, Executive Director

## **Role of a RSG Member**

**Janette Campbell**, Ebony Holdings, LLC

- Roles
- Calendar of events

## **Roundtable Session**

**Janai Williams**, Ebony Holdings. LLC  
**Dave Bingham**, AECOM

- Communication Avenues
- Alternative Analysis Process, Defining non-technical, non-financial evaluation criteria
  - Define the evaluation criteria (identifying and assessing)
  - Assessment of local impacts of wet weather control facilities

## **Questions & Next Steps**

**Jim Protin**, AECOM

## **Handouts**

1. Meeting agenda
2. Regional Stakeholder Group calendar
3. Regional Stakeholder Group Communication questionnaire



ALCOSAN.  
Regional Wet Weather Plan

# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING AGENDA

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting # 4**  
**Thursday, October 15, 2009, 10:30 am**  
**ALCOSAN Trefz Boardroom**

# #1

- 
- I. Welcome** **Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director**
- II. Program Updates** **Colleen Hughes, CDM**
- III. RSG Administrative Updates** **Janette Campbell, Ebony Holdings**
- RSG Draft Bylaws
  - Updates on membership tour(s)
- IV. RSG Agenda** **Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings**
- **Communicating with the General Public**
    - ALCOSAN Public Participation Plan update
    - Public comments and feedback
      - Public Commentary Process
      - Public Comment Card
    - Public Outreach Materials/Collateral
      - Consent Decree Booklet
      - Public Comment Card
      - Frequently Asked Questions Sheet
      - Current fact sheets
    - Public Outreach events
      - Basin level public outreach
      - ALCOSAN Open House
    - ALCOSAN web site updates
  - WWP Implementation Factors
    - Defining of non-technical/non financial criteria
    - Early action projects
- V. Next Steps**
- Re-cap of meeting key points
  - Re-cap of meeting action items
  - 2010 RSG Tentative Meeting Dates
  - RSG Goals & Agenda for 2010



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING AGENDA

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting # 4**  
**Thursday, October 15, 2009, 10:30 am**  
**ALCOSAN Trefz Boardroom**

---

## **Anticipated Handouts**

1. Meeting #4 agenda
2. 2010 RSG Tentative Meeting Dates
3. Regional Stakeholder Group Communication Questionnaire Summary Report
4. ALCOSAN Public Comment Card & Information
5. Current Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Fact Sheet
6. Current Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Fact Sheet
7. Current Basin Planning Committee (BPC) Fact Sheet
8. Stormwater Management: Promoting Source Reduction in Your Municipality Fact Sheet
9. Source Reduction: A Residential Approach to Stormwater Management Fact Sheet
10. Sample RSG Monthly Communication Report (MCR)
11. Basin Public Meetings Schedule
12. 2009 Meetings #3 Key Points
13. RSG Meeting # 2 Summary
14. RSG Meeting #3 Summary
15. Meeting Evaluation Form

## **Materials Presented on CD-Rom**

16. Basin Quarterly Activity Reports: Issue #1
17. ALCOSAN Public Participation Plan (PPP)



ALCOSAN.  
Regional Wet Weather Plan

# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING AGENDA

RSG Meeting/ Number 5  
Thursday, February 11, 2010 / 10:30 AM  
Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

#1

- 
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>I. Welcome</b>   | <b>Arletta Scott Williams,</b><br>ALCOSAN Executive Director |
| <b>II. Comparative Analysis Criteria</b>  | <b>Janai Michelle Williams,</b><br>Ebony Holdings            |
| <b>III. CSO Control &amp; Alternatives Technologies</b>   | <b>Dave Bingham,</b><br>AECOM                                |
| <b>IV. Evaluating Site Screening Criteria</b><br><i>(Screening of WW Control Site Alternatives)</i> | <b>Matt Smith,</b><br>AECOM                                  |
| <b>V. Next Steps</b>  | <b>Janai Michelle Williams,</b><br>Ebony Holdings            |



# **ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING**

## **AGENDA**

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) / Number 6**  
**Thursday, May 13, 2010/ 10:00 AM**  
**Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN**

---

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>I. Welcome</b>   | <b>Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director</b> |
| <b>II. Meeting Objectives</b>                               | <b>Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings</b>            |
| <b>III. RSG Participation Discussion</b>                    | <b>Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings</b>            |
| <b>IV. Understanding the Affordability Analysis Process</b> | <b>Tom Schevtchuk, CDM</b>                                |
| <b>V. Comparative Analysis of Wet Weather Programs</b>      | <b>Peter Thomas, AECOM</b>                                |
| <b>VI. Next Steps</b>                                       | <b>Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings</b>            |



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

## AGENDA

RSG Meeting / Number 7  
Thursday, August 12, 2010/ 10:00 AM  
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

#1

- 
1. Welcome Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN
  
  2. Meeting Objectives Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings
  
  3. Affordability Analysis Process Update Tom Schevtchuk, CDM
  
  4. Preliminary Alternatives Evaluation/Development Process Jan Oliver, ALCOSAN  
Colleen Hughes, CDM
  
  5. Public Outreach Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN  
Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings
  
  6. Next Steps Lugene Keys, KCI



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

## AGENDA

RSG Meeting / Number 8

Tuesday, November 16, 2010/ 10:00 AM

ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building

#1

- 
1. **Welcome** **Arletta Scott Williams**, ALCOSAN Executive Director
  
  2. **Meeting Objectives** **Janai Michelle Williams**, Ebony Holdings
  
  3. **Open Discussion** **Michael Kenney**, PWSA  
**Janai Michelle Williams**, Ebony Holdings
  
  4. **Green Technologies** **Colleen Hughes**, CDM  
**Peter Thomas**, AECOM
  
  5. **Regionalization** **David Bingham**, AECOM
  
  6. **Public Outreach** **Nancy Barylak**, ALCOSAN  
**Janai Michelle Williams** Ebony Holdings
  
  7. **Next Steps** **Janai Michelle Williams**, Ebony Holdings
  
  8. **Handouts:**
    1. Meeting #8 Agenda
    2. RSG Tentative 2011 Meeting Schedule
    3. Green Infrastructure: Alternatives for CSO Control PowerPoint Presentation
    4. Green Technologies PowerPoint Presentation
    5. ALCOSAN's Regionalization RFP Response PowerPoint Presentation
    6. Meeting #8 Evaluation Form

#### RSG VISION STATEMENT

The Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) represents the diversity and broad range of interests that comprise ALCOSAN's general service area population.

The RSG is committed to articulating those interests along with the concerns, questions, and ideas of the general service area population in an ongoing dialogue with ALCOSAN. The RSG is dedicated to the development of a fiscally-responsible and operationally-efficient Long-Term Regional Wet Weather Plan (LTRWWP) that complies with the Clean Water Act and USEPA's Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Control Policy.

In addition to being a representative voice, the RSG will continually strive to share the information received with their constituencies, and cultivate broader public participation and support of ALCOSAN's efforts to develop cost-effective wet weather solutions that serve the region's best interests.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

## AGENDA

RSG Meeting / Number 9

Thursday, March 17, 2011/ 10:00 AM

ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building

#1

- 
1. **Welcome** **Arletta Scott Williams**, ALCOSAN Executive Director
  
  2. **Meeting Objectives** **Janai Michelle Williams**, Ebony Holdings
  
  3. **Open Discussion** **Mary Ellen Ramage**, Manager of Etna
  
  4. **Wet Weather Plan Update** **Colleen Hughes**, CDM
  
  5. **ALCOSAN Research Discussion** **Dave Borneman**, ALCOSAN
  
  6. **ALCOSAN Regionalization/Consolidation Study** **Jan Oliver**, ALCOSAN
  
  7. **Public Outreach** **Nancy Barylak**, ALCOSAN  
**Janai Michelle Williams**, Ebony Holdings
  
  8. **Next Steps** **Lugene Keys**, KCI Technologies
  
  9. **Handouts:**
    1. Meeting #9 Agenda
    2. Meeting #9 Evaluation Form

### RSG VISION STATEMENT:

The Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) represents the diversity and broad range of interests that comprise ALCOSAN's general service area population.

The RSG is committed to articulating those interests along with the concerns, questions, and ideas of the general service area population in an ongoing dialogue with ALCOSAN. The RSG is dedicated to the development of a fiscally-responsible and operationally-efficient Long-Term Regional Wet Weather Plan (LTRWWP) that complies with the Clean Water Act and USEPA's Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Control Policy.

In addition to being a representative voice, the RSG will continually strive to share the information received with their constituencies, and cultivate broader public participation and support of ALCOSAN's efforts to develop cost-effective wet weather solutions that serve the region's best interests.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

## AGENDA

RSG Meeting / Number 10

Tuesday, May 17, 2011/ 10:00 AM

ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building

#1

- 
1. **Welcome** **Arletta Scott Williams**, ALCOSAN Executive Director
  
  2. **Meeting Objectives** **Jada Shirriell**, E. Holdings
  
  3. **ALCOSAN S.E.P Project Update** **Dan Lockard**, ALCOSAN
  
  4. **Funding Efforts** **Joe Day**, ALCOSAN
  
  5. **Open Discussion and Redevelopment Strategies for Stormwater and Overflow Controls**  
**Matt Smuts**, URA/RSG  
**Dave Borneman**, ALCOSAN
  
  6. **Public Outreach** **Nancy Barylak**, ALCOSAN
  
  7. **Next Steps** **Lugene Keys**, KCI Technologies
  
  8. **Handouts:**
    1. **Meeting #10 Agenda**
    2. **ALCOSAN Stream Removal Projects**
    3. **Basin Planning Committee Meeting #10 Schedule**
    4. **Meeting #10 Evaluation Form**

### RSG VISION STATEMENT:

The Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) represents the diversity and broad range of interests that comprise ALCOSAN's general service area population.

The RSG is committed to articulating those interests along with the concerns, questions, and ideas of the general service area population in an ongoing dialogue with ALCOSAN. The RSG is dedicated to the development of a fiscally-responsible and operationally-efficient Long-Term Regional Wet Weather Plan (LTRWWP) that complies with the Clean Water Act and USEPA's Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Control Policy.

In addition to being a representative voice, the RSG will continually strive to share the information received with their constituencies, and cultivate broader public participation and support of ALCOSAN's efforts to develop cost-effective wet weather solutions that serve the region's best interests.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING AGENDA

**RSG Meeting / Number 11**  
**Thursday, August 18, 2011/ 10:00 AM**  
**ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building**

---

1. **Welcome** **Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director**
  
2. **Meeting Objectives** **Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings**
  
3. **Open Discussion** **Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings**
  
4. **Wet Weather Planning Update** **Colleen Hughes, CDM**
  
5. **Public Outreach** **Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN**
  
6. **Next Steps** **Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings**
  
7. **Handouts:**
  1. Meeting #11 Agenda
  2. Meeting #11 Evaluation Form

#### RSG VISION STATEMENT:

The Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) represents the diversity and broad range of interests that comprise ALCOSAN's general service area population.

The RSG is committed to articulating those interests along with the concerns, questions, and ideas of the general service area population in an ongoing dialogue with ALCOSAN. The RSG is dedicated to the development of a fiscally-responsible and operationally-efficient Long-Term Regional Wet Weather Plan (LTRWWP) that complies with the Clean Water Act and USEPA's Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Control Policy.

In addition to being a representative voice, the RSG will continually strive to share the information received with their constituencies, and cultivate broader public participation and support of ALCOSAN's efforts to develop cost-effective wet weather solutions that serve the region's best interests.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

## AGENDA

**RSG Meeting / Number 12**

**Wednesday, November 09, 2011/ 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building**

---

1. **Welcome** **Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director**
  
2. **Meeting Objectives** **Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings**
  
3. **The Clean Rivers Campaign Update** **Barney Oursler, Pittsburgh UNITED**
  
4. **Open Discussion** **Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings**
  
5. **Wet Weather Planning Update** **Darby Neidig, AECOM**
  
6. **Public Outreach** **Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN**
  
7. **Next Steps** **Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings**
  
8. **Handouts:**
  1. Meeting #12 Agenda
  2. Meeting #12 Evaluation Form

### RSG VISION STATEMENT:

The Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) represents the diversity and broad range of interests that comprise ALCOSAN's general service area population.

The RSG is committed to articulating those interests along with the concerns, questions, and ideas of the general service area population in an ongoing dialogue with ALCOSAN. The RSG is dedicated to the development of a fiscally-responsible and operationally-efficient Long-Term Regional Wet Weather Plan (LTRWWP) that complies with the Clean Water Act and USEPA's Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Control Policy.

In addition to being a representative voice, the RSG will continually strive to share the information received with their constituencies, and cultivate broader public participation and support of ALCOSAN's efforts to develop cost-effective wet weather solutions that serve the region's best interests.

---



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

## AGENDA

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG)**

**Meeting # 13**

**Wednesday, March 28, 2012/ 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building**

---

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>I. Welcome</b>                                     | <b>Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director</b> |
| <b>II. Meeting Objectives</b>                         | <b>Janai Williams Smith, E. Holdings</b>                  |
| <b>III. Open Discussion</b>                           | <b>Janai Williams Smith, E. Holdings</b>                  |
| <b>IV. Wet Weather Planning Update</b>                | <b>Colleen Hughes, CDM-Smith</b>                          |
| <b>V. ALCOSAN Regionalization/Consolidation Study</b> | <b>David Bingham, AECOM</b>                               |
| <b>VI. Public Outreach</b>                            | <b>Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN</b>                             |
| <b>VII. Next Steps</b>                                | <b>Janai Williams Smith, E. Holdings</b>                  |

**Handouts:**

1. RSG Meeting #13 Agenda
2. RSG Meeting #13 Evaluation Form



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

## AGENDA

# #1

RSG Meeting / Number 14

Thursday, May 24, 2012/ 10:00 AM

ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building

---

- I. Welcome** **Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director**
- II. Meeting Objectives** **Janai Williams Smith, E. Holdings**
- III. Open Discussion** **Janai Williams Smith, E. Holdings**  
**Purpose:** Presenter will lead a discussion on the key topics important to stakeholders.
- VI. Wet Weather Plan Update & Discussion** **Colleen Hughes, CDM Smith,  
Tom Schevtchuk, CDM Smith, & Jan Oliver, ALCOSAN**
- V. Municipal Update** **Dave Bingham, AECOM**
- VI. Public Outreach** **Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN**
- VII. Next Steps** **Janai Williams Smith, E. Holdings**

**Handouts:**

- Meeting #14 Agenda
- Meeting #14 Evaluation Form

**Meeting Summaries**

---



# ALCOSAN Regional Stakeholder Group Meeting Summary

**Meeting Purpose / Number:** RSG Meeting / Number 1

**Date / Time:** Wednesday, March 11, 2009, 10:30 am

**Location:** William C. Trefz Boardroom

---

**Attendees:** Please see attached attendance list.

## **1. Welcome & Introduction:**

### **Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director**

Arletta Williams opened the meeting thanking the participants for the commitment of their time to the Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG). She introduced ALCOSAN direct staff, extension staff (Consultants) and asked that all participants state their name and affiliation.

## **2. Overview of ALCOSAN Organization:**

### **Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Manager of Public Relations Slides 4 - 14**

Nancy informed RSG members of ALCOSAN's history and presented the organization's status. She explained ALCOSAN's mission statement does not only include the commitment to treatment wastewater but that they "Provide cost effective environmentally conscious wastewater treatment that enhances the use of our natural resources". Nancy provided an overview of the ALCOSAN organizational structure, Board of Directors, and service area.

## **3. Consent Decree Requirements:**

### **Arthur Tamilia, Esq. ALCOSAN Deputy Executive Director and Director of Environmental Compliance, --- Slides 15 - 38**

Art provided a detailed status on the Consent Decree requirements. ALCOSAN is pleased to report that they have successfully paid all US, Pennsylvania, and Allegheny County Penalties and have not incurred any additional penalties. They are in compliance.

## **4. Program Update:**

### **Wet Weather Program-Colleen Hughes, Ph.D., P.E. (CDM)--Slides 39 - 48**

Colleen presented the ALCOSAN service area that encompasses the 83 municipalities. There are 4,000 miles of collector sewers and 90 miles of interceptors with over 300 ALCOSAN & 160 municipal overflow locations. ALCOSAN is permitted to provide 250 mgd of flow. Pertinent information was also provided on the impacts of Sewer Overflows on the environment and public health. In comparison to cities such as Chicago, Cleveland, Seattle, San Francisco, and Philadelphia, the ALCOSAN service area makes up one of the largest combined sewer systems in the U.S. Additional detail can be found in the attached presentation slides 39-48.

### **Regional Wet Weather Plan Development-David Borneman, P.E. (ALCOSAN) – Slides 49 - 65**

Dave touched briefly on the Consent Decree requirements for the development of the Regional Long-term Wet Weather Control Plan (RLTWWCP). He explained key elements of the Wet Weather Plan, such as the financial and institutional assessments, municipal and public participation, and the implementation strategy. He gave details about the Hydrologic & Hydraulic modeling and its long term benefits to the region. This model will be implemented at a basin planning level and will serve to optimize solutions regionally. Additional detail can be found in the attached presentation slides 49-65.

### **Public Participation-Nancy Barylak--- Slides 65 - 69**

Nancy gave an overview of public participation related to: the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC), ALCOSAN's Public Participation Plan, Overflow Reporting, and the Annual Progress Reports.

Nancy informed the group of the Consent Decree requirement of Public Notice and Outreach as well as ALCOSAN's past, current, and future events. Tasks ALCOSAN has completed to date are: The Overflow Monitor (Quarterly Newsletter), the Annual Information Meetings, the Boat Show, the ACHD River Advisory Program. The ALCOSAN public web site has been transformed and updated ([www.alcosan.org](http://www.alcosan.org)). Additional outreach opportunities past, present and future are as follows: Home Show-(Feb. 09), Scholastic Outreach Presentations, Summer Science Camp Partnerships (June-Aug. 09), ALOM (Allegheny League of Municipalities) (Apr 09), ALCOSAN's Annual Open House (Sept. 19, 2009) and Plant Tours-(Year Round). Additional detail can be found in the attached presentation slides 65 - 69.

## **5. Roles and Responsibilities**

### **Janai Williams, (Ebony Holdings. LLC) Slides 70 - 75**

Janai briefly explained to the RSG members their purpose, responsibility, membership representation, and relationship to the CMAC and BPC.

- **Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG)**-The purpose of the RSG group is to provide expertise, feedback and a clear perspective of the various stakeholder groups represented during the development of the RLWWCP. The RSG will be responsible for providing knowledge and information that will be considered in the evaluation of control technologies and water quality improvements to meet the needs of the region's water user's and ALCOSAN ratepayers. Representation consists of academia, civic, charitable, and environmental organizations, municipal government (elected officials, managers & engineers), and regional development/land use planning departments. The RSG will provide feedback from the stakeholders it represents to the CMAC to help guide the development of the RLWWCP.
- **Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC)**-The purpose of the CMAC is to use a consensus-based process to solicit support for the RLWWCP as well as provide feedback and information during the development of the RLWWCP. The CMAC will meet a least quarterly with ALCOSAN to actively participate in guiding the development and acceptance of the RLWWCP in accordance with the ALCOSAN Consent Decree and Municipal Consent Orders. Participants are representative of all seven (7) ALCOSAN Planning Basins and the region at-large. Committee members were appointed by the County Executive and ALCOSAN.
- **Basin Planning Committee (BPC)**-The purpose of the BPC is to facilitate coordination and cooperation between ALCOSAN and the Municipalities. The BPC will also focus on professional discussions of technical and institutional issues related to the development of the RLWWCP and facility plans. They will be responsible for: alternatives analysis, development of facility plans, current land use and municipal sewer system feasibility studies. Participants represent: Basin Planners, ALCOSAN Engineers & Regional Conveyance, Program Manager, Basin Coordinators, Municipal/Authority Managers, Directors of Public Works, and Consulting Engineers.

Additional detail can be found in the attached presentation slides 70-75.

## **6. Questions & Next Step**

### **Jim Protin (AECOM)**

Jim Protin engaged the group for questions and/or comments. They are as follows:

**Question:** Will the group would be receiving contact information for the tab in their binders for the Contact Directories. A request was made for a list of the CMAC Participants, the Basin Coordinators and a list of the municipalities.

**Response:** The information requested will follow shortly as part of the overall follow-up process. Members can expect this information in 10-14 business days.

**Question:** What is the best vision for the convening of the RSG?

**Response:** The anticipated schedule for the group is to meet on a quarterly basis unless otherwise specified. The meeting will be dictated by the public outreach efforts. More definitive dates for meetings will follow and members will be given advanced notice.

**Question:** What research and/or measures have ALCOSAN/Consultants found in other cities as it relates to what they are doing or have done for their Planning Process?

**Response 1:** We have taken advantage of the planning progress made in other cities; there is no need to reinvent the wheel where they have found success with the same issues. ALCOSAN has conducted research in: Milwaukee, Detroit and Philadelphia.

**Response 2:** It was also stated that ALCOSAN has identified 8 to 20 top national environmental firms. ALCOSAN is doing due diligence to stay abreast of the state of the art processes, programs, updates, sewer overflow issues. This includes having constant dialogue with other cities across the country with similar RLTWWCP.

**Comment:** Participant commented on the impressive level of detail and quality of information presented. There was a good diverse representation on participation and qualified consultants.

**Comment:** The Public Outreach is going to start ramping up shortly. All participants were asked to please confirm their contact information and the best method of which they can be contacted. The RSG members can expect follow-up information in 10-14 business days.

Meeting adjourned at Noon.

*We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Regional Stakeholder Group and the meeting, is encouraged. A request for modifications or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to James Protin, AECOM (james.protin@aecom.com or 412-316-3503) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.*

Attachments: Attendance List



## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Meeting Purpose / Number:** RSG Meeting / Number 2

**Date / Time:** May 14, 2009, 10:30 am

**Location:** Trefz Boardroom

---

*The following is a summary of the Regional Stakeholder Group meeting #2 held on the date referenced above. Response indicates a summary of the answer given to a direct question; comments represent general information shared, not directly associated with a question; and discussion signifies that a dialogue continued about the question and/or comment with participation from multiple parties.*

**Welcome: Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director**

Arletta Williams welcomed all attendees. She acknowledged new attendees and asked if everyone would “reintroduce” themselves. She reiterated the importance of active participation by the RSG members; this group is participating in the largest public works project in the history of Allegheny County.

**Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Manager of Public Relations**

Although there is a full agenda to cover, questions are encouraged throughout the presentations.

**Program Updates: Wet Weather Program Review: Colleen Hughes, CDM**

The following points provide a brief overview of the major concepts and milestones in the development of the wet weather plan process:

- Data collection: the flow monitoring has been completed and we are in the process of analyzing the data. The gathering of the water quality assessments and monitoring discharges helps to evaluate the benefits of the monitoring process.
- Biological assessment data (DEP’s) is used as part of system characterization receptors.
- Recreational use surveys (who is using the waterways and how) will begin this summer.
- Assessments for funding the WWP will begin in the summer of 2009. We will gather information from the maintenance programs with the municipalities.
- This is a costly program; the public will want to know how these costs are going to be paid and that we are making the most cost effective use of the dollars.
- Decision support tools (model): the models are being developed and validated and should be completed by the fall 2009.

