

**Appendix A-3:
Customer Municipal Advisory Committee (CMAC)**

Membership List



ALCOSAN Basin Facilities Planning Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Membership List

1. **Charles Arthrell**, Councilperson, Borough of Braddock Hills (Upper Monongahela Basin)
2. **Robert Callen**, Manager, Borough of McKees Rocks (Chartiers Creek Basin)
3. **John Capor**, General Manager, Monroeville Municipal Water Authority (Turtle Creek/Thompson Run Basin)
4. **John Ciangiarulo**, Council President, Borough of McKees Rocks (Chartiers Creek Basin)
5. **William Easton**, Commissioner, Neville Township (Lower Ohio/Girty's Run Basin)
6. **Amanda Ford**, Secretary, Borough of Swissvale (Upper Monongahela Basin)
7. **Vanessa McCarthy Johnson**, Councilperson, Borough of Wilkinsburg (Upper Monongahela Basin)
8. **Michael Lamb**, Controller, City of Pittsburgh (Main Rivers Basin)
9. **Ken LaSota**, Mayor, Borough of Heidelberg (Chartiers Creek Basin)
10. **Cheryl McAbee**, Councilperson, Borough of Churchill (Turtle Creek/Thompson Run Basin)
11. **Dave Montz**, Manager, Borough of Green Tree (Saw Mill Run Basin)
12. **Steve Morus**, Manager, Borough of Forest Hills (Turtle Creek/Thompson Run Basin)
13. **Mary Ellen Ramage**, Manager, Borough of Etna (Upper Allegheny Basin)
14. **Tim Rogers**, Manager, Shaler Township (Lower Ohio/Girty's Run Basin)
15. **Patricia Schaefer**, Council President, Borough of Edgewood (Upper Monongahela Basin)
16. **Casey Shoub Sr.**, Councilperson, Borough of Trafford (Turtle Creek/Thompson Run Basin)
17. **Stephen Simcic**, Co-acting Executive Director, Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority (Main Rivers Basin)
18. **William Zachery**, Councilperson, Borough of Braddock (Upper Monongahela Basin)
19. **Jeaneen Zappa**, Sustainability Manager, Allegheny County (Main Rivers Basin)

Meeting Agendas



ALCOSAN Customer Municipal Advisory Committee

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Purpose / Number: CMAC Meeting Number 1
Date / Time: Wednesday, February 18, 2008, 10:30 am
Location: William F. Trefz Board Room

Welcome & Introductions

Arletta Scott Williams
ALCOSAN Executive Director

Overview of ALCOSAN Organization

Consent Decree Requirements

Arthur Tamilya, Esq.
ALCOSAN Deputy Executive Director &
Director of Environmental Compliance

Rules and Responsibilities:

James Protin
AECOM

Organizational Overview

Regional Stakeholder Group

Basin Planning Committee

Program Update:

Regional Wet Weather Plan Development

David Borneman, P.E.
ALCOSAN Director of Engineering & Construction

Flow Monitoring Update

Timothy Prevost, P.E.
ALCOSAN Manager of Wet Weather Programs

Public Participation

Nancy Barylak
ALCOSAN Manager of Public Relations

Next Steps



ALCOSAN

Customer Municipal Advisory Committee

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Purpose / Number: CMAC Meeting / Number 2
Date / Time: Tuesday, May 12, 2009, 10:30 am
Location: William F. Trefz Boardroom

Welcome

Arletta Scott Williams, Executive Director

Program Status

- Wet Weather Program Review
 - Early Action Projects
- Understanding the Basin Planning
- Basin Planning Overview/Updates

Jan Oliver, Director of Regional Compliance

Dave Bingham, AECOM Water
Mike Lichte, Dan Lockard, Tim Prevost,
ALCOSAN Basin Project Managers

CMAC Roles & Responsibilities

- Roles as a Member of CMAC
 - Consent Decree Compliance
 - Municipal Advocacy
 - Liaison for ALCOSAN and Municipalities

Jim Protin, AECOM

Public Participation

- ALCOSAN
- Wet weather issue

Nancy Barylak, Manager of Public Relations

Roundtable Session

- Communication with Elected/ Municipal Officials
 - Basin Quarterly Activity Report
- Communication with the General Public
- Education of Program Costs
- Multi-Municipal Issues/Concerns

Lugene Keys, KCI Technologies

Next Steps

- CMAC Important Dates

Jim Protin, AECOM Water

Handouts:

1. Meeting #2 Agenda
2. Customer Municipality Advisory Committee Calendar
3. Public Participation Directory (ALCOSAN RSG, CMAC, and Basin Planners)
4. Draft of the Basin Quarterly Activity Report
5. Basin Planning Meeting Summaries for Meeting #3 (Feb/Mar 09)



ALCOSAN Basin Facilities Planning Meeting Agenda

Meeting Purpose/Number: Customer Municipality Advisory Committee Meeting #2b

Date/Time: June 23, 2009, 10:30 AM

Location: ALCOSAN, William C. Trefz Boardroom

Welcome

Arletta Scott Williams,
ALCOSAN Executive Director

CMAC Roles & Responsibilities

- Role as a Member of CMAC
 - Consent Decree Compliance
 - Municipal Advocacy
 - Liaison for ALCOSAN and Municipalities

Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

Roundtable Session

- Communication with Elected/ Municipal Officials
 - Basin Quarterly Activity Report
- Communication with the General Public
- Education on Program Costs
- Multi-Municipal Issues/Concerns

Lugene Keys, KCI Technologies

Next Steps

- CMAC Important Dates

Jim Protin, AECOM

Handouts:

1. Meeting # 2b agenda
2. CMAC Calendar/Schedule
3. Draft template of the Basin Quarterly Activity Report
4. Basin Planning Committee meeting summaries from meeting #3 (Feb/Mar '09)



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING AGENDA

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee Meeting #4
Wednesday, October 14, 2009, 10:30 AM
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

Regional Wet Weather Plan

- I. **Welcome** **Arletta Scott Williams,**
ALCOSAN Executive Director

- II. **Program Updates** **Colleen Hughes, CDM**
Dave Bingham, AECOM Water
 - Basin Planning Overview/Update

- III. **CMAC Administrative Updates** **Janette Campbell, Ebony Holdings**
 - CMAC Administrative Resource Sheet
 - RSG Steering Committee
 - Update on membership tour(s)

- IV. **CMAC Agenda** **Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings**
 - **Municipal Advocacy**
 - **Liaison for ALCOSAN and Municipalities**
 - Communications with Elected Officials
 - Multi-Municipal Issues/Concerns
 - August '09 Federal Government Funding Seminar
 - Early Action Projects
 - 3RWW Feasibility Study Working Group update
 - Schedule, budget, results

 - **Communicating with the General Public**
 - ALCOSAN Public Participation Plan update
 - Public comments and feedback
 - Public Commentary Process
 - Public Comment Card
 - Public Outreach Materials/Collateral
 - Consent Decree Booklet
 - Public Comment Card
 - Frequently Asked Questions Sheet (FAQs)
 - Current fact sheets
 - Public Outreach events
 - Basin level public outreach
 - ALCOSAN Open House
 - ALCOSAN web site updates

- V. **Next Steps**
 - Re-cap of meeting key points
 - Re-cap of meeting action items
 - CMAC Schedule for 2009-2010
 - CMAC Goals & Agenda for 2010



Regional Wet Weather Plan

ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING AGENDA

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee Meeting #4
Wednesday, October 14, 2009, 10:30 AM
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

Anticipated Handouts

1. Meeting # 4 agenda
2. CMAC Schedule for 2009-2010
3. CMAC Administrative Resource Sheet
4. ALCOSAN Public Comment Card & Information
5. Current Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Fact Sheet
6. Current Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) Fact Sheet
7. Current Basin Planning Committee (BPC) Fact Sheet
8. Stormwater Management: Promoting Source Reduction in Your Municipality Fact Sheet
9. Source Reduction: A Residential Approach to Stormwater Management Fact Sheet
10. Municipal Connections Newsletter
11. Basin Public Meetings Schedule
12. 2009 Meeting #3 Key Points
13. Meeting # 2-3 Summaries
14. Meeting Evaluation Form

Material Provided on CD-ROM

15. Basin Quarterly Activity Reports: Issue #1
16. ALCOSAN Public Participation Plan (PPP)



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

AGENDA

CMAC Meeting / Number 5
Tuesday, March 2, 2010/ 10:30 AM
Trefz Boardroom / ALCOSAN

#1

I. Welcome

Arletta Scott Williams,
ALCOSAN Executive Director

II. CMAC Municipal Advocacy

Janai Michelle Williams,
Ebony Holdings

III. CSO Control and Alternatives Technologies

Dave Bingham,
AECOM

IV. Evaluating Site Screening Criteria
(Screening of WW Control Site Alternatives)

Matt Smith,
AECOM

V. Program Key Updates

Dave Bingham,
AECOM

VI. Next Steps

Lugene Keys,
KCI Technologies



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

AGENDA

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting / Number 6
Tuesday, May 11, 2010/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

- I. Welcome** **Arletta Scott Williams**, ALCOSAN Executive Director

- II. Meeting Objectives** **Janai Michelle Williams**, Ebony Holdings

- III. Basin Planning Report** **Peter Thomas**, AECOM

- IV. Communicating with Elected Officials & Municipal Managers** **Dave Bingham**, AECOM
Lugene Keys, KCI

- V. Municipal Advocacy** **Janai Michelle Williams**, Ebony Holdings

- VI. Understanding the Affordability Analysis Process** **Tom Schevtchuk**, CDM

- VII. Next Steps** **Janai Michelle Williams**, Ebony Holdings



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

AGENDA

CMAC Meeting / Number 7
Tuesday, August 3, 2010/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

1. **Welcome** **Arthur Tamilya Esquire**, ALCOSAN Deputy Executive Director &
Director of Environmental Compliance

2. **Meeting Objectives** **Janai Michelle Williams**, Ebony Holdings

3. **Municipal Advocacy** **Janai Michelle Williams**, Ebony Holdings

4. **Municipal Preliminary Flow Estimates & Program Schedule Update** **Tim Prevost**, ALCOSAN
Dave Bingham, AECOM

5. **Preliminary Alternatives Evaluation/Development Process** **Peter Thomas/Dave Bingham**, AECOM
Colleen Hughes, CDM

6. **Public Outreach** **Nancy Barylak**, ALCOSAN
Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

7. **Communicating with the Elected Officials & Municipal Managers** **Lugene Keys**, KCI

8. **Next Steps** **Lugene Keys**, KCI



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING AGENDA

CMAC Meeting / Number 8
Tuesday, November 9, 2010/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building

#1

1. **Welcome** **Arletta Scott Williams**, ALCOSAN Executive Director

2. **Meeting Objectives** **Janai Michelle Williams**, Ebony Holdings

3. **Municipal Advocacy** **Janai Michelle Williams**, Ebony Holdings

4. **Basin Planning Summary Progress Report** **Peter Thomas**, AECOM

5. **Feasibility Study Working Group Correspondence** **Tim Prevost**, ALCOSAN/
David Bingham, AECOM

6. **3RWW Regionalization RFP** **Jan Oliver**, ALCOSAN/
Dave Bingham, AECOM

7. **Public Outreach** **Nancy Barylak**, ALCOSAN
Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

8. **Communicating with the Elected Officials & Municipal Managers** **Lugene Keys**, KCI

9. **Next Steps** **Lugene Keys**, KCI

10. **Handouts:**
 1. Meeting #8 Agenda
 2. CMAC Tentative 2011 Meeting Schedule
 3. Basin Planning Summary Progress Report (through August 2010)
 4. 3RWW FWSG Memorandum: Issues Critical to the Feasibility Study Process
 5. Regionalization Case Studies of Other Cities Similar to the ALCOSAN System
 6. ALCOSAN Region-wide Meeting Booklet
 7. Meeting #8 Evaluation

CMAC VISION STATEMENT

The **Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC)** exemplifies ALCOSAN's dedication to providing environmentally conscious wastewater treatment that protects public health, enhances the use and encourages preservation of the region's natural resources through meaningful partnerships with its customer municipalities.

Accordingly, the CMAC membership strives to proactively provide input, participation, and support of ALCOSAN, as the regional authority, in the development of a fiscally-responsible and operationally-efficient Long-Term Regional Wet Weather Plan (LTRWWP) to achieve compliance with the Clean Water Act and USEPA's Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Control Policy.

The CMAC membership is committed to presenting ideas, concerns, questions and answers representative of individual constituencies and fellow municipalities that complement the development of wet weather solutions to serve the region's best interest.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

MEMBER AGENDA

CMAC Meeting / Number 9
Tuesday, March 1, 2011/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building

#1

-
1. **Welcome** **Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director**

 2. **Meeting Objectives** **Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings**
Purpose: Presenter will outline the meeting objectives.

 3. **Open Discussion** **Mary Ellen Ramage, Manger of Etna**
Purpose: Presenter will discuss the Etna downspout disconnect program.

 4. **Municipal Advocacy** **Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings**
Purpose: Presenter will lead discussion on the key topics important to municipalities.

 5. **Basin Planning Report** **Dave Bingham, AECOM**
Purpose/Message: Presenter will discuss present financial, scope & schedule for basin planning efforts

 6. **Wet Weather Plan Update** **Colleen Hughes, CDM**
Purpose: Presenter will provide a wet weather planning progress update, including a preliminary assessment of wet weather program costs compared to affordability.

 7. **Communicating with the Elected Officials & Municipal Managers** **Tim Prevost, ALCOSAN**
Dave Borneman, ALCOSAN
Lugene Keys, KCI
Purpose: Presenters will discuss information exchange with municipalities; past events and meetings with regulators; upcoming events.

 8. **ALCOSAN Regionalization/Consolidation Study** **Dave Bingham, AECOM**
Purpose/Message: Presenter will discuss updates on ALCOSAN's Regionalization/Consolidation Study efforts.

 9. **Public Outreach** **Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN**
Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings
Purpose: Presenter will provide members with a glimpse into the 2011 program year.

