

SUMMARY OF MINUTES FOR 6/19/14 STAKEHOLDERS MEETING

I. Parking Lot Issues (pp. 6-7)

Mr. Brueckner reported that in response to the issue of using future precipitation projections for design of the Phase III facilities that NOAA is currently updating these projections and that they should be available by September 2015. These projections will be used for design of the Phase III facilities.

II. Presentation by MWH on GSI (pp. 7-71)

Mr. Raiche (MWH) provided a quick overview of GSI alternatives that had been discussed at the last meeting. Most of the CSO areas that are being looked at are very densely developed and we do not have the surface footprint to do infiltration at the surface.

Ms. Kerr asked if we have the information on where all the contaminants are for infiltration into soils. Mr. Raiche responded that a contamination vetting will be part of the Phase III design for GSI alternatives.

Mr. Anderson provided a review of the GSI approach discussed at the last meeting.

Mr. Scialabba asked how we would deal with GSI alternatives on private property. Response was that it would be carried as a cost in evaluating the alternatives that could possibly be paid by NBC even though it is on private property.

Mr. Turin asked if we could control a higher volume of overflow than that incurred in the 3 month storm with GSI, would we? The intent is to control that and if affordable, a higher volume. Even it is not affordable now to treat a higher volume it could be done so in the future.

III. Presentation by Sheila Dormody on Regional Storm Water Utility Project (pp.71-86)

Ms. Doromody explained that Phase I of the study, which evaluated if a regional approach to storm water management made sense and funding a regional district through fees based on storm water contribution, was complete. Phase II is expected to begin in late summer. There was further discussion from the stakeholders on the possible cost of implementing a storm water management district with estimates varying widely (\$13-\$300per year) and that these costs should be considered as part of the affordability analysis.

IV. Evaluation Criteria (pp.86-127)

Mr. Raiche (MWH) stated that evaluation criteria will be developed with input from stakeholders to be used in the alternatives evaluation.

Mr. Searles (MWH) discussed the proposed evaluation criteria and weighting of the criteria. There was a general discussion of the criteria. MWH distributed a handout listing proposed criteria and asked the stakeholders to rate the criteria in order of importance to them. Jamie Samons will email the spreadsheet to the stakeholders for them to fill out, including adding criteria that may not be on the list. The completed forms are to be emailed back to Jamie. (The emailed criteria list is attached.)