**Understanding Basin Planning: David Bingham, AECOM**

There are specific deliverables and deadlines in the Consent Decree that ALCOSAN must satisfy. ALCOSAN and its consultants are complying with these requirements in order to develop the WWP. Additionally, each of the municipalities has a Consent Order which requires a feasibility study. The ALCOSAN planning portion ends in January 2013 when the WWP is due to the regulators; the plan must be approved prior to implementation. There are seven basins that represent the ALCOSAN service area; a CMAC member represents each these basins.

**Question:** With seven distinctive basins and 83 municipalities, how do you (ALCOSAN) ensure that there is a set standard of uniformity within the specifications? Are there too many people involved?

**Response:** ALCOSAN has basin coordinators that work with basin planners to make sure that we have standards and uniformity. The seven different basin planners provide ALCOSAN with an overall view of municipal input; this helps to ensure that the information is consistent when communicated to the municipalities and rate payers.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Meeting Purpose / Number:** RSG Meeting / Number 2  
**Date / Time:** May 14, 2009, 10:30 am  
**Location:** Trefz Boardroom

---

## **Basin Planning Overview:**

**Tim Prevost**, ALCOSAN Manager of Wet Weather Programs (Basin Project Manager)

*3 Rivers Wet Weather Feasibility Study Working Group*

The Feasibility Study Working Group (FSWG) was created to assist the municipalities in understanding what should be included in their feasibility studies. The group stems from the Flow Monitoring Working Group and is comprised of municipal engineers, municipal managers, ALCOSAN, 3RWW, and the regulatory agencies. More representatives from the various municipalities are encouraged to participate. The meetings are held in Greentree Borough, 10 W. Manilla Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15220 at 9:00 AM, the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday of every month. CMAC and RSG members are also encouraged to attend.

**Question:** Who is attending the Feasibility Study Working Group meetings and what is the basic conversation?

**Response:** Attendees include engineers, elected officials, and ALCOSAN. We are all providing a status update on the feasibility studies.

To date, 6 out of 7 of the next Basin Planning Committee (BPC) meetings have been confirmed for various dates in June. The information exchange process during these meetings has been successful. This information is helpful for various reasons:

- The basins have received Geographic Information System (GIS) information.
- Studying/updating point of discharge.
- Identifying locations that municipalities did not know were points of discharge.
- ALCOSAN will build additional models that are not required in the Consent Decree, but may be helpful to the municipalities as they develop their feasibility studies.

*A schedule of the BPC meeting logistics was distributed.*

*Handout: A chart outlining BPC meeting #4 dates for June2009.*

At the next BPC meeting the discussion will focus on various available technologies and where these facilities may be located (site selection). It is preferred that the municipalities suggest places to locate facilities. ALCOSAN is looking to the RSG members to identify any properties, vacant land, brown fields, etc., of which ALCOSAN may not be aware. We will be discussing concerns of the municipalities.

We are soliciting municipalities' input on topics they want to discuss. This dialogue needs to be looked at as a discussion not as an ALCOSAN presentation.

**Question:** How can we be the most useful panel for you, who can we mobilize? How would you engage municipalities?

**Response:** If you look at the agenda, this is one of our Roundtable Session topics which will be taking place shortly.

**Question:** How prepared are the municipalities?

**Response:** With eight basin committees (Lower Ohio/Girty's Run has two sub-basins) there is uniformity; however, there is the opportunity for uniqueness within each basin. This is a learning process, we are all still trying to get our arms around it and learn how to communicate the message.



## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Meeting Purpose / Number:** RSG Meeting / Number 2

**Date / Time:** May 14, 2009, 10:30 am

**Location:** Trefz Boardroom

---

**Question:** To what extent does ALCOSAN need to help the municipalities to start building additional capacity?

**Response:** The input provided by the municipalities' feasibility studies will help us to determine the following: (1.) if additional capacity is needed and (2.) where additional capacity is needed. Six months after we turn in the WWP, each municipality has to turn in their feasibility study. We need their input.

To date, all basins planning committee efforts have been a series of information exchange sessions. For the next few months the process will continue to be a back and forth dialogue. By fall of this year, we will have a model that a substantial amount of resources has been invested in to build. ALCOSAN will then provide the model to the municipalities at no cost. PWSA shared their model with ALCOSAN, which in turn saved the region money. Other municipalities are on record as having also shared their models in the past. The wheel does not have to be reinvented; if there are resources available that will help save valuable time and money those resources will be shared. That way we can collectively focus our efforts elsewhere. These are examples of collaborative efforts that we need for a successful Wet Weather Plan and Public Participation Involvement Plan.

The municipalities understand Phase I of the Wet Weather Program, but they do not understand Phase II or the urgency of the entire project long term. Part of the problem is that there is no firm cost assessment or budget. This is a planning effort, not design. We understand this will be an expensive effort, but will it be affordable to everyone? The flow monitoring data collected is bringing us closer to assessing what type of cost municipalities may incur.

**Question:** What does affordability to everyone mean? One of the perceptions is that this plan is coming together somehow, has everyone done everything that needs to be done to date?

**Response:** It is amazing how many municipalities did not understand their systems' assets. For the municipalities, Phase I is to find the issues and fix them. Phase II is to start working with ALCOSAN.

Between now and 2013, a lot of construction can happen and small municipalities may have concerns. This is a planning issue. For example, Cranberry has new subdivisions. The hope is that they are using the correct regulatory pipe lines. We can encourage these smaller municipalities to be proactive, to share resources to help each other and save money for the region. This is more of a regulatory issue. PWSA is a customer of ALCOSAN, the way that people pay for sewage is by consumption, and there is no way to bill for storm water. The issue is local control; we can take the lead to try to promote things.

With five different public meetings, the intention of the process was to walk through the sites working with the municipalities. Some of the assessments that need to be made are what technologies will be effective in ten years and can the water be collected, held and treated by each of the municipalities.

**Question:** Do the two facilities use two different technologies?

**Response:** Yes, but they have similar performance and they both have disinfectants.

**Question:** In what sense is ALCOSAN unique in treating wastewater or managing flow?

**Response:** The number of communities that we serve and the level of the communities' sizes.



## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Meeting Purpose / Number:** RSG Meeting / Number 2  
**Date / Time:** May 14, 2009, 10:30 am  
**Location:** Trefz Boardroom

---

**Question:** How can ALCOSAN plan so far ahead but you do not know the impact until critical things are done?

**Response:** It is very difficult, but the flow monitoring program is an indicator. We cannot worry on a micro level; we have to build first and sustain.

**Suggestion:** Re-educating the newly elected public officials should be taken into consideration.

Jim Protin commented that the dialogue was great. However in the interest of member's time; we moved forward in the agenda to Nancy Barylak who spoke about ALCOSAN's Public Participation efforts.

### **Public Participation: Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Manger of Public Relations**

- Public Tours: ALCOSAN recently hosted over 300 visitors including school groups and the Russian ambassadors.
- Summer Science Academy: This is free of charge and ALCOSAN accepts 30 middle school students. There are 3 different camps, June 22 – June 23, July 7 – July 17, July 27- July 31. Each camp has a different theme.  
Scholastic Outreach Programs: ALCOSAN's staff teaches lessons. This is a great program. There are 32 presentations with 519 students. ALCOSAN is educating youth on the importance of the WWP, giving them the message in hope that they will take it with them. You are all welcome to come and sit in on the lessons. *The brochure with information regarding outreach programs was distributed.*
- ALCOSAN Open House: The annual Open House is on Saturday September 19, 2009, from 9:00am to 4:00pm. In the past ALCOSAN has worked with local schools by developing a professional teacher's workshop to fulfill continuing education requirements. Students also took advantage of extra credit opportunities by participating in science activities. ALCOSAN has expanded its exhibits to 25; this expansion includes plant tours and an interactive walkthrough of the sewer overflow issue. *Save the Date flyers were distributed.*
- The meeting minutes, fact sheets, CMAC, RSG, and Basin meeting minutes are posted on ALCOSAN's web site.
- The Home & Garden Show: ALCOSAN had a booth and received a lot of feedback about the web site.
- Consent Decree Booklet: This booklet is to explain the process for the development of the WWP.

The purpose of the roundtable session is to engage feedback from the RSG members on how to get information out to the public, in addition to updating the members on the progress of the WWP. ALCOSAN wants to discuss strategies to reach out to involve municipal officials who are not participating. We want to get them informed and involved.

### **Roundtable Discussion:**

**Technology/Site Screening: Dave Borneman, ALCOSAN Director of Engineering and Construction**

The members were encouraged to join in at any point with any questions and/or feedback. Technologies are driven by performance. There are flows that are not getting treated. There are other areas that need additional improvement, storage, and conveyance.



## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Meeting Purpose / Number:** RSG Meeting / Number 2

**Date / Time:** May 14, 2009, 10:30 am

**Location:** Trefz Boardroom

---

Many cities are further along than Pittsburgh in the development of a wet weather plan. Some are using tunnels which are very expensive but they are very good for storage. The region's options are still ambiguous; however, the public is going green. ALCOSAN is encouraging people to look at the ways they can help with green efforts and source reduction. We are doing these all on a basin level.

During the planning stages, we are dealing with a wide range of pipe sizes, and will therefore have a range of costs. For more effective performance you can only build pipes so big and with that comes cost. Within the next 6 to 9 months the basin planners will identify types of technology solutions. The basin planners are trying to engage the municipalities. Two good examples are Portland and Philadelphia. In these cases 40 percent of the land that can potentially be used for sites is publicly owned, and we want to try to encourage these practices. ALCOSAN would also like to try these tested and proven practices used by these cities, with the end result being to have the most cost effective, technological savvy game plan for siting.

It is not just along the rivers, it is going to be upstream. This is all going to start to evolve in the next 6 to 9 months. As a region, you get to see the big picture.

**Question:** Someone here is representing Greenway or Land Trust. Is there a way that we can work together?

**Response:** That is very possible.

Communities want to feel as though they are important; these municipalities would like to see something tangible that will benefit the entire community. If there are any facilities that are identified we can work together to make it mutually beneficial. One suggestion was that ALCOSAN can make mutual benefits part of the package deal. Maybe everyone can get back to ALCOSAN with different ideas as to a standard that we can use with this process. ALCOSAN wants to be clear that green technology will not replace the need for grey technology. There will be no free treatment of sewage anywhere, anyway, anytime.

Members were informed that moving forward an email blast with appropriate documents and updates will be sent. As well, they were asked to double check their contact information on the sign in sheet.

### **Questions & Next Steps: Jim Protin, AECOM**

Jim Protin asked if everyone would be available for a follow up meeting to meeting #2 in mid-June. The RSG members were informed that they will be receiving an email with some tentative dates and times inviting them to attend a follow-up meeting in June. The follow up meeting will begin by discussing Communication, as this agenda item was not covered in meeting #2. Handouts that were not distributed were as follows:

- Public Participation Directory
- RSG Tentative Schedule
- CMAC Tentative Schedules

Jim noted that Nancy Barylak has a fact sheet with ideas on green initiatives that was developed for municipalities. The fact sheet was developed for the Allegheny League of Municipalities (ALOM); however, it can be made available to anyone who is interested in receiving the information.



## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Meeting Purpose / Number:** RSG Meeting / Number 2

**Date / Time:** May 14, 2009, 10:30 am

**Location:** Trefz Boardroom

---

**Member Suggestion:** Because of the broad nature of this group, information related to public meetings and any project updates should be sent to the members before any scheduled meetings.

**Response:** Email blasts will be sent to keep members informed. All members were asked to confirm their contact information on the sign in sheet.

**Meeting adjourned at Noon.**

**Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:**

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, [nancy.barylak@alcosan.org](mailto:nancy.barylak@alcosan.org), 412.734.8353
- Matt Smith, AECOM, [matt.smith@aecom.com](mailto:matt.smith@aecom.com), 412.297.4504
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, Public Relations Coordinator, [jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz), 412.434.6571.

*We believe that the above accurately reflects the key point of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Regional Stakeholder Group and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings ([jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz)) or (412.434.6571) within five days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.*



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Meeting Purpose / Number:** RSG Meeting / Number 3

**Date / Time:** July 14, 2009, 10:30 am

**Location:** Trefz Boardroom

---

*The following is a summary of the Regional Stakeholder Group meeting # 3 held on the date referenced above. The term “response” indicates a summary of the answer given to a direct question; comment represents general information shared, not directly associated with a question.*

**Welcome: Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director**

Arletta Williams welcomed all attendees. She asked if everyone would “reintroduce” themselves.

**Roles of a RSG Member: Janette Campbell, Ebony Holdings, LLC**

The goal of the first two meetings was to inform and educate the members on the Consent Decree and the accomplishments of the Consent Decree that ALCOSAN has made to-date.

We are now looking for the group to engage their constituents throughout the ALCOSAN service area who will be affected by the development of the wet weather plan.

**RSG Roles & Key Points: Janette Campbell, Ebony Holdings, LLC**

***Handout: Regional Stakeholder Group Calendar.***

**Janette reviewed the following RSG role:**

- To provide feedback based on the RSG member’s organizational area(s) of expertise;
- To gather public feedback on the wet weather issue; and
- To provide a clear perspective on how to successfully engage constituents throughout ALCOSAN service area.

It was also noted that the term for RSG membership is through the development of the wet weather plan which is due in January 2013.

The collaborative efforts of the RSG’s experience and expertise in conjunction with ALCOSAN, consultants, CMAC & BPC efforts will be the driving force in developing a comprehensive and effective wet weather plan.

Members will receive a draft copy of the RSG Bylaws in the next few weeks. Feedback is encouraged as these are the guidelines in which the members will be following throughout their term.

**Communication Avenues: Janai M. Williams, Ebony Holdings, LLC**

***Handout: Regional Stakeholder Group Communication Questionnaire***

Based on comments at the May 14<sup>th</sup> meeting, a questionnaire was developed to solicit member input on various WWP related topics of public interest and communication methods. The questionnaire was distributed to RSG members in attendance and will be forwarded to those who were unable to attend. Responses to questionnaires should be emailed to Janette Campbell by July 31<sup>st</sup> at [jmccampbell@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmccampbell@eholdings.biz). A copy of the questionnaire is available electronically.

# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Meeting Purpose / Number:** RSG Meeting / Number 3

**Date / Time:** July 14, 2009, 10:30 am

**Location:** Trefz Boardroom

---

## **Question #1: What is the most important topic (or topics) the public needs to know related to the wet weather facing our region?**

During the discussion, the following topics were identified as key issues of concern to the public:

### **1. Rate Increase**

**Discussion:** What will this cost? The same 3 people attend the public meetings; therefore, the majority of the public still needs to be informed.

### **2. Assessing and fixing the problem, to include public input & buy-in**

ALCOSAN needs to communicate to the public how we got in this situation and how fixing this would be good for the region.

**Question:** Are residents equating the wet weather issue with flood mitigation? Most residents are not aware that there is an issue.

**Response:** No.

The residents who are aware of the issue are aware because they have experienced a problem. There continues to be a mentality of “my sewer is working just fine, why is it that I have to change it?”

The only time people care is when there are cost changes. A bill is what most residents equate with sewer; unless their sewer is backing up they are uninterested. With the systems that are older, the bill is not the only change that will be seen; they need to consider the streams over flowing and the risk of having their basements flood.

Residents are very aware of the wet weather problem throughout the Edgewood borough. Edgewood educates and informs residents through newsletters and at council meetings. The residents were pretty upset because of flooding. They had no clue about lateral problems until they were educated on the subject. No matter how much you educate them on the issue, if it is of no concern to them, residents will not retain the information.

Municipalities are just recently learning about their system(s) and who is connected to whom. Residents cannot seem to wrap their minds around why the rates will increase. It was also stated that there is a time factor to consider. Residents are asking how long this project(s) and cost increases will last. To help the public understand, ALCOSAN and the municipalities need to communicate that these changes are permanent. These permanent changes will enhance quality of life and lessen wet weather issues.

### **3. The effect on property value**

Maintaining property value has to be considered when identifying building sites. ALCOSAN may want to carefully think through the process of entering into an agreement with residents as it relates to property value.

ALCOSAN must also take into consideration private property versus public property. ALCOSAN may want to discuss with the public why certain locations may have been chosen over others; as most residents will want to see improvements in their communities.

**Response:** If the situation is presented correctly for instance in a rundown area, residents will welcome this to get amenities.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Meeting Purpose / Number:** RSG Meeting / Number 3

**Date / Time:** July 14, 2009, 10:30 am

**Location:** Trefz Boardroom

---

#### **4. Inform the public of what's happening in other cities and what steps these cities have been taking to resolve wet weather issues.**

It would help residents understand the issues better if we compare our issues with other areas who are now or have been under mandates. Maybe if residents could identify with communities who have similar issues, but have successfully worked through the issues it would help. These cities, such as Evansville and others have had to pay the cost. Compare what is happening in other area's (Ohio River) the main downstream areas. Others are under the same mandate, and have accepted rate increases.

#### **5. Quality of Life and Water Quality**

**Question:** How do we fix the quality of life? What are quality standards? What are we being required to address?

You have to understand that what may be wet weather in the east is completely different from wet weather in other areas. Some areas have fairly newer systems. Wet weather can mean run off from developments.

**Question:** How many managers get calls asking about the water quality?

**Response:** The City of Pittsburgh does receive calls asking why the city has not done anything to eliminate wet weather issues (i.e. basement flooding, sewer overflow, etc.) and how these issues will affect public health. (Callers represent a diverse group). The dilemma is the aging systems, the leaking sewers, and the impact of overflow on incoming streams.

There are a lot of things that impact water quality both upstream and downstream. Sewage is a smaller component of something bigger to residents. You will have some people say yes, we want the rivers to be clean but I do not own a boat. It is not hitting home. People turn on the water and they think PWSA and Wilkesburg Penn Joint Water Authority are doing their job, not understanding that there is a bigger overarching issue within the entire infrastructure.

In some communities, water quality is associated with mine drainage, therefore water quality may not equate with the meaning of water quality of a neighboring community.

Elected official turnover is not the only turnover we have to consider; there are a lot of renters who are unaware of this problem. How can we get the public to understand, that this is part of an aging infrastructure? We need to reenergize. By being proactive now, when it is time to get started we can go.

#### **Question #4: What other topics should be addressed in the near future?**

**Note:** No response from members at this time. Response that the questionnaire may yield can be added to this section at a later date.

**Alternative Analysis Process:** Janai M. Williams, Ebony Holdings, LLC and Dave Bingham, AECOM Over the next six (6) months ALCOSAN is asking the basins to come up with possible sites, screening.

**Question:** With there being so many stages to the Feasibility Study process, at what pace are the municipalities expected to move?

**Response:** ALCOSAN is looking for early action projects. If there are things that could be done early and quickly then we want to move forward with them.

# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Meeting Purpose / Number:** RSG Meeting / Number 3

**Date / Time:** July 14, 2009, 10:30 am

**Location:** Trefz Boardroom

---

There are numerous technical and financial criteria and factors that will be considered when evaluating potential sites. However, equally as important is the possible implementation impact for sites as well as other technical solutions. As such the members were asked to brainstorm some non-technical/ non-financial implementation/impact criteria to be considered. Suggested criteria to consider are listed as follows:

1. Zoning Issues;
2. Site Location (pros & cons);
  - a. Other uses compatible with existing or additional site locations that will benefit the community;
3. Ownership Issues;
4. Routing at a cursory level.

**Question:** Can other uses be compatible like secondary uses such as parks etc.?

**Response:** Yes, all these uses can be considered. RSG members should submit their ideas and suggestions.

The problem is that until you have a Feasibility Study that is further along you do not know what you are building. There is also the size of the parcel when considering what should be built.

**Question:** When talking about holding tanks, what are the size requirements? It is difficult to recommend a site and not know if it is the correct size.

**Response:** It depends on the situation, this is case by case, and this is what the basin planners have to figure out.

Everything that we will be building will be underground. There are some ways to have secondary uses on the surface. The feasibility study gives good data to help understand what we need and what site would work. There may be an instance when one or two buildings or structures may be built above ground. The municipalities can discern what is needed and where the best place is to build.

As the Feasibility Studies come to completion, we will start pairing municipalities up with sites. ALCOSAN is looking for general criteria. Step back from the specific to see what things have been important to the residents? (i.e., how close is the solution to resident's homes, and what about odor?)

**Question:** Who is going to do the construction as a result of the Feasibility Studies? The first figure needed is how much flow ALCOSAN can take?

**Response:** That is the purpose of your Feasibility Studies. ALCOSAN is mandated to take whatever you give us. Do what is most cost effective for your municipality. Municipalities should advise ALCOSAN as to how much flow they are sending.

The issue should not be a "we" frame of mind; we need to get use to saying "us". Let's work together now. How do we use an organization to get good data and help one another? Strengthen coordination issues by doing the following:

- Build on success;
- Focus on using resources already in place;
- Share cost and responsibility and have one feasibility study for the region;
- Open up the lines of communication with neighboring municipalities.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Meeting Purpose / Number:** RSG Meeting / Number 3

**Date / Time:** July 14, 2009, 10:30 am

**Location:** Trefz Boardroom

---

Right now the focus should be on what each municipality is individually responsible for. Studies will eventually be reviewed for similarities and cost effective ways of combining them throughout neighboring communities.

As it relates to keeping informed the basin planning meetings go hand in hand with the feasibility meetings. Members should consider attending these meetings.

## **Next Steps: Jim Protin, AECOM**

To summarize the next steps are:

- To communicate between meetings.
- Members should complete the questionnaire and email to Janette Campbell by July 31<sup>st</sup>, [jmcampbell@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmcampbell@eholdings.biz). Members should continue to share with ALCOSAN the feedback, input and ideas presented by constituents. RSG Members do not have to wait for a formal meeting to share this information. Information can be submitted to Janai Williams, [jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz).
- ALCOSAN Open House is September 19<sup>th</sup>, spread the word. This is a great forum to get the message out to the public.
- ALCOSAN Plant tours are scheduled for July 27<sup>th</sup> or August 12<sup>th</sup>
- Members should review and submit comments on draft bylaws. Bylaws are tentatively scheduled to be distributed prior to meeting #4. A deadline for submitting comments will be provided at that time. The next meeting of the RSG is scheduled for October 15, 2009. Members will receive logistics on meeting #4 in the following weeks.
- Members will receive a follow-up email within 5-7 business days, with some key points attached, while the meeting summary is being prepared for distribution.

## **Meeting was adjourned at Noon**

### ***Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:***

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, [nancy.barylak@alcosan.org](mailto:nancy.barylak@alcosan.org), 412.734.8353
- Matt Smith, AECOM, Program Manager, [matt.smith@aecom.com](mailto:matt.smith@aecom.com), 412.297.4504.
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, Public Relations Coordinator, [jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz), 412.434.6571.

*We believe that the above accurately reflects the key point of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Regional Stakeholder Group and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Williams, Ebony Holdings ([jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz)) or 412-434-6571 within five days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.*



## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

### Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting #4 October 15, 2009, 10:30 AM Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

---

The following summarizes the discussion segment from the Regional Stakeholder Group Meeting #4 held on the above referenced date. The term “response” indicates a summary of the answer given to a direct question; comment represents general information shared, not directly associated with a question.