 10. **Next Steps** **Lugene Keys, KCI**
Purpose: Presenter will summarize the key points, action items from the meeting.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

AGENDA

CMAC Meeting / Number 10
Tuesday, May 10, 2011/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building

#1

-
1. **Welcome** **Arletta Scott Williams**, ALCOSAN Executive Director

 2. **Meeting Objectives** **Jada Shirriell**, E Holdings

 3. **Communicating with the Elected Officials & Municipal Managers** **Nancy Barylak**, ALCOSAN

 4. **Public Outreach** **Nancy Barylak**, ALCOSAN

 5. **Open Discussion** **Mary Ellen Ramage**, Manager of Etna

 6. **Wet Weather Planning Update** **Tim Prevost**, ALCOSAN

 7. **ALCOSAN Regionalization/Consolidation Study** **Jan Oliver**, ALCOSAN

 8. **Funding Efforts** **Jan Oliver**, ALCOSAN

 9. **Next Steps** **Lugene Keys**, KCI Technologies

 10. **Handouts:**
 1. **Meeting #10 Agenda**
 2. **Meeting #10 Evaluation Form**

CMAC VISION STATEMENT

The **Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC)** exemplifies ALCOSAN's dedication to providing environmentally conscious wastewater treatment that protects public health, enhances the use and encourages preservation of the region's natural resources through meaningful partnerships with its customer municipalities.

Accordingly, the CMAC membership strives to proactively provide input, participation, and support of ALCOSAN, as the regional authority, in the development of a fiscally-responsible and operationally-efficient Long-Term Regional Wet Weather Plan (LTRWWP) to achieve compliance with the Clean Water Act and USEPA's Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Control Policy.

The CMAC membership is committed to presenting ideas, concerns, questions and answers representative of individual constituencies and fellow municipalities that complement the development of wet weather solutions to serve the region's best interest



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING AGENDA

CMAC Meeting / Number 11
Tuesday, August 2, 2011/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building

#1

-
1. **Welcome** **Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings**

 2. **Meeting Objectives** **Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings**

 3. **Municipal Advocacy** **Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings**

 4. **Wet Weather Planning Update** **Colleen Hughes, CDM/Dave Bingham, AECOM**

 5. **ALCOSAN Regionalization/Consolidation Study** **Dave Bingham, AECOM**

 6. **Public Outreach** **Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN**

 7. **Next Steps** **Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings**

 8. **Handouts:**
 - a. **Meeting #11 Agenda**
 - b. **Updated Basin Planning Summary Progress Report (through May 2011)**
 - c. **Meeting #11 Evaluation Form**

CMAC VISION STATEMENT

The **Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC)** exemplifies ALCOSAN's dedication to providing environmentally conscious wastewater treatment that protects public health, enhances the use and encourages preservation of the region's natural resources through meaningful partnerships with its customer municipalities.

Accordingly, the CMAC membership strives to proactively provide input, participation, and support of ALCOSAN, as the regional authority, in the development of a fiscally-responsible and operationally-efficient Long-Term Regional Wet Weather Plan (LTRWWP) to achieve compliance with the Clean Water Act and USEPA's Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Control Policy.

The CMAC membership is committed to presenting ideas, concerns, questions and answers representative of individual constituencies and fellow municipalities that complement the development of wet weather solutions to serve the region's best interest



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING AGENDA

#1

CMAC Meeting / Number 12
Thursday, November 10, 2011/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building

1. **Welcome** **Arletta Scott Williams**, ALCOSAN Executive Director

2. **Meeting Objectives** **Janai Michelle Williams**, E. Holdings

3. **Municipal Advocacy** **Janai Michelle Williams**, E. Holdings

4. **Draft Municipal Feasibility Studies** **Tim Prevost**, ALCOSAN

5. **Wet Weather Planning Update** **Dave Bingham**, AECOM

6. **Public Outreach** **Nancy Barylak**, ALCOSAN

7. **ALCOSAN Regionalization/Consolidation Study** **Dave Bingham**, AECOM

8. **Next Steps** **Janai Michelle Williams**, E. Holdings

Handouts:

1. Meeting # 12 Agenda
2. Meeting # 12 Evaluation Form
3. A copy of the letter sent to municipalities in complex sewershed regarding draft Municipal Feasibility Studies and a list of municipalities in receipt the letter



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

AGENDA

CMAC Meeting / Number 13
Tuesday, March 20, 2012/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building

- | | |
|---|---|
| I. Welcome | Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director |
| II. Meeting Objectives | Janai Williams Smith, E. Holdings |
| III. Municipal Advocacy | Janai Williams Smith, E. Holdings |
| IV. Basin Planning Report | Dave Bingham, AECOM |
| V. Municipal Information Update | Dan Lockard, ALCOSAN |
| VI. Wet Weather Planning Update | Colleen Hughes, CDM-Smith |
| VII. ALCOSAN Regionalization/Consolidation Study | Jan Oliver, ALCOSAN |
| VIII. Public Outreach | Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN |
| IX. Next Steps | Janai Williams Smith, E. Holdings |

Handouts:

- CMAC Meeting #13 Agenda
- Meeting # 13 Evaluation Form



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

AGENDA

CMAC Meeting / Number 14
Wednesday, May 23, 2012/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building

#1

-
- | | |
|---|---|
| I. Welcome | Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director |
| II. Meeting Objectives | Janai Williams Smith, E. Holdings |
| III. Municipal Advocacy | Janai Williams Smith, E. Holdings |
| IV. Municipal Information Update | Tim Prevost, ALCOSAN |
| V. Wet Weather Plan Update/Discussion-update | Colleen Hughes, CDM Smith Tom Schevtchuk, CDM Smith, & Jan Oliver, ALCOSAN |
| VI. Regionalization Study & Review Panel | Jan Oliver, ALCOSAN |
| V. Public Outreach | Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN |
| VI. Next Steps | Janai Williams Smith, E. Holdings |

Handouts:

- Meeting # 14 Agenda
- Draft Letter to Elected Officials on behalf of CMAC
- Meeting # 14 Evaluation Form

Meeting Summaries



ALCOSAN Customer Municipality Advisory Committee Discussion Session Notes

Meeting Purpose / Number: CMAC Meeting Number 1
Date / Time: Wednesday, February 18, 2009, 10:30 am
Location: William C. Trefz Boardroom

The following notes summarize the discussion segment from the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee Meeting held on the above referenced date. Response indicates a summary of the answer given to a direct question; comments represent general information shared, not directly associated with a question; and discussion signifies that a continued dialogue about the question and/or comment with participation from multiple parties.

REGULATORS & FLOW MONITORING

Question: What is a “regulator” in the system?

Response: It is an overflow mechanical device that restricts flow to the plant; some regulators are simply plates to restrict flow patterns.

Additional explanation for the purpose of this summary: A regulator is a structure that functions as a flow control device to the ALCOSAN interceptor system. Regulators are typically located immediately upstream of a CSO discharge point to a local waterway. Flows enter the chamber and are directed through a flow control device, typically a tipping gate or orifice plate. This flow control device can be adjusted to allow measurable quantities of wastewater to enter the ALCOSAN interceptor pipelines which will ultimately convey the wastewater to the treatment plant. Flows in excess of the allowable flow capacities typically crest a static weir wall and overflow to the local receiving water body.

Question: Has there been any flow retention by businesses?

Response: None to date. Flow retention is related to batch discharge, this would be from manufacturers or companies that do batch runs with periodic discharge. These are users with the ability to schedule a discharge into the system. Also, parking lots and other structures where water is physically retained are other ways to consider flow retention.

CUSTOMER MUNICIPALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Question: How will the CMAC function with the other components of the program? What is their role?

Discussion: In compliance with the Consent Decree (CD), the group will meet a minimum of quarterly. Additional frequency is at the discretion of ALCOSAN and/or the CMAC, and will be in line with the program milestones and significant events. The CMAC’s role is to assist in soliciting stakeholder buy-in and approval of the WWP. Additionally, in the near future, the CMAC members should consider attending the next Basin Planning Committee for their respective basin and attending the next 3RWW program meeting. The CMAC is a mandate of the CD, however, you are resources and the role and focus of this group will evolve overtime. ALCOSAN is anticipating good representation at CMAC meetings from the membership. The scope of work for the CMAC will be driven by the WWP program. Interim meetings will have roughly a 3 week lead time where possible.

PROGRAM FUNDING AND RATES

Question: Has ALCOSAN applied for Economic Stimulus funds?

Discussion: Yes. ALCOSAN will and has applied for all relative funding. ALCOSAN cautions that not all available funds are attractive or accessible because of their bond capacity. ALCOSAN recently submitted a PENNVest application. The program manager is always looking for both obvious and creative financing opportunities.



ALCOSAN Customer Municipality Advisory Committee Discussion Session Notes

Meeting Purpose / Number: CMAC Meeting Number 1
Date / Time: Wednesday, February 18, 2009, 10:30 am
Location: William C. Trefz Boardroom

Question: What is the plan for long-term rate structure? This year ALCOSAN anticipates an X percent increase and next year a Y percent increase? Is there a way to communicate the long term projections?

Discussion: At this time, ALCOSAN is unable to commit to a long term rate structure; there are too many unanswered questions. There are several factors that will determine rates in the future and the only guarantee is that rates will continue to increase. However, these increases will not solely address the program solutions. It is important that ratepayers and customers understand the cost of inflation.

Question: Are rates going to increase going forward?

Discussion: Yes. Even in the absence of the WWP program, there are inflationary factors, fuel cost increases, construction costs, etc. It is best to prepare for multiple rate increases moving forward. The PA Municipal Authority Association has a listing of rate increases on their site.

Comment: Michael Kenney has a rate study available for anyone's use. Simply email him and he will distribute the information.

SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS (SEPs)

Question: How are the SEPs related to the fines imposed on ALCOSAN?

Discussion: There is \$3 million being spent for the SEP efforts. However, the fines were initially estimated at \$9 million and through negotiations ALCOSAN was able to reduce the fines.

Question: What are the community improvements from the SEPs? What will make it [the program and its costs] an easier sell? Are there SEPs that are community improvement projects?

Discussion: At this time the SEPs are not specifically community improvement projects and are currently outlined in the Consent Decree in Appendix J. It is important to note that there are other control alternatives that can provide the benefits of a community improvement project.

BASIN PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Question: With whom does ALCOSAN have the most contact? Engineers?

Discussion: No, it is anticipated the most contact will be with elected officials. ALCOSAN is targeting municipalities and elected officials, though for technical purposes ALCOSAN does focus on engineers and managers.

Question: How is the participation at the BPC meetings?

Discussion: Participation varies. Most Basins have been well represented by their municipal engineers at the meetings.

COMMUNICATION WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS

Question: Is there a lack of feedback [at the BPC meetings]?

Discussion: Currently there is significant representation from the [engineering] consultants. The elected officials may be missing information related to the magnitude and financial implications of the program. The elected officials must be involved and engaged because they have to vote and support the cost of the program; the program needs their buy-in. ALCOSAN will attend council meetings, etc where feasible to reach out to those officials.



ALCOSAN Customer Municipality Advisory Committee Discussion Session Notes

Meeting Purpose / Number: CMAC Meeting Number 1
Date / Time: Wednesday, February 18, 2009, 10:30 am
Location: William C. Trefz Boardroom

Comment: Perhaps the CMAC with ALCOSAN can start writing to elected officials for engagement and participation. Every elected official should get a letter to encourage accountability from each official.

Comment: In order to inform and engage public officials, this may require “progress reports” to the municipalities on a quarterly basis to be on the agenda at Council meeting. This will allow the information to be part of the record for the elected officials.

Question: How should ALCOSAN communicate the “progress reports” report?

Discussion: Suggestions included:

- Sending the report to the manager to be included in the monthly manager report or to the secretary to be included with that information.
- Consider making the report an executive summary.

Question: What about the information that is going over the heads of the elected officials? What if they do not receive the information?

Discussion: ALCOSAN will incorporate the suggestions presented and the report will be a hybrid between a white paper and a newsletter.

EDUCATION OF PROGRAM COSTS

Question: There is a top-down disconnect related to the cost impact. How do the CMAC and ALCOSAN educate the elected officials?

Discussion: We have to reach the general public in order to reach the officials.

Question: How can the CMAC with ALCOSAN address the community without the manager? When should they use their engineer? Who is going to pay for those costs?

Discussion: Most Boards and Councils want the manager or engineer to go to meetings and bring back summarized information for their review. The picture should not be painted that the money for this program is going to come from somewhere else. Each community is going to be responsible for contributing. Information needs to be distributed to the public about what has to be fixed and that the municipalities and public will have to pay.

Comment: The CMAC and ALCOSAN should not ignore the inequality throughout the county, particularly Wilkesburg. Wilkesburg cannot look independently because our average income is low and our taxes are high. There needs to be a little more sympathy and consideration of flexibility for areas such as these whose average household income is only \$25,000.

Comment: The CMAC and ALCOSAN also need to remember “full-cost pricing.” Historically, municipalities have priced services artificially low. As service providers, we are not priced to account for the full-cost of the services at approximately 4 percent per household. The [full-cost pricing] is what, as service providers, we need the customer base to understand.

Comment: The CMAC and ALCOSAN need to provide the general public with benchmarked rates from across the county. In addition to benchmarking, the CMAC and ALCOSAN should be cautious to add the percentage of burden, as the EPA’s interpretation on the financial impact. The CMAC and



ALCOSAN Customer Municipality Advisory Committee Discussion Session Notes

Meeting Purpose / Number: CMAC Meeting Number 1
Date / Time: Wednesday, February 18, 2009, 10:30 am
Location: William C. Trefz Boardroom

ALCOSAN need to educate the rate payers on their rights and bring to their attention to the fact that they have not had a rate increase in a long time.

FEASIBILITY STUDIES

Comment: During the feasibility study process there will be required information exchange between the municipalities and ALCOSAN that will enhance communication. Everyone needs to budget for feasibility studies in the next few years.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH GENERAL PUBLIC

Question: Can ALCOSAN do PR through enclosures in the bills? People do not understand the Consent Decree; it is important and should be meaningful to them. It is also a cost-effective way to communicate.

