

SUMMARY OF MINUTES FOR 9/4/14 STAKEHOLDERS MEETING

I. Parking Lot Issues (p.1)

Mr. Brueckner reported that the only parking lot issue discussed was that NBC will use precipitation projections currently being developed by NOAA for the design of the Phase III facilities.

II. Presentation by MWH on Alternatives Development, Hydraulic Model Results and Evaluation Criteria (pp. 2-73)

Mr. Raiche reviewed alternatives being considered: green infrastructure, storage (tunnels, near surface tanks and interceptor storage), sewer separation, satellite treatment (screening and disinfection) and regulator modifications. It was determined through the hydraulic model that some overflows, particularly those to be addressed by regulator modifications, may be the result of surcharged interceptors discharging through the overflow rather than as a result of flow collected in the CSO drainage area. Wetland treatment was considered but land is not available to implement it.

For screening and disinfection, UV and chlorination were considered for disinfection. Because the effectiveness of UV is highly variable depending on the strength of the incoming flow, it was not considered to be as effective as chlorination. Also, satellite treatment facilities would need a permit issued by RIDEM to discharge.

Mr. Liberti (p.16) said that "...unless everything else is unaffordable, it doesn't seem likely that screening and disinfection is going to rise to the top as an acceptable alternative", that bacterial standards will need to be met at the end of the discharge and that this would be the most difficult alternative to approve. (p.24) It's all going to come down to affordability. Because it may be the least effective alternative, it may be considered as an interim solution to be changed in the future.

Mr. Turin (p.27) said screening and disinfection would not meet the minimum requirements of the Clean Water Act of secondary treatment. Even if it is permitted in the short term, NBC would have to do additional alternatives to achieve elimination and complete treatment of those discharges.

Mr. Domenica (p.27) asked if Mr. Turin was saying that CSO treatment facilities have to provide secondary treatment even though CSO policy says equivalent primary treatment is all that's required.

Mr. Turin (p.28) Equivalent primary treatment is under the CSO policy so that's not complying. Secondary treatment should be provided to get out from under the CSO policy otherwise you would continue to fall under the cycle of continually needing to assess affordability.

Mr. Bishop (p.31) would like to see if screening and disinfection can be inexpensively implemented at a small number of sites.

Mr. Domenica (p.32) summed up Mr. Turin's comments. If we install screening and disinfection and meet bacterial standards it would still violate the Clean Water Act until you provide secondary treatment.

Mr. Raiche (pp.37-62) provided extensive discussion on rating criteria for alternatives evaluation.

Mr. Anderson (pp. 63- 73) provided a discussion on the methodology used to assess the feasibility of green infrastructure. The result of their assessment for GSI was that we would get a 10% reduction in overflows if GSI were done only on public land and a 34% reduction on both public and private land.

III. Presentation and Discussion of Alternatives by MWH/Pare (pp. 73- 120)

Mr. Raiche (pp.73-76) Alternatives being considered are the Phase III baseline alternative which is the Pawtucket Tunnel, including interceptors to bring flow from northernmost CSO's to the tunnel, stub tunnel to the main tunnel for OF 220, sewer separation, green infrastructure, and near surface storage (screening and disinfection).

Mr. Gardner (pp. 76-100) provided a presentation on sewer separation, GSI hybrids and interceptor relief for Overflows 035, 039/056 and 206 and extensive discussion on the ratings.

Mr. Thies (pp.100- 117) provided a presentation on Near Surface Storage alternatives for overflows 101, 103, 104, 105, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 220 and screening and disinfection for 205, 218 and 220. It was pointed out that many of the available sites for these tanks are not really suitable because of impacts to business or the local community and there are limitations on the size of the tank that can be constructed.

Mr. Hill (p.117) stated that the tank options would be pretty rough for the communities and businesses. One benefit of sewer separation is the cost savings to be realized for not having to treat the storm water currently transported through the combined sewers to the Bucklin Point and Field's Point Wastewater treatment facilities.

Mr. Holmes (p.121-128) said that the shell fishermen are concerned about the beds in the lower bay because it is the main source of their income. Can we reduce the volumes from 205, 218 and 220 because they comprise such a large percentage of the Phase III overflow volume. Is it possible to break Phase III into smaller phases to take care of the worst offenders first.