**WELCOME: Arthur Tamilia, ALCOSAN, Director of Environmental Compliance**

Arthur opened the meeting by thanking the participants for their time and commitment to the Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG). He stated that there was a very full agenda and turned the meeting over to Colleen Hughes.

**PROGRAM UPDATES: Colleen Hughes, CDM**

Colleen stated that at previous meetings her presentations involved a lot of background on the Wet Weather Plan (WWP). During meeting #4 she gave an update on those activities. The municipal flow monitoring program is now complete except for added/extended sites. The data is being used for model validation.

**CSO pollutant monitoring plan status:**

- The dry weather sampling is complete
- Wet weather sampling is about 32% complete
- CSO's are obviously making the situation worse
- Over the next several months this data will be processed
- Continue to try and assess water quality

The program began in 2006 with 50 different wet weather locations. We were looking for small, medium and large events. We do have a fair level of dry weather issues. The next step is to begin analyzing the systems during these dry weather issues. Three dry and three wet weather events were conducted. These events monitor what's coming into the system at 50 sampling locations throughout the ALCOSAN service area.

To protect public health (recreational) we will be monitoring/analyzing the data over the next couple of months. The best method to use now is to look at what is phase appropriate and figure out what we need to handle first.

- **Recreational Use Survey-** This summer we began this survey by going out during weekends. The purpose of the survey was to identify prevalent recreational uses and characterize current uses relative to discharge locations, frequency and volume. We will use the results to support prioritization of water quality improvements.

**Dave Borneman, ALCOSAN**

Dave stated that parallel efforts have been going on for some time and that he would provide an update on progress relative to expansion of the plant for the wet weather process. The strategy is to use existing areas and move them out and free up space to further the treatment process. The basin screenings of controls and sites reports are expected this fall. These will help identify control alternatives to evaluate with H&H models and Alternatives Costing Tool (ACT).

- Source Control
- Storage
- Conveyance

- Treatment

Final Reports have been completed. In upcoming months we will begin to assess whether another pump system is required, to double or triple capacity. ALCOSAN is aware that we may have to treat outside of the plant, and municipalities may have alternative methods of treatment. However, all flows have to be treated. Another concept in the plan is to consider secondary treatment.

The Consent Decree requires us to explore the need for secondary treatment outside of service area. It is an enormous cost to expand the plant.

Some of the factors that ALCOSAN has to consider:

- How can we optimally add to the plant?
- Strategies to take advantage of some of the land/area of the plant
- Consolidate some of the campus
- Prospect to free up some property
- Explore possible highway settings

**Question:** Does ALCOSAN have to build/use secondary sites?

**Response:**

Dialogue between ALCOSAN and Munhall is ongoing. We are trying to evaluate the basic picture and monitor progress. A lot of issues will be addressed through the PennDot Project.

**Colleen Hughes, CDM**

Preliminary technologies are currently being reviewed to determine which one would be the most reliable and cost-effective.

**Question:** Can you talk a little about how or if you plan to share with municipalities' information on if they want to apply green infrastructure?

**Response:** In terms of the sharing of information, yes.

**Question:** Is the H&H model able to be used by the municipalities or can we go a different route?

**Response:** Yes, if municipalities choose a different approach they are welcomed to. But the models/tools are available. ALCOSAN is encouraging municipalities to use Source Reduction Alternatives.

**Question:** Is there any type of support given by Alcosan to understand whether greening will work or not.

**Response:** To think that greening will eliminate is unrealistic. It may have some help with the frequency but there has to be a commitment from the municipalities to maintain.

**Suggestion:** One of the things that we would like to see is greening explored and highlighted for people with ALCOSAN's support.

ALCOSAN thinks that this is good. Think about how you want to do that, there are a lot of municipalities. Identify the roles for ALCOSAN.

**Question:** Is the recustudy available, can we just have the two (2) slides?

**Response:** We are currently working on the report. We could try to make some information available.

**RSG ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES: Janai Williams, Ebony Holdings**

Janai welcomed a few new members and asked everyone to reintroduce themselves.

Included in your folder are the RSG draft Bylaws. The purpose of the RSG Bylaws is to:

- Promote efficiency, organization, define the roles of the members; and stipulate the requirements for membership.
- Provide direction, setting parameters for effective public outreach and stakeholder participation (i.e. providing organization specific expertise and feedback) in the successful development of LTWWCP.
- Preserve consensus and maintain ALCOSAN's commitment to a consistent message.

The Bylaws are eleven pages of information that are somewhat technical in nature. RSG members are being asked to review and provide feedback and comments on the Bylaws within 30-45 days.

You all have received a CD-Rom with a copy of the ALCOSAN Public Participation Plan (PPP). This is ALCOSAN's draft plan/guidelines of how we want to engage the public.

**Question:** Can ALCOSAN please distribute an updated acronym directory?

**Response:** Yes

Member's Corner - Janette Campbell will reach out to you. ALCOSAN encourages you all to attempt to have connection with one another.

ALCOSAN Plant tour – this is a great way to get an understanding about the plant and its capacity. A few members have already participated in a tour. Are there any comments or feedback that anyone would like to share? No response at this time.

**Question:** How long is the tour?

**Response:** 1 hour.

**RSG AGENDA: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings**

**Communicating with the General Public**

At RSG meeting #3 we distributed a communication questionnaire and from that we were able to gather four basic questions. One of the questions we gathered is as follows:

1. How do we communicate with the general public?

We do have the answer. Let us know if we have your municipal newsletter available for us to use

Key items/questions that need to be answered:

- Explain the overall issue from beginning to end
- How are we going to solve the problem?
- Financial implications on communities
- How long the project will take, give the public an idea of the schedule, when they can expect the next milestone
- Alternate communication methods other than internet and web



## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

### Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting #4 October 15, 2009, 10:30 AM Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

---

**Dave Bingham, AECOM Water**

Screening of Control and Site Report (SCSR) - The BPC focuses primarily on site locations that are available. They are trying to start early with the identification of sites and vent to community. Our 7 Basin Planners are currently in the planning process. The SCSR is close to being completed.

**Question:** Can you talk a little about alternative analysis?

**Response:** The initial screening process might give you a handle on what's best, what may work or not. All will be put into a report that will be available; there will be a series of seven.

**Janai Williams, Ebony Holdings**

Some of the main points when discussing alternatives analysis include:

- Zoning
- Site features (might mean piece of land or route)
- What are the future plans for these sites
- Environmental impacts

Private or public property has to be taken into consideration. This project will need land and lots of it.

**Question:** Between sewer sheds were the controls very similar?

**Response:** They haven't been identified; we are in that process now.

**Question:** Are all the options still open?

**Response:** The reports are not in yet.

There is not a lot of ability to store sewage in available conveyance. ALCOSAN is looking for relatively flat land. The municipalities were encouraged to let ALCOSAN know if they need to do anything upstream, so to analyze the flows.

One of the positive impacts that this process can have is jobs and economic growth. For example: how can a township capitalize off its projects and vice versa? This occurs when a lot of green infrastructure takes place.

**Question:** Are there any other particular issues that this group needs to have information on?

**Response:** What do we say about cost? One suggestion is to marry some of the better concepts with the problem, this doesn't come cheap. Another issue is the way it gets billed out, we are not hearing anything. We have to give the public the bad and the good. The utilities purchasers are going to have to pay so give them a cost.

**Question:** If people take steps to reduce the source do they get credit for that? Rain barrels, gardens, etc.

**Response:** That is rate structure that you are referring to.

These are issues that need to be explored. We want to present the total picture and the cost. We realize now that the system has to change and it needs to be evaluated. We are starting to see what other cities are doing.



## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

### Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting #4 October 15, 2009, 10:30 AM Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

---

In terms of rates ALCOSAN can provide you with the information to give a response when you receive calls about rate increases.

This group weighs the value versus the cost; you can help by documenting your concerns.

**Question:** Are there any additional topics that the group would like to add to the list?

**Question:** What can be done to get more members to attend? There are currently 30 members and only eight in attendance.

**Question:** Would any of you be willing to contact your fellow members?

**Response:** Can ALCOSAN provide the numbers?

**Response:** Please remember that you all have been provided a member directory.

**Response:** Representative of Monroeville Mall, hospital, and other large consumers; it also affects their employees. This may be an opportunity to expand communication with employees.

Handouts #4 through #8 are Fact Sheets. Take the opportunity to read at your leisure. These are documents that have been put together to get information out there. We can provide electronically and/or hardcopies if anyone would like to use. If there are any questions about the handouts please reach out to Janette Campbell. She is a resource to you.

#### **NEXT STEPS: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings**

- Members received a schedule for tentative meeting dates for 2010. These dates are just placeholders for RSG meetings next year at this point. If members know of any conflicts please let us know as soon as possible.
- Public Comment Cards (PCC) - each member received a set of PCC. The postage is prepaid so they can just be dropped into the mail and they will come directly to ALCOSAN where they are catalogued and/or responded to.

#### **Meeting was adjourned at 12:00pm**

#### ***Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:***

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, [nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org](mailto:nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org), 412.734.8353
- Matt Smith, AECOM Project Manager, [matt.smith@aecom.com](mailto:matt.smith@aecom.com), 412.297.4504
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings Public Relations Coordinator, [jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz), 412.434.6571

*We believe that the above accurately reflects the key point of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Regional Stakeholder Group and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings ([jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz)) or (412.434.6571 ext 224) within five (5) of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.*



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting #5**  
**March 16, 2010, 10:30 AM**  
**ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom**

---

*The following summarizes the Regional Stakeholder Group Meeting #5 held on the above referenced date. The term “response” indicates a summary of the answer given to a direct question; comment represents general information shared, not directly associated with a question.*

**WELCOME: Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN, Executive Director**

Arletta welcomed RSG members. She noted that since we had a full agenda, members did not need to feel obligated to stay for the lunch, but if they could participate in the entire meeting she would appreciate their participation. Arletta also noted the members’ energy and encouraged everyone to maintain it. She also asked the membership to offer recommendations on how to get more of the members to attend the meeting, stressing the value of their input. She then asked everyone to introduce themselves.

**MEETING OBJECTIVES: Janai Williams, Ebony Holdings**

The meeting objectives were outlined as follows:

- There is a full agenda to include lunch at 12:30p.m.
- Because ALCOSAN respects each members’ time, as the end time for each agenda topic nears, you will be asked if you want to continue the discussion or move on to the next agenda item.
- We will be using a PowerPoint and flip charts for discussion, to convey information and to capture your feedback.
- By the end of this meeting the goal is to have:
  - Discussed members concerns and questions;
  - Gathered members input and feedback on the criteria for the WWP comparative analysis with other cities;
  - Provided a primer on CSO Alternatives & Control Technologies;
  - Gathered members relative ranking on the proposed Site Screening Criteria;
  - Discussed and determined next steps and action items for the next meeting.

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS CRITERIA: Janai Williams, Ebony Holdings**

Janai engaged members in an open discussion of the evaluation criteria which members felt important for a WWP comparative analysis. For members who were new to the RSG, Janai explained the discussions from meetings #3 and #4 about what others cities are doing. Janai noted that there were wet weather plan experts present who could speak to some possible criteria that would be useful to compare with efforts in Pittsburgh.

The floor was then opened for discussion on comparative analysis criteria, unless members had more specific questions. Jan Oliver provided examples as follows: the level of controls, what regulatory agencies accepted; engaging the public; impact on rate structure, types of technology. Jan noted that while these things have already been identified, ALCOSAN was still interested in learning what is important to the members.

The ideas suggested from the members included the following:

- Program cost (affordability - public will be concerned when it hits their pocket).
- Recreational use – being able to touch bodies of water without fear of contamination.
- Geographic limitations – the region has such a unique geography and topography.
- Watershed awareness – organizing around watersheds to address upstream issues.
- Influence of upstream communities – their impact and/or evaluation of water quality.
- Economic/community benefits of green infrastructure.
- Source reduction – its impact and methods, its effectiveness at addressing surface runoff, the effect of using green infrastructure.
- Multi-municipal/regional plans – understanding its impact on jurisdiction and control of sewer systems, approaches to using green infrastructure.

## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting #5**  
**March 16, 2010, 10:30 AM**  
**ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom**

---

There was a lengthy dialogue between members, ALCOSAN representatives and consultant project team members regarding some of the ideas put forth. One idea (watershed awareness) generated a follow-up item offered by Colleen Hughes as follows: There are a number of programs that are taking the holistic watershed approach. We will make note of this, and will have a presentation on examples of research in other cities available for meeting #6.

Janaï thanked everyone for their input, and turned the meeting over to Dave Bingham to discuss CSO Control and Alternatives Technologies.

**CSO CONTROLS & ALTERNATIVES TECHNOLOGIES:** Dave Bingham, AECOM Dave's presentation on this topic included a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was provided to the members.

Dave began his presentation by pointing out that from the beginning to mid-point of this process the steps that have been taken are as follows: existing conditions have been reviewed and data has been synthesized; series #6 of the basin planning committee quarterly meetings have been conducted (meetings are open to the public), and we have worked on identifying sites. The basin planners are also working with communities to develop potential sites. Currently, the development of alternatives to reduce CSOs and SSOs is taking place. There are several levels of control for CSOs and SSOs to consider.

**Slide #2** gave the formula for an alternative analysis:

Technologies + Site (or Routes) + Flow Regime = an alternative

**Slide #3** gave an overview of the major categories for the control site screening criteria being considered. The major categories include: economic factors, public factors, water quality/public health & environmental impacts, operation impacts and implementation impacts. Members will have the opportunity to participate in a weighting exercise later in the meeting.

**Slide #4** provided an overview and the goals of the Alternative Analysis process to include completion date of October 2010. The "alternatives analysis figure – (remove it, hold it, move it, treat it) is Arletta's famous figure. Dave explained that there are several different ways of dealing with wet weather flows: remove it, hold it, move it, treat it, and that he would address the technologies that do these things.

**Slides #5-12 Remove It.** We can remove wet weather flows by sewer separation; by conveying or pumping to another location, and green technologies.

**Sewer separation:** Years ago combined sewers were acceptable. One way to deal with this is sewer separation – put in new sanitary sewer. This is disruptive and can be costly. However, in some cases it may make sense to do this.

**Question:** How much would separation cost and how long would it take to get people to buy in?

**Response:** PWSA has an estimate to separate their system and it is on the order of a billion dollars just to separate a combined system. Mike Lichte indicated it is higher than that almost 2 to 5 hundred dollars per foot.

**Public factors for alternatives evaluation:** we have to consider disruptions to community by tearing up streets – environmental justice – focusing solutions in depressed areas;

**Pumping stations:** remove flow and send it to other areas.

**Green technologies:** –green roofs; vegetated swales, parking lot storage. Members mentioned that the key is municipal control and because municipalities have control, they determine the types of green technologies.

Dave Bingham gave examples of two programs. One program is in Portland Oregon, which has a good green infrastructure program. Portland's program is very advanced, and has incorporated both green and grey technologies. Even where you are aggressive with green, you may still need gray technologies. The other program is in San Francisco. San Francisco's desire is to be green; however, because of sink holes and slope failures, green technology solutions will not be as effective and this limits their ability to implement a lot of green technologies.

## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting #5**  
**March 16, 2010, 10:30 AM**  
**ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom**

---

**Question:** Are you suggesting that this is something that has to be controlled by municipalities?

**Response:** Yes. These tend to be very localized and small facilities. Unless there is an institutional change in approach, the municipalities would need to control the facilities.

**Question:** If billions are going to be spent, and ALCOSAN just looks at what they get in – can some of that money be used in the municipalities for these projects?

**Response:** When we evaluate the alternatives, particularly for green infrastructure, maintenance is key, so we will have to consider this impact as well.

**Slides #14-20: Hold it.** The following examples of methods for holding back flow before it gets to the treatment plant were discussed.

**Above ground tanks:** sometimes treatment plants have an equalization facility, which stores flow and helps balance incoming flow. You can also work them into underground storage. In Newport, RI, they have buildings above ground that are located above an underground facility. The buildings above ground are designed to fit in contextually with the other buildings in the neighborhood.

**Storage tunnel:** you just need access shafts to access tunnel and sites where you can build the tunnel from one way of getting around siting a lot of individual facilities. You also have to consider how easy it is to construct (implementation impacts).

**Slides #21-23: Move it.**

A number of “remove it” technologies can also be “move it” solutions; this includes replacement/relief pipes, consolidation of sewers, tunnel conveyance, and pumping.

**Slides #24-26 Treat it.** There are a lot of different treatments for wet weather overflows.

**Detention treatment:** a combination storage and treatment facility. You can store a certain volume and any overage is treated at the facility.

**Screening/disinfection:** using screens to remove solids and add disinfectant before it is relieved into a stream.

**Swirl/vortex:** a circular unit that spins around and solids settle at the bottom which are removed. A lot of these have been put in around the country. However, the more you fill it with flow, the more you lose effectiveness.

**High rate treatment:** involves flocculation to speed up settling of solids and pollutants. These are tricky to operate and are fairly new. This method is used widely in Europe. It provides high levels of removal, and is nearly a secondary treatment. The secondary treatment can only handle a certain amount of flow; however, when flow exceeds the limit, you can bypass the secondary treatment process and use this. This relates to water quality and public health impacts by affecting the following: overflow volume reduction, bacteria discharge reduction, solids and floatables capture, BOD control, nutrient control, control of discharge to sensitive areas, and impact to slopes, shorelines, and wildlife.

**Satellite waste water:** additional water treatment capacity. Additional treatment plants in various locations. The basin planners will be considering this throughout this process.

*Handout: Copy of Power Point presentation*

Next –we will discuss the process of evaluating site screening criteria.

### **EVALUATING SITE SCREENING CRITERIA: Peter Thomas, AECOM**

#### **Screening of WW Control Site Alternatives**

Peter Thomas asked members if they had any questions on what has been covered so far.

Comment: In terms of water quality, it would be interesting to look at which technologies use the least electricity considering utility costs are pretty high. Once you install the system, you are stuck with the utility costs.

**Response:** Good point; you are correct. Is there anything else?



## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting #5**  
**March 16, 2010, 10:30 AM**  
**ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom**

---

**Question:** Now that we know what the flows are, we talked about biggest areas of overflow – can ALCOSAN determine the number of gallons and cost to treat per gallon?

**Response:** Costs are so site specific; this is difficult to do. If you are along the river and you are sinking in piles, this will drive the costs. ALCOSAN did provide a costing tool to all municipalities and is available to RSG members by request. The costing tool provides a rough idea of dollars per gallon. Results of the tool will vary widely depending on the site.

**Question:** Is there a quick and dirty analysis that can be provided as it relates to this?

**Response (Jan Oliver):** In 1999, ALCOSAN developed a preliminary report that had an associated cost. It assumed a certain level of problem without flow meter and data with an estimated cost of \$2 billion; \$1 billion of which was for regional facilities. We are trying to move to a more detailed analysis; that was a quick and dirty analysis.

Peter thanked members for their input and proceeded in explaining to members the importance of their opinion on the criteria categories. We want you to take part in an exercise that will allow you to give your opinion on the importance of each of the criteria. The basin planners will use this information to evaluate the alternatives for each basin and then regional alternatives. You are the last group to go through this exercise; eight other groups have completed this exercise.

Members were provided a screening of ALCOSAN wet weather control alternatives form along with one large orange dot, and nine smaller blue dots to use for the ranking exercise. Members were encouraged to ask questions as each of the five categories and criteria were explained.

1. **Economic Factors.** This includes the cost to build and the cost to maintain.

**Question:** Does this include energy cost?

**Response:** Yes. And it is CSO and SSO discharge.

**Question:** Does it include the cost to the customer?

**Response:** Yes. The other part of the cost to think about is the building costs. If we were building today, we would get relatively low estimated costs, considering the economy. If we are building five years from now, who knows what the cost could be? It will be much higher. Your input will determine the importance of cost compared to the other factors.

2. **Public Factors.** When it comes to wastewater, people ask what do I smell, hear, and see? There is the disruption issue construction, blocked roads, night work, dust. There are some positive factors like sites. Some sites may also be used for recreation. In terms of environmental justice, if we have two communities a couple of miles apart the engineers may consider consolidation from seven outfalls to two. Economically it is best to dump into one of two communities. They select community and the community is concerned that the results are not equitable.

3. **Water quality, public health, and environmental impacts.** Understanding that ALCOSAN will develop a plan to address these items in accordance with EPA regulations, we want to know how important are these items to you? Overflow volume is going to be reduced. In terms of bacteria, how can we control and/or reduce its impact on water quality. There is also the issue of sensitive areas.

Peter asked if anyone had questions or comments on this area, and the response was no.

4. **Operational Impact.** This is critical to success of the WWP as a long term proposition. The ease of operation should be considered. If you have multiple types of facilities, consider the complexity, maintenance and ease of operations of these varying facilities.

**Question:** O&M consistency with existing practices – what does that mean?

**Response:** You want this to be consistent for the operators. This means using what is familiar; this saves money and saves costs.



## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting #5**  
**March 16, 2010, 10:30 AM**  
**ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom**

---

**Comments:** Since some of technologies are new anyway – on some level does this eliminate new technologies that we discussed?

**Response:** We are trying to balance these things; it depends on how it is weighted.

**5. Implementation Impacts.** This includes constructability, how hard or easy is it to build. Expandability, should we need to change or adjust existing conditions. Site availability, how easy or hard it is to get sites through land acquisitions. We have identified 142 potential sites and some of those will need to be acquired

**Question:** Where is life cycle costs mentioned?

**Response (Dan Lockard):** Dan informed members that when looking at a basin-wide solution is it easier to maintain one or two treatment sites versus five or six. In one situation, this exercise will be used site to site; other times some of these categories apply to technology or technologies. These solutions all have different costs associated with them. As we look at regional plan, we combine and/or incorporate the basin-wide solutions. Sometimes it seems that the categories oppose each other. The public may seem to accept green technologies, but there may not be enough flow to solve the problems and then you have implementation issues to consider. There are a lot of trade-offs. You are to weight what is important to you, and then this will all be integrated when we look at the basin alternatives.

**Scoring Exercise:** It was explained that the scoring should be done individually, but members are encouraged to discuss their views and opinions on what they feel are the most important. Members were told to then weight what is important to them as individual. A scoring sheet and 10 dots (9 blue, 1 orange) were distributed to members. Each of the 10 dots represents 10%; the orange dot represents what the member feel is the most important of the five categories. In terms of importance, the blue dots should be in alignment with the orange dot. The group was given 15 minutes to complete the exercise.

Members were also shown (4) examples of scoring techniques via a PowerPoint slide:

- 1) an incorrect example with an orange dot and no supporting blue dots;
- 2) an incorrect example with an orange dot with too few blue dots supporting the category. The orange dot is to represent what the individual feels is the most important category;
- 3) an incorrect example with no orange dot with an acceptable number of blue dots supporting the category
- 4) a correct example with an orange dot and the appropriate number of supporting blue dots.

