

MEETING MINUTES

Project Name: Huntington Long Term Control Plan

Project Number: 10151.00

Date of Meeting: November 5, 2009

Present: Steve Updike, Mayor
Dave Schoeff, Director of Engineering
Colin Bullock, WWTP Superintendent
Anthony Goodnight, Asst. Director of Engineering
Steve Davidson
Keith Eller
Doyle Krieg
Jack Slusser
Kyle Marlow
Drew Stone
Jeff DeWitt, Bonar Group
Derek Davidson, Bonar Group
Mark Jesse, Bonar Group

Topic: **Public Meeting**

Introductions

- Jeff DeWitt introduced himself and reviewed the presentation outline.

Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs)

- Jeff described what a CSO is and why they are
- Huntington is not the only community that is being required to address its CSO problem. 108 communities in Indiana are going through the same process.
- A diagram of how a CSO functions during dry and wet weather was discussed.

CSO Impacts

- CSO discharges contain high concentrations of e. coli and organic matter. E. coli is a harmful bacteria that poses health risks to humans. The organics that are discharged deplete the oxygen in the water body as they degrade. This can cause a decrease in populations of aquatic animals.

State Judicial Agreement

- Jeff reviewed the requirements of the State Judicial Agreement (SJA) that was signed in 2003. The SJA required the City to comply with the requirements of the clean water act.
- It also requires several activities to occur such as the installation of monitoring equipment, evaluation of the design storm approach, and forming a Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC).

- Monitoring is important because it allowed for a greater accuracy in developing a model of the combined sewer system. In the past CSO volumes were estimated, now they are measured.
- All of the required activities have been completed.

Sensitive Areas

- LTCP guidance documents required potential sensitive areas to be identified. These are areas where people would potentially come into contact with an increased e. coli concentration during wet weather. These areas may require prioritization depending on the level of treatment selected.
- The areas that were identified were the Forks of the Wabash Historic Park, Elmwood Trail, Riverview Terrace Apartments, and the Island by Marsh.
- Each of these locations were identified as places where fishing occurs.

Combined Sewer System Modeling

- The model that was developed with the CSO monitoring data was approximately 76% accurate when predicting CSO events and 90% accurate when predicting CSO volume. An accuracy of approximately 80% is acceptable.
- The model estimates that the population will remain constant over the course of the plan. The population decreased by 5.3% between 2000 and 2008.
- Guidance documents outlined two approaches to solving the CSO problem. The first and option that is preferred by IDEM is the design storm approach. It provides the greatest level of control for CSOs. In this approach approximately the first 1" of rain in an hour would require full treatment at the WWTP. A storm with an intensity greater than 1" per hour and less than approximately 2" per hour would require partial treatment.
- The other alternative is to reduce the number and volume of CSO to a level that is acceptable to IDEM. This alternative is used only if the design storm approach proves to be too expensive and would result in an economic hardship.

CSO Reduction Technologies

- Several different types of methods were considered as options in the alternatives developed.
- These included separation of the remaining 20 miles of sewers, adding wet weather treatment processes to the WWTP, and installing interceptors to collect overflows and transport them to the WWTP. LTCP guidance required a no action alternative to be evaluated as a base line. This shows what would happen if no projects were implemented.

Project Selection and Cost

- Alternative 1A and 1B meet the requirements of the design storm approach. These alternatives cost \$63,000,000 and \$73,000,000 respectively.
- To provide the most cost effective alternative to the City we evaluated the CSO reduction that would be possible by implementing certain aspects of the design storm alternatives. This resulted in alternatives 2 and 3. Alternative 2 collected the CSO's on the north side of the Little River. Alternative 3 collects CSO's on the southside of the Little River. Alternative 2 provides a greater reduction in the CSO, but more it has more events that alternative 3.
- Alternative 4 assumes that all sewers in Huntington are separated. CSO are still believed to occur even though the system will be separated. This is due to infiltration due to leaky pipes, illegal roof drains, and some inlets are not able to be removed
- Alternative 5 is the no action approach which results in no reduction in CSOs.
- The cost for each alternative was plotted against the number of CSO events per year. The preferred alternative, as long as it is affordable, should occur at the knee of the curve, which is the point of diminishing returns.
- According to EPA/IDEM guidance documents a community's wastewater costs can be approximately 2% of the median household income before causing a financial hardship.
- Alternative 1A is the proposed alternative because it provides a significantly higher level of control even though it costs approximately 2.1 % of the MHI.

Implementation Schedule

- The length of time that a community has to implement its LTCP is dependent on several factors. These include annual wastewater cost per household, property tax revenue collection rate, median household income, net debt per capita, bond rating, and the local unemployment rate. These criteria are intended to determine the overall financial capability of the community.
- Based upon these criteria for Huntington they fall in the 10-20 year category. The LTCP proposed an implementation schedule of 16 years. This schedule has to be approved by IDEM. They may want the project to be implemented quicker.

Project Phasing

- At the end of the project the average monthly wastewater cost per household would be approximately \$83. This is equivalent to \$58 in today's dollars.
- This table shows the proposed rates that other communities will be paying once their projects are completed. All of these communities have approved LTCPs. The average rate is estimated to be about \$60 per month.

Questions

- How much will early projects cost?
 - The first proposed project is a rehabilitation of the WWTP that is scheduled to begin next year. This project is estimated to cost \$9.5 million. This will result in a rate increase of approximately \$4 per month.
- A lot of money is currently being spent on rock excavation for the current project. Why can't the new sewers be installed in the existing sewer trench?
 - The existing sewer contains the old combined sewer that is being converted to a storm sewer. In order to reconnect the homes to the new sanitary sewer it must be at the same elevation or lower than the existing line. If it was installed in the same trench it would be too high.
- Will the plan have to be revised if the 2010 census shows an increase in population?
 - The first couple project will not be affected by an increase in population. Subsequent project can be tailored to any new conditions as they are being designed. Any growth would most likely occur on the outskirts of the community. These developments would not be allowed to exceed the capacity of the sewer system. If needed it would be necessary to install new liftstations and interceptor sewers to transport the wastewater to the WWTP.

- Is the sewer system at capacity?
 - The model shows that it has capacity for dry weather flows. No bottlenecks are known to exist in the sewer system.

This is the writer's best recollection of matters discussed at this meeting. Let me know as soon as possible if you have any additions or other modifications.

Minutes prepared by:

Derek Davidson, EIT
Engineer
317-570-6800 x 339

cc: Present