Discussion: There are only five agencies which ALCOSAN directly bills so a unified bill insert is not feasible. Our experience has been that ratepayers only pay attention to rates and property taxes, so ALCOSAN has had to reach out to them with different mechanisms. ALCOSAN participates in a number of events, elaborated on previously, to help educate our rate payers on ALCOSAN and this challenge. Our next steps are to reach out into the communities.

Comment: Applaud Nancy on her efforts in engaging the public thus far.

NEXT STEPS

CMAC

1. CMAC members are asked to provide feedback and comments on the Consent Decree Booklet located under "Program Materials" tab by March 20, 2009 to Nancy Barylak ALCOSAN PR Manager.
2. CMAC members are asked to submit ideas on better ways/opportunities to reach out to elected officials, municipalities, and general public.

ALCOSAN

1. ALCOSAN will distribute a preliminary quarterly meeting calendar for the CMAC.

Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, nancy.barylak@alcosan.org, 412.734.8353
- James Protin, AECOM, Municipal & Public Relations Coordinator, james.protin@aecom.com, 724.977.5176.
- Janai Michelle Williams, AECOM|Ebony Holdings, Public Relations Coordinator, jmwilliams@eholdings.biz, 412.434.6571.

We believe that the above accurately reflects the key point of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to James Protin, AECOM (james.protin@aecom.com) or 412-316-3503) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

CMAC Meeting Number 2
Tuesday, May 12, 2009, 10:30 am
Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

The following summarizes the discussion segment from the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee held on the above referenced date. The term “response” indicates a summary of the answer given to a direct question; comment represents general information shared, not directly associated with a question.

Welcome: Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director

Arletta Williams opened the meeting by introducing Lugene Keys of KCI Technologies as the newest member of the ALCOSAN Consultation team. A full agenda had been planned, to include updates and discussion on the following items: the Wet Weather Program, the Basin Planning process, and the Committee’s issues and concerns. These items will enable ALCOSAN to develop the most effective, long term WWP ever seen by the regulatory community.

Program Status:

Wet Weather Program Review: Jan Oliver, ALCOSAN Director of Regional Conveyance

Jan Oliver noted that the meeting would be conducted informally and if there were questions during the presentation, participants should ask or provide any feedback.

General Basin Planning Overview/Updates: Dave Bingham, AECOM Water

Explanation of the Basin Concept

ALCOSAN started the WWP process in 2002 in partnership with CDM. The basins provide a more localized process to include additional expertise from outside the company. Members of the CMAC represent each of the seven basins and together we can gather detailed observations, concerns, and issues. ALCOSAN provides program details to take back to the municipalities so that more knowledge exists about the entire process. This is a major role for the CMAC in this process.

The Basin Planning Committee should be used as a liaison for the CMAC to come directly to ALCOSAN with issues.

Information exchange updates

- Mapping of sewer systems - There are neighborhoods connected that ALCOSAN was not aware of. This information is important for flow data.
- Flow splits – Some areas were found where the flow splits. CMAC members are familiar with their systems and with this expertise we can go beyond the mapping.
- Discovered SSO’s (sanitary sewer overflows).
- Knowledge- This kind of information is very valuable to us.
- MDS Site- there is value in the information on this site.

Development of Working Models

Models are being developed (critical sewers) and will be completed in September 2009, at which time the models will be calibrated. This will help us to better assess the level at which the system is capable of conveying flow. This is important to the feasibility process; additional information that may be of importance will be presented to the process and should be provided to ALCOSAN. Critical sewer maps and models will be available to the municipalities for the planning process and will be used to develop the WWP.

ALCOSAN is using the SWMM Model (Storm water Management Model) – the most widely used model nationally. It is important to look at flow monitoring data, paying particular attention to spikes,



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

CMAC Meeting Number 2
Tuesday, May 12, 2009, 10:30 am
Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

infiltration, and inflow. These are all things you would assess when information is gathered from flow data.

WWP Issues

Since 2001 water quality sampling has been performed. During 2001 to 2006, ALCOSAN's focus had been on bacteria.

- Flow monitoring data will be analyzed; work begins at the municipal level.

If the CMAC needs more information or hears any new information, please bring those issues to the meetings.

Stream Survey - ALCOSAN's focus is on the following:

- What are the uses of these rivers and how often they are used during wet weather?
- Helps determine site location issues.
- Utilized by consultants and ALCOSAN.

Many of the river locations are at the mouth of your streams; we are sampling the river at these locations to get impacts from that particular stream. Wet weather sampling is more difficult to mobilize. ALCOSAN has a contract with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) to carry out this effort. Fifty-one locations are currently being sampled.

Stream surveys will be used to identify the use of rivers under varying rainfall conditions. These surveys will support our assertion to regulators as a regional plan in the most cost-effective means possible. Surveillance cameras on the main rivers are also being considered.

Controls

“Convey it, Hold it; Move it; Treat it.” Each team should familiarize themselves with these processes to make sure the project uses the best technology regionally. It is also about the philosophy behind the technology. We have to present this to regulators to get their buy-in with regards to the location of facilities. Certain technologies bring with them a philosophy that you will need to ask more about the technologies to understand the philosophy behind it.

Question: Is ALCOSAN experiencing any dry weather capacity issues? (Reference made to the revaluation ALCOSAN conducted of Plan 537).

Response: This is not only a cost issue, the question is can we actually do this? ALCOSAN is conveying dry weather flows with no problem. It is the wet weather flows that are the issue.

All wet weather flow would increase from the existing 250 MGD (million gallons a day) of wet weather flow to approximately 800 MGD or more.

Creating, building, and opening more plants could potentially result in starving this system. ALCOSAN is unclear about what role that Federal government wants it to fulfill. We have the ability to handle the increased flow here. We're re-evaluating what we did under the Act 537 plan in '96.

Question: Can we have multiple treatments upstream?

Response: None given



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

CMAC Meeting Number 2
Tuesday, May 12, 2009, 10:30 am
Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

Question: Is there a need for more secondary plants and is ALCOSAN looking beyond secondary treatment plants?

Response: None given

Question: What measures are being taken in the City as it relates to roots & gutter drainage? What were the issues that the boroughs were having as it related to SSO's & CSO's? (I.e. roof drainage) The situation that was raising questions actually had to do with Urban Run Off. This presents an entirely different range of contributors to pollutants.

Response: None given

Question: Will the City be required to take care of this issue?

Response: None given

Where are the municipalities going to get money to fund these requirements? There looks as though there will be quite a few costs looming.

Question: Will the municipalities be reimbursed? How will these requirements benefit the municipalities? It appears like the only benefactor is ALCOSAN.

Response: There has to be an understanding that the wet weather the Basins receive also flows down to ALCOSAN. ALCOSAN is still receiving wet weather even after it has stopped raining. ALCOSAN continues to treat what the municipalities hold and store. (Consider joint facilities?)

Existing resources that are currently available to the Basins include: ALCOSAN, CDM and research studies gathered from other cities that are experiencing similar issues. Basins are encouraged to utilize these resources to the fullest.

There is also an urban storm water runoff issue. We need to make sure we develop the most common sense, cost-effective plan possible. All of the technologies are being evaluated. Feel free to talk with the Basin Planners and CDM about these technologies.

Roundtable Discussion: James Protin, AECOM Water

We are trying to identify total costs both locally and regionally. More information and numbers are needed in order to have a dynamic and conclusive conversation on costs.

Financial Analysis/ Early Action Projects/Funding (Multi-Municipal Contributions):

Jan Oliver took advantage of this opportunity to segue into Financial Analysis. What's affordable? It is important for ALOCSAN's costs and your costs to be included so that we can determine how we're going to address this problem. Rate structure, financing, and consolidation all need to be considered. Collectively, ALCOSAN's finances and the municipalities' finances are very important to solving this problem.

ALCOSAN wants to work with the municipalities. Our early action projects allow us to focus on what we can do to rehabilitate existing systems with multi-municipal applications. We can then apply for multi-municipal funding. It is important that we gain support from state and federal politicians throughout the project.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

CMAC Meeting Number 2
Tuesday, May 12, 2009, 10:30 am
Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

Available Funding Resources Include:

RUS Program – Some municipalities are eligible. ALCOSAN should provide the Basins with information to research this grant for themselves.

PENNVEST – The wet weather issue and the importance of the Consent Decree has elevated ALCOSAN and the municipalities to the top of the list for funding consideration. Submitted documents under the program were approved quickly. Interest loans and grants are available for those who qualify. ALCOSAN is willing to work with municipalities on the process required for applying for such funding. Pennvest has also set aside 20% of Grant Monies for Greening efforts. Government officials are looking closely at the development of green infrastructure.

Green Infrastructure:

This is a control that will benefit the entire region. Green applications like bio-retention basins, roof gardens, and rain gardens, generate interest and support from the public. (Jim noted that Nancy Barylak has a fact sheet with green ideas that was originally developed for ALOM but can be adapted for use by the municipalities.) As sewer rates go up, people are less likely to object when they see that green initiatives are part of the updates. ALCOSAN is looking at funding sources for this green technology.

ALCOSAN strongly encourages the CMAC's involvement. This will ensure that the municipalities are being heard and are provided with the information they need to make valuable contributions to the overall WWP process. The further we go on the feasibility studies, the greater the cost may become. Therefore, any green technology used must be included early in the planning phases. Most towns have embraced the "greening up" trend. North Hills is now required to include greening in their development efforts. It was also stated that Frick Park is gaining more support for their effort in implementing green practices. Wilkinsburg is looking to become a destination for greening and is looking for funding.

Financial capabilities analysis should be seriously considered. Basins should immediately start researching bookkeeping matters.

ALCOSAN is revisiting the 537 Plan from 1996. As previously stated, all technologies are being evaluated. Other options to consider would be to look at other city programs and take advantage of some of the strategies and expertise of these cities.

Question: Where does the money come from?

Response: The money comes from all the same places, the rate payers.

By partnering with the basins, ALCOSAN is trying to identify total cost impact for both local and regional areas, by assessing the following:

- It helps identify what's affordable.
- It is important for ALCOSAN's costs and municipal costs to be included in what it is going to take to fix this problem.
- Everyone needs to pay more attention to bookkeeping.
- Both ALCOSAN and your finances are very important in this process.

General Basin Planning Overview/Updates Continued:



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

CMAC Meeting Number 2
Tuesday, May 12, 2009, 10:30 am
Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

ALCOSAN's WWP is due in 2013 and the CMAC is acting as liaison between ALCOSAN and the customer municipalities. We have a little over 3 years of this process ahead of us. The feasibility study process should be a collective effort by each basin. The Basin feasibility studies will be affected by the others, whether directly or indirectly. During the Feasibility Working Group Sessions (FWGS), ALCOSAN and the Basin Coordinators are sharing technical information and best practices. We are currently working on GIS to keep the region up to speed on current data. We want you to be aware of what is being done so that you can effectively communicate this information to the municipalities. ALCOSAN wants CMAC's input on to what information the municipalities need. Budgets and cost control will be discussed at upcoming meetings within a month or two.

Communication with local business and organizations that will be affected is very important to the project goals and objectives. The entities should be evaluated for inclusion in our efforts (i.e. If Giant Eagle wants to build a new building, then they would have to agree to make room for a holding tank on-site or in close proximity to the new infrastructure.) This process would not require a lot of money; the municipalities engineer would be responsible for seeing this process through from design to implementation.

Reports should be provided to managers on any related efforts. It cannot be stressed enough that this must remain a collective effort. Working together in an honest, professional manner is a must.

The Municipalities did not have a hand in determining where the streams are located and they are concerned that they will be responsible for the majority of the project costs which they deem is unfair and was intentionally designed by the borough and PennDot.

Feasibility Study Working Group

This group is comprised of municipal engineers, municipal managers, ALCOSAN Managers, 3 Rivers and regulatory agencies. The group encourages more involvement by municipal engineers.

Question: Can we have a list of the participants and meeting logistics emailed to us?

Response: The meetings are held in Greentree at 9am, the 2nd and 4th Thursday of every month. Everyone is encouraged to attend.

Basin Planning Overview/Updates: Tim Prevost, ALCOSAN

Flow Monitoring updates

- The program is complete
- QA/QC data is available on ALCOSAN's municipal website and additional information is available on the 3 Rivers Wet Weather MDS website.

Data Analysis updates

- 3Rivers WW completed short term municipality monitor.
- 3R WW is looking to complete the long term (long term what?).

BPC meeting #3 was held in February/March. Updates include:

- Information exchange.
- Finalizing model extents.
- Review affordability assessment.
- Request for municipalities' input on agendas since there has been none thus far.

Handouts: the Basin Planning Committee (tentative) schedule for meeting # 4.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

CMAC Meeting Number 2
Tuesday, May 12, 2009, 10:30 am
Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

BPC meeting #4 (June) updates

- Early action items (Jan touched on).
- Technology screening, really want to discuss siting.
- Multi-municipal coordination.
- Municipal feasibility study.
- 5 out of 8 of the next BPC meetings have been confirmed.

The issue remains with getting municipal officials to attend the meetings and to have more than one representative present the message to the people as opposed to one person's view impacting so many people, as is the current situation.

When talking about site location, municipalities may be more cooperative than you may think. Familiarity with the site locations is important for understanding and is highly encouraged for all teams.

Question: Is ALCOSAN looking for municipalities to identify these sites, or will ALCOSAN identify?

Response: At some point all sites are going to be investigated but we really want the municipalities to come forth first. We are asking for ideas from municipalities, but we want sites close to our facilities and there are issues such as hydraulics, and the sites need to be expandable sites.

ALCOSAN needs to understand the municipality's strategy. The challenging part is the municipalities are holding back because they do not have a clear understanding of what is required for the feasibility study. Multi-municipal issues are the hardest to resolve.

Question: Do the other municipalities know that there is a working multi-municipality program?

Response: The difference is they have the notoriety, if it floods everyone is aware of it.