After the exercise was completed, the scoring sheets were collected for calculation. While the results were being calculated, Janai went through the next steps with members.

### **NEXT STEPS: Janai Williams, Ebony Holdings**

Members were asked to have an open discussion on how to increase member participation. Is it the time of day, location? What would make it more convenient for others?

### **Responses from the members were as follows:**

- The location of the meeting is great, it allows for a change environment and more focus.
- The big picture needs to be illustrated to members. If members have a simple illustration of where we are in the big picture, it would help us in conversations with them; and it may also help them.
- Send a questionnaire to the members who have not attended (i.e. missed 2 meetings out of 5). If they cannot attend, consider replacing those members with someone else who can attend meetings.
- As the program progresses, each community should get their public works people involved. These individuals know how to implement technology throughout their particular systems, and are aware of how bring things of this nature together. You're talking about rerouting systems and pumping to different locations. Who is going to pay to move the lines, and maintain these systems? If the community is responsible, the elected officials will need to know in order to inform the residents. (This will have to be done on a local level. When you ask who is going to pay for it, it will be the same people who are paying for it now)



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting #5**  
**March 16, 2010, 10:30 AM**  
**ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom**

---

**Response(Janai Williams):** This will be included on the agenda for discussion at the next meeting.

**Comments:** Affordability is a key issue we need to discuss. Affordability is not a question with the consent order. Municipalities have signed on; therefore, once a community has signed on the dotted line affordability should no longer be an issue if they understand what they have signed.

**Comment:** There are other things related to ability to implement, other than costs.

**Response: (Members):** But this is what people want to have a conversation about.

**Question:** Are there criteria when considering additional committee members?

**Response:** The RSG does have bylaws which identify the targeted stakeholder representation for membership. We can also create sub committees.

**Comment:** Have the meeting dates and times sent in advance.

**Response:** In members were provided with a tentative 2010 meeting schedule.

**Comment:** I am not sure why I am here. If you want members to attend, provide a brief statement as to why it is important, how long it will go on, and the results.

**Response:** Members will receive a draft agenda to comment on for the next meeting which will is scheduled for May13.

**Question:** Can we send an alternate?

**Response:** We ask that you send us an advance notice before sending an alternate; however we do want the selected members to be at the meetings. If you cannot come and you want to continue the discussion let us know.

There were no further questions, comment from members. Janai asked Peter to report the results of the scoring exercise.

Listed below are the results of the scoring exercise, in which RSG members present participated.

CATEGORY	RSG RESULTS
<b>1. Economic Factors</b>	31.4%
<b>2. Public Factors</b>	16.0%
<b>3. Water Quality, Public Health and Environmental Impacts</b>	30.2%
<b>4. Operation Impacts</b>	10.0%
<b>5. Implementation Impacts</b>	12.4%

**Meeting was adjourned at 12:15pm**

**Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:**

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, [nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org](mailto:nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org), 412.734.8353
- Peter Thomas, AECOM Project Manager, [peter.thomas@aecom.com](mailto:peter.thomas@aecom.com), 412.316.3603
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings Public Relations Coordinator, [jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz), 412.434.6571

*We believe that the above accurately reflects the key point of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Regional Stakeholder Group and the meeting are encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings ([jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz)) or (412.434.6571 ext 224) within five (5) of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.*



## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

### Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting #6 May 13, 2010, 10:00 AM Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

---

The following summarizes the discussion segment from the Regional Stakeholder Group Meeting #6, held on the above referenced date. The term “response” indicates a summary of the answer given to a direct question; comment represents general information shared, not directly associated with a question.

#### **WELCOME:**

**Arletta Scott Williams**, ALCOSAN, Executive Director

Arletta welcomed and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. An upbeat atmosphere and continuous dialogue was encouraged. She asked everyone to introduce themselves and their organization.

#### **MEETING OBJECTIVES:**

**Janai Michelle Williams**, Ebony Holdings

Janai reviewed the agenda with members, and noted that there was a substantial amount of information to cover. Out of respect and consideration of everyone’s time, Janai informed the members she would like to keep the agenda moving, however if the members had questions or would like to discuss a specific topic as it presents itself, she would stop and discuss. Every effort was made to facilitate discussions in order to cover the agenda in its entirety.

Janai also noted that a PowerPoint presentation and flip charts to aid in capturing pertinent information and discussions would be used. By the conclusion of RSG meeting #6, the goals were to: 1) generate an ongoing discussion of members’ questions and concerns; 2) a presentation and open discussion on the affordability of the Wet Weather Program (WWP); 3) discuss a draft RSG Vision statement for members to provide comment and review; 4) a presentation and open discussion on the comparative analysis of wet weather programs in other cities. Following the presentations and discussions, Janai informed members that a brief discussion regarding some next steps and action items would ensue to mark the conclusion of the meeting.

#### **RSG PARTICIPATION DISCUSSION:**

**Janai Michelle Williams**, Ebony Holdings

The members were given a few minutes to read the draft Vision Statement for the RSG. Janai explained the purpose and meaning of the Vision Statement, and engaged members on their thoughts and feedback. There was no member feedback at this time. Members were informed that the Vision Statement would also be distributed via email, and electronic feedback would be welcomed as well. Members in attendance should forward all comments to Janette Campbell via email by noon, Thursday, May 20, 2010. Members not in attendance should forward all comments to Janette Campbell via email by noon, Thursday, May 27, 2010.

#### **UNDERSTANDING THE AFFORDABILITY ANALYSIS PROCESS:**

**Tom Schevtchuk**, CDM

Tom introduced himself along with Tony Catania, and their roles in the WWP. Tom stated that he would discuss the financial capability assessment, which is a requirement under the CSO policy. This policy requires the development of an affordability analysis. The work is being done in two phases: Phase I looks at the current conditions, and the ability of ratepayers to pay their sewer bills. Phase II looks at financial capabilities of the permittee(s), and the collective ability to finance and administer program as it moves forward. The methodology being used for affordability analysis was explained. It included initial findings on affordability for a range of communities in various service areas and explained USEPA’s guidelines for determining affordability.

**Discussion/Response:** RSG member commented that the fact that the majority of people in the low income range are not paying the full amount of their rent would need to be considered; properties could be multi-unit facilities or subsidized housing. The person making \$8,000/year would not be bearing the

## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

### Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting #6 May 13, 2010, 10:00 AM Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

---

full brunt of the \$405. There are also other entities or situations that may affect this overall cost, such as the apartments that are situated over the mom and pop stores.

**Discussion ensued:**

Tom responded that this would be considered on another level of the analysis to be completed. Multi-units water meters will be reviewed, but for the first round it made sense to look at the number of residential connections – the plurality of the residential population in single family homes.

Art Tamilia reminded members that this exercise is to help determine how long the schedule and payments for implementation of the correction(s) can be spread out. The economic status of the service area needs to be determined, and there are a number of considerations behind the process, (i.e. how it is presented, and how it will be used). We want to create a program that is affordable across the board. However, the end result does not change that we need to be in compliance with the Clean Water Act.

Jan Oliver noted that many cities are trying to use this to leverage control, and their inability to afford to overflow more times per year. However, she noted that she was not aware of any groups that subsidize sewer or energy rates.

**Question:** Based on this understanding, in order to get to the level of the pain index, the sewer rates will basically be double what they are today? This was followed with a question pertaining to how limits on the capacity of municipalities to borrow would play into this.

**Response:** Tom indicated that the abilities of the municipalities to finance their programs; their financial feasibility study, is not a part of the Wet Weather Plan or Consent Decree compliance. However, if the plan includes something the municipalities' cannot afford, that will be a challenge.

**Comment:** The municipalities can only borrow so much.

**Response:** Tom noted that this is the first of two important factors to be recognized. One is the ability of region as well as individual municipalities to afford the cost of improvements and the other is the ability to finance these improvements.

**Response:** Dave Borneman stated that financial capability is something in which municipalities should keep in the forefront of their arguments-financial capability, because there are separate decrees;. However, the fix is in implementation-some improvements may be good to do today; some down the road and this will be impacted by funding.

**Discussion/Comment:** If the affordability analysis went out today, is there anything that shows consumption across median household income that adjusts with the fact the majority of these households are probably not running dishwashers, and using water such as high-end consumers use? In reality of what they are paying, are we reacting to what the high-end uses? Could the numbers be artificially inflated?

**Discussion/Comment:** As someone with experience in living at lower income level, Section 8 housing payments may not rise in proportion to an increase in expenses, so the full burden would be on the tenant. When you are living at a lower income level, any sort of increase is devastating because it comes out of things like the food budget. The member cautioned not to underestimate impact on lower income people.

There was no other input from the members; Tom concluded his presentation.

## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting #6**  
**May 13, 2010, 10:00 AM**  
**Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN**

### COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF WET WEATHER PROGRAMS:

**Peter Thomas, AECOM**  
**Dave Bingham, AECOM**

Peter invited the members to review the comparative analysis material that was included as a handout, explaining that the criteria utilized for comparison was provided by the group during RSG meeting #5, held in March 2010. Peter reviewed the criteria and the programs/areas that were selected explained that similarities to ALCOSAN's program and service area were considered when identifying the different programs/areas. The status of the programs in progress was also considered. In comparison to ALCOSAN's large service area, at least two of the programs identified had similar sized service areas. Additionally, green technologies were considered. This helped to narrow down the cities to consider. Three of four programs included green technologies. Peter explained the format of the material, with the first page being background information on each city. It was noted that the volume of the overflow problems in each of the cities researched were comparable to ALCOSAN. When considering the ownership of the facilities, the closest to ALCOSAN would be the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA) in Boston, Massachusetts. Also, Northern Kentucky had about 30 communities in its service area.

**Comment:** Jan Oliver pointed out that while Northern Kentucky only has 30 communities, they are responsible for everything that comes into their system. MWRA is most similar to the structure of ALCOSAN.

Peter pointed out that all of the data included in the handout is published data. In addition, where information was not easily available, most of the detailed research was not conducted. Peter recapped the criteria in which the RSG members specifically asked for a breakdown. The criteria were as follows: costs, planning, design, and construction and upstream water quality influences (both of which could not be found). He noted that Boston was the only case studied to report drastic improvement in water quality.

**Question:** How is water quality compliance measured within ALCOSAN's system?

**Response:** Jan Oliver responded that ALCOSAN has a sampling program – upstream and downstream (wet and dry weather), and sampling is done at end of pipe and receiving streams.

**Question:** That is how you measure water quality, but it is well known that there is an issue with acid mine drainage. Are you required to mitigate your discharge to receiving waters?

**Response:** Colleen Hughes responded that cause or contributions are demonstrated with monitoring. There is some aspect of what is being asked in the regulations.

**Response:** Jan Oliver added that this is not a basis that regulatory agencies will accept for doing less.

Following this round of discussion, Peter turned the presentation over to Dave Bingham to discuss some additional points of interests on comparative analysis, beginning with Massachusetts.

**Dave Bingham.** Going back to MWRA (Boston), he pointed out that they own the treatment plant that major interceptors' municipalities discharge into. They are similar to ALCOSAN in how they are operate and maintain these facilities. Their planning efforts began in the late 1980's, and finished up in the 1990's. Massachusetts had significant overflow volume reduction, ridding their systems of over 98 % CSO discharges. They also experienced significant water quality improvements in receiving waters.



## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting #6**  
**May 13, 2010, 10:00 AM**  
**Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN**

---

Their watershed association has implemented a system which rates the waterways like a report card. Their grade to-date is a B+.

Source reduction was a major focus in their program. For every 1 MGD of water being sent for treatment, 2 MGD of infiltration/flow had to be removed. They worked with communities on programs to remove the infiltration inflow. The more flow member communities removed, the more members saved on billing the rate payer.

There have been 2 major public works programs in Boston over the last decade. Dear Island treatment plant, the cost of the program was \$ 3 million and a program for wet weather and control of CSOs, whose cost was \$876 million. The program was estimated at \$3.8 billion, down from \$6 billion initially estimated. The way in which the process of these programs are estimated and implemented over time can make significant difference in cost. Typically wet weather programs can cost from one thousand to two thousand per capita.

Dave moved on to **Northern Kentucky** which also discharges into the Ohio River as does ALCOSAN. They have 3 major counties with small municipalities. These municipalities were consolidated in the 1990's, and has a small customer base compared to ALCOSAN. Northern Kentucky is trying a watershed approach for decreasing the planning. They are in their first 5 years of planning, and will submit an interim plan at the end of 5 years. This plan will focus on the highest pollutant loads, and will provide an estimate for the overall program which is estimated at \$3.2 billion. By specifically focusing on the most critical issues, (pollutant sources), their cost will not be this absorbent amount. To this point, they are not sure what the regulatory reactions or repercussions will be.

Also, there are a couple of counties across from **Cincinnati, Ohio** that are still growing, as new households tap in. These counties are made up of small communities that have not had the resources to maintain their systems over the years. For this reason, consolidation is being considered. These counties are trying to incorporate green solutions.

**The City of Portland, Oregon** has full control of their sewers, storm drainage and treatment plants and therefore differs from ALCOSAN. Their program is comprised of green and grey technologies, and is projected to be completed in 2011. Portland is focused on storm water removal and claim to have removed significant flow by going after the elimination of downspouts from homes.. Portland has good soil for infiltration and as a result they currently have extensive green solutions in the public street system as well as ecoroofs. Portland developed and educated groups to maintain these types of facilities. Although they have implemented green solutions, Portland still has the need for grey solutions To-date, Dave noted that, he has not seen a program where green solutions solves everything.

**DC Water and Sanitation Authority (DC WASA)** has a largely combined system, which includes several larger systems (**Fairfax & Loudon Counties and WSSE**). Collectively, they serve 2.2 million people. The combined sewer area is largely in DC. Dave noted that DC is moving into the design stage, and that they do have a plan for green technology. DC is also incorporating low impact development (LID) into its overall plans.

Dave asked if there were other questions, and there were not. He concluded noting that if anyone desired additional information or needed clarity, it could be addressed later.

## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting #6**  
**May 13, 2010, 10:00 AM**  
**Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN**

---

### **NEXT STEPS:**

**Lugene Keys**, KCI Technologies  
Lugene recapped a significant amount of information that was presented during the meeting. Some of the key points that were introduced were the affordability and comparative analysis, and a draft of the RSG vision statement. She informed members that the vision statement is something that ALCOSAN and the RSG want to look at a few years from now and proudly say “we have fulfilled the purpose of the Vision.”

Lugene reminded the members that their comments on the draft RSG vision statement were due by from members in attendance should forward all comments to Janette Campbell via email by noon, Thursday, May 20, 2010. Members not in attendance should forward all comments to Janette Campbell via email by noon, Thursday, May 27, 2010. Topic ideas for the next RSG agenda may also be submitted at this time. The next RSG meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 12, 2010, @ 10 AM.

The RSG members identified the following agenda items as topics of discussion for the next meeting as follows: Update on the Affordability Presentation, ALCOSAN’s approach to green technologies, and the final version of the RSG vision statement.

**Meeting was adjourned at 12:00pm**

### ***Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:***

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, [nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org](mailto:nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org), 412.734.8353
- Peter Thomas, AECOM Project Manager, [peter.thomas@aecom.com](mailto:peter.thomas@aecom.com), 412.297.4504
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings Public Relations Coordinator, [jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz), 412.434.6571

*We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, feedback is encouraged if the input causes a difference in understand, or further explanation is needed to define the purpose of the Regional Stakeholder Group. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings ([jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz)) or (412.434.6571 ext 224) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.*



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 7**  
**Thursday, August 12, 2010 / 10:00 AM**  
**ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom**

---

## **Welcome: Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN**

Nancy welcomed everyone and noted that Arletta Scott Williams was on vacation. She also brought to everyone's attention an article in the August 12 issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. The article discussed increased recreation on waterways and sewer overflows, and she urged audience to read the article when they had the opportunity. She provided an update on the ongoing construction at ALCOSAN, advising that several buildings are getting new roofs, and that road repairs were underway. The old CS&T building, old security shack, and the circle will be taken down to make room for new buildings. Nancy acknowledged that there were many new faces in the room, and invited everyone to introduce themselves. Following the introductions, Nancy thanked everyone for coming, and turned the meeting over to Janai.

## **Meeting Objectives: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings**

Janai Williams began by stating that ALCOSAN respects the members' time, and that if the discussions began to approach the end of the time allotted, the members would be polled to determine if the discussion should continue.

Janai explained that a PowerPoint and flipcharts would be used throughout the meeting to convey information and capture feedback from discussions. She then introduced Tom to give a presentation on the affordability analysis.

## **Affordability Analysis Process Update: Tom Schevtchuk, CDM**

Tom reminded the members of the presentation about this topic given several months ago to CMAC and in the last round of BPC meetings. He explained that today his intent was to update the members on the activities completed over the past few months. He noted that similar feedback was received from the Affordability Analysis Process presentations made at CMAC, RSG and each basin planning committee meeting.

Tom emphasized the need ALCOSAN to have a good understanding of municipal costs moving forward. He also noted if they (municipalities) are developing or could be developing a capital improvement budget over the years; this information will also need to be captured. Gathering comprehensive and accurate future costs will be critical to developing a solid affordability analysis.

Tom referred to Slide #3 (RSG handout #2) as he discussed how the rate model had been expanded to 2050. He stated that the costs will have to be included to get a sense of what will happen in terms of financial requirements and rate impacts 10 to 20 years from now. Regarding residential indicators from other Long Term Control Plans (LTCPs), Tom explained that they have started gathering information from other analogous wastewater facilities similar to ALCOSAN. They also looked into what steps they are taking with their affordability analysis. In brief, major urban systems around the country are in a similar predicament to ALCOSAN. For example, in Indianapolis their plan is at 1.8% of the median household income. Kansas has a \$2.4 billion plan, but they are expecting \$500 million from state and federal funding. Philadelphia is using a 2.27% median household income in 2029. Washington DC has a 40-year implementation schedule, analogous to Kansas City. They are hoping for federal funds to help move the program toward completion in less than 40 years. Atlanta pursued a very huge program when the economy was good, but now that the economy has slowed down they cannot meet their schedule. There are changes in the economy that impact the affordability of the program. Most of these programs are focusing on 2% target and what they have to do to meet to stay at this target, they are informing the regulatory agencies of how difficult it is to meet this target and that adjustments in scope and/or schedule are needed to be for improvements to be affordable in their communities. The regulatory agencies are hearing this from a number of programs and are trying to figure out how to respond. Some programs consent orders require 5 year plans to be submitted for approval. Once approved these improvements are implemented. This is another way to build in accordance with affordability.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 7**  
**Thursday, August 12, 2010 / 10:00 AM**  
**ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom**

The National Association of Clean Water Agency has hosted seminars around the country and online seminars called “Money Matters”; ALCOSAN participated in a seminar in June. They are working with the states and EPA and the National Conference of Mayors to address affordability, what affordability means, and to see if we will be allowed to work with something other than the 2%. They are interested in working toward obtaining regulatory flexibility from EPA in the implementation of the long term control plans. They are interested in getting the EPA to recognize and accept changing economic conditions of agencies implementing LTCPs. There are a number of programs that look at 5 year increments; looking at incomes and adjusting/re-evaluating accordingly in terms of implementation and affordability. The concerns discussed by this group about affordability are similar to those around the country who have LTCPs. There are no clear distinct answers yet from EPA, but there is a push to get the agencies to understand that some flexibility is required and that as plans that are put forth regulatory flexibility will be needed.

**Question:** Looking back at your previous presentation, is the goal of affordability to try to get to 2% for each municipality or for the whole region?

**Response:** 2 percent is a regional goal. Some finesse is needed as to how to average incomes, but this is at a regional level. Beyond that we want to know what this means if the lower 25% of the population is looked at separately, as they would be paying close to 3% of their median household income.

A discussion ensued.

A member of the CDM team indicated that EPA would prefer the 2% standard. Tom added that you cannot stop at the lowest percentage, but it is certainly worth knowing about and worth suggesting a policy to look at those rate structures. Dave Borneman added that other funding sources will be needed to help level affordability in service area in the future. It will help to target what this region can do using its own money, and to determine the best way to use this initial investment.

Janai took a moment to encourage everyone to make sure they have signed in, and asked the members for permission to take still photos of the meeting. Everyone was receptive to the request; Janai then indicated to the members that Joe Day would be taking the photos. Janai then turned the meeting over to Jan Oliver for the next presentation.

## **Preliminary Alternatives Evaluation/Development Process: Jan Oliver, ALCOSAN**

Jan indicated she would provide an update on steps taken in the alternatives development process. We are all clear that the problem is – overflows from sanitary and combined systems. The major impact is bacteria and other floatables. This is a stormwater impact that does not occur during dry weather. Also, this is not a flood control program, but ALCOSAN is hopeful that it will address basement backups. There are 300 overflows in the ALCOSAN system and 140 in the municipal system. In 2008, there were 83 maximum overflow events at a single outfall.

ALCOSAN and the municipalities have discussed how this problem is being analyzed so it can be addressed. We are using flow monitoring data information from municipalities on their projected flows. We started with assuming all flows will be sent to ALCOSAN and we are now asking the municipalities if they are expecting anything different and what their intent is to manage overflows.

We then size the control facilities for a range of number of overflow control conditions as allowed in our consent order. ALCOSAN also looked at various technologies and costs associated with implementing these technologies. This information is also useful to the municipalities who are addressing their overflows.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

## MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 7**  
**Thursday, August 12, 2010 / 10:00 AM**  
**ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom**

We have gone through an initial screening process to identify available sites. These sites have to be suitable for a range of technologies as well as have room for expansion if needed. We also looked at the best routes to capture all of the overflows in order to get them to a facility, whether its treatment, storage or conveyance.

We are looking at peak flow during the summer and winter. Summer months usually have peak flows. In winter months snow melts in saturated conditions can have larger flow volumes. We are looking at design storms for SSOs - the 2 year 24 hour storm. We also look at how well overflows are captured for CSO's on an annual basis.

**Question:** Is there a design storm for CSOs?

**Response:** There is not. For CSOs, continuous modelling simulation is used, and the system will only be able to discharge so many times per year with a certain percentage of capture.

Jan continued to discuss the type of controls that are being considered (Remove it, Move it, Hold it, and Treat it). The analysis to date is coming up with favoured technologies which are really the more feasible technologies. ALCOSAN is keeping as many sites and technologies as possible. As the technologies are being analyzed, a few are starting to rise to the top. Eventually there will be fewer of these technologies to consider.

Regarding the sites, Jan explained that the site must fit the infrastructure – this is important as the facilities need to be accessible for maintenance. It is preferred that the site require the least amount of mechanical equipment therefore a site suitable for gravity flows is better than one at which pumping is needed. ALCOSAN wants to have a range of alternatives to make sure that there are options. The best sites are located along rivers and major streams and are in close proximity to the ALCOSAN system. This is typically the most cost-effective approach because it is where the existing flows converge. We are trying to work with railroads upfront, as there are many potential impacts that can occur. We want to consolidate flows by looking at this as a regional program.

