

SUMMARY OF MINUTES FOR 10/23/14 STAKEHOLDERS MEETING

I. Parking Lot Issues (p.3)

Mr. Brueckner reported that the one parking lot issue was regarding secondary treatment being required for satellite treatment facilities. After further discussions with EPA after the meeting, it was determined that secondary treatment is not required for satellite treatment facilities. Screening and disinfection are acceptable but more treatment could be required if water quality standards were not met after the facilities became operational.

II. Presentation by MWH on Affordability Analysis (pp.6-72)

Mr. Baird and Mr. Albertson of MWH provided an extensive presentation on affordability of the Phase III program in the approved Conceptual Design Report Amendment. This analysis considered the cost of the proposed Phase III work, as well as NBC's other capital projects, the median household income (MHI) of the NBC service area as a whole and the Cities of Pawtucket, Providence and Central Falls, and projected sewer rates. A second analysis was done which included additional capital project costs that would be assumed by the Cities for sewer infrastructure improvements and storm water related expenditures. According to EPA guidance that was presented by **Mr. Baird**, if the sewer rates exceed 2% of MHI, then the project could be considered unaffordable. It might also be unaffordable if the sewer rates were less than 2% of MHI, but there were other economic factors that made it unaffordable. The analysis also looked at affordability based on MHI by census tract. For the entire district, the residential indicator was 1.67% of MHI, but for many of the census tracts in Providence, Pawtucket and Central Falls, the indicator was above the 2% threshold. When the infrastructure costs for the member communities were added to the NBC costs the residential indicator for the entire service area increased to 1.98%.

Stakeholder Comments

Mr. Reitsma (p.46). There's going to be significant cost and it could impact the population very significantly. He asked if the purpose of the analysis was to justify not making the investments instead of trying to determine the most cost effective way to protect Narragansett Bay and finding a way to fund it.

Mr. Gagnon (p.70). The Bay is here for the whole state so instead of lengthening the time for construction it should be shortened and the state in its entirety should be bearing the cost of this.

III. Presentation by MWH on Alternatives Costs and Subsystems Alternatives Analysis (pp.72-135).

Mr. Raiche and Mr. Anderson of MWH presented the Alternatives being considered and their estimated costs. The alternatives included the baseline CDRA alternative consisting of a tunnel, interceptors and some sewer separation. Another alternative considered was green infrastructure (GSI). **Mr. Anderson** pointed out that the best an all green program could achieve would be a 36% reduction in CSO discharges at a cost of \$540M. The cost/gallon is comparable to the cost of \$0.85-\$1.50/gallon over 25 years for GSI implemented in other cities. GSI alone would not be sufficient to provide the needed CSO reductions. **Mr. Raiche** reviewed the alternatives being considered for each overflow. Sewer separation was considered the best alternative for OF's 035 and 206. For OF's 039 and 056 the West River Storage Interceptor was the recommended alternative. Because of cost and siting issues, Near Surface Storage was not recommended for further consideration except for OF 220. Although inexpensive, screening and

disinfection may not be able to meet long term water quality goals and was considered as a possible interim solution for OF220. Siting issues for screening and disinfection also limited its applicability. The recommended alternative for the OF's along the Blackstone and Seekonk Rivers was the Pawtucket Tunnel for storage of the design storm overflows because of cost, siting and water quality considerations.

Stakeholder Comments

Mr. Reitsma (p.75) regarding GSI: Suggested that there should be a second opinion on GSI based on aggressive applications of GSI in other cities. The question is, have we really given it (GSI) our best?

Ms. Karp (p.76). What water quality goals are we trying to achieve in the Seekonk and upper Narragansett Bay, fishable or swimmable or do we really not expect to achieve that?

Mr. Liberti (p.80). We're trying to put together a plan that we think is the correct plan... that will impact uses during certain conditions and the uses will not be available at all times and at all places but it's a good investment. At this point, I think we still could look at the alternatives with recognition that there's virtually no CSO plan that meets water quality standards one hundred percent of the time.

Mr. Reitsma (p.94). We currently have predictions for increasing intensity of storms available from the National Weather Service and the state meteorologist and these predictions should be dealt with now.

Mr. Hamblett (p.129). There are cities and states around the country with green and gray infrastructure, that are doing things in very different ways and I think we need to bring that kind of horsepower to this table...the rate increase projections are staggering, but we need to proceed with the cleanup of Narragansett Bay. So let's not limit ourselves in our thinking and in our expertise here.

Mr. Walker (p.132). I am a little disappointed that in the analysis of affordability there was no discussion on affordability on the nonresidential side.