Regionally, no efforts are moving forward regarding collective efforts; the mindset to just think municipality specific, basin specific, borough specific, etc. How are the municipalities going to fulfill their requirements if they have not grasped the understanding or concept of what is happening or what they are dealing with concerning the entirety of the project?

Consider some different or effective solutions to communicate to the elected officials. There is a language barrier. It would be easier to relay the message to residents once elected officials understand.

Cost comparisons need to be done publicly. Can you provide a cost comparison for the public that explains how much money it will cost in the future and how much it will cost if we fix the problem now and do things differently?

Question: If each municipality is doing their own feasibility study, wouldn't it be more cost effective to combine efforts and do one large study?

Response: But, you need to use your experience and do one for your own municipality. Everyone including you has a lot of background that can be brought to the table. Collective efforts will be determined once the individual studies are completed. This entire problem is related to what is in the pipes and the message needs to be communicated this year.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

CMAC Meeting Number 2
Tuesday, May 12, 2009, 10:30 am
Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

Question: Can ALCOSAN's existing pipes handle all the flows that have been researched?

The regulatory agencies have not given us what they are looking for in the feasibility study. When the residence find out that it will be cheaper to be consolidated, we will get push to do it. It is all about dollars and cents. Municipal agreements may be needed or revisited as we get into more of the feasibility studies.

Added benefits of the project are getting ALCOSAN and the municipalities to work together and in educating the public on the WWP and the general water systems. The message must be simple and easy to understand in a way that keeps them interested and motivated to get involved in the process. When talking about clean water, you can say that we need to do things or people are going to get sick.

The public will pay attention when they understand that it is cheaper to consolidate

The boards are looking at compliance with the Consent Decree, but they have not taken action as required. If good ideas for regionalization are presented, the boards' status may change.

Facilities are going to be influenced by site land.

Note: Arletta Scott Williams pointed out that the committee had not covered the entire agenda. She suggested that the committee reconvene in June rather than wait till the next quarterly meeting. There was no expression of disagreement, so Arletta noted that the committee would be notified electronically of the next meeting date.

Public Participation: Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Manager of Public Relations

Logistics for ALCOSAN's Science Summer Camp were given.

Nancy provided statistics regarding the scholastic outreach program and distributed the outreach brochure to the committee members. It was suggested that the members provide the information to schools throughout their own municipalities who may benefit from participating in the program.

Next Steps: Jim Protin, AECOM Water

CMAC members will be receiving an email with some tentative dates and times inviting them to attend a follow-up meeting in June, meeting two.

Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org, 412.734.8353
- Matt Smith, AECOM Project Manager, matt.smith@aecom.com, 412.297.4504
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings Public Relations Coordinator, jmwilliams@eholdings.biz, 412.434.6571

We believe that the above accurately reflects the key point of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings (jmwilliams@eholdings.biz) or (412.434.6571 ext 224) within five (5) of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

CMAC Meeting Number 3
Tuesday, June 23, 2009, 10:30 am
Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

The following summarizes the discussion segment from the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee held on the above referenced date. The term “response” indicates a summary of the answer given to a direct question; comment represents general information shared, not directly associated with a question.

WELCOME: Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director

Arletta Scott Williams, opened the by thanking the participants for their time and commitment to the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC).

CMAC ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES:

Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, LLC

This meeting was to continue the discussion from CMAC meeting #2. Some of the major talking points from meeting #2 are the basin planning process, early action projects (EAP), green infrastructure, and communication with the municipalities. The group was encouraged to discuss its role and responsibilities

ALCOSAN anticipates the CMAC members will continue to participate and provide comments throughout the development of the WWP. This input will provide information on related plan development issues which ALCOSAN may take into consideration. The following items are important to remember:

1. The group is a mix of elected officials and municipal managers that were chosen as regional representatives. This group is not comprised of engineers because the intent is to communicate and gather information that is non-technical in nature.
2. The group is to provide a collective discussion on municipal concerns. Although each municipal representative may have a specific set of concerns, these concerns should be examined collaboratively by the CMAC. This will allow each municipality to share their concerns, questions and experiences.
3. The members are strongly encouraged to attend the Basin Planning Committee (BPC) meetings for the respective basins in which they are located. The participation of the CMAC members at the BPC meetings allows for the exchange of information between meeting municipal participants and the basin engineers and representatives.

ROUNDTABLE SESSION:

Lugene Keys, KCI Technologies

Communication with Elected/Municipal Officials

Communication Disconnect

The discussion on communicating with elected officials began with several participants emphasizing the following:

- Elected officials cannot always be reached electronically;
- Elected officials often want information presented in a bulleted format directly from the municipal managers;
- One way ALCOSAN can reach the elected officials is by providing printed materials directly to the managers; and
- Regardless of the outreach efforts, there will be some officials that will not respond.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

CMAC Meeting Number 3
Tuesday, June 23, 2009, 10:30 am
Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

Question: What are some alternative methods of communication besides email that are effective when trying to reach out to the elected officials?

- Newsletters
- Executive Summaries

Handout: ALCOSAN Basin Quarterly Activity Report Template. The Basin Quarterly Activity Report template is a byproduct of previous discussions on communicating with the elected officials.

Comment: There seems to be a communication disconnect between ALCOSAN and the elected officials. What is the nature of this disconnect? ALCOSAN first needs to communicate the basics by explaining several things:

1. As an elected official, why is my participation in the development of the WWP critical?
2. In addition to rate increases, what will be a result of the WWP?
3. What are the benefits?

When elected officials do not know the answers to these questions, they may feel helpless.

A coordinated effort between CMAC members and ALCOSAN must occur to reduce or eliminate the communication disconnect. Consider the following:

- What are some of the valid myths/barriers that municipalities and ALCOSAN should eliminate for the successful outcome of the project or public participation efforts to be successful? to break? (past & future);
- Existing relationships should be used to build relationships between “new” elected officials, managers, etc. Priorities within each municipality need to be set, shared with neighboring municipalities, and examined to see if there can be some collaborative efforts in sharing of resources;
- The language barrier needs to be examined closely; and

Building relationships and Multi-municipal issues/concerns

The municipalities are starting a new phase involving ALCOSAN and the planning feasibility study, and are not yet comfortable. The elected officials and municipalities need to work with ALCOSAN. Until the elected officials start to see numbers and feasibility, regionalization is going to be tough. Municipal feasibility studies cannot be completed independent of the ALCOSAN study and vice versa. A regional plan is required that will implement municipal and ALCOSAN developed WWPs.

ALCOSAN understands the level of difficulty required to develop the municipal feasibility studies. Municipalities need to be involved and need to understand the importance of their involvement in the feasibility studies and the O&M planning requirements.

Question: When doing the feasibility studies, how will the municipalities determine cost?

Response: No response.

Besides insurance payments, one of the biggest checks going out of the municipalities’ door is ALCOSAN’s service charge. We continue to be comfortable in our own communities, handling and dealing with our own problems which results in neighboring communities not reaching out to one another.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

CMAC Meeting Number 3
Tuesday, June 23, 2009, 10:30 am
Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

Question: If the fear of cost was removed, will people be more willing to come to the table?

Response: Yes. The majority of the members were in agreement. This topic may be opened for discussion in the future.

Floods are devastating but there is nothing worse than having sewage in your basement. Show the officials that what we are doing will keep this out. There is going to be a point where we will have to say, if they do not want to know, shame on them.

Question: What is an effective way to get everyone to the table?

Response: The managers present felt that their engineers were well equipped to be at the “table.”

- Some are of the opinion that because the elected officials come and go and the managers are in the municipalities for the long haul, that they (managers) are the key players in the communication process.
- Municipalities and communities should not wait until facing an issue to come together. There should be collaboration with neighboring municipalities, communities, and their engineers to bring awareness of the issue as a whole.

Communication with the General Public

The discussion on communicating with the general public began with several participants’ suggestions on how to inform and keep the public updated. These suggestions include the following:

- Adding a link to ALCOSAN’s website for residents to access WWP updates and important information related to the project.
- Providing information to the CMAC members so they too can share the overall message with the general public.
- Empower the general public. While educating the public on the development and direction of the Wet Weather Plan through a variety of avenues, share the education materials with municipal officials as they will be the first line of communication with their constituents. This may encourage the elected officials to renew their interest in the facts, issues, and opportunities associated with the WWP.
- An example of avenues to communicate with the public may include 3 Rivers Wet Weather public participation survey.

Educating the general public should not be seen as a burden, but as a chance to get them involved and create potential employment opportunities. If municipalities “fix” their sewer systems, municipalities will have less of a financial burden. As for the smaller municipalities, they are not worried about jobs but they are worried about how much this project will cost.

Question: Can the Basin Quarterly Activity Reports (BQAR) be put on the web site so that the public would have access?

Response: The reports are sent to the municipal managers and they are provided extra copies to distribute.

Note: The BQAR can be distributed through electronic mail, US mail, and made available at Basin Planning Committee meetings.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

CMAC Meeting Number 3
Tuesday, June 23, 2009, 10:30 am
Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

When communicating with the public about the status of work complete for the Consent Decree, ALCOSAN wants the information given to be as consistent as possible so that we are all providing uniform information to the public. If the public has an understanding of the project, they may eventually begin to support it. Benefits and activities of the WWP should highlight the information and communication presented to the general public. For example, we are all working together to save money. We need to figure out how to communicate to the public at a regional level to peak interest. There should be a way to convey the message that “we are cleaning up” environmentally, keeping in mind that the public appreciates getting the basic information.

Because ALCOSAN does not have the same level of contact with the general public (individual residences) like other utilities, the following avenues should be considered:

- Internet
- Television
- Direct mailings
- Churches and religious organizations
- Radio
- Literature/Flyers

Education on Program Costs

The municipalities want ALCOSAN to consider absorbing more of the costs. ALCOSAN is the expert, the municipalities cannot sell the services and ALCOSAN has been providing this service for years. There will be assumed pros and cons to debt consumption that the municipalities will have to address. If more work tasks are done collectively, the individual municipal costs may not be so high.

Question: How are the municipalities getting the money? It appears as if ALCOSAN has not considered this nor does it appear to care about the municipalities financial concerns.

Response: ALCOSAN is concerned with the municipalities’ financial capabilities.

A good example of a program that worked really well is the ALCOSAN flow monitoring. If ALCOSAN steps up and says, for another nickel or for another \$1 we will take care of this, we will sit back and say ok. The rates are going to go up anyway.

The more we do together the cheaper this will all be. ALCOSAN had a way to pay for their flow monitoring. It is not ALCOSAN charging the people; it is ALCOSAN charging the municipalities. The municipalities had a major burden lifted when ALCOSAN took on the cost of the flow monitoring fees.

Question: If ALCOSAN were to pay for something and charge the municipalities a fee, can the municipalities do real estate taxes to get the money to pay? If yes, why has not this been used before?

Response: The municipalities have various sources of funding.

Municipalities understand that there have been numerous studies completed which may be of value; however, the cheapest study, not the most effective study may be chosen if left up to the municipalities to decide. The suggestion was made that the municipalities could look into building systems that will help more than one community. Municipalities could identify a “host” community who may be willing to pay a little less than the other municipalities, because they would receive a credit for hosting the facility.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

CMAC Meeting Number 3
Tuesday, June 23, 2009, 10:30 am
Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

From feedback that some of the CMAC members have had with the constituents, some additional concerns regarding program costs and issues from their conversation(s).

Some of the municipalities visioning processes should include the following:

- Community improvements and economic development opportunities.
- A certain percentage of employment opportunities going to residents who live within the community.
- A series of forums and public meetings.
- The opportunity for the average citizen to go to managers/elected officials and discuss their views and opinions.

Some municipalities are smaller and may not have an issue with employment, but may have a financial concern.

NEXT STEPS:

Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN, Manager of Public Relations

CMAC important dates & updates

- News Release: a copy the News Release identifying CMAC members will be sent to the CMAC members before it goes to the media. Nancy will be submitting in the near future. Unanimous approval was given by the CMAC.
- A CMAC tab will be added on the ALCOSAN website. The CMAC will be given the opportunity to review and comment on the meeting summaries prior to them being posted to the ALCOSAN web site.
- CMAC meetings will be held quarterly. The next meeting is October 14, 2009 after ALCOSAN's open house which is September 19, 2009.

Handouts given: CMAC Public Participation & Stakeholder Involvement Activity Schedule 2009

ALCOSAN will communicate with CMAC members before the next meeting. The purpose of this dialogue is to:

- Provide updates on progress of ideas discussed at this meeting;
- Provide updates on major milestones and/or accomplishments;
- Inform members of activities that require or request CMAC participation. Identify additional information ALCOSAN needs to provide to the members; and
- Understand members can jointly communicate progress and updates on the program.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

CMAC Meeting Number 3
Tuesday, June 23, 2009, 10:30 am
Trefz Boardroom, ALCOSAN

Action Items:

1. ALCOSAN:
 - Provide copies of all Basin Quarterly Activity Reports to CMAC members and post the reports.
 - Issue a news release identifying the CMAC members.
 - Develop brief informational materials that can be distributed by the municipalities to their residents.
2. CMAC members:
 - Attend BPC meeting # 4. The time and location of the meetings will be distributed to the members once confirmed.

Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org, 412.734.8353
- Matt Smith, AECOM, matt.smith@aecom.com, (412) 297-4504.
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, Public Relations Coordinator, jmwilliams@eholdings.biz, 412.434.6571.

We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, (jmwilliams@eholdings.biz or 412-434-6571) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.



ALCOSAN.

Regional Wet Weather Plan

ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 4
Thursday, October 14, 2009, 10:30 am
ALCOSAN Trefz Boardroom

The following summarizes information from the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee Meeting #4, held on the above referenced date. The term “response” indicates a summary of the answer given to a direct question; comment represents general information shared, not directly associated with a question.

WELCOME: Arthur Tamilia, ALCOSAN, Director of Environmental Compliance

Arthur opened the meeting by thanking the participants for their time and commitment to the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC). He stated that there was a very full agenda and turned the meeting over to Colleen Hughes.