Jan referenced a map of 146 potential sites, and gave an example of a site in the Upper Allegheny Planning Basin site at Washington Blvd. and Route 8. Jan explained the features of the site to the audience, and indicated the types of things are being considered on a regional basis. She explained that sites can be used to consolidate existing outfalls. There is also the potential to apply green technologies if an outfall has a small flow.

Jan discussed a combination of flow scenarios. Technologies and sites can create hundreds of options. ALCOSAN has a number of consultants running the models to reduce the number of alternatives. ALCOSAN is also looking at combining basin potential solutions and their impact on the existing treatment plant.

As cost is important and we are looking at the best benefit for the cost, all of these components will be pulled together and analyzed as a part of the long term control plan.

**Question:** How many sites are being considered and what are those sites?

**Response:** Jan responded that these sites are preliminary, and as alternatives are selected, it is discovered that some sites are not necessary. Dan Lockard added that in the Chartiers Creek basin, they started with 13 sites which included a few suggested by the municipalities. At this point they are down to 5 or 6 sites. Dave Borneman noted that even though there are 5 or 6 primary sites; all the other sites are not automatically dismissed because a potential problem may still exist and use of the other site may be necessary. He explained that ALCOSAN is asking the planners to develop a handful of preferences, and then they will be narrowed down. Jan added that once the number of preferences is narrowed down, an environmental assessment will be conducted on the site.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 7**  
**Thursday, August 12, 2010 / 10:00 AM**  
**ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom**

**Comment:** The member reiterated that he was just trying to get a better understanding on the order of the magnitude on the number of sites.

**Response:** Dan Lockard responded that in Chartiers we will end up with 4 or 5 sites, as Chartiers is probably more complicated than others. In Lower Ohio they may have 2 or 3. In some basins, you are looking at where the flow is headed. Saw Mill Run, Route 8 is probably one of the biggest sources of overflow for the system. It does not take much to realize that this needs to be a site for an alternative.

**Question:** Do the technologies considered to be “rising to the top” differ from the various sites or across the board?

**Response:** They vary at different sites. We may have two very similar technologies that rise to the top, but we are also looking at standardizing alternatives used across the system.

Dan Lockard noted that the costing tool is pretty uniform. Both the costs of alternatives and the performance of alternatives will be uniform across the basins. will be uniform We are looking at standardization across the system.

**Question:** When talking about green infrastructure, is ALCOSAN only considering those facilities being located on one of the selected sites? Generally green infrastructure needs to occur upstream.

**Response:** Jan responded that ALCOSAN is looking at it in terms of what the impact will be to the regional facility. Dave Borneman commented that what is currently being looked at are the grey solutions, but green has to be a component. He also noted that ALCOSAN is aware that some of those facilities where sewer sheds are joined could be reducing flows by implementing green improvements upstream. When we size facilities and see the flow patterns we are looking at implementing pockets of green infrastructure.

**Question:** Is ALCOSAN willing to make upstream investments where benefits of the investment?

**Response:** That information is not known.

**Question:** Has ALCOSAN started to negotiate with the railroads yet since that process can be difficult? Does ALCOSAN have alternative plans in place just in case the negotiations with the railroad do not go well?

**Response:** Discussions have been initiated with the railroads, and scenarios are being developed to share with them. Jan explained that it is difficult to do at this time when it is not known what exactly is going to be proposed.

**Question:** Are all of the 146 sites that were presented in the PowerPoint presentation greenfield sites?

**Response:** Yes, all 146 proposed sites are greenfield sites.

Jan asked if there were any questions; members indicated that there were none. Jan turned the presentation over to Colleen Hughes to talk about the issue of water quality.

## **Water Quality Assessment: Colleen Hughes, CDM**

Colleen Hughes stated that she would be addressing the water quality impact. The technical building blocks that go into this program have been discussed in some detail. With the Water Quality Impact Assessment Program, we evaluate what impact proposed controls will have to determine the most effective strategy for the long term plan. We started by monitoring water quality. We monitored discharges from outfalls, receiving streams and pollutant streams. The monitoring program has been underway for 3 years. There are 26 different locations required to be monitored per the Consent Decree. Monitoring is conducted during dry weather and wet weather. We monitor for various parameters. We take this information based on the 26 locations to develop a tool to determine the pollutant load for all the different outfalls. We add to this information to the receiving water quality information, collected from 50 different sampling locations throughout the ALCOSAN service area.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 7**  
**Thursday, August 12, 2010 / 10:00 AM**  
**ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom**

We are monitoring at sensitive areas that have been outlined in the Consent Decree. There are also 10 stream flow monitoring locations which is very important (volume of flow). We are monitoring for 3 wet and 3 dry weather events in this area. Per the Consent Decree we are required to monitor 10% of the region's outfalls.

A few examples of preliminary results compiled in these graphs to share with you.

Dissolved Oxygen - the monitoring results are minimum and maximum results of dissolved oxygen are shown for a number of water bodies that were sampled. The point is that in only one body of water had results below the standard which is really good news and indicates that dissolved oxygen is not a problem here.

Bacteria: The bacteria results from a range of water bodies show that during the May to September timeframe bacteria standards are exceeded 50 to 100% of the time. Clearly bacteria is a problem to be addressed.

**Question:** Has any bacterial source tracking been tried to consider how much is contributed by human and how much is being contributed by other sources?

**Response:** A representative of CDM responded that at this point in the program – the CSOs are typically human sources. This is a good question to address down the road after you control CSOs.

Colleen went on to explain the water quality benefit example slide – a graph of Fall Creek with watershed improvements. These types of charts will be developed for the numerous scenarios.

The different sets of information will come together and contribute to the goal of improving water quality to protect human health and aquatic life. The costs of achieving water quality goals will have to be balanced with affordability.

**Question:** Why use 365 days and not the direct use days (115)?

**Response:** This result is an example from Indianapolis. Graphs to be proposed for this program will be based on a 115 day usage.

## **Public Outreach: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings**

Janai began to discuss ALCOSAN's public awareness campaign regarding the alternative analysis and/or potential solutions. The purpose is to inform the public about the sewer overflow issue; to familiarize the public with the topic and generate interest for attending the community meetings scheduled for October and November of this year. ALCOSAN wants the public to continue to follow the issue, stay informed, and continue to be involved.

Dave Borneman added ALCOSAN has worked with the public primarily through the Basin Planning Committees. We are just starting to orient the public; they have not seen of this type of information to date. We are giving the CMAC and RSG members a progress report, but when we talk about the public at the upcoming meetings we will be sharing the type of information we presented at today's meeting.

Janai added that during the public meetings three specific points will be addressed (1.) What is the problem; (2.) How we are fixing the problem, and (3.) What the public can do to help. We are looking for feedback from you on this strategy, and input on the tools we are considering for reaching the public.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 7**  
**Thursday, August 12, 2010 / 10:00 AM**  
**ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom**

Some existing resources we will be using are feature articles, a newsletter to 1100 municipal officials, news releases, newly launched twitter and Facebook sites. Being able to communicate with all audiences is important. Lastly, we will have a complement of bulletins, brochures and fact sheets on the ALCOSAN web site or upon request. This is a quick broad-brush list of what we are going to do. If you can add this information to your newsletters and help us make the public aware of this issue, and generate interest in getting the public to attend the upcoming meetings it would be appreciated.

## **Public Outreach: Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN**

Nancy advised the group she also wanted their input on a few items. The first of which was regarding the upcoming community meetings scheduled for late October, early November. Nancy referred everyone to the flier in their meeting packet. She noted that these meetings will not be advertised until after the Open House.

## *Upcoming Community Meetings*

Nancy continued on to explain that the Consent Decree dictates that an annual meeting for the public be held; this meeting must provide an update on the Wet Weather Program. Over the past 2 years, the annual meeting has occurred in January. ALCOSAN has decided to do something different for the 2010 annual meeting by moving the meeting to October; this meeting will be in conjunction with the potential solutions meeting. We are looking to close the gap from what is a CSO to the alternatives analysis process in order to educate the public such that they can provide informed input. The public needs to be on the same track as the basin planning committee. The locations selected were determined after careful consideration. Members were asked to refer to handout # 5 and note that the location for the region-wide meeting is pending. The community meetings will be an open house format. We will have stations, displays and a PowerPoint presentation with the first part being the update, and then the basin alternatives analysis. Details for the region-wide meeting are pending; this is where ALCOSAN is seeking input. The goal for the region-wide meeting is to get the people who work downtown to attend this meeting; the meeting will be from 10 am to 4 with 3 different presentation times. Members offered the following suggestions: Party-liner boat, the Heinz History Center, the casino, ball parks, community college locations, and the Monroeville Convention Center. It was suggested that no one wants to pay \$10 for parking, and Nancy responded that ALCOSAN is understanding that there may be parking concerns. Nancy encouraged the members to send an email with any other suggestions.

## *Web Site Updates*

Nancy explained that the ALCOSAN web site would be more interactive with more basin planning information. It is expected that the updated web site would be launched by the Open House. Portals will be in place for RSG and CMAC to allow members to access and/or download information.

## *ALCOSAN Annual Open House*

Nancy noted that the purpose of the Open House is to educate, inform and get input from the general public.

Nancy stated that the date is Saturday, September 18, and that a lot of activities are planned. Mailings went out in August, and the media advertisements will begin in September. ALCOSAN is anticipating an estimated 2500 people in attendance this year, and asks that members help ALCOSAN get the word out. If an organization wants to exhibit or have a booth please contact ALCOSAN. Also, if an organization has information they wanted displayed or distributed, please provide it to ALCOSAN. She added that the wet weather issue will also be a focal point for the Open House.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 7**  
**Thursday, August 12, 2010 / 10:00 AM**  
**ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom**

---

## Next Steps: Lugene Keys, KCI

Lugene acknowledged the good discussion from today's meeting. She noted the following:

- The public awareness effort is critical. It can be a challenge in informing the public about this important issue. We are asking the members to provide us with any assistance in spreading the word. Please direct inquires to ALCOSAN and they will be sure to respond.
- Announced the Allegheny County Green Festival Event. This information was sent on behalf of RSG member Darla Cravotta. The event is scheduled for Saturday, August 14; fliers were made available.
- The next RSG meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 16<sup>th</sup> and will be held in ALCOSAN's new Customer Service and Training building. Members will receive advance notice as they have in the past, once details have been finalized.
- Community meetings – ALCOSAN has a sincere desire to communicate this information to the public to give them a good understanding of this information. This will also prepare the public for meaningful participation in future meetings including the public hearing. This includes understanding the impact of the program in their community and regionally.
  - Suggestion from member: a series of info-mercials about where we are at, where we are going, to provide background and a reference point for the public about our efforts to educate them. This will be a way to get the message out more broadly and can be evidence of ALCOSAN's efforts to communicate information about the problem, potential solutions, and impact
  - Sunday morning programs are also an option. To discuss where we are and what are the next steps.
  - Discussion with public affairs persons at local television stations or perhaps Comcast spotlight is another way to get out the message.
  - What about using municipal newsletters? We (members) would be happy to publish an ALCOSAN article.

Lugene thanked the members for their ideas and their willingness to further publicize and distribute this information. In the near future, information will be distributed to members to help us reach the broadest audience as possible. Lugene asked if the members had items to be included on the agenda for the next meeting. The following suggestions were provided:

- The role green solutions will play in the wet weather program; these solutions should be part of the holistic effort. We can come up with opportunities beyond ALCOSAN paying for these technologies.
- What other cities have done with integrating green technologies? The alternatives to the alternatives. Keep the group informed as these alternatives evolve.
- Consider a stormwater utility for Allegheny County that would be uniform across all municipalities
  - Research existing models somewhat locally in Philadelphia and just recently the Cleveland area.

Jan Oliver noted that 3RWW has a request for proposal for the consolidation of systems. ALCOSAN will submit a response.

Lugene asked if there were any other topics for the agenda. There was no response from the members, so she asked everyone to remember to complete and return your evaluation form. The meeting concluded at that time.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 7**  
**Thursday, August 12, 2010 / 10:00 AM**  
**ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom**

---

**Meeting was adjourned at 11:36 am**

***Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:***

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, [nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org](mailto:nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org), 412.734.8353
- Peter Thomas, AECOM Project Manager, [peter.thomas@aecom.com](mailto:peter.thomas@aecom.com), 412.297.4504
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings Public Relations Coordinator, [jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz), 412.434.6571

*We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, feedback is encouraged if the input causes a difference in understanding, or further explanation is needed to define the purpose of the Regional Stakeholder Group. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings ([jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz)) or (412.434.6571 ext 224) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.*



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 8**

**Tuesday, November 16, 2010 / 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service and Training Conference Room**

---

**Welcome: Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN**

Arletta Williams started the meeting by welcoming the group and initiating introductions.

**Meeting Objectives: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings**

Janai Williams began by stating that ALCOSAN respects the members' time, and that if the discussions began to approach the end of the time allotted, the members would be polled to determine if the discussion should continue.

Janai explained that the meeting handouts are numbered for quick reference during the meeting presentations.

**Stormwater Management – What is the City of Pittsburgh planning?**

*Stormwater Management: Michael Kenney, Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority (PWSA)*

Michael Kenney, PWSA Executive Director, presented information on PWSA's plans and priorities related to stormwater management and reviewed in depth the major elements of PWSA's storm water management approach. He stated the following:

Storm water runoff is any water that is not soaked into the ground after a rain storm. Consequently, storm water runoff can pick up pollutants while flowing into local streams and rivers. The components of storm water management are planning, maintenance, construction, facilities management and education. The focus of storm water management is water quality. There are three major elements to storm water management: water quality, channel protection and flood control requirements.

Water quality requirements stipulate management of the first inch of runoff from all Direct Connected Impervious Areas (DCIA). The water quality requirement is established to: 1. Recharge the ground water table and increase stream base flows; 2. Restore more natural hydrology; 3. Reduce pollution in runoff and 4. Reduce combined sewer overflows. Consideration must be given when infiltration is determined to be infeasible due to contamination, high groundwater table, shallow bed rock, poor infiltration rates or where it can be demonstrated that infiltration would cause property or environmental damage.

Channel protection is a slow release of the 1-year, 24 hour storm event detained from Direct Connected Impervious Areas. Channel protection is required to: 1. Protect quality of stream channels and banks, fish habitat, and man-made infrastructure from the influences of high stream velocity erosive forces; and 2. Reduce the quantity, frequency and duration of CSOs.

Flood control is established to: 1. Reduce or prevent the occurrence of flooding in areas downstream that may be caused by inadequate sewer capacity or stream bank overflow; and 2. To reduce the frequency, duration and quantity of overflows in combined sewer sheds.

Michael also noted that PWSA would like to establish a stormwater district as part of their long range stormwater control plan. A request for proposals (RFP) to determine how to move forward will be issued later this year. The key issues that will be considered are 1) Who should control or maintain the process? 2) Who should manage all aspects of storm water management? 3) How will this process be financed?

**Question:** Is there a current stormwater line item in PWSA's budget?

**Response:** No; however, some of the funding may come off of the sewer rate. Also, using an incentive based program for future development to reduce stormwater could generate some funding.

**Question:** What geographic areas are being considered for the stormwater district? Are there plans for the boundaries to go beyond the City of Pittsburgh?



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 8**

**Tuesday, November 16, 2010 / 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service and Training Conference Room**

---

**Response:** At this time, there are no boundaries; this will not be a standalone PWSA effort. A public education process will be a large component of the project.

**Question:** What is the time period for the study in the RFP?

**Response:** 12 months.

**Question:** ALCOSAN service area only?

**Response:** No, again there are no boundaries.

**Question:** How soon will the RFP be released?

**Response:** Before the end of 2010.

**Question:** What about contributors outside of the stormwater district?

**Response:** We are looking at this as a holistic watershed approach.

**Question:** How do you get ratepayers to pay to mitigate stormwater at their own expense? Will the RFP consider a county-wide stormwater mitigation strategy?

**Response:** The biggest thing will be the design of the rate structure and how or if credits are applied to home and business owners. PWSA's fear is how do we know green structure will work and how will we maintain it.

A group member suggested that efforts in Colorado Springs be researched in the process of reviewing storm water management alternatives.

## **Green Technologies: Colleen Hughes, CDM and Peter Thomas, AECOM**

Colleen Hughes prepared information to share with the RSG in response to questions asked by group at the last RSG meeting. This information will assist the group in coordinating with their respective municipalities to look at green infrastructure as an alternative to CSO control.

Presentation Summary – Green Infrastructure Alternatives for CSO Control – Key Points from the slides include:

- Green Infrastructure benefits include quality of life improvement, restoration of aquatic ecosystems, carbon footprint reduction, improved air quality, increased public awareness of wet weather issues and reduced effect of excessive heat.
- Green Infrastructure challenges include ownership and maintenance challenges, limited knowledge of performance history, uncertainty of large scale performance, public acceptance and participation, stormwater ordinances / revisions and new design and construction standards.
- Recent green infrastructure news in southwest Pennsylvania includes: the Pittsburgh “Clean Water Act,” Allegheny County plumbing code revisions to include green stormwater management BMPs as storm drainage alternatives and several private and institutional projects (green roofs at CMU, University of Pittsburgh, City/County building, PNC, Children’s Hospital, private developments; rain garden and rain barrel programs supported by 3RWW; and Street Trees – Friends of the Pittsburgh Urban Forest)
- ALCOSAN’s role in green infrastructure as part of an alternatives analysis process is to conduct technology screening and costing, workshops, technical approaches and planning assumptions, basin level feasibility screening case study feasibility analyses, and promote green infrastructure.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 8**

**Tuesday, November 16, 2010 / 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service and Training Conference Room**

- 
- The municipal role in green infrastructure alternatives analysis is to conduct a municipal level alternatives analysis, provide comparison to other technologies, cost-benefit analysis, implement and address O&M requirements as well as develop and enforce local ordinances.
  - Green Infrastructure Alternatives Analysis Approach and Planning objectives include the identification of where green infrastructure is cost-effective at the sewershed scale, the development of site-level concepts and scale to the sewershed level, encouraging early action projects to demonstrate successful application, and capitalizing on grant funding opportunities.
  - The performance objective planning assumptions are 1) Site-level: limit runoff exceeding the capacity of the downstream trunk sewer and 2) Sewershed-level: target less than 10 overflows per year initially.
  - The cost estimating approach utilizes the standardized Alternatives Costing Tool (ACT); unit-area cost approach (cost over impervious acre controlled). It assumes capture of the first inch of runoff, is derived from engineering cost estimates and bid data, has location factors applied and is appropriate for planning level estimates. A tool has been provided to municipalities for their use and all basin planners use a standardized tool for cost estimating (for screening purposes).
  - In May 2010, ALCOSAN hosted a workshop the benefits of green infrastructure for CSO control and presented information to help municipalities identify opportunities as well as conceptual planning, technical support, grant application assistance and encouraged consideration of green alternatives. About 10 participants received hands-on site-specific assistance and follow up support was offered.
  - Colleen discussed several local green infrastructure opportunities. The first being the Bells Run analysis which included an exploration of an apartment complex, a single family residential and a commercial land use. The conclusions drawn where:
    - Technical solutions exist for all land use types;
    - Approximately 85 percent of impervious cover needs to drain to controls (storing 1.5” of runoff) to achieve less than 10 overflows per year to avoid need for new conveyance and/or storage;
    - Costs were comparable to transmission or storage;
    - Municipal, institutional, and stakeholder preferences are key;
    - Pittsburgh is very interested in pursuing this alternative; and
    - Grant funding opportunities are being pursued.
  - The next opportunity discussed was the West View Borough analysis which included an exploration of a commercial area and residential street land use, as well as downspout disconnection. The conclusions gathered from this analysis include:
    - Technical solutions exist for commercial and residential areas studied;
    - There is significant potential for cost-effective downspout disconnection here and regionally;
    - Approximately 80 percent of the impervious cover needs to drain to controls (storing 1.5” of runoff) to reach less than 10 overflows per year to avoid need for new conveyance and/or storage;
    - Municipal, institutional, and stakeholder preferences are key;
    - West View is interested;
    - Downspout disconnection costs generally less than \$100 per household and could be applicable to majority of residences in West View; and
    - Grant funding opportunities are being pursued.
  - Green infrastructure opportunities identified through basin planning technology screenings will be pursued in coordination with municipalities. ALCOSAN continues to advocate green infrastructure where, cost-effective at reducing overflow frequency. Green infrastructure may eliminate the need for new conveyance and ALCOSAN continues to offer technical and grant application support.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 8**

**Tuesday, November 16, 2010 / 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service and Training Conference Room**

---

In conclusion, Colleen noted that green technology infrastructure is relatively new, and that ownership is a major challenge and adds a fair amount of complexity to this approach. The exploration of next steps relative to downspout disconnection will take into account the concerns of the Allegheny County Health Department.

**Question:** Has there been any thought on how many gallons of stormwater runoff will be mitigated per rainfall?

**Response:** Not at this time.

**Question:** What green infrastructure implementations were reviewed for the cost estimation approach?

**Response:** We looked at Portland and Philadelphia implementations, and recently looked at how local projects align. As technology progresses, cost efficiencies are gained, but there is not yet a real economy of scale. Many contractors are not fully trained in these technologies, which can make the process slower and more costly.

Discussion on local conditions ensued. Major comments included: keeping in mind our region's topography, which can increase the rate of infiltration, and that the parking lot of the building in which our meeting is being held is an example of bio soil application.

**Question:** Are the impervious structures under consideration; those where flow goes into combined sewer system only?

**Response:** Yes, as a matter of priority, but it is also generally worthwhile to explore other areas (SSOs).

Discussion ensued on the success of the downspout disconnect program in Etna. Etna is working closely with the Allegheny County Health Department to determine what criteria should exist. Etna's borough enforcement has provided workshops, and there are incentives for residents who can disconnect. Also, the County has been monitoring its green roof during wet weather activity for four years. The data is available for groups to look at in terms of its wet weather performance. One member suggested that municipalities should pool existing resources and data. It was noted that the quality of life that results from the implementation of these kinds of green technologies is a great benefit for communities and should always be part of the equation.

Additionally, in Philadelphia and Portland, they made it clear up front that grant funding is needed to demonstrate what works through pilot programs, but in the long run, it is hard to continue to rely on grant funding. As a group, the RSG, should consider figuring out what it would cost to pilot some of these technologies and where to get the biggest bang for the buck by being able to demonstrate which approaches do and do not work. In Portland, the downspout disconnections were the biggest bang for the buck – costing \$180-200M for a three county area and reducing total flow by about 30 percent.

It was pointed out that many projects are well designed and well thought but suffer from terrible implementation. The distinction between bad execution and a bad technology needs to be made. It took Villanova 3 tries to get their pervious concrete to set correctly due to an inexperienced [in implementing green technology] contractor. Also, do not overlook the need for good inspection.

**Question:** What is meant by implementation?

**Response:** By implementation, we are referring how a green technology is implemented. Actions that impair implementation are the use of bad or inconsistent contractors, making design decisions based on funding such as eliminating, reducing or cutting details out of the project scope.

**Question:** How could a county wide disconnect program be done to meet the Health Department's criteria? How would we even begin?



