

**Overflow Control Facilities (OCF) Demonstration Project
Allegheny Basin Working Group Meeting
Tuesday, May 5, 2009
10:00 – 11:30 AM
Millvale Community Center**

Attendees:

Dave Weiss, Millvale Boat Club
Joy Nix, Three Rivers Rowing Association
Oliver Poppenberg, Three Rivers Rowing Association
Jen Novak, Pennsylvania Environmental Council
John Schombert, Three Rivers Wet Weather
Grace Jesteadt, Millvale Marina
Dennis Blakeley, Girty's Run Joint Sewer Authority
Bill Youngblood, Girty's Run Joint Sewer Authority
Thomas Flanagan, Department of Environmental Protection
Megan Driscoll, Riverlife
Therese Moss, Student Conservation Association
Kevin Creagh, Shaler Township
Tim Rogers, Shaler Township
Don Hopey, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette
Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN
John Findley, ALCOSAN
Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN
Jim Bowser, Chester Engineers
Karen Brean, Brean Associates

Presenters:

ALCOSAN staff: Dan Lockard
ALCOSAN consultant: Greg Heath, AECOM

Presentation Overview

Dan Lockard welcomed the attendees and asked all to introduce themselves. He explained that ALCOSAN's Long-term Wet Weather Control Concept Plan recognized the need for satellite treatment facilities. The Overflow Control Facilities Demonstration Project was developed to explore technologies and site issues. The two areas of Girty's Run and Munhall were selected for study for the demonstration project. He also stated that the purpose and goals of the project were to:

- Comply with combined sewer overflow (CSO) policy;
- Improve water quality;

- Control solid and floatable materials;
- Demonstrate effective technologies;
- Design a remote facility capable of intermittent operation; and
- Develop a facility that requires low maintenance.

Greg Heath presented an overview of the study area and project. He stated that the project team had examined the system characterization and siting options, developed alternatives, and evaluated and compared alternatives. The project team distributed the Draft Recommended Plan and, following the comment period, will prepare the Final Recommended Plan.

Greg Heath explained that the development of alternatives involves examining the “fit” between the technologies, the level of control (ranging from zero to seven untreated overflows per year), and the potential sites. He explained that the range of technologies includes:

- Screening and disinfection;
- Swirl/vortex;
- Detention/treatment;
- Ballasted flocculation;
- Storage tank; and
- Storage tunnel.

Greg Heath described the site issues and the fit between technologies and the following sites:

- GR2 – Marina;
- GR3 – Park;
- GR4 – Site near Rowing Club; and
- GR5 – River Avenue.

He also discussed the major cost factors, the non-monetary factors used to evaluate and compare the sites and the technologies, and the cost/performance graphs, which provide another way to compare the alternatives. Based on the analysis, the conditionally recommended alternative would be a swirl/vortex facility, sized to provide zero untreated overflows per year, located on site GR2, the marina.

Dan Lockard outlined the project’s next steps. He noted that the comment period on the Draft Recommended Plan extends through mid-June. Following that, the project team will address and incorporate regulatory agency and public comments in order to finalize the Plan. He also noted that implementation of the Plan is not anticipated at this time. Rather, the analysis will be folded into the basin planning so that the control technologies will be incorporated into the Long Term Wet Weather Control Plan.

Questions/Comments

- Sean McWilliams (Girty’s Run Joint Sewer Authority) asked why the project team did not look at a full blown treatment facility for continuous waste treatment, rather than promoting intermittent treatment.

Greg Heath answered that it would not be effective to treat overflows with a full-scale treatment facility because conventional waste treatment centers can only handle a certain ratio of peak to regular flow.

- Dave Weiss (Millvale Boat Club) asked why ALCOSAN would spend millions to treat the wet weather rather than separating the flows upstream? If the municipalities would correct the problem, there would not be a problem with storm flow.

Dan Lockard answered that separation is an option that will be looked at in all of the planning basins, but separation is the most costly solution. He added that, even if the flows are separated, the regulations may point to the need to mitigate pollution into the rivers generated by storm water flowing over asphalt surfaces, etc.

- Tim Rogers (Shaler Township) noted that the upstream communities have spent millions but have not seen much return on their investment in terms of reducing the wet weather flow.
- Bill Youngblood (McCandless Township Sanitary Authority) added that McCandless spent \$22M and only reduced the wet weather flow by 30%.

Dan Lockard stated that another reason to defer going forward on the overflow treatment facility is to give the municipalities time to come up with alternatives, such as storage options. It would also allow time to investigate green infrastructure initiatives.

- Bill Youngblood noted that McCandless is now in negotiations with West View regarding source reduction.
- Sean McWilliams (Girty's Run Joint Sewer Authority) stated that they had received a \$.5M Block Grant to work on separating the system. They are also trying to address source control, but even the "top" of the system is combined.

Dan Lockard emphasized that green solutions take a long time to implement to a significant extent.

- Grace Jeasteadt (Millvale Marina) asked whether, since the artist's renderings are of the park and marina, they are the preferred sites.

Dan Lockard answered that there were tough choices and that the evaluation was very close between GR2, GR3 and GR4, though all sites had trade-offs. No one wants to detract from business or disrupt the park. There are also uncertainties such as the projected flow following the completion of the Route 28 reconstruction. The project team recognizes the need to look regionally. Therefore, the recommendation is to defer implementation of this facility and to fold the analysis into the Regional Wet Weather Plan. That planning process could shed more light on this decision by the end of 2010.

- Grace Jeasteadt (Millvale Marina) asked whether consideration was given to the construction challenges of the Marina site, such as getting materials and equipment to the site.

Dan Lockard answered that those constructability issues would be looked at during the design phase if that site were to move forward.

- Oliver Poppenberg (Three Rivers Rowing) asked how far the discharge would go into the river. They also asked whether there are any plans to dredge the back channel, which is getting smaller at the north end of the island.

Dan Lockard answered that there would be a new outfall maximizing the distance, particularly since it is a sensitive area. He added that dredging the area is not in ALCOSAN's plans and that ALCOSAN is not the appropriate agency to do so.