PROGRAM UPDATES: Colleen Hughes, CDM

Colleen began by providing an updated status of the Wet Weather Plan (WWP). The municipal flow monitoring program is now complete with the exception of some added/extended sites. Data collected is being used for model validation.

Question: Are you monitoring upstream to the baseline for stream quality?

Response: Yes, we also conducted dry weather monitoring. Three dry and three wet weather events were conducted to monitor what’s coming into the system at 50 sampling locations throughout the ALCOSAN service area.

CSO pollutant monitoring plan status:

- The dry weather sampling is complete
- Wet weather sampling is about 32% complete
- CSO’s are obviously making the situation worse
- Over the next several months we will be processing this data
- Continue to try and assess water quality

Recreational Use Survey: Surveys were conducted city-wide during the weekend. The purpose was to identify prevalent recreational uses and characterize current uses relative to discharge locations, frequency and volume. We will use the results to prioritize locations for water quality improvements. A report of the overall study will be submitted to ALCOSAN.

Dave Borneman, ALCOSAN

Dave provided an update on the progress of treatment plant expansion for the wet weather process. The strategy is to use existing areas and free up space for further treatment process. Controls and sites reports from basin screenings are expected this fall. This will help identify control alternatives to evaluate with H&H models and the Alternative Costing Tool (ACT).

- Source Control
- Storage
- Conveyance
- Treatment

Final Reports have been completed. In upcoming months we will begin to assess whether another pump system is required to double or triple capacity. ALCOSAN is aware that we may have to treat outside of the plant and municipalities may have alternative methods of treatment. However, all flows have to be treated. Another concept in the plan is to consider secondary treatment.

The Consent Decree requires us to explore the need for secondary treatment outside of service area. It is an enormous cost to expand the plant.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 4
Thursday, October 14, 2009, 10:30 am
ALCOSAN Trefz Boardroom

Some of the factors that ALCOSAN has to consider:

- How can we optimally add to the plant?
- Strategies to take advantage of some of the land/area of the plant
- Consolidate some of the campus
- Prospect to free up some property
- Explored possibility highway settings

The next step in the flow monitoring process is to start researching/assessing H&H characterization and future flow estimates. As the plan proceeds, we will be engaging the municipalities on a continuous basis. Some additional next steps include:

- Screening of control technologies and sites reports
- Alternatives development/analysis
- Cost estimating

The members were asked if they had any additional questions at this time, there were none.

Basin Planning Overview/Update: Dave Bingham, AECOM Water

Question: Have any of you been to any of the five Basin Planning Committee (BPC) meetings?

Response: Yes

We are just completing the 5th round of BPC meetings. At these meetings we basically present in detail the information that the Basin Planners are working on and ask for feedback on this progress. The Basin Planners are in the final stages of completing the H&H modeling. I believe that Tim Prevost is going to speak about sharing information with municipalities.

Screening of Control and Site Report (SCSR): During these meetings reports focus primarily on site locations that are ready to be used/readily available. We are trying to start early with identifying sites and gauging community reaction.

Question: Will ALCOSAN consider full dry and wet weather facilities.

Response: Yes

There will be a report produced and submitted to ALCOSAN in the months ahead which will detail the collective efforts of the Basins. In addition to the collective report, all seven basins will have individual reports. In terms of the question asked – what will ALCOSANs rate structure be for future facilities - right now, there's no answer to that.

Dave took to time to introduce Matt Smith, the newest member to the AECOM team. Our hope is to use some of his background experience with this type of project.

CMAC ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES: Janette Campbell, Ebony Holdings

We are in the process of preparing a CMAC Administrative Resource Sheet. This will be used as a tool by the CMAC members on how to effectively communicate with other CMAC members and ALCOSAN between quarterly meetings.

Some of the key points listed within the resource sheet consist of general meeting guidelines such as:

- Respecting the agenda
- Listening attentively to others
- Addressing the issues
- Being concise.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 4
Thursday, October 14, 2009, 10:30 am
ALCOSAN Trefz Boardroom

The guidelines also will include effective ways in which ALCOSAN and its extended staff can effectively communicate with CMAC members between quarterly meetings. These methods of communication will include but not be limited to:

- Proper distribution of key points and meeting summaries within 30 days of the meeting
- Providing members with key updates and information as information becomes available
- Communicating on a monthly basis with CMAC members through the Monthly Communication Report (MCR).

We understand that this is the first time members are hearing of this process. A draft was provided for members to provide feedback and comments. Members are encouraged to do so since open feedback and comments will help us to determine if there is a need for additional information within the guidelines. Members will have a 30-60 day window in which they can provide comments and feedback.

Members also were provided with the RSG draft Bylaws. The purpose of the RSG Bylaws is to:

- Promote efficiency, organization, define the roles of the members, and stipulate the requirements for membership.
- Provide direction and set parameters for effective public outreach and stakeholder participation (i.e. providing organization specific expertise and feedback) in the successful development of the Long-Term Wet Weather Control Plan (LTWWCP).
- To preserve consensus and maintain ALCOSAN's commitment to a consistent message.

CMAC members are being asked to review and provide feedback and comments on the Bylaws within 30-60 days.

Additional handouts to CMAC members included a CD-Rom with the ALCOSAN Public Participation Plan (PPP), which was submitted to the EPA in January of 2008.

Within the PPP there are details about the requirements of a Steering Committee for the Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG).

Members were informed that it is the decision of ALCOSAN's Executive Director to identify members who will serve on the Steering Committee for the Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG). Details of the Steering Committee's function are being formulated and more information regarding future actions will follow.

CMAC ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES:

As a brief overview, the Steering Committee will be responsible for:

- Preparing policy papers
- Establishing meeting outlines
- Focusing on the creation of sub-committees that will be responsible for handling key issues and concerns with the municipalities
- Serving as a spokesperson for the Regional Stakeholder Group

The Steering Committee would meet quarterly to fulfill these duties.

The CMAC Membership Directory is being updated to include member photographs and information on individual organizations. A sign-up sheet was distributed for members to provide information to a contact person from whom we could obtain a photograph of CMAC members for the new Directory. Members who were not present at the meeting will be contacted via email and/or phone for their information.

There were no questions regarding any of the handouts. The floor was opened to any CMAC member who participated in one of the two Plant tours that took place in August to give an update on their tour experience.

Response: The plant tour was very interesting. The member also was impressed with ALCOSAN's Open House and the fact that it gave the kids a hands-on experience at the plant.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 4
Thursday, October 14, 2009, 10:30 am
ALCOSAN Trefz Boardroom

We will be conducting a tour of the plant directly after the meeting. If there is anyone who would like to participate please contact Janette Campbell.

This is our fourth and final meeting for 2009.

CMAC AGENDA: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

Municipal Advocacy

Question: Has any CMAC member received public comments and/or feedback on any issues or topics that you would like to discuss?

Response: Yes, one issue is that everyone is starting to get “sewered out”. There are so many organizations and those who are involved are subject to repetition and those who are not involved are not being reached, and we need to figure out how to change that.

Comment: The Forest Hills Board of Directors is not involved; it is apparent that they don’t understand what is happening. The magnitude of information is large so they are not communicating to the community. The feeling is that they are waiting for ALCOSAN to conduct a meeting. More municipal interaction is needed.

Comment: More people are worried about what their rates will be. The impression is that some communities have buried their heads in the sand. Is there any way the communities who are doing I&I work can apply for grants or get an incentive program?

Comment: It is agreed that there should be communication with elected officials. In January it will be a new education process due to the turnover.

Question: Do any of the elected officials in the room have any comments?

Response: The bottom line is that in the end there is going to be a rate increase and most elected officials do not want to be tied to issues on rates. It was also stated that the elected officials are just unaware.

Response: Everything seems to be geared towards the consulting engineers, when it needs to be geared towards elected officials.

Response: The most effective way of getting through to elected officials is to educate the public and they will get to the elected officials. We have been asking for something that we can maybe put in our organizations newsletters that the general public can understand.

Liaison for ALCOSAN and Municipalities

There are three things that we have taken away from previous meetings and requests.

1. A Bi-monthly municipal newsletter has been developed. It will be one page, front and back. The front page will include Basin News and the back page will include ALCOSAN updates.

The first issue of *Municipal Connections* will be distributed in December 2009. It will mention the importance of municipality input and involvement being key. It also gives a brief overview of how the rate structure is calculated. ALCOSAN is encouraging all members to submit ideas for topics for future issues.

An email will be sent requesting the following feedback and more:

- Have you heard about people reading?
- How the newsletter was perceived?



ALCOSAN.

Regional Wet Weather Plan

ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 4
Thursday, October 14, 2009, 10:30 am
ALCOSAN Trefz Boardroom

Comment: Theoretically we are doing the right thing by having a newsletter like this. But on the other hand if you want to be practical you have to understand that nobody really cares. All they want is cliff notes. The public doesn't care until you raise their rates. I personally think that the newsletter is a good idea.

Comment: I disagree that the public doesn't care. Since our (Green Tree) newsletter has been out, we've reduced back-ups in basements and we have had a positive feedback. It is our job to let the people know and to ask them the question, do you want sewer in your basement or flooding at the curb. The more we can get out to the public the better.

Comment: There are people who won't care until they are impacted by a rate increase; they don't understand what is going on. I agree that in a lot of cases the elected officials are overwhelmed; they don't understand or have the time. They think that there is going to be an end point, but there is not. It is widespread and Green Tree can be considered an exception.

ALCOSAN understands that the planning process and efforts have been going for a long time. All points and suggestions are valid until we can determine what pieces connect and will result in the most effective overall plan.

2. Members mentioned at CMAC meeting #1 that you wanted to do a letter writing campaign. What are some of the key points that should be addressed within the letter? Members present expressed what they would consider key points to add to that letter. These key points are as follows:
 - a. EPA- Will fine municipalities (are you at risk of being fined?)
 - b. Some good fear would help.

Comment: We don't want to get the elected officials so involved that they become so distracted. The main goal is to keep them informed. We need to get to the end solution. Let's not get them politically charged.

Question: How far off are we on the end game?

Response: The costs are going to be realized next year. We keep hearing wild numbers and it is scaring everyone off. The end game is going to be regional. There are over 400 miles of major sewers that need attention.

There was a workshop; there will be a follow up. We are seeing the need to conduct sewer reduction, this is still a long process, and it is going to be 2010/2011.

Comment: A good point was made. How involved do we, the elected officials, want to get. Are there things that we can recommend be done soon, like early action projects?

Response: If they are on point with their feasibility studies.

Comment: The EPA wants to establish that ALCOSAN's municipalities are informed, educated and, on target with the program and its requirements. For example, if a municipality says that they can't do what is required of them in 15 years, but would instead need 50 years. The EPA can come in knowing that the municipalities are informed and they want a record of the action and dialogue. It is all about perception and building their case. We have to get them involved. ALCOSAN has to demonstrate that they have been involved.

Comment: Elected officials are going to have a turnover soon, which alone would be a great education piece. Art-You have to understand that this turnover is in January.

Question: Are there that many communities that are involved? Let them get fined. We need to make sure that we don't get bogged down by their lack of understanding.



ALCOSAN.

Regional Wet Weather Plan

ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 4
Thursday, October 14, 2009, 10:30 am
ALCOSAN Trefz Boardroom

3. Idea of Municipal Feasibility Study (handout #11) letter from ALCOSAN given an explanation for schedule attachment. The letter is for your reference.

At this time Dave Bingham gave an update on the Feasibility Study Working Group (FSWG). A goal for the FSWG is to start discussing ways to get to a point where municipalities can start to develop studies. 3RWW developed a draft Municipal Feasibility Study of key activities and deadlines in which the municipalities can follow. The schedule of key activities is as follows:

1. System Inventory/System Investigation
2. Flow Monitoring Program-complete
3. System Characterization - Almost Done, System Capacity – Deliverable that should be done
4. System Capacity Analysis

5. System I&I Screening Investigation – group is going through now
6. Detailed I/I System Investigation
7. Preliminary Flow Estimate and Strategy to ALCOSAN. How are municipalities working together?
8. Alternative Evaluation (1)- Internal Municipal Alternatives Compare and review all tasks
9. Alternative Evaluation (2) - Integrated Alternatives How is this going to be paid for and how will municipalities work together to get it done?
10. Compare/Review ALCOSAN Regional Alternatives

Members were given a copy a Feasibility Study Planning Schedule letter from ALCOSAN along with an attached schedule of Key Activities and End Dates required for the development of the ALCOSAN Regional Wet Weather Plan (WWP). This letter and schedule were forwarded to the Municipal Managers throughout ALCOSAN's 83 municipalities.

Working papers 2 through 9 are in draft form. The submission date for these deliverables is March 2010. We need to focus on the point of direction and get an idea that people are talking and that multi-municipal coordination is occurring. Give us the worst case scenario of what will be coming into ALCOSAN and we may be able to give a cost point. We are looking for input from the municipality, Basin Planners and Municipalities. Numbers are required by March 31, 2010.

Dan Lockard, ALCOSAN; Mike Licthe, ALCOSAN and Dave Minard, AECOM also attend these meetings. They may have something to contribute to these efforts.

Mike Licthe- Part of getting anticipated costs and numbers to ALCOSAN is to work with your neighboring municipalities. Open dialogue, which should be taking place now, is key to the successful outcome of this process. There are still roughly 15 municipalities who are not represented at these meetings, how do we get them involved? This is for the municipalities.

Communication with the General Public

Handouts 4 through 8 are current Fact Sheets on the CMAC, RSG, BPC, Stormwater Management and Stormwater Reduction. These documents have been put together to provide information to the general public. These documents can be provided electronically and/or via hardcopies upon request.

As was previously stated members were provided with a CD-Rom containing a copy of ALCOSAN's PPP. ALCOSAN has a draft plan and guidelines on how we want to engage the public which you can review.

Also contained on the CD- Rom are the Basin Quarterly Activity Report (BQAR) summer '09 issues.



ALCOSAN.