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

## MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 8**

**Tuesday, November 16, 2010 / 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service and Training Conference Room**

---

**Response:** In Monroeville, a municipal resolution and ordinance has already been passed, and crews have been dispersed to begin monitor and regulate the disconnection from people's homes at the property owner's expense. Also, the City of Pittsburgh has an ordinance to have all illegal connections removed over time.

Additional discussion ensued regarding downspout disconnection. It is important to know where you are sending the water in the case of downspout disconnections. How to do it responsibly is a huge challenge. Also, it is very difficult to achieve targets (less than 10 overflows annually) in highly urbanized residential areas without disconnections. Disconnections can be a means to the solution, but it is not the ultimate solution. Moreover, conflicting city and county requirements for combined and separate sewers can be problematic for homeowners.

Rain barrels are an alternate solution that can slow down the rate of infiltration. Rain gardens were installed in eight small residential lots in East Liberty about 1 ½ years ago. They cost about \$300 each and five of the eight are working well so far. All storm water is mitigated and there is no flooding of neighbors. A lesson learned is that you cannot install rain gardens everywhere.

Peter Thomas distributed and reviewed with the group information compiled on green technologies in other cities as a point of reference. This information, obtained via literature search, includes references, reviews of other communities and common technologies. It was important to provide the reference to show the source of data provided. The four technologies presented were downspout controls, vegetated stormwater controls (bio-retention and bio-infiltration BMPs), non-vegetated stormwater controls and rooftop controls. Generally cost and performance data for these technologies vary widely, and maintenance costs can vary significantly. Peter noted that many cities are trying downspout controls. However, New York City is an example of where downspout controls are banned.

Presentation Summary – Green Technologies – Key Points from the slides include:

- Green technology categories include:
  - downspout controls (ex. downspout disconnects, rain barrels, cisterns),
  - vegetated stormwater controls (bio-retention and bio-infiltration BMPs such as rain gardens, planters, tree wells, vegetated swales, infiltration basins, green streets, constructed wetlands, and wet ponds,
  - non-vegetated stormwater controls (ex. grass pavers, gravel pavers, concrete pavers, permeable asphalt and porous concrete), and
  - rooftop controls (ex. extensive – eco-roofs and intensive – roof gardens.

Peter then described the contents of his handout (handout #5), which included a brief summary per green technology category: description, benefits, feasibility criteria, data on stormwater effectiveness, costs (capital and O&M), maintenance requirements and locations where implemented. The information in the handout is by category and it was important to provide data on costs, stormwater retention effectiveness, standards and operation and maintenance requirements as those items are often impact how much implementation is done.

- Downspout controls have been widely implemented in urban environments but standards are needed to implement them successfully. Seattle and Portland have both developed standards based on past performance of these systems – both are included in handout. Downspout controls are relatively inexpensive to implement, however in cities in cold temperatures systems relying on infiltration into soil can end up being disconnected during winter.
- Vegetated controls are implemented in a variety of ways. Common ones are rain gardens, tree wells and vegetated swales. Sometime the terms are confusing in that, for instance, infiltration basins can be



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 8**

**Tuesday, November 16, 2010 / 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service and Training Conference Room**

---

same thing as vegetated controls. Some places have incorporated constructed wetlands into a park. Data from Minnesota showed a wide range in O&M costs, from 10% to 140% of capital costs, for different types of vegetated controls. Understanding and addressing O&M is key to successful vegetated controls.

- Non vegetated controls such as permeable paving are used in large number of states on local roads but not on highways. Cost data is provided of San Diego County comparing permeable pavements to non-permeable pavements in capital and O&M costs.
- Rooftop controls have been extensively implemented in places like Chicago, Portland and Vancouver, Canada which has largest green roof. Pittsburgh has a number of green roofs also. There are green roofs which are extensive (known as eco roofs) and other which are intensive (which have deeper soil levels than ecoroofs). Major rooftop controls have been implemented with support of leadership in these cities and requires standards for implementation and for O&M. Studies comparing the ability of green roofs to retain stormwater in Portland, OR, for instance, show that green roofs are very effective at reducing stormwater runoff.

Members have the opportunity to add to the list of technologies by sending information to Peter.

It was noted that the ALCOSAN customer service building is a green building and has a holding tank which holds stormwater which is later used for the building's restrooms.

### **Regionalization: David Bingham, AECOM**

David Bingham began by explaining that Jan Oliver, who could not be at the meeting, is ALCOSAN's point person for regionalization. ALCOSAN recently submitted a proposal to 3RWW for a global review of regionalization ideas. The proposal touched on technical tasks and a stakeholder involvement process. There are a range of regional consolidation options, but none are clearly defined. Regionalization will be a stakeholder driven process and ALCOSAN is looking for as funds from 3RWW, rate payers and other sources to possibly include PWSA.

Presentation Summary – Regionalization – Key Points from the slides include:

- In response to the 3RWW Regionalization RFP, ALCOSAN proposes to conduct a regionalization study that would include stakeholder support and engagement.
- Key tasks include :
  - Data collection (review of existing conditions, organizations, compliance needs and legal requirements),
  - Initial evaluation (review options, examine case studies, identify regional needs and develop stakeholder involvement plan),
  - Stakeholder involvement (How will the municipalities be engaged? What other groups/agencies will or should be key stakeholders? What is the role and size of the stakeholder group? How will we engage the general public?),
  - Detailed analyses of options (proposed options include develop, operate, and maintain select wet weather control facilities; perform annual operation and maintenance of sewers and facilities for municipalities under contract; develop a regional sewage and stormwater plan, including the operation of facilities; develop, operate, and maintain selected inter-municipal trunk sewers serving areas of greater than an agreed upon number of acres; and own, operate and maintain County sewage and stormwater infrastructure and an implementation plan), and
  - An implementation plan for the selected option.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 8**

**Tuesday, November 16, 2010 / 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service and Training Conference Room**

---

David informed the group of his participation in a case study trip to Cleveland and the North Kentucky Sanitation District. In Kentucky, 34 out of 35 communities are aligned in terms of their stormwater management.

**Question:** What worked and what did not? What were the challenges?

**Response:** The decision between who will operate and maintain versus ownership is a challenge.

David noted that CMAC has had extensive discussions on regionalization and ALCOSAN could be considering the entire county rather than just the current ALCOSAN system.

Discussion ensued regarding how regionalization can help individual municipalities to afford improvements. For process effectiveness, a steering committee could be formed to include customer municipalities to address regionalization issues/activities. The steering committee composition needs to be determined both in terms of how many members as well as who are the members. For example, Montour Run is in the process of trying to develop a stormwater management plan but stormwater management plans need to be considered for all communities. Any effort to plan regionalization in this area must have Allegheny County represented within the planning group. It is difficult to secure funding for smaller subgroups try to regionalize. One member cautioned the group that steering committees larger than four people tend to be ineffective. Steering committee members need to be really focused. It was also noted that cost needs to be determined because parts of the Wet Weather Plan will be hard to afford, as there is great disparity in neighborhood resources.

**Question:** What is ALCOSAN's timeline for responding to the RFP?

**Response:** The proposal has been submitted and funding would go through June 2011. ALCOSAN has already started some regionalization planning tasks.

**Question:** Has 3RWW said yes to ALCOSAN's proposal?

**Response:** Currently, there is no determination on how any of the proposals would be funded.

## **Public Outreach: Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN**

Nancy Barylak reported statistics for the October/November series of community meetings. She reported that ten community meetings were held, with a total attendance of approximately 170. The average meeting attendance was about 15 people, with Heidelberg being the outlier since the mayor initiated a door knocking campaign to encourage residents to attend the meeting. The meetings were attended by CMAC members, RSG members, elected officials, municipal staff, general citizens, and representatives of development and environmental groups. Meetings were held at neighborhood fire halls, churches, libraries, and the Heinz History Center (region-wide meeting), as suggested by each community's municipal leadership. The meetings were in open house format with a scheduled presentation. The meeting format and locations worked well to accommodate busy people. There was little media attention outside of Heidelberg and Etna community meetings.

Based on comments from the public, the general sentiment is that everyone understands the need to address overflows, but do not want the necessary technologies implemented in their neighborhoods. There is also interest in which technologies were employed in other cities, their impacts on surrounding residential communities, and how and when green technologies can be implemented. ALCOSAN also received public comments on the perceived lack of advertising. Advertising for the fall meetings included a mailing to 3,000 contacts; radio PSAs on DUQ and KQV; print ads in the Gateway publications, Pittsburgh Post Gazette, Pittsburgh Tribune Review, New Pittsburgh Courier, and neighborhood papers/newsletters; website postings; and phone calls. The project staff is in process of transcribing questions and answers captured during the meetings. Responses to written questions



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 8**

**Tuesday, November 16, 2010 / 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service and Training Conference Room**

---

will be provided within two weeks, with the exception of concerns expressed during the Heidelberg meeting—where 45 days is needed.

**Question:** Have you considered advertising in water bills?

**Response:** ALCOSAN only direct bills five communities. Requests to municipalities for water bill inserts may or may not materialize. Some municipalities were able to post fliers, sent postcards, etc. In the case of Pennsylvania American Water, extensive permissions are needed for advertisements. Overall, use of water bill inserts is not a viable opportunity.

**Question:** The existing ads do not seem to convey a sense of urgency. Do the currently used ad vehicles reach the typical consumer (and not the highly engaged consumers)?

**Response:** ALCOSAN is open to suggestions.

**Question:** Were meeting attendees asked how they heard about the meeting?

**Response:** Yes, that information is captured on the meeting sign in sheet. Most seem to be from KQV and DUQ radio ads.

**Question:** When is the next round of public meetings?

**Response:** The Consent Decree requires an annual meeting. In past years, the annual update has been held in January. The meetings were moved to October this year and featured the annual information update as well as basin information. The next series of meetings will be held by next October, if not sooner. There are also quarterly basin planning events.

## **Next Steps: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings**

Janai Williams wrapped up the meeting, and distributed a handout for the ALCOSAN Technology Series on behalf of Jan Oliver. Janai thanked Michael Kenney, who is a CMAC member, for his participation in the meeting, and requested the group to make suggestions topics for the next meeting. Suggestions can also be sent to Janette Campbell. The following suggestions were made during the meeting:

- Updates from Michael Kenney on the PWSA study
- Updates from ALCOSAN on the regionalization discussion and study
- Information on 3RWW approved grants
- Presentation on Philadelphia 5-year storm water management planning process (or similar agency)
- Presentation from a representative from the Etna Borough about their downspout disconnection program – (suggested names were Mary Ellen Ramage or Jamie French)

**Question:** Is there a national clearinghouse of green stormwater technologies that have and have not worked? How objective is this? Are current technologies shared based on word of mouth only?

**Response:** There is a green infrastructure task force working on putting together a more comprehensive list. There are also website resources, but they are not comprehensive. This technology is relatively new; nationally, it came to light within the last five or six years. The National Association for Clean Water Technologies hosts an annual spring working forum, and the WWPartnership is active in this area. The Low Impact Development Center conducts research across the country and Penn State main campus has a green technology research group.

The next RSG meeting will be held in March 2011. Janai Williams asked members to continue to identify possible agenda ideas and to complete the evaluation form.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 8**

**Tuesday, November 16, 2010 / 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service and Training Conference Room**

---

**Meeting adjourned at 11:42 am**

***Information, questions, and feedback should be submitted to:***

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, [nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org](mailto:nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org), 412.734.8353
- Peter Thomas, AECOM Project Manager, [peter.thomas@aecom.com](mailto:peter.thomas@aecom.com), 412.297.4504
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings Public Relations Coordinator, [jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz), 412.434.6571

*We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, feedback is encouraged if the input causes a difference in understanding, or further explanation is needed to define the purpose of the Regional Stakeholder Group. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings ([jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz)) or (412.434.6571 ext 224) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.*



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

RSG Meeting / Number 9

Thursday, March 17, 2011/ 10:00 AM

ALCOSAN Customer Service and Training Building

---

## Welcome

Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director

Arletta Scott Williams (ASW) welcomed everyone to the meeting and led introductions.

---

## Meeting Objectives

Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

Janai reviewed the hand-outs for the meeting.

---

## Open Discussion

Mary Ellen Ramage, Manager of Etna

Mary Ellen Ramage (MER) was introduced as a member of the CMAC, and guest speaker invited to talk about the Etna downspout disconnection program. Mary Ellen indicated the borough's downspout disconnect program is being undertaken to address local problems within their combined sewer community. The municipality is partnering with Pennsylvania Environmental Council (PEC), Allegheny County, and the Nine Mile Run Watershed Association to promote this program. She explained how stormwater runoff has adversely impacted the community over the years – sewer overflows, overloaded conveyance facilities, drainage problems, street and basement flooding. It has also affected the quality and aesthetics of nearby streams. She continued with her presentation showing how they have invested in recreational facilities but even they are still affected by stormwater runoff. MER had a PowerPoint slide that illustrated how they contribute stormwater to adjacent sections of Pine Creek.

Mary Ellen went on to explain that Etna is required, under their consent order, to address impacts of sewer overflows and achieve a reduction in frequency and volume of CSOs. She showed a slide that indicated that the Pine Creek Watershed has more than 95% pervious area, and that Etna has more than 29% impervious area. This means that they are being flooded primarily by upstream communities. She explained that the primary focus of the presentation is that the communities have to start helping themselves.

Etna is exploring source reduction as part of their solution to the problem. They are now looking at green streetscape programs and residential downspout programs.

Etna has received \$370,000 for a green streetscape program in their business district thru 319 Growing Greener for the initial phase to reconstruct the Borough streetscapes in the business district. She described their approach as a 4 phased approach.

- (1.) **Street side rain gardens, infiltration BMPs, permeable pavers, subsurface detention, and dedicated conveyance** - Etna is removing buildings and but making use of vacant lots as rain parks and rain gardens—incorporating them in to the streetscape programs.
- (2.) **Program Development** - Making sure Etna's plans adhere to the watershed implementation plan, PADEP department wide priorities, land use plans, borough stormwater management and flood ordinances, NPDES permit coordination, etc.
- (3.) **Flow monitoring**—This is a critical part to the process and includes of the EPA work plan and funding this information needs to be documented and quantified to measure success/non-success of the program.
- (4.) **Public outreach and education**—The Borough has used newsletters in the past year, and this summer workshops will start for residents. Etna is also working with PEC, Nine Mile Run and the Audubon Society on this.

Mary Ellen indicated there has been significant development upstream, but there has been a history of flooding and problems in the area prior to this development. Etna would never have recovered from the damage caused by Hurricane Ivan had the upstream communities not helped us. Our perspective was changed – we are all concerned about how the consent order will affect everyone – but we believe that this is an opportunity for us to make a change that will last for generations and the green infrastructure program is a part of this.

Mary Ellen concluded her remarks noting that the next workshop at the Green Tree municipal building on April 8 and it is free.

---

## Wet Weather Plan Update

Colleen Hughes, CDM

Colleen Hughes discussed the evaluation process for prioritizing alternatives. She also discussed affordability in terms of compliance, and acknowledged that the group's input was relevant and complemented her presentation on the wet weather program update.

Colleen reviewed the program progress report and the various activities and the percentage of completion with flow and precipitation monitoring, GIS and screening of controls & sites being the only tasks complete. She focused on the progress of the water quality assessment and the alternatives analysis for this presentation. Colleen stated that last year the basin planners started looking at alternatives within their basin. The idea was to bracket the possibilities and to identify what will be most viable for the regional solution. She also reviewed the results that included a regional tunnel-based strategy. Now all of these alternatives are being stitched together regionally to see what the best solutions will be, and the cost effectiveness is being evaluated.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 9**

**Thursday, March 17, 2011/ 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN Customer Service and Training Building**

Colleen addressed the cost performance curve noting that regions cannot be overburdened with wastewater treatment system costs. She indicated that they are looking at the options which include:

- 1) A plan can be developed by 2026, but it may not make EPA happy in terms of where EPA wants to see ALCOSAN
- 2) Possibly seek a schedule extension - but how far out does it need to go
- 3) Phased implementation strategy – 2026 affordable plan with interim milestone targets
  - Longer term implementation schedule for full compliance
  - Adaptive management approach (this is recommended to allow flexibility of plan)
- 4) Water quality standards review & revision

## ALCOSAN Research Discussion

**Dave Borneman, ALCOSAN**

Dave Borneman explained ALCOSAN's involvement with ORSANCO. ORSANCO is comprised of representation from 8 states that contribute to the Ohio River Valley. There are 180 treatment plants that discharge into the Ohio River; ALCOSAN is one of them. ORSANCO meets 3 times per year to discuss issues similar to what we're covering today. Dave indicated they wanted to try to standardize and preserve the use of the Ohio River.

ALCOSAN is trying to establish limits on the Ohio River – the big topic is the level of total dissolved solids in the Ohio River. Concerns are starting with Marcellus shale and what it is doing to the Ohio River. The other concern is what is going on with the Chesapeake Bay with nutrient removal. Northern KY has a big program underway but they are possibly facing double digit rate increases but they are still going forward with improvements. Cincinnati is still doing some things with green.

## ALCOSAN Regionalization/Consolidation Study

**Jan Oliver, ALCOSAN**

Jan Oliver stated that the regionalization study is being currently funded by ALCOSAN, not 3RWW. ALCOSAN has met with some foundations and the Allegheny Conference. More than the funding – the purpose of being involved with some sort of support from another agency was to legitimize the regionalization study. ALCOSAN would like to conduct this evaluation with a very involved stakeholder process. The five options for consolidation:

- 1) Take responsibility for design construction maintenance and operation of wet weather control facilities;
- 2) Assume responsibility for inter-municipality sewer systems – where municipalities are having problems
- 3) Look at operation and maintenance of municipal sewer systems to perform services on a contracted basis;
- 4) Assume responsibility for all sewers including storm sewers throughout the service area
- 5) Assume responsibility for all storm and sanitary sewers throughout Allegheny County

## Public Outreach

**Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN  
and Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings**

Nancy Barylak opened this discussion with mention of ALCOSAN's new display and how it conveys information on the alternatives. She said the general public is beginning to understand the wet weather issue, but the intent is to get them educated about the alternatives. She noted that ALCOSAN has participated in the home shows held in Pittsburgh and Monroeville. Next event is the ALOM conference at 7 Springs April 7 -10. Nancy also explained that ALCOSAN's summer science program is up coming and enrolment is still open. Open House is on track to be held on September 17.

## Next Steps

**Lugene Keys, KCI**

Lugene asked RSG members if they had questions about any of the topics discussed. There were several comments pertaining to how to help people better understand whether or not they are an ALCOSAN customer, developing continuity in the appearance of the sewer bills that residents receive, updating the group on what ALCOSAN is doing with green infrastructure and when it is expected that the discussion of rates will take place. An additional idea a put forth by a member involved ALCOSAN partnering with others to develop an approach on how regionalization should be addressed to share with the legislators and others.

## Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, [nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org](mailto:nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org), (412)734-8353
- David Bingham, AECOM Water, Vice President, Project Director, [david.bingham@aecom.com](mailto:david.bingham@aecom.com), (412) 316-3615.
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, Public Relations Coordinator, [jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz), (412) 434-6571.

*We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, ([jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz) or 412-434-6571) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.*



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 10**

**Tuesday, May 17, 2011/ 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building**

---

## **1. Welcome**

**Arletta Scott Williams**, ALCOSAN Executive Director

Arletta welcomed everyone to the meeting, and asked everyone to provide self-introductions. Upon completion of the introductions, she turned the floor over to Jada Shirriell.

## **2. Meeting Objectives**

**Jada Shirriell**, E. Holdings

Jada explained to the attendees that ALCOSAN respects their time, and that as discussions get underway they can sometimes exceed the allotted time frames. Prior to continuing on with the discussion, she will poll the group to see if they would prefer the discussion continue. She also noted that PowerPoint presentations would be used to convey information, and flip charts would be utilized to capture their input and ideas. Jada then reviewed the contents of the folders that each member received upon registration, and the agenda topics.

## **3. ALCOSAN S.E.P Project Update**

**Dan Lockard**, ALCOSAN

Dan Lockard presented an update on stream removal and supplemental environmental projects. 11 locations identified where streams go into the combined sewer system. Dan noted that these situations were a by-product of days gone by when there was no ALCOSAN. However, today this type of situation is less than ideal. As part of the consent decree negotiations were undertaken between ALCOSAN and USEPA that resulted in supplemental environmental projects being performed in lieu of fines. ALCOSAN agreed to contribute \$3 M in stream removal projects in lieu of fines. The municipalities have also negotiated agreements with the health department and DEP, and part of their agreement as well was to remove the streams if it was economically feasible.

One of the problems is that stream flow increases overflow, and keeps the overflow occurring for a longer duration. It consumes treatment and conveyance capacity during storm events, clogs sewers with debris, gravel and rocks (maintenance) and contributes to basement backups.

Originally – ALCOSAN approached 5 communities that were significant contributors – Stowe, Carnegie, and Pine Hollow and a couple of others; but these were the only ones that were receptive.

Dan referred to the PowerPoint presentation to point out ALCOSAN's partnering agencies for each project; namely: Kennedy Stowe McKees Rocks - \$150,000 each; US Army Corp of Engineers \$3.4M, and ALCOSAN \$2.6 M – Pine Hollow Project. Project is under construction now, 25% complete, 100 mil gals of combined sewage overflow removed in a typical year.

Orr Street and Stowe – Stowe \$150,000; Char-West COG - \$140,000; ALCOSAN \$525,000. Stowe took the lead on this one. Project is done; 17 mil gals of sewage overflow removed in an average year.

Carnegie Park – ALCOSAN \$550,000; Carnegie \$300,000. Project to be completed by Oct 2011; an estimated 9 mil gals of sewage overflow to be removed in an average year.

ALCOSAN has also partnered in other stream removal projects; Jack's Run, Sheraden Park, Dooker Hollow, Delafield road, and Millvale industrial park. These were good partnering projects demonstrating partnering between communities. To date, ALCOSAN has contributed \$7 million; federal and state \$8 M and local municipalities' contribution has been \$2 mill.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 10**

**Tuesday, May 17, 2011/ 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building**

---

ALCOSAN is also investigating a wind turbine at Dooker Hollow.

Sheraden Park is not only going to be a stream removal, but the natural habitat will be restored.

One of the RSG members commented that ALCOSAN is talking about spending money to take care of Japanese Knotweed; how is that being done? Dan responded that native plantings have been placed in the area. The goal is that they will establish themselves and crowd out the invasive species. The RSG member responded that they too have a knotweed problem and they have been unsuccessful in taking care of it. If ALCOSAN is successful with this effort, that information should be published as there are a lot of people struggling to get rid of this type of vegetation.

Danielle Crumrine asked who the contractor was doing the planting as her organization might be able to be of assistance. Dan responded he would get that information to her.

#### **4. Funding Efforts**

**Joe Day, ALCOSAN**

Joe Day introduced his presentation – NACWA Money Matters. He explained that he, Jan Oliver and John Schombert attended this event that was held in Washington, DC. He noted the conference was split into two facets and included featured speakers – Cong. Russ Carnahan and Cong. Earl Blumenauer – top environmental activist in Congress currently. Caswell Holloway – NYC Environmental Commissioner, and Adel Hagekhalil, assistant director of the LA bureau of sanitation. Laren Denton, and James Hanlon of USEPA were also speakers and were challenged regarding how everyone should be approaching the consent decrees. There were also a lot of networking opportunities amongst the attendees to see how these issues are being addressed across the country.