Regional Wet Weather Plan

ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 4
Thursday, October 14, 2009, 10:30 am
ALCOSAN Trefz Boardroom

Efforts are continuing to relay the message to the public and the Basin Planners have been charged with facilitating basin-specific public meetings. CMAC members are encouraged to participate and attend the meeting(s) closest to their municipality.

Basin Public Meetings:

The primary goal of these first meetings is to educate and engage the public concerning the overall WWP and the related issues. The first meeting will serve as a 101 introduction to ALCOSAN, the Wet Weather Plan; assess public awareness, the basin specific action plans and the public involvement options.

There will be a Basin Specific booth there. Meetings generally start at 7:00pm. Elected officials will be briefed one hour earlier.

Meeting Wrap-up:

We will summarize the key points of the meeting. These key points will be distributed to members within 30 days after the meetings and will develop into agenda items and topics to be discussed at the next meeting.

NEXT STEPS: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

- Members received a schedule for tentative CMAC meeting dates for 2010. These dates are just place holders for CMAC meetings next year at this point. If member knows of any conflicts please let us know as soon as possible.
- Public Comment Cards (PCC). Each member present received a set of PCCs, with an explanation included. The postage is prepaid so they can just be dropped into the mail and they will come directly to ALCOSAN where they are catalogued and/or responded to.
- You will be receiving a Administration Resource Sheet – Comments
- RSG By-laws (mostly administrative) 30-day comment window
- Municipal Connection newsletter is being distributed. Members will be provided a copy.
- Elected Official Letter. Member's feedback and comments will be incorporated into the existing draft.

Members who were not in attendance will receive handouts and other pertinent information via US Mail.

Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org, 412.734.8353
- Matt Smith, AECOM, matt.smith@aecom.com, (412) 297-4504.
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, Public Relations Coordinator, jmwilliams@eholdings.biz, 412.434.6571.

We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, (jmwilliams@eholdings.biz or (412) 434-6571) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this timeframe, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 5
Tuesday, March 2, 2010, 10:30 am
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

The following summarizes the discussion segment from the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee Meeting (CMAC) held on the above referenced date. The term “response” indicates a summary of the answer given to a direct question; comment represents general information shared, not directly associated with a question.

WELCOME: Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director

MEETING OBJECTIVES: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, LLC

The objective of this meeting was to discuss committee member concerns and questions related to the development of the Wet Weather Control Plan, provide a brief overview of relevant CSO control and alternative technologies, gather input and feedback on the draft criteria for evaluating proposed controls and sites, and discuss and determine next steps and action items for the next CMAC meeting.

MUNICIPAL ADVOCACY: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, LLC

The purpose of this portion of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for committee members to pose questions and present comments on topics of choice. Some of the major talking points included overall program costs, affordability, basin planner work products completed to date, consideration of green solutions, preliminary flow estimates, and Marcellus shale potential impacts.

The following is a summary of the questions, comments and responses that took place during this discussion.

Question: Roughly how much has ALCOSAN spent on the planning effort to date?

Response: ALCOSAN has spent approximately \$19.6 million and is about 47% through the basin planning effort.

Question: What are some of the work products available to date?

Response: Some of the deliverables include basin models, flow monitoring data and the Alternative Costing Tool (ACT).

Question: Will ALCOSAN consider affordability in its analysis?

Response: ALCOSAN has been tasked with identifying affordable solutions. In the late 90's when ALCOSAN was presenting on their conceptual Long Term Control Plan (LTCP), affordability or a “magic formula” was often referenced, in which a lot of factors are taken into consideration. When more detailed information is available, the point will be made to everyone to emphasis that affordability is a large part of creating a solution and that ALCOSAN's goal remains the same since square one - least cost solution to the rate payer.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 5
Tuesday, March 2, 2010, 10:30 am
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

Factors like median income and unemployment will be considered. Currently, rates that are 1.5 to 2% of median income are considered fair by governmental agencies that enforce compliance with clean water laws. It is recognized that these factors will vary greatly across the service area, therefore it was suggested by a committee member that the process begin with an affordability analysis then hone in on what alternatives can be applied based on what's affordable. It was pointed out by the ALCOSAN PM that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) expects alternatives over a range of control measures and requires other factors be considered such as the cost curve (knee of curve analysis) established to meet the objectives of the CSO policy and the Clean Water Act. Affordability is one of those factors being considered.

ALCOSAN recognizes there are issues with the application of the "magic formula" such as how to apply the 1.5 or 2%; does it consider existing debt? ALCOSAN was successful in making sure that SSO correction is a consideration when addressing affordability in the Wet Weather Plan (WWP).

Question: It was clarified that the municipalities have consent agreements with the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and Allegheny County Health Department (ACHD) and ALCOSAN's agreement is with ACHD, DEP and the EPA. Since the municipalities are not regulated by the federal government, is affordability going to be looked at from the local perspective or ALCOSAN's perspective and how do we encompass that when rate structures and median incomes vary greatly?

Response: ALCOSAN's goal is to capture total costs incorporating ALCOSAN and local costs.

This is also part of the financial data mining exercise that Three Rivers Wet Weather (3RWW) is facilitating. Part of this exercise's objective is to better understand what the municipal costs are and what municipal plans are in terms of future costs.

It is noted that the EPA drafted guidance did not consider a system as complex as the ALCOSAN system. Therefore, it was suggested ALCOSAN and the municipalities will have to sit down and make a unified case to the EPA.

Part of the collaborative alternatives development process with the basin planners, which will take place over the next few months, is to complete a knee of curve analysis or cost benefit analysis to determine the flow basis for sizing the alternatives. This is part of the process of narrowing down to the lowest- cost alternatives that, ultimately, will be put in front of the regulators.

Question: As we move forward what happens when there is a difference between what the municipalities agree to (their LTCP) with the regulators and what ALCOSAN develops on their end? How will this be coordinated going forward?

Question Follow-up: What is ALCOSAN's current relationship with the regulators? What is the current interaction with the EPA or strategy for addressing it?

Response: There has been interaction since the consent decree was implemented, specifically regarding deliverables such as flow monitoring plans, sampling plans, and overflow report plans. The DEP and ACHD also attend Feasibility Study Working Group (FSWG) and Basin Planning Committee (BPC) meetings so they are aware of how all parties are proceeding.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 5
Tuesday, March 2, 2010, 10:30 am
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

ALCOSAN BC Dave Bingham noted in his prior experience that the state is controlled by EPA Region 3 and this region is controlled by EPA headquarters. Even though EPA headquarters is not directly involved in the municipal agreements they will wield their influence to make sure everything works for the region.

ALCOSAN's coordination strategy is to be in compliance, make submissions on time and when there is an opportunity to make an argument make it, but also understand the regulators can hold ALCOSAN to their agreement.

Question: Have green solutions been considered in the Wet Weather Control Plan?

Response: Green solutions are being considered and will be "part of the toolbox." The solutions will not be a 100% green or 100% gray. The ultimate solution will most likely encompass green and gray solutions.

Allegheny County representative Jeaneen Zappa asked on behalf of the County Executive that ALCOSAN be very cooperative in incorporating green solutions into the final solutions. ALCOSAN acknowledged the request.

Question: General discussion revealed that the municipalities are concerned with the March 31st deadline for Preliminary Flow estimates. Is ALCOSAN still interested in receiving this data and can the deadline be extended? Can the municipalities forgo preliminary flow estimates and submit final flows?

Response: There is currently no extension. The reason why ALCOSAN asked for preliminary flow estimates was to get the municipalities that share upstream flows to start talking to each other. This coordination needs to take place in order to get accurate flow estimates at the downstream points of connection.

ALCOSAN recommended there be a high level of communication between basin planners and municipal engineers when determining preliminary flows.

ALCOSAN understands the level of complexity and difficulty in determining flows with multiple upstream municipalities and overflows. It was also noted that there are points of connection that are less complex in which the models may not have to be used and the flow monitoring data may be sufficient.

ALCOSAN PM suggested an estimate of flows be provided with the best available information and when the models and the H&H characterization reports are released the municipalities can then go back and "tweak" their flows.

ALCOSAN is going to provide a response to the municipalities regarding the due date of the preliminary flow estimates.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 5
Tuesday, March 2, 2010, 10:30 am
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

Question: Is the Marcellus Shale an issue that is being factored in; are the excess flows being considered? (Churchill Country Club has already leased land to a developer for the extraction of natural gas.)

Response: ALCOSAN is not currently required to receive this waste and has no plans to treat this waste stream. It was suggested that municipalities take it upon themselves to address the handling of waste in their communities and/or consider an ordinance to address this issue.

- As long as there are overflows and wet weather problems, the receipt of this waste cannot be considered.
- The nature of the waste including Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) can adversely affect the plant and the regulations regarding TDS limits are still pending with the DEP.
- It is roughly estimated that it would cost approximately one Billion dollars in treatment technology at plant in order to handle this waste stream.
- Odor and taste impacts are unknown.
- ALCOSAN would have to perform a treatability study in order to receive the waste and apply the new regulations to everyone that discharges to them.
- Some research says the waste needs to be addressed at the source or onsite.
- It is still unknown what additives the frac water is composed of which likely adds to the difficulty of ALCOSAN treating this water.
- This will remain an ongoing issue.

CSO CONTROL and ALTERNATIVES TECHNOLOGIES: Dave Bingham, AECOM

The purpose of this presentation was to briefly inform the group of relevant CSO Control Alternative Technologies for the development of the WWP and in preparation for the next discussion regarding on-site screening criteria. Handouts of this presentation were provided and the following summarizes the key points mentioned.

Dave informed the group that Site Screening and Controls reports were developed and used to identify sites for potential wet weather controls and the different technologies that might be employed at these sites. This information along with hydraulic models will be used to determine the best basin-specific solutions and then these solutions will be combined and evaluated to determine the best regional solution options while considering cost and affordability. Alternatives Analysis is a key phase this year in the planning process and ALCOSAN plans to work with the municipalities as this process moves forward.

There are four simple ways to group alternatives:

- Remove It
- Hold It
- Move It
- Treat It



Regional Wet Weather Plan

ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 5
Tuesday, March 2, 2010, 10:30 am
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

Remove It – Typically refers to getting the flow out of the system, potentially by moving it to another location.

- One example is sewer separation. This method tends to be expensive and disruptive.
- Green Technologies Case Studies:
 - Portland Oregon – Despite aggressive implementation of green technologies they still needed gray solutions in order to meet required control levels.
 - San Francisco – Very determined to implement green solutions but they found out how much factors such as soil conditions and steep slopes determined how green they could be. As a result, San Francisco ended up incorporating gray solutions as well.

Hold It – Storing flows

- Can be above or underground facilities.
 - Can be disguised into residential or historical neighborhoods so residents wouldn't know they are there.
- Tunnels can be used where it is difficult to site facilities on the surface.

Treat It – Treatment

- Detention/Treatment facilities – flow thru treatment and storage.
- Screening/Disinfection – flow is screened and then disinfected.
- Swirl/Vortex – works in circular fashion where grit and contaminates settle and underflow goes to the treatment plant.
- High Rate Treatment – more complex and yields high pollutant removal; harder to operate and maintain.
 - Vendors can provide systems such as Actiflow.
- Satellite Wastewater Treatment Plants (WWTP) – small plants in key locations; may be most optimum configuration of wet weather facilities.

Handout given: CSO Control & Alternative Technologies

EVALUATING SITE SCREENING CRITERIA (SCREENING OF WW CONTROL SITE ALTERNATIVES): Peter Thomas, AECOM

The purpose of this exercise was for the CMAC members to “weigh” the relative importance of the categories/factors (mentioned below). The information provided by the members would be used to assist with the evaluation of the alternatives. ALCOSAN would like to have an idea of what's important to the municipalities and stakeholders in general, in addition to cost. If a solution comes down to closely priced alternatives this exercise helps determine which of these factors will play most into the decision on which alternative to select.

The main categories for evaluating alternatives are listed below. Each Category is then further broken down into more specific items listed as Criteria. The criteria that pertained to each category were explained to give members a concept of what each category addressed is and are summarized as follows:



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 5
Tuesday, March 2, 2010, 10:30 am
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

Economic Factors – these are capital costs, operating costs, and predictability of cost

Question: What do you mean by Present Worth?

Response: This is the cost in today's dollars including capital, operating and maintenance costs.

Public Factors – How will this affect my community? It includes both disruptive factors during construction and/or more lasting beneficial use opportunities to local communities.

Question: Will the creation of jobs as a result of this program be considered a multi-benefit opportunity?

Response: Yes.

Water Quality, Public Health and Environmental Impacts – Reducing overflows into the rivers; reduction of bacteria in river; addressing sensitive areas (where people fish, boat and swim)

Operation Impacts – Technologies will have to be operated and maintained.

Implementation Impacts –include constructability and land acquisition.

Alternatives have three main components:

- land
- technology
- flow

Question: Was sustainability considered in any of the screening criteria?

Response: Yes. Sustainability is incorporated into various criteria listed. For example, costs associated with operation and maintenance (energy costs) and Environmental Impacts address sustainability of the ecosystem.

Committee members were asked to indicate which category they considered most important and to indicate the relative importance of categories. The tabulated results are as follows:

Economic Factors - 24%

Public Factors - 13%

Water Quality, Public Health and Environmental Impacts - 24%

Operation Impacts - 24%

Implementation Impacts - 15%

Discussion on Results:

- Results of this exercise have been collected and will continue to be collected from the Basin Planning and Stakeholder meetings.
- CMAC results diverge from the results collected to date. Economic Factors is usually the highest-rated category with Public and Environmental Factors being second or third but close in score to each other and with Operation Impacts and Implementation Impacts being close in score to each other but with the lowest scores.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 5
Tuesday, March 2, 2010, 10:30 am
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

Handouts given: ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING Definitions of terms, draft screening tool; DRAFT Screen Summary of ALCOSAN Wet Weather Control Site Alternatives.

PROGRAM KEY UPDATES: Dave Bingham, AECOM

The purpose of this portion of the meeting was to provide key program updates and milestones for 2010.

- The focus for 2010 will be on alternatives development and evaluation.
- Flow monitoring has been completed.
- H&H models are about to be distributed.
- The Sites and Screening Reports are in final review stages; the date for posting is not yet available.
- ALCOSAN will continue to attend Feasibility Study Working Group meetings.
- ALCOSAN will continue to hold Basin Planning Committee meetings in each basin.
 - Attendees were encouraged to get in touch with their Basin Planners if they have questions.

Janai provided a brief report on the municipal outreach with the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County public officials and administrators held by ALCOSAN on 2/17/2010 and 2/18/2010.

- Very important information was gathered from each of the meetings.
- The city meeting attendance was lower than what was anticipated but representatives from key departments such as the URA, City Planning, Mayor's Offices, PWSA, and City Council were in attendance.
- Some of the topics presented and discussed during these meetings included:
 - What is wet weather?
 - What is the issue we are dealing with?
 - ALCOSAN's work to date
 - Building blocks for the wet weather plan
 - What are the next steps?
 - How can they as elected officials and administrators participate and promote the WWP?
- A formal report summarizing the meetings will be provided at a later time.

NEXT STEPS: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, LLC

CMAC meeting #6 is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, May 11, 2010.

Suggestions for May agenda topics included:

- An update on the affordability analysis
- An update on findings from the preliminary flow estimates



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 5
Tuesday, March 2, 2010, 10:30 am
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

Additional Comments:

Allegheny County representative Jeaneen Zappa suggested the municipalities control implementation of green measures. The County recognizes that there are limitations but encourages creative solutions that can enhance the community. Dave Bingham suggested that green projects may be more likely to get funding and support. ALCOSAN has spent a lot of time researching these funding opportunities and it may be possible to move forward with a few pilot projects.

The current City hurdles are county plumbing code limitations and ongoing maintenance (who is responsible?). How do you enact storm water management initiatives or incentives when you do not have a funding source to do so? A resolution was passed authorizing the Mayor to begin negotiations with Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority (PWSA) for handling storm water. As a result, PWSA hopes to have a way for people to get credit for implementing onsite green storm water management solutions.

It was noted that issues face municipalities whose flow goes through the city and there is a need to get elected officials to attend meetings. How do we get these officials involved?

Attendees also were concerned with municipal managers not being involved in the process.

It was noted that there are more communities working together at the point of connection meetings.

Attendees also see benefits in using area Councils of Government (COG).

Question: Can a schedule of completed tasks be provided?

Response: Schedules/flow charts currently exist and can be modified and distributed for the purpose of this request.

Action Items:

1. ALCOSAN:
 - Provide municipalities with letter addressing the March 31st deadline for preliminary flows.
 - Compile BP schedule of work/tasks completed
2. CMAC members:
 - Tim Rogers indicated he will be submitting a letter to Arletta Williams requesting an extension on the preliminary flow estimate deadline.

Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org, 412.734.8353
- Peter Thomas, AECOM, peter.thomas@aecom.com, (412) 316-3603.
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, Public Relations Coordinator, jmwilliams@eholdings.biz, 412.434.6571.

We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, (jmwilliams@eholdings.biz or 412-434-6571) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting / Number 6
Tuesday, May 11, 2010/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

The following summarizes the discussion segment from the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting held on the above referenced date. The term “response” indicates a summary of the answer given to a direct question; comment represents general information shared, not directly associated with a question.

WELCOME: Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director

Arletta welcomed the members and made note of the new members. Arletta introduced Tom Schevtchuk with CDM and Anthony Catania with KBealer Consulting, the consultants who would give the presentation on “Understanding the Affordability Analysis Process”. She also asked everyone to introduce themselves and their organization.

MEETING OBJECTIVES: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

Janai discussed the goals of the meeting which included: 1) follow-up on questions from CMAC meeting #5; 2) continue the discussion on communicating with fellow elected officials, to include review of a draft letter to elected officials/municipal managers; 3) provide an update on the Allegheny League of Municipalities (ALOM) meeting held this past April; 4) discuss Municipal Advocacy; 5) review a draft vision statement for the CMAC and discuss any member input and feedback; and 5) present information on the Affordability Analysis Process.

BASIN PLANNING REPORT: Peter Thomas, AECOM

Peter directed the CMAC members to handout #3 in their meeting packet. This handout was prepared in response to the members’ request during meeting #5 on how much ALCOSAN has paid its planning consultants to date and their responsibilities. The report was intended to give an overview of project information for each of the seven basins and included information on: the schedule, deliverables, and upcoming tasks. The chart also captures the schedule and deliverables as of the end of March 2010. Peter noted that there are a few blanks on the chart indicating modeling tasks that had not been completed by the end of March. However, most of the models have been completed as of this date, and the model reports will be distributed shortly. Financial information is provided at the bottom of the chart including the budgets for each basin and how much has been spent as of the March 2010. The other side of the report provides a more detailed description of each task. ALCOSAN hopes this report captures the information the members requested.

Peter asked members if they had any questions. Members had no questions. Members thanked Peter for the information presented.

**COMMUNICATION WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS AND MUNICIPAL MANAGERS: Dave Bingham, AECOM
Lugene Keys, KCI**

Preliminary Flow Estimates were also discussed during meeting #5. It was noted that the computer models of system (H&H Models) have been provided to the municipalities and they are being used by the engineers to help determine the alternatives needed to eliminate SSOs and/or control CSOs. Tim Prevost is maintaining a log of all responses and communications related to preliminary flow estimates. Tim noted that responses have been received from all but four (4) municipalities. The remaining responses are expected to come in over the next 60 days.

Dave Bingham noted that the planning process is now shifting from discussing and determining flows towards alternatives development and technologies evaluations. Alternatives development will be the focus of the next few months for each basin. Within the packet of information given to each CMAC member was the Basin Planning Committee Series #7 meetings scheduled for June and July of 2010. Members are encouraged to attend meetings within their basin or as their schedule permits. Alternatives and Evaluation Analysis will be the topic of discussion at the next series of meetings. Presentations on sites and technology evaluations will be discussed. Input from the public and municipalities are welcomed. Dave concluded by commending the municipal representation and participation.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting / Number 6
Tuesday, May 11, 2010/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

Question: Who can attend the Basin Planning Committee meetings?

Response: The BPC meetings are usually attended by Municipal Managers, Municipal Directors of Public Works, Municipal Authority/Executive Directors and/or Municipal Consulting Engineer. However, elected officials and other groups who should consider attending; although these meetings are technical in nature, anyone that has an interest should attend.

Members had no further questions.

Lugene reviewed a draft letter developed in response to the CMAC's recommendation of a letter writing campaign to communicate with fellow elected officials and municipal managers. The letter details the importance of their involvement and active participation in the Wet Weather Plan development process. Members were asked to review the letter and provide comments to Janette Campbell by noon on Wednesday, May 19, 2010. The comments will be incorporated into the final version of the letter which will be printed on ALCOSAN letterhead. CMAC member signatures will be added by way of a signature block, to the letter.

Also noted, any CMAC member that was not in attendance would be contacted to arrange an opportunity to provide their signature. ALCOSAN will then distribute the letter to their mailing list of 1100 elected officials and municipal managers. CMAC members were urged to provide the names of individuals they want to receive the letter to Janette Campbell. CMAC members not in attendance will be contacted to determine the best way to receive their signature.

Allegheny League of Municipality Conference (ALOM): Lugene asked if any of the members attended the conference; two members indicated they had. There were several hundred people in attendance. ALCOSAN's booth focused on municipal partnerships. ALCOSAN distributed an estimated 200 packets of information which included the ALCOSAN OVERFLOW and Municipal Connections Newsletters, a number of Wet Weather Plan Fact Sheets, a public comment card, and flyers advertising green initiative events that ALCOSAN is hosting in June of 2010. A save the date card for ALCOSAN's Annual Open House, which is scheduled for September 18, 2010, was also included.

Members were also given a brief update of an article in the ALCOSAN Employee Newsletter regarding ALCOSAN Chairman Harry Readshaw's call to action encouraging municipal officials to question the candidates running for governor, whenever they have the opportunity on funding these federal mandates and their position on the issues. The Chairman also asked elected officials to begin speaking up as a region to address future financial impacts of implementing the municipal and ALCOSAN plans to solve sewer overflows.

During ALCOSAN's presentation, given by Arletta Scott Williams, Executive Director, there was an engaging discussion with elected officials on the most effective way to send information and materials regarding the program. Overall response was that they would like ALCOSAN to offer evening meetings and the materials presented to be put on a disc or in a packet that they can review at their leisure.

Municipal Connections Newsletter: Lugene asked if everyone receives a copy of Municipal Connections – and everyone nodded in agreement. She explained that this was another idea generated by CMAC, and that 1100 copies of the bi-monthly are distributed for each issue. The goal is to issue six copies each year and provide recipients with pertinent information to follow throughout the WWP.

Basin Quarterly Activity Report (BQAR): Lugene asked if the officials were familiar with the Basin Quarterly Activity Report; several members indicated they receive this publication. Lugene explained that the format is being updated to make contents more succinct.

MUNICIPAL ADVOCACY: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

Before the discussion, Janai asked members if they would be opposed to having their picture taken throughout the meeting. Members did not object.

Janai opened the floor up to members to discuss any questions, concerns or issues they have encountered since the last CMAC meeting in March. The discussion is as follows:



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting / Number 6
Tuesday, May 11, 2010/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

Question: Does ALCOSAN know the status of the municipalities' compliance?

Response: The status of municipalities' compliance is not being tracked by ALCOSAN. 3RWW would know more about the progress of the municipalities.

Question: What is ALCOSAN's position on stream removal projects that impact more than one municipality?

Discussion: A solution in which one of the members offered up was that most municipalities managed - all managed to figure issues out individually or collectively. However, these issues were on a smaller level. Some neighboring municipalities chose not to participate.

Comment: It was publicly noted at an event that "green infrastructure is not a proven technology." This leads to the assumption that ALCOSAN is not seriously looking to incorporate greening into its solutions.

Discussion: This statement was taken out of context; green infrastructure was referenced as an overall solution. ALCOSAN is considering green technology throughout the plant. ALCOSAN is giving equal weight to green infrastructure as it is all other alternatives and technologies – but this information is not being discussed publicly at this time. All basins are giving equal consideration and/or weight to all control technologies.

Question: Have the regulators given any guidance on this issue?

Response: To date, there has not been any specific guidance given by the regulators on this issue. Philadelphia has submitted their plan and there is an interest in how the regulators respond.

Discussion: Other examples in which Green and Grey are being incorporated include Portland. ALCOSAN will be hosting a seminar with NACWA in September 2010. The theme of this seminar is Green Infrastructure: What is Legal? Members will be provided information and are encouraged to attend.

UNDERSTANDING THE AFFORDABILITY ANALYSIS PROCESS: Tom Schevtchuk, CDM

Tom utilized a PowerPoint presentation to discuss this topic with the CMAC members, noting the purpose was to provide a snapshot of where ALCOSAN is with the affordability plan and trying to determine what the region can afford. The methodology for developing the affordability plan was presented and it incorporated financial data received to date from customer municipalities. Information was also presented on EPA guidelines for affordability. .

A discussion took place during and after the presentation. A summary of questions posed by the CMAC members and responses provided are as follows:

Question: It as noted that 72 percent of the total cost is expected to be borne by the residential class of customers. That is an extraordinary amount. Since that is case, are you considering different models to distribute the cost?

Response: Currently, the residential class is paying 72 percent of the cost. The numbers are qualified as much as possible. The last few slides were presented with the qualifications "we think," might apply "in the future." This is a valid point to be considered. However the intent is that you don't leave here concerned about numbers that are not finalized. There will be some difficult decisions to make about funding. Funding for these programs is national issue as federal funding is needed.

Question: Do you have a rate study that shows the rate for each community?

Response: 3RWW is doing a similar study that will hopefully clear this up. They met with the basin groups about a year ago. Corriack is a consulting firm that 3RWW used to put together their data mining. We will have to look into retrieving that information.

Question: CMAC member noted that s/he had never met anybody who said they want to make \$16,000.00 per year. Is the jobs issue relevantly factored in this analysis? What about the impact on putting people to work? My assumption is no. Given the unemployment rate and the trend of declining income, this needs to be taken into consideration. We need to start looking at that so that we can look at this project as not only bringing clean water at an affordable rate – but that it is sustainable. I am suggesting that we include jobs into this analysis – 72 percent is a very high number in my opinion. Commercial closings are a part of the reason for that. The concept of jobs creation (sustainable jobs) should be a part of this model – otherwise you are going to find that you are going to a well that is going dry. I am concerned that the people coming in to do these jobs will not be from here.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting / Number 6
Tuesday, May 11, 2010/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

Response: We may not be sharing a lot of hope for this, but we will have to start showing a need to lobby for funding. We need to show the decision makers that the real number is a burden of cost. In other cities they are promoting a more affordable plan—that captures the number of job that could be created. Your point is well taken but we are not at that point. We will not let this fall off the radar – we will be looking at this and will figure a way to address this the best way that we can.

It was also noted that on a more parallel track to those efforts, Dan Onorato, Allegheny County Executive has been very interested in this topic, and is working through a procedure that has to do with the construction of what will be required – it has to do with sustainability. He is on it and actively engaged.

Comment: Many communities do not come close to being able to afford something like this. The information provided is valuable; however, to someone who is low income, these numbers make a significant impact on their lives. Wilksburg has the highest number of head of households who are female, which means a lot of kids who use a lot of water.

Response to comment: The point about water consumption is valid—moving forward this will be considered. We have qualified these numbers as much as we can; we will show you additional information when available but this is the best we know right now.

Comment: Carnegie Mellon University is conducting a study of water in the region with GSP Consulting. This study will look at the economics of water as a resource.

Tom asked members if they had any additional questions or feedback on the presentation. There no further questions or discussion from members.