Another lobbying effort spearheaded by Jan included visits to the House and Senate – Cong. Altmire, Doyle and Murphy; and Sen. Casey and Toomey (met with their chiefs of staff). We were able to give ALCOSAN's perspective on what we were looking for, and responses to some of their constituent inquiries they received about what we were doing. Takeaways – no federal monies available now but when this money becomes available they will work toward getting some directed this way. They also indicated that they would support ALCOSAN's efforts in any other way possible. ALCOSAN will continue to keep them informed of the project progress. Joe indicated the trip overall was successful.

Bernie Oursler asked what the constituent questions were. Joe responded that they were more about the types of projects being undertaken and dealt with environmental issues. Matt Smuts asked if funding was being sought for CSO issues. Joe responded that it would include regionalization and other type projects, although there was not expectation that they would offer a blank check. The goal was to gain political support for grants and other federal monies that may become available in the future.

Andy Maul asked in what other ways could they be supportive? Joe responded that they could help with grants and with interaction/support in dealing with the regulatory agencies, and to assist with the timeline of the project.

#### **5. Open Discussion and Redevelopment Strategies for Stormwater and Overflow Controls**

**Matt Smuts, URA/RSG**

**Dave Borneman, ALCOSAN**

Matt Smuts delivered a PowerPoint presentation on creative applications of stormwater management/green infrastructure using photo examples captured at various developments throughout the Midwest.

# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 10**

**Tuesday, May 17, 2011/ 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building**

---

Matt explained that he travelled to the Pacific Northwest to look at projects from a URA perspective (Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh). These are ideas they would like to consider incorporating as they move forward. The following reflects key comments offered by Matt as he provided commentary on the various photographs from his travels.

- Southeast False Creek Vancouver, BC – a former industrial site like Pittsburgh. It's not completely built out. They have a lot of green roofs (a requirement on this site). Has an extensive artificial but natural looking stream area for stormwater flow. 3.9 mil sq. ft. mixed use community w/ a focus on residential use. Green specs – green roofs and stormwater treatment. Matt showed pictures of how stormwater was used as an amenity on the site – adding value rather than taking it away. Includes permeable paving and recycled concrete.
- Victoria, British Columbia – Dockside Green Development. Former industrial site – 1/3 complete. The gist of the development – extensive green roofs and stormwater management on site. A central facility that makes an amenity out of the stormwater. 1.3 mill sq. ft. of mixed use. They have an onsite wastewater treatment facility. Wind turbines are also included.
- Seattle Washington – High Point Community – residential development. This is located above one of the most valuable biological streams in the area. Use – 5.2 mill sq. feet; 16 housing units. First and only built green neighborhood in Seattle. They used street side swales, no curbs; streets are depressed in the middle rather than crowning in the middle. They have permeable paving/concrete.
- Thornton Place, Seattle Washington. – built adjacent a historic mall and transit centre. This is built over a parking area and a historic stream. 261,360 sq. feet – mixed-use use but mostly residential. There is extensive signage to educate people about the facility.
- Portland, Oregon – Hoyt Yards/Pearl District. LEED certified buildings, green space and green roofs. Former brownfield area. 90% of rainwater will be harvested from the site.
- Tanner Springs Park, Portland Oregon – signage to explain what's going on; includes a water feature. Bus shelter roof actually designed like a leaf.
- South Waterfront, Portland, Oregon – ext. green roofs, green space and stormwater management. Former brownfield and industrial site. Bio swales and eco roofs will capture 90% of rainwater onsite.
- Tabor to the River – Brooklyn Creek Basin Program. They're collecting \$80 M a year to pay for many of the things they are doing. They are using this as a study area. They're adding over 500 green facilities; replacing 81,000 feet of sewer pipe and restoring natural areas. It was actually cheaper to deal with this from a green approach rather than a grey approach. They also had signage to show people what watershed they were in. Some of the streets had permeable paving.

At the end of Matt's PowerPoint presentation, he opened the floor for questions from the audience. Brian Jenson noted that there's a cost premium to do this, and he asked if these projects were funded by public subsidy or if there was a market ability to pay for this? Matt responded that there is a market there for green buildings. They collect extensive amounts of money thru stormwater utilities; and there is some uptake from private developers. Mat indicated that he does have a more detailed presentation from Oregon that will provide this kind of information.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 10**

**Tuesday, May 17, 2011/ 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building**

---

Steve Sismic asked if URA was involved in some of the development in the Strip District. Matt said he was aware of it and that URA is looking at some of those projects. Projects over \$1M will be required to do 95% capture – and they will look at how they can help others to get there.

Andy Maul asked if the City of Philadelphia's wet weather plan was rejected by EPA since it used primarily green technology. Coleen said that her firm designed that plan and that it is currently being evaluated.

Danielle Crumrine asked has there been an effort to invite an EPA person to the RSG meetings. Arletta responded no – ALCOSAN has separate interaction with the agencies. Danielle noted that she goes to a lot of conferences and it appears the EPA praises green infrastructure there, but that she gets a different feel here.

Colleen added that we are in a transition stage with the agencies on the issue of Green Technology as it is still relatively new; it's not unusual to get mixed messages on this topic as a result.

Dave Borneman asked about the \$1M dollar figure that Matt referred to earlier. Matt explained that it would be \$1M of public subsidy. Mike Lichte asked who would be responsible for enforcement of the 95% capture. Barney Oursler said it would probably be building inspectors, and Matt said he would be responsible for URA projects. Mike Lichte asked if URA is lobbying for areas where they want to see this first as it will be difficult to get that push without legislative support. Matt said that is not being done at this time. Barney indicated that there were a lot of objections to how you could get to the 95%; so it was decided that the publicly subsidized development would be done to see how it works.

Dave Borneman explained that this type of dialogue is encouraged, and we can continue through and after his presentation. Dave explained that he would be discussing the status of the regional facilities siting process.

Dave explained that there are 4 ways to control what is coming out of the pipes. The existing facility is built out – and what we've been doing in the 7 basins is addressing the fact that there is a need to build more facilities. We've are now identifying the types of additional facilities that need to be built. In addition to updating the RSG members on where we are in the process, Dave asked for their assistance in developing a better strategic plan regarding how to approach property owners.

The map reflects efforts dating back to August of 2010. We're looking at vacant parcels. We started out with 146 sites along the existing system. Some of the remote facilities are on brownfield sites located predominately along the Monongahela and Turtle Creek. We're costing out options of controls. We have 4 sites along Chartiers Creek; 2 along Lowry's Run; 2 along the lower Ohio; 8 potential sites within Main Rivers; 6 along Sawmill Run that we're still looking at; 5 along Turtle Creek; one in Upper Allegheny and potentially 9 different areas in Upper Mon.

Some of the issues – 27 of 35 sites are privately owned. The problem is not just the use of the land, but how we approach the land owners.

Some of the areas we're focusing on – interchange of Liberty Avenue. Depending on the solution (remote storage in parking lot); a parcel of land for another interceptor system.

South Oakland – LTV (?) site in the vicinity of the Hot Metal Bridge. Eminent domain can be used on some of these sites, but we would prefer to educate the land owner, we would prefer to be a partner in the process. We don't want to be a bad neighbor; how do we approach and who do we approach?



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 10**

**Tuesday, May 17, 2011/ 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building**

---

Turtle Creek – in the area of Broadway Blvd and Mosside Blvd (outside of Pitcairn).

Stowe Township above McKees Rocks – we’re working with Stowe Township. This is a parcel that can’t be developed. County Economic Development has a role in this.

Brunot Island where Duquesne Light is. Pieces of McKees Rocks - although they’ve asked us to find other areas – they don’t really want to be a part of this.

Heidelberg – in Chartiers Creek. The area we were looking at has all the issues that were possible. There is a residential and industrial park nearby. It is public property – how does the community embrace this and keep the use of their park? The elements of how to get buy in at this point are ongoing. Dan indicated that there are also supporters in addition to some of the community members who are in opposition. There is also some remediation to clean up the site as well – we were looking at underground storage.

Washington’s Landing – the only parcel that could address overflows is on a parcel between River Ave and Waterfront Drive on the one side; or on the other side of 31<sup>st</sup> bridge – there are a few parcels there. The community is going to have concerns about anything we build in here.

At what point do we start to lock in to some of these parcels with a draft plan due a little over a year from now.

Etna – we have a parcel identified – but Etna has other plans.

Carrie Furnace Site – We have a whole track of land – and they wanted us up near N Braddock’s Field Ave and Ridge Ave. At some point – how do we get the economic redevelopment to embrace us as much as we want to embrace them as new customers?

Hazelwood – we’ve talked to them about 20 acres to build a treatment facility – and they said no. Tim Prevost said their IDC did set aside 5 acres for a future facility if ALCOSAN needed it – but they didn’t want one in the area of Minden and Kansas Street. The parcel that is set aside goes from Second Street to the river.

The last one – in the vicinity of PNC Park. ALCOSAN was looking at a parking area on the other side of west general Robinson Street. There’s a hotel in that area now.

Danielle Crumrine noted that they are heading a master planning effort and ALCOSAN is at the table. We’re looking at creating a tree canopy throughout the area. How can we help you where you have significant runoff areas – possibly planting trees in specific areas? Coleen – as far as your planting practices – have you looked at what Matt presented? Danielle – yes, but they didn’t have salt problems like we do here. My point is to target where we want to plant.

## **6. Public Outreach**

**Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN**

Nancy Barylak began her presentation with a discussion on the issue of CSO Reporting Season. She noted that ALCOSAN is in a CSO status currently. On May 15 the health department began their annual CSO reporting season. ALCOSAN has been in CSO since May 13. ALCOSAN’s CSO information is provided to the health department and they pass the information on so that the orange CSO flags are flown. Also on ALCOSAN’s web site there is the SOAK program information that complements the CSO program.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 10**

**Tuesday, May 17, 2011/ 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building**

---

Brenda Smith (Nine Mile Run Watershed) asked if May 13 was the first instance of a CSO condition. Nancy responded no, that was not the first time this year, but May 13 was the first since the start of the public reporting period.

Brenda commented that in terms of the public's understanding of the CSO issue, and from the way it was reported this morning on DUQ, it can be understood why people do not understand the issue. Nancy responded that she has seen this problem, and one of the reasons there is confusion may be that other people speak on the issue but they do not have the correct information (not being critical of the media). Boaters, for instance, are very aware of the CSO and Soak program.

Nancy went on to explain that there will be some modifications to the CSO program next year as ALCOSAN may take over. However, the flags that are flown are done on a voluntary basis – and sometimes some of the organizations will fly the flag and never take them down.

Brenda Smith asked if you're trying to build an understanding about an increase in their bills due to the overflow problem; why try to educate people about CSOs only during boating season. Why not talk about it year-round? Nancy responded that it was primarily a public health issue from the beginning. We are trying to bridge that gap – more people using the trails are becoming more informed about it as well. Brenda suggested that if ALCOSAN is taking the program over, the opportunity to consider educating people for more than six months out of the year will be available.

Bernie Oursler commented that McKeesport now has a consent decree for their authority. Dave Borneman responded that they had a consent decree with DEP (state) not USEPA. They're taking bids for improvements and it involves 10 communities.

Nancy went on to cover a few additional items including the annual Open House even which is scheduled for Saturday September 17. She stated that ALCOSAN is also starting to plan for the next series of fall public meetings that will be held during October and early November. These will be very important as the last set of meetings prior to the plan being completed next year. We've tried a lot of things and tactics on how to get attendance up – it's challenging. Matt Smuts asked if any of the advertising talks about the rate hikes. Nancy responded that we temper it – we don't want the media to focus on just rates. Brenda indicated that this would get the public to come out. Nancy commented in closing that ALCOSAN is willing to come out and address anyone's group if they were interested.

## **7. Next Steps**

**Lugene Keys, KCI Technologies**

Lugene Keys reviewed the key topics of discussion covered over the course of the meeting; namely:

- 1) Dan Lockard's presentation on stream removal projects that in addition to reducing flow/overflows have an added value of re-establishing natural vegetation and habitats;
- 2) Funding efforts presented by Joe Day – an ongoing effort of ALCOSAN to identify funding sources for this undertaking;
- 3) Matt's presentation on green infrastructure projects in place in other places such as Vancouver, British Columbia; Portland, Oregon and Seattle Washington. The visual explanations provided a better point of reference for the various applications of green technology;
- 4) Dave Borneman's presentation on the process of siting facilities for the wet weather plan and the importance of educating and partnering with the property owners. He asked for any assistance or ideas that the RSG could offer to make this a more effective process;



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**RSG Meeting / Number 10**

**Tuesday, May 17, 2011/ 10:00 AM**

**ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building**

---

- 5) Public Outreach – Nancy addressed the CSO program, highlighted the upcoming Open House event to be followed by the fall community meetings.

Lugene asked if anyone had any additional questions or comments that they did not get to ask during the presentations. A representative of PWSA asked about a meeting that ALCOSAN held with the Nine Mile Run Watershed regarding facility siting; they weren't invited and wanted a follow up meeting. Tim Prevost explained the purpose of the meeting and that while no one was intentionally slighted; the meeting was set up specifically for Nine Mile Run. This had been addressed and explained previously.

Matt Smuts suggested that consideration be given to having Nancy Stoner from EPA attend this meeting so that she can explain if there has been a change in their approach to compliance since the consent decree was in place prior to green infrastructure being so prominent. Dave Borneman responded that ALCOSAN's position has been and continues to be that it is the municipalities' responsibility to implement green technology to help contribute to resolving the problems.

Lugene then reviewed the follow-up items which included:

- a) providing Danielle Crumrine with the name of the contractor that was dealing with the Japanese Knotweed problem. Dan Lockard indicated he would get that information to her;
- b) Danielle Crumrine wanted to work with Dave Borneman regarding the possibility of identifying tree planting opportunities at some of the facility locations.

Lugene reminded the members that if they had suggestions or ideas for agenda items for the next meeting, that they could email them to Jada Shirriel. She advised that the next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 18, and asked that everyone complete the evaluation form which was included in the folder, and to drop their completed evaluation form and folder off at the table before leaving.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting # 11**  
**Tuesday, August 18, 2011, 10AM**  
**ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

The following summarizes the *attendance, key points, and follow-up items* from the Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) meeting #11 held on August 18, 2011.

**ATTENDANCE**

<p><b>Members:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Joe Costa for Rebecca Bradley, Wilkins Township</li> <li>2. Darla Cravotta, Allegheny County</li> <li>3. Chuck Duritsa, ORSANCO</li> <li>4. Aftyn Giles, City of Pittsburgh</li> <li>5. Brian Jensen for Ken Zapinski, ACCD</li> <li>6. Roy Kraynyk, Allegheny Land Trust</li> <li>7. Barney Oursler, Pittsburgh United</li> <li>8. James McCarville, Port of Pittsburgh</li> <li>9. Dave McMillen, Montour Run WSA</li> <li>10. Kathy Risko, University of Pittsburgh CONNECT</li> <li>11. Doug Sample, Bellevue Borough</li> <li>12. Brenda Smith, Nine Mile Run WSA</li> </ol> <p><b>CMAC:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. John Ciangiarulo, McKees Rocks Borough</li> </ol>	<p><b>ALCOSAN &amp; Consultant</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Arletta Scott Williams</li> <li>2. Nancy Barylak</li> <li>3. Joe Day</li> <li>4. Doug Jackson</li> <li>5. Michael Lichte</li> <li>6. Dan Lockard</li> <li>7. Ross Towers</li> </ol> <p><b>Consultants</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dave Bingham</li> <li>2. Karen Brean</li> <li>3. Janette Campbell</li> <li>4. Colleen Hughes</li> <li>5. Janai Michelle Williams</li> </ol>
--	--

**MEETING KEY POINTS:**

**Open Discussion**

Jim McCarville, Port of Pittsburgh informed members about the Port of Pittsburgh’s Wireless Project Network currently being implemented along the rivers. They are using the network to collect data and if any member is interested in submitting their organization’s information please contact him directly.

**Wet Weather Planning (WWP) Update:** Colleen Hughes

Colleen presented the Wet Weather Plan schedule and noted that ALCOSAN is currently developing the ALCOSAN Control Strategy and the draft Wet Weather Plan. She explained that there will be a six (6) month municipal comment period in 2012 and, in January 2013, the Wet Weather Plan will be submitted to the regulatory agencies for review. Colleen noted that the regional alternatives will move, treat, store, and/or remove flow from the collection/conveyance system. She explained that it is important that ALCOSAN and the municipalities stay connected throughout this process, that collaborative efforts will result in the best plan. She presented three analyzed control strategies: a basin-based control alternative, a tunnel based control alternative, and a regional integration and optimization alternative.

Components of the basin-based and the tunnel-based approaches will be evaluated in order to develop the best and most cost-effective solution to prevent overflows. The regional integration and optimization alternative is a hybrid of the basin-based and tunnel-based alternatives. Each alternative will result in substantial improvements to prevent overflows and will make a large impact on improving water quality.

**Question:** Has ALCOSAN made the decision to implement the basin-based or tunnel-based approach?

**Response:** No; ALCOSAN is in the process of developing the ALCOSAN Control Strategy and the draft Wet Weather Plan.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting # 11**  
**Tuesday, August 18, 2011, 10AM**  
**ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

---

**Question:** Is there a possibility that the tunnel can be used by multiple entities, in order to share the cost?

**Response:** This scenario is unlikely due to potential problems that may occur with shared maintenance.

**Question:** Are SSOs only an issue for municipalities?

**Response:** No, SSOs are not exclusively an issue for municipalities. ALCOSAN must also eliminate SSOs, likely caused by the deterioration of the older systems due to the wet weather issues.

**Question:** Is ALCOSAN tracking stormwater contributors – can there be an associated fee?

**Response:** ALCOSAN is evaluating source control incentives for municipalities.

**Question:** Could a percentage of plan cost be invested in green solutions (source reduction)?

**Response:** ALCOSAN has grant money for municipalities to complete source reduction projects and/or Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEP). However, there does not seem to be an interest from many of the municipalities to take advantage of these funds. ALCOSAN will continue to provide as much technical assistance as possible.

If ALCOSAN can track stormwater runoff by property then it was suggested that there be some incentives to the property owner(s) for implementing green alternatives. These incentives could even include bill adjustments, etc.

## *Water Quality Benefits/Regulatory Framework*

Protecting the region's water quality is the ultimate objective of the Wet Weather program. ALCOSAN has monitored CSO pollutants by sampling various locations and has also developed water quality models to predict the water quality improvements from the alternative overflow control strategies. Colleen discussed the regulatory water quality framework to include an explanation of the various designated uses.

Colleen explained the "water contact sports" protection criteria for fecal coliform bacteria levels during the recreation season and non-recreational seasons. During the recreation season, which is May through September, there is a maximum geometric mean of 200 coliforms per 100 ml. Additionally, the coliform level cannot exceed 10 percent (400 coliforms per 100 ml.). For the remainder of the year, the maximum geometric mean is 2,000 coliforms per 100 ml.

Based on these standards, ALCOSAN developed a series of water quality benefits analysis maps that illustrate the recreational season water quality in the ALCOSAN service area. Colleen explained that each map varied by condition and illustrates the percent of sample set with a joint exceedance for each waterway.

**Question:** What pollutants enter the receiving waters upstream of ALCOSAN's service area? How do the regulatory agencies address this issue?

**Response:** The PA Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) work with each municipality to determine what their system contributes to the receiving waters from their systems as well as how they address these issues.

**Question:** If water quality improvements do not take place upstream of ALCOSAN's service area, who will the EPA pursue?

**Response:** The regulatory agencies will pursue all parties responsible for improving the water quality, to include ALCOSAN. This is not just one entity's responsibility.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting # 11**  
**Tuesday, August 18, 2011, 10AM**  
**ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

---

**Question:** Can you subtract the non-human fecal matter from the water quality analysis? It may be the source of the evaluated fecal matter numbers, causing ALCOSAN not to meet the EPA's standards.

**Response:** The regulators do not take into consideration the source of the fecal matter. Non-human fecal matter also impacts water quality. Additionally, human matter also contributes E. coli bacteria which can be a cause for concern.

**Question:** During the recreational season (May through October), how often is ALCOSAN 'compliant'?

**Response:** Compliance is not measured on a "daily-basis;" ALCOSAN can be in compliance for 29 days and one wet weather event can occur and peak your system. This singular event can "take you out" of compliant status. The data for these Water Quality Benefits Analysis maps is based on 5 random samples taken over a 30-day period.

### *Financial & Implementation Analysis*

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidance utilizes the residential indicator to determine affordability. Annual wastewater costs that exceed 2 percent of the median household income (MHI) constitute high burden impact. Colleen explained that financial capability is based on the permittee's financial ability to implement. She displayed the preliminary cost performance curves for the basin and tunnel-based controls that depict what the region can afford verses the estimated improvement costs for various levels of control. ALCOSAN estimates \$2 billion in new capital expenditures with 2010 dollars. The uncertainty range, based on economic variable assumptions, is between \$1.0 and \$2.3 billion. Based on the preliminary cost estimates and the estimated \$2 billion dollar region's affordability, all of the alternatives evaluated thus far exceed the high burden affordability threshold. ALCOSAN is discussing these concerns with the EPA.

Additionally, Colleen presented maps that detailed, by census tract, the current residential indicator conditions and the residential indicator projections for the \$2.0 billion plan by 2026. According to the 2026 projections, the residential indicator for many census tracts increases above the 2 percent threshold, particularly the tracts adjacent to the Main Rivers Basin.

**Question:** If ALCOSAN meets with the regulatory agencies on a monthly basis, the agencies should already be aware that the WWP is affordability limited. What feedback has ALCOSAN received concerning this issue?

**Response:** The regulatory agencies are willing to consider allowing ALCOSAN additional time to implement the WWP, but they have not specifically addressed the affordability limit.

**Question:** Have you seen in other regions, examples from other authorities, where the need(s) outweigh affordability?

**Response:** We have seen other regions in a similar dilemma and we are closely watching how they are handling their individual situations. In some cases, the implementation schedule has been extended.

**Question:** If the region needs \$4B to comply, is it worth discussing a \$2B plan?

**Response:** Yes; some authorities have phased the implementation of their WWP. This is considered an "adaptive management" approach.

**Question:** Will implementing a hybrid system reduce costs?

**Response:** ALCOSAN is analyzing the cost; the estimated cost is currently \$4.3B.

**Question:** Will there be significant cost for municipalities with an aging infrastructure?

**Response:** Yes.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Meeting # 11**  
**Tuesday, August 18, 2011, 10AM**  
**ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

---

**Question:** If you are meeting with the regulators on a monthly basis, they should already be aware that the affordability limited is exceeded, what are the regulators saying?

**Response:** The regulators are allowing more time, but they are not responding with specifics to the affordability exceeding limits.

### *Competing Needs*

Colleen concluded her presentation with a discussion of competing regional needs during the development of the Wet Weather Plan. She discussed three major areas:

1. Program Elements – eliminating SSOs and controlling CSOs
2. Program Objectives – realizing water quality benefits and planning for economic and population growth
3. Schedule Challenges – eliminating SSOs in Chartiers Creek by 2019 and meeting the Consent Decree mandates that implementation be completed by 2026.

**Question:** If you are meeting with the regulators on a monthly basis, they should already be aware that the affordability limited is exceeded, what are the regulators saying?

**Answer:** The regulators are allowing more time, but they are not responding with specifics to the affordability exceeding limits.

**Question:** Have you seen in other regions, examples from other authorities, where the need(s) outweigh affordability?

**Response:** We have seen other regions in a similar dilemma and we are closely watching how they are handling their individual situations. In some cases, the implementation schedule has been extended.

### **Public Outreach**

Nancy Barylak announced that the public outreach updates will be distributed to the members in advance of the next meeting.

### **Next Steps**

The following topics were suggested by members for the next meeting:

1. ALCOSAN should create a schedule that focuses on regulatory requirements and deadlines.
2. RSG should discuss with ALCOSAN, the formation of a subcommittee to work with legislators regarding state regulations and strategies on how to advocate for green infrastructure.

Meeting #12 is scheduled for Wednesday, November 9, 2011 @ 10:00 AM at the ALCOSAN Customer Service & Training Building.

### **Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:**

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, [nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org](mailto:nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org), (412)734-8353
- Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings Public Relations Coordinator, [jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz), (412) 434-6571

*We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Regional Stakeholder Group and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings, ([jmwilliams@eholdings.biz](mailto:jmwilliams@eholdings.biz) or (412) 434-6571) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this timeframe, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.*



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) / Meeting # 12**  
**Wednesday, November 9, 2011 / 10AM**  
**ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

The following summarizes the *attendance, key points, and follow-up items* from the Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) meeting #12 held on November 9.

**ATTENDANCE**

<p><b>Members:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kim Amey, Carnegie Science Center</li> <li>2. Denise Edwards, Wilkinsburg Borough</li> <li>3. Tom Hoffman, Clean Water</li> <li>4. Brian Jensen for Ken Zapinski, ACCD</li> <li>5. Roy Kraynyk, Allegheny Land Trust</li> <li>6. Barney Oursler, Pittsburgh United</li> <li>7. Dave McMillen, Montour Run WSA</li> <li>8. Kathy Risko, University of Pittsburgh CONNECT</li> </ol>	<p><b>ALCOSAN</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Arletta Scott Williams</li> <li>2. Nancy Barylak</li> <li>3. Dave Borneman</li> <li>4. Joe Day</li> <li>5. Doug Jackson</li> <li>6. Michael Lichte</li> <li>7. Dan Lockard</li> <li>8. Jan Oliver</li> <li>9. Timothy Prevost</li> </ol> <p><b>Consultants</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dave Bingham</li> <li>2. Darby Neidig</li> <li>3. Janette Williams</li> <li>4. Colleen Hughes</li> <li>5. Janai Michelle Williams</li> </ol>
---	---

**MEETING KEY POINTS:**

**Open Discussion**

Barney Oursler from Pittsburgh UNITED presented information about the Clean Rivers Campaign. The Clean Rivers Campaign is a partnership among five local organizations with the intent to educate and raise public awareness about issues of stormwater run off and sewage overflows in Allegheny County. These organizations are aware of the issues related to wet weather and our aging infrastructure. In order to support ALCOSAN’s efforts to educate and inform the public, member organizations have been door knocking in communities that will be directly affected by stormwater issues.

Barney stated that, through these collaborative efforts, the campaign has reached a few thousand people. The Clean Rivers Campaign has developed a workshop and informational PowerPoint to educate the public on the important stormwater issues facing communities and various green infrastructure initiatives which communities could consider for implementation. Additionally, Barney reported that this workshop was developed by the Nine Mile Run Watershed Association. He asked the workshop participants to continue to stay involved.

Barney also noted that the intent of the Clean Rivers Campaign is to work collaboratively with ALCOSAN to resolve a problem that has been “inherited” as well as to promote green alternatives. Although the Tribune Review ran an Advertisement n last Sunday’s paper listing the ALCOSAN public meetings, Barney expressed his utter disbelief at the lack of interest the media has shown in the wet weather issue.

**Question:** Which communities have been visited?

**Response:** Clean Rivers’ partnership organizations have visited the following communities: Ross, West View, Plum, Mt. Lebanon, Crafton/Ingram, Etna, East End, Sharpsburg, Highland Park, and Shadyside.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) / Meeting # 12**  
**Wednesday, November 9, 2011 / 10AM**  
**ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

---

**Question:** When did the Tribune Review run the Ad about the Campaign (which Sunday run)?

**Response/ (Clarification of Statement previously made):** The Tribune Review ran an Ad in last Sunday's paper listing the public meetings and the logistics for those meetings.

The discussion on the Clean Rivers Campaign continued. Members acknowledged that very few people are aware of the solutions to address sewer overflows. Barney acknowledged that, through their grassroots efforts, they have been able to get the average citizen involved to educate his/her neighbors. Barney suggested that "sewage is sexy; and we need a sewer superhero!"

**Question:** Has ALCOSAN considered attracting the public's attention by using the recent flood on Washington Boulevard, as an example of why the public should be aware of the issues and as an example of what could happen in other communities?

**Response:** The recent tragedy at Washington Boulevard was not a direct result of the sewer overflow issue and to indicate that the incident was a result of the system would be inaccurate. The flooding of Washington Boulevard was a result of a set of pre-existing conditions.

**Question:** To clarify, does the Clean Rivers Campaign support an increased number of overflows if green infrastructure controls are in the WWP?

**Response:** Clean Rivers Campaign is in favor of an increase in green infrastructure controls. Member Kathy Risko, from CONNECT, acknowledged that CONNECT also agrees that an increase in green infrastructure solutions in the WWP is favorable.

A discussion ensued on ways to bring people together to educate them so they may work cooperatively with ALCOSAN. A member cited an example of communities discussing the problem of sewer overflows, noting that Councilman Bill Peduto hosted a community meeting on wet weather and the immediate impacts of sewer overflows versus the potential long term solutions. The meeting had 300 people in attendance. They provided a map for individuals that showed where the issues are in each community. Some of the local churches also partnered in this effort. It was also noted that there may be an increased interest from the general public, and in media coverage, once the rates increase.

Member, Kathy Risko discussed the recent CONNECT study. Kathy outlined the findings from the study, agreeing with the point that there is little awareness among the public on the magnitude of the problem and the potential solutions.

## **Wet Weather Planning (WWP) Update: Darby Neidig**

Darby Neidig provided an update of the Municipal Wet Weather Cost Estimates (MWWCE). The MWWCE considered 3 types of costs:

- **Capital Costs** – the data for capital cost was taken from the Draft Municipal Feasibility Studies and 92 percent of municipalities submitted capital cost information. If no costs were provided, ALCOSAN used the "conveyance of all flows" assumption. For the "convey all flows" assumption, the costs were estimated using the Alternatives Costing Tool (ACT) and assuming that there will be a new pipeline from the overflows to the ALCOSAN system.
- **Operation and Maintenance (O&M)** – again, the data for O&M cost was taken from the Draft Municipal Feasibility Studies and 75 percent of municipalities submitted O&M cost information. If no costs were provided, ALCOSAN assumed: 1.) cost estimates of \$0.50 per linear foot of pipe; 2.) a 10-year inspection and critical repair cycle. Again, the costs were estimated using the Alternatives Costing Tool (ACT).
- **Renewal and Replacement Costs (R/R)** – similar to the previous assumptions, the data for R/R cost was gathered from the Draft Municipal Feasibility Studies and 56 percent of municipalities submitted this information.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) / Meeting # 12**  
**Wednesday, November 9, 2011 / 10AM**  
**ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

---

If costs were not provided, ALCOSAN assumed: 1.) 100-year R/R cycle; 2). Pipe R/R work is 85 percent CIPP and 15 percent is open cut. Again, the costs were estimated using the Alternatives Costing Tool (ACT).

Members posed the following series of questions about the Municipal Wet Weather Cost Estimate presentation:

**Question:** How many problematic points of connection (POC) are there from the municipalities to ALCOSAN?

**Response:** There are over 100 points of connection which have problems.

**Question:** Are the overall municipal costs, which are shown at \$0.5B included in the overall program costs?

**Response:** Yes, the municipal costs are included in the overall program costs, with the exception of the annual O&M and R/R costs.

**Question:** Are the estimates presented today similar to the initial estimates made from the assumptions?

**Response:** Yes, there is a similar trend.

## **Public Outreach: Nancy Barylak, Manager of Public Relations**

Nancy updated the members on ALCOSAN's efforts to inform and educate elected officials. There have been publications specifically created for the officials that highlight pertinent information and updates. Nancy reported that, on October 19, ALCOSAN hosted a Town Hall Briefing specifically for elected officials. The purpose of this meeting was to provide elected officials with the opportunity to preview the information that will be presented to the public at the town hall meetings as well as to ask questions or receive clarification. The meeting was designed with the assumption that once constituents become involved and attend the town hall meetings, they may have questions for their elected officials and may also encourage increased participation by the elected officials. Nancy acknowledged that ALCOSAN is open to suggestions from members on ways to get the elected officials more involved.

Nancy provided an update on this year's Annual Open House where ALCOSAN welcomed slightly less than 1,500 people. She noted that, over the past 9 years, ALCOSAN has welcomed over 15,000 guests!

Nancy concluded by discussing the ALCOSAN Town Hall meeting series which is currently underway. She notes that, despite advertising, there continues to be a low turnout at the meetings. A question ALCOSAN is consistently asked at the public meetings is, "why aren't more people involved?" ALCOSAN's response is to thank those individuals in attendance and encourage them to spread the word to neighbors, family, friends, etc.

**Question:** Is ALCOSAN working with the Local Government Academy (LGA), specifically the Newly Elected Officials sessions? It may be a good idea to be put on the agenda.

**Response:** No, we have not considered them as a source to reach elected officials. Thank you for the suggestion; we will consider it and provide the information to those members who volunteered to share with LGA.

Nancy reiterated that 2012 will be a busy year, as the public and municipal comment period on the draft Wet Weather Plan will take place for three months. ALCOSAN will have six months after the comment period to finalize the plan and submit it to the agencies.

## **Announcements from Members:**

1. CONNECT will be hosting a semi-annual update meeting on Thursday, November 17, from 6 to 8pm. If anyone is interested in attending, contact Kathy Risko directly.
2. Brian Jensen, Allegheny Conference on Community Development, announced that the upcoming 11<sup>th</sup> Annual Smart Growth Conference will be held on December 13, at the David Lawrence Convention Center. Allegheny



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) / Meeting # 12**  
**Wednesday, November 9, 2011 / 10AM**  
**ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

---

Conference and NAIOP are some of the conference sponsors. The sessions focusing on green infrastructure will occur from 9 to 10am; the conference is being held from 7:30am to 4:30pm.

3. The Carnegie Science Center (CSC) hosts a series of town hall type café meetings. These meetings are not only for kids, but also for adults. The intended purpose of these café meetings is to educate the public on science as well as answer their questions. The CSC would like to partner with Barney Oursler in the near future.

## **Next Steps**

1. The 2012 meeting schedule is pending. The first quarterly meeting of 2012 will likely be in February or March. The members will be polled via email for their availability in 2012.
2. The members encouraged ALCOSAN to participate in the upcoming Local Government Academy's session for newly elected officials.
3. The members requested that ALCOSAN review and consider the anticipated capacity of green infrastructure solutions as well analyzing the benefit of creating jobs verses simply reducing overflows.

## **Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:**

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Manager of Public Relations, [nancy.barylak@alcosan.org](mailto:nancy.barylak@alcosan.org), (412)734-8353
- Karen Brean, Brean Associates, [karen@breanassociates.com](mailto:karen@breanassociates.com), (412) 244-3445
- Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings, [janai.smith@eholdings.biz](mailto:janai.smith@eholdings.biz), (412) 434-6571

*We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Regional Stakeholder Group and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings, ([janai.smith@eholdings.biz](mailto:janai.smith@eholdings.biz) or (412) 434-6571 within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this timeframe, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.*



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING POST MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) / Meeting # 13**  
**Wednesday, March 28, 2011 / 10AM**  
**ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

The following summarizes the *attendance, follow-up items, and evaluation results* from the Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) meeting #13 held on March 28.

<p><b>Members in attendance:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Darla Cravotta, Allegheny County</li> <li>2. Denise Edwards, Wilkinsburg Borough</li> <li>3. Jim Hannan, West Mifflin Borough</li> <li>4. Will Bernstein, for Brian Jensen, ACCD</li> <li>5. Representative for Roy Kraynyk, Allegheny Land Trust</li> <li>6. James McCarville, Port of Pittsburgh</li> <li>7. Barney Oursler, Pittsburgh United</li> <li>8. Kathy Risko, PITT CONNECT</li> <li>9. Matt Smuts, URA</li> </ol>	<p><b>ALCOSAN Staff:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Nancy Barylak</li> <li>2. Dave Borneman</li> <li>3. Doug Jackson</li> <li>4. Michael Lichte</li> <li>5. Dan Lockard</li> </ol> <p><b>Consultants</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dave Bingham</li> <li>2. Karen Brean</li> <li>3. Colleen Hughes</li> <li>4. Janai Williams Smith</li> <li>5. Janette Williams</li> </ol>
<p><b>Members not in attendance:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. Kim Amey, Carnegie Science Center</li> <li>11. Rebecca Bradley, Wilkins Township</li> <li>12. Donald Burke, Pitt Graduate School of Public Health</li> <li>13. Harry Dilmore, Borough of Avalon &amp; Kilbuk</li> <li>14. Patrick Dowd, City of Pittsburgh</li> <li>15. Chuck Duritsa, ORSANCO</li> <li>16. Aftyn Giles, City of Pittsburgh, Mayor's Office</li> <li>17. Tom Hoffman, Clean Water Action</li> <li>18. Stan Kabala, Duquesne University</li> <li>19. Damiel Keller, Former ALCOSAN Board member (Resident, Brighton Heights)</li> <li>20. Dave Mazza, Pennsylvania Resources Council</li> <li>21. Dave McMillen, Montour Run Watershed Assoc.</li> <li>22. Evelyn O'Brien, Former ALCOSAN Board member (Resident, Brighton Heights)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>23. Edward Patton, Riverlife</li> <li>24. Doug Sample, Bellevue Borough</li> <li>25. Diane Selvaggio, Turtle Creek WSA</li> <li>26. Bud Schubel, Allegheny County Econ. Development</li> <li>27. Tim Schumann, Peters Creek WSA</li> <li>28. Brenda Smith, Nine Mile Run WSA</li> <li>29. Mike Terrick, Munhall Municipal Authority</li> <li>30. Charles Vogel, O'Hara Township</li> <li>31. Davitt Woodwell, The Pennsylvania Environmental Council</li> </ol>



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING POST MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) / Meeting # 13**  
**Wednesday, March 28, 2011 / 10AM**  
**ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

---

## **TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

Member suggested the following topics for the May meeting agenda:

- ALCOSAN host a discussion panel for the RSG with several municipalities to discuss municipal concerns and provide an update on their Municipal Feasibility Studies.
- A demonstration of the 3RWW green infrastructure tool.

## **FOLLOW-UP/ACTION ITEMS FOR ALCOSAN**

1. ALCOSAN will provide meeting date and time for the May 2012 RSG meeting.
2. ALCOSAN will solicit feedback from the members on the draft WWP release as well as other ALCOSAN 2012 Public Outreach efforts.
3. ALCOSAN will provide a copy of the Wet Weather Program Update PowerPoint presentation presented by Colleen Hughes.

## **FOLLOW-UP/ACTION ITEMS FOR RSG MEMBERS**

1. Members will provide ALCOSAN feedback on the draft WWP release as well as other ALCOSAN 2012 Public Outreach efforts.

## **SUGGESTED ACTION ITEMS**

1. ALCOSAN to consider convening a joint meeting with the CMAC and RSG, to exchange ideas and municipal and stakeholder group concerns.
2. RSG to consider starting a dialogue about opportunities to integrate green infrastructure into the ALCOSAN Control plan after the Plan is submitted to the regulatory agencies. This could be a potential focus for the RSG after July 2012.

## **MEETING #12 HANDOUTS & ITEMS TO BE POSTED TO THE ECM:**

1. Meeting #13 Agenda
2. RSG Meeting #13 Evaluation Form
3. Meeting #13 Sign-in-sheet (posted to ECM only)

## **NEXT MEETING**

The date and time for the next meeting are pending but the meeting will occur in May.

## **FEEDBACK FROM EVALUATION FORMS**

The following feedback was provided by members via the meeting evaluation forms:

1. Could I get a copy of the Wet Weather presentation? (Jim Hannan)
2. More handouts with (the) materials presented would have been useful.



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING POST MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) / Meeting # 14**  
**Thursday, May 24, 2012 / 10AM**  
**ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

The following summarizes the *attendance, follow-up items, and evaluation results* from the Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) meeting #14 held on May 24.

<p><b>Members in attendance:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kim Amey, Carnegie Science Center</li> <li>2. Darla Cravotta, Allegheny County</li> <li>3. Anne Wallace, for Brian Jensen, ACCD</li> <li>4. Daniel Keller, former ALCOSAN Board member</li> <li>5. Roy Kraynyk, Allegheny Land Trust</li> <li>6. Dave McMillen, Montour Run Watershed Assoc.</li> <li>7. Barney Oursler, Pittsburgh United</li> <li>8. Kathy Risko, PITT CONNECT</li> <li>9. Bud Schubel, Allegheny County Economic Development</li> <li>10. Brenda Smith, Nine Mile Run WSA</li> </ol>	<p><b>ALCOSAN Staff:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Nancy Barylak</li> <li>2. Dave Borneman</li> <li>3. Joe Day</li> <li>4. Michael Lichte</li> <li>5. Dan Lockard</li> <li>6. Jan Oliver</li> <li>7. Tim Prevost</li> </ol> <p><b>Consultants</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dave Bingham</li> <li>2. Tamaira Binion</li> <li>3. Colleen Hughes</li> <li>4. Tom Schevtchuk</li> <li>5. Janai Williams Smith</li> <li>6. Janette Williams</li> </ol>
<p><b>Members not in attendance:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11. Rebecca Bradley, Wilkins Township</li> <li>12. Donald Burke, Pitt Graduate School of Public Health</li> <li>13. Danielle Crumrine, Executive Director, Tree Pittsburgh</li> <li>14. Harry Dilmore, Borough of Avalon &amp; Kilbuk</li> <li>15. Patrick Dowd, City of Pittsburgh</li> <li>16. Chuck Duritsa, ORSANCO</li> <li>17. Denise Edwards, Wilkesburg Borough</li> <li>18. Nancy Gift, Rachel Carson Institute</li> <li>19. Aftyn Giles, City of Pittsburgh, Mayor's Office</li> <li>20. Jim Hannan, West Mifflin Borough</li> <li>21. Tom Hoffman, Clean Water Action</li> <li>22. Stan Kabala, Duquesne University</li> <li>23. James McCarville, Port of Pittsburgh</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>24. Evelyn O'Brien</li> <li>25. Edward Patton, Riverlife</li> <li>26. Doug Sample, Bellevue Borough</li> <li>27. Tim Schumann, Peters Creek WSA</li> <li>28. Matt Smuts, URA</li> <li>29. Mike Terrick, Munhall Municipal Authority</li> <li>30. Charles Vogel, O'Hara Township</li> <li>31. Davitt Woodwell, The Pennsylvania Environmental Council</li> </ol>



# ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING POST MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) / Meeting # 14**  
**Thursday, May 24, 2012 / 10AM**  
**ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

---

## TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING AGENDA

There were no topics suggested for the next meeting agenda.

## FOLLOW-UP/ACTION ITEMS FOR ALCOSAN

1. ALCOSAN will poll members on their availability on July 24 or July 30 for a joint meeting with the Customer Municipalities Advisory Committee.
2. ALCOSAN will solicit feedback from the members on the draft WWP release as well as other ALCOSAN 2012 Public Outreach efforts.

## FOLLOW-UP/ACTION ITEMS FOR RSG MEMBERS

1. Members will provide ALCOSAN feedback on the draft WWP release as well as other ALCOSAN 2012 Public Outreach efforts.
2. Members will suggest organizations, clubs, and groups for ALCOSAN to conduct the ALCOSAN Grassroots presentation.

## SUGGESTED ACTION ITEMS

1. ALCOSAN should consider exploring opportunities to partner with local organizations to create public access to the trails along Chartiers Creek.
2. Members suggested the following ideas to enhance public outreach efforts:
  - Create a feature message on the jumbo-tron at a Pirates game;
  - Member will provide a list of about 120 County community groups;
  - Utilize the CMAC & RSG as “mini” trainers/ambassadors;
  - Create an informational video for YouTube; and
  - Invite the ALCOSAN Board members to attend the next CMAC & RSG meeting.

## MEETING #12 HANDOUTS & ITEMS TO BE POSTED TO THE ECM:

1. Meeting #14 Agenda
2. RSG Meeting #14 Evaluation Form
3. Meeting #14 Sign-in-sheet (posted to ECM only)
4. Wet Weather Plan Update PowerPoint presentation

## NEXT MEETING

Members will be polled via email for the next meeting to identify the best date for the Wet Weather Plan preview meeting. The meeting will be July 24 or July 30. The time and location of the meeting is pending.

## FEEDBACK FROM EVALUATION FORMS

The following feedback was provided by members via the meeting evaluation forms:

1. Great presentation, slightly too long. (Anonymous)
2. The background noise makes it a bit hard to hear, but it's basically a nice room. (Anonymous)
3. “The organization and efficiency of the presentation” would have been rated a “5” except for problems with the microphone; it shouldn't be hard to get a good portable mic. (Anonymous)
4. “The relevance of the meeting handouts” would have been rated a “5” if the handouts were regularly supplied to committee in electronic form. (Anonymous)



ALCOSAN.  
Regional Wet Weather Plan

## ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING POST MEETING SUMMARY

**Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) / Meeting # 14**  
**Thursday, May 24, 2012 / 10AM**  
**ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

---

5. “Adequate and timely notification of the meeting provided”, would have been rated a “5” but it would be great if the facilitators would do an online poll to check on committee members availability, giving 2 or 3 choices, rather than just announcing a date/time. Committee members are busy and calendars often fill up many weeks in advance. (Anonymous)
6. You indicated a timed agenda in remarks, yet there is no time indicated on the agenda itself. So-how long does each item receive? Thank you for the handouts; very helpful. (Darla Cravotta)
7. Really appreciate have a copy of the PowerPoint at the presentation. (Barney Oursler)
8. The microphone improved the presentation, but it needs work. Pinning it to individual allowed everyone else to ignore it. Work out technical difficulties. (Dave McMillen)
9. Thanks for a good meeting! Green Infrastructure not on agenda-IMPORTANT TOPIC-but increased meeting time. Meeting also started 10 mins late. That’s really my only my negative-and I wouldn’t even term it a ‘negative.’ (Daniel Keller)