NEXT STEPS: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

Janai Michelle Williams asked the audience to offer their ideas on what topics they would like to include on the agenda for the next CMAC meeting to be held in August. The ideas generated include the following:

- 1) One of our biggest problems is going to be prioritization amongst the municipalities.
- 2) An update to the discussion on affordability – can we collectively move forward with this?
- 3) ALCOSAN needs to get into the field and find out what the municipalities are doing. When the flow numbers come into ALCOSAN, we need to come back to talk about what we're doing to control flow. ALCOSAN will need to expand its footprint within the communities. This will address the inequity in the system – this (ALCOSAN's) expansion will help address this.

The members' discussion on topics turned to a question and answer session. The following represents a summary of the key questions and answers that were covered during this time:

Question: Is anyone working on gathering what the municipalities are spending?

Response: Feasibility studies are being developed which will help to gain an idea of their improvement costs and how they look compared to ALCOSAN's capital costs.

Question: What are the quality control measures for this information (flow data)?

Response: This process has been going through the 3Rivers with the feasibility study working group. This is one venue ALCOSAN uses to express to the municipalities how we want to see this information and what form.

Question: Are we going to do something that is sustainable? We cannot ram down the throats of people something that costs \$2 billion. Sustainability is really important.

Response: This is why 2010 is an important time to start these discussions. 2011 will be a critical year since that is when the preliminary regional and local plans will be made public.

Janai wrapped up the meeting providing members with the next date of CMAC meeting #7. The meeting is scheduled for August 3, 2010. She confirmed with members that everyone prefers a 10 am starting time versus a 10:30 starting time.

Members received copies of ALCOSAN's Green Infrastructure Workshop (May 2010) and ALCOSAN's Technology Outreach (June & September 2010) information and were encouraged to attend these events. She reminded members that there was a second signature sheet to be completed, and requested that everyone complete an evaluation form.

ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting / Number 6
Tuesday, May 11, 2010/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

Meeting concluded.

Action Items:

1. ALCOSAN:

- Provide information to members regarding the following upcoming events in 2010:
 1. ALCOSAN Green Infrastructure Community Workshop-due to response workshop the evening session will not be taking place. The daytime session is scheduled for Wednesday May, 12, 2010 at noon. The workshop will be held at the Authority's Customer Service & Training Building, located at 3101 Preble Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15233. Registration information is listed on the flyer that was distributed to members.
 2. ALCOSAN has partnered with NACWA in a series of Flow Series Seminars.

1. CMAC members:

- Provide feedback and comments on the Elected Officials/Municipal Managers letter and the draft CMAC Vision Statement to Janette Campbell at jmccampbell@eholdings.biz, by noon May 19, 2010.
- Provide the names and contact information for any elected officials/municipal manager to receive the aforementioned letter.

Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org, 412.734.8353
- Peter Thomas, AECOM, Program Manager, peter.thomas@aecom.com, (412) 316-3603.
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, Public Relations Coordinator, jmwilliams@eholdings.biz, 412.434.6571.

We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, (jmwilliams@eholdings.biz or 412-434-6571) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.

ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING CMAC ABRIDGED SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting / Number 7
Tuesday, August 3, 2010/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

WELCOME: Art Tamilia, Esq., ALCOSAN Deputy Executive Director & Director of Environmental Compliance
Art Tamilia welcomed everyone to the meeting on Arletta Scott Williams' behalf.

MEETING OBJECTIVES: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

Janai expressed the intended goals of the meeting noting that ALCOSAN respects the members' time and as such discussions that exceed the allotted times will only be continued at the direction of the members.

MUNICIPAL ADVOCACY: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

Janai asked members to share what they have heard, have question about, or items for discussion.

The discussion began with commentary on the CMAC membership. A member noted that the group is intended to have 14 members, yet only six or seven people attend the meeting regularly. A suggestion was made that there is a need to get people who are interested on the committee to replace those who have not actively participated. It was noted that Arletta is aware of this matter and has approached the County Executive about it, as he is the person who appoints the members for this group.

Another concept mentioned was for ALCOSAN to consider "taking over" the interceptors. Jan Oliver explained that she is willing and anxious to hear what the CMAC thinks should be considered. She added that she is also a proponent of looking at more than just the interceptors.

A discussion ensued. Dave Borneman commented that there is some history with Saw Mill Run and this area could potentially be used as a model. It was also noted that that when Saw Mill Run was considered concerns arose about how far into the system to go and what branches off from the interceptor lines. This could be a model for consideration as follow-up on this discussion item.

It is understood that the municipalities consider their interceptor's as the municipalities' best conditioned pipes, and that the region should be looking at the most economical and beneficial approach. ALCOSAN will need to better understand the critical pipes in the municipal system and talk about capital expenditures. This is not just a matter of transferring operations.

A member noted that laterals are part of the system. As the municipal's interceptors are in good shape, they are the low hanging fruit. If ALCOSAN is to consider relieving the municipalities of responsibility for the interceptors and major facilities, the municipalities can spend more money on the feeder systems. ALCOSAN realizes that laterals are an issue across the country and is aware that there are a lot of inconsistencies throughout the service area. It was also noted by ALCOSAN that if this is evaluated, ALCOSAN will have to consider everything that is a need.

It was suggested that there should be a standardized starting point for everyone to begin this process, beginning with the actual structures. The point where the responsibility ends needs to be standardized so that the whole system is on the same page. The same rules should exist for everyone regarding the laterals.

From the ratepayers' point of view, the question remains, "how are we going to get the system fixed?" This is going to cost a lot of money. A member suggested that representatives of the state should be on the committee, although she was not sure which agencies should be represented. A fellow member noted that the Consent Decree dictates the structure for this group. Jan Oliver acknowledged that the idea about regionalization was for discussion purposes, and CMAC members should email any additional comments or thoughts on this issue directly to her.

MUNICIPAL PRELIMINARY FLOW ESTIMATES (PFES): Tim Prevost, ALCOSAN

Tim provided background on the request for preliminary flow estimates (PFEs), indicating that they were delayed because the municipalities did not receive the models in the time frame initially anticipated. The models were sent out in April and but at that time ALCOSAN had received the majority of the PFEs.

After the models were made available, notices were sent to municipalities and authorities requesting PFEs and all but one has responded that they are working on furnishing PFEs. As of today – ALCOSAN has received the majority of the preliminary flow estimates. This information is passed on to basin planners to see how well these estimates compare with their estimates. When there is a discrepancy, the municipalities are contacted to discuss and get a better understanding of the basis of their flow projections.

ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING CMAC ABRIDGED SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting / Number 7
Tuesday, August 3, 2010/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

A discussion ensued. It was explained that there is a multi-step process that is followed. ALCOSAN is obligated to inform DEP, the Allegheny Health Department, and EPA who is not responding to ALCOSAN's requests associated with the Consent Decree. ALCOSAN is trying to avoid going this route as long as possible, with friendly interaction, but there is an obligation to advise the agencies. The agencies can then decide to take an action themselves. At some point, EPA may want to make an example of the uncooperative entity. ALCOSAN will not stop the process due to a municipalities' inaction.

UPDATE ON AFFORDABILITY ANALYSIS PROCESS: Tom Schevtchuk, CDM

Tom provided an update on the Affordability Analysis and what has transpired since the last update provided during CMAC meeting #6.

ALCOSAN is researching similar long term control plans (LTCPs) across the nation and how they have handled their affordability analysis. Members were given a handout which is a snapshot of approximately 10 LTCPs. The highpoints from this information is the EPA's 2 percent threshold of affordability based on income that we discussed before.

- Philadelphia - Philadelphia turned their plan in at 2.7 or 3 percent expected to occur in the year 2029. For example, we wanted to look at how the different municipalities were structuring rate projections and cost allocations.
- Atlanta - Atlanta came up with a 1% sales tax; their program is at \$3 billion. The household financial impact is over 2% for a significant percentage for their population.
- Indianapolis - Most of Indianapolis is looking at impacts on different communities and income groups. They have a unified government with Marion County for the entire area. They are at 1.8% overall but the service area around center of city is at 3 percent.
- Kansas City - Kansas City has contingent levels of control and contingent implementation schedules are being considered, based on availability of outside funding. They have a \$2.4 billion program holding their impact at 1.7%, contingent on federal and state funding. If they do not get the funding, they go to a longer schedule and cut back on their program.
- Washington, DC - In DC, they have a very long-term implementation plan. They are going forward with what we believe to be a 40-year implementation schedule with the provision that federal money becomes available and then they can accelerate the implementation.

SCHEDULE UPDATE: Dave Bingham, AECOM

Dave initiated a discussion on the program schedule with a quick update. In overall planning process, ALCOSAN started with flow monitoring, screening of sites, development and calibration of models which are all completed. We are working toward a November 1st deadline to produce a draft of the feasibility study. Each basin planner will present a feasibility study which will contain alternatives developed within each basin. We are also starting to combine basin alternatives into initial regional alternatives.

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION/DEVELOPMENT PROCESS: Dave Bingham, AECOM

Dave proceeded to discuss the alternatives development/evaluation process and informed members that there was a copy of the presentation in their packet. He encouraged members to offer any comments or feedback during the presentation. During wet weather, there are over 300 locations overflows that can occur in ALCOSAN system and 140 locations in the municipal system where overflows can occur. We can get up to 83 overflow events a year, at a single outfall. In 2008, an estimated 10 billion gallons of overflow discharged in waterways.

Several tools are available for data evaluation and to investigate the problem. ALCOSAN's costing tool tends to focus on larger sized components while the municipalities are adding to the costing tool data on the smaller sizes. The result will be all entities using the same basis for cost estimating. We have mapping that 3 Rivers has developed with their "One overall" map as well as the data from water quality surveys. This information will allow ALCOSAN to analyze flow rates, develop and evaluate alternatives and produce cost estimates for alternatives.

In conclusion, when looking for sites, we need a large enough site for the proposed technology. The sites tend to be near the discharge points, and when considering sites, utilities, railroads and other types of infrastructures are researched to avoid conflicts. Dave showed a map of a 146 potential sites. In identifying sites, each basin planner worked with the communities within their basins to identify these sites. While some sites are more complex than others, the basin planners have completed some preliminary screenings to eliminate those sites that are not feasible.

ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING CMAC ABRIDGED SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting / Number 7
Tuesday, August 3, 2010/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Trefz Boardroom

WATER QUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROCESS: Colleen Hughes, CDM

Colleen explained that this information may help bring some of this together which is balancing the need to meet water quality goals and achieving a combined solution. Colleen explained the need to develop a CSO pollutant monitoring program. Once the program is developed, it will be implemented at 26 CSO outfall locations. The CSO monitoring program is 75 percent complete. There are about 30 parameters being analyzed as specified in the Consent Decree but main ones are bacteria, dissolved solids, oxygen demand, nutrients, suspended solids and metals. This information is used to assist in estimating frequency and volume of pollutants.

The receiving water (rivers and streams) quality monitoring was completed at 50 locations. In addition to main rivers and streams, sampling was done at Consent Decree defined sensitive areas and upstream of the ALCOSAN service area. Water quality results were presented for the three most important parameters, which are: 1) Fecal coli form (bacteria); 2) dissolved oxygen; and 3) oxygen demand. A detailed explanation of charts showing the results was provided. Results were presented from 18 rivers and streams throughout the service area and were summarized as follows:

- Bacteria levels exceeded the water quality standard (200 cfu/100ml) from 50-100% time during the recreational season (May to September). This indicates bacteria levels are a significant issue to be addressed.
- Dissolved oxygen levels on average seem adequate to support aquatic life. The standards shown are for warm water fisheries and results shows only one sample falling below the standard. This is a great message about existing water quality. The good news is that our primary problem is on the bacteria side, not on the aquatic life side.

This process may help on the level of treatment we provide. The discharges of stormwater and from overflow events are consuming oxygen in the rivers and streams. It was noted that associated with the dissolved oxygen is biochemical oxygen demand (BOD). This measures what is reducing the dissolved oxygen levels in the rivers. This is a concern with CSO programs. The data shows a few instances with high BOD but generally BOD is not a problem.

PUBLIC OUTREACH: Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN, and Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

Janai acknowledged that there was not sufficient time to discuss all that remained on the agenda; however, she did want to mention the following updates on upcoming events: The ALCOSAN Open House will be held on September 18 and community meetings will be held in October/November 2010. ALCOSAN has launched a public awareness campaign on potential solutions. In addition to communicating with elected officials and municipal managers, ALCOSAN would also like to engage members on how to communicate with the general public. ALCOSAN is planning a rigorous schedule for the campaign.

COMMUNICATING WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS & MUNICIPAL MANAGERS: Lugene Keys, KCI

Lugene stated that the next issue of the Municipal Connections newsletter would be coming out soon and will include an article on the potential solutions to help familiarize individuals with the topic prior to coming to the community meeting. The BQARs were published in June/July 2010.

NEXT STEPS: Lugene Keys, KCI

The next CMAC meeting will be held November 9, 2010 and will be the last meeting of the year. Again, ALCOSAN will be soliciting your input on items to be included on the agenda. Lugene noted that this information is taken into consideration and will be incorporated into future agendas, and that everyone is encouraged to provide input.

Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org, 412.734.8353
- David Bingham, AECOM Water, Vice President, Project Director, david.bingham@aecom.com, 412.316.3615
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, Public Relations Coordinator, jmwilliams@eholdings.biz, 412.434.6571

We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, (jmwilliams@eholdings.biz or 412.434.6571) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING ABRIDGED MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting / Number 8
Tuesday, November 9, 2010/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building

Welcome: Arletta Scott Williams, Executive Director, ALCOSAN

Arletta Scott Williams welcomed everyone.

Municipal Advocacy: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

The group had no updates to report from their fellow municipal leaders, or anything in particular they wanted to discuss with ALCOSAN that was not already on the agenda.

Basin Planning Report: Peter Thomas, AECOM

Peter reported that work is continuing on the feasibility study. Peter explained that on average approximately 60 percent of the funds have been spent to-date, and the project is on track to be finished within budget.

Feasibility Study Working Group Correspondence: Tim Prevost, ALCOSAN and Dave Bingham, AECOM

Dave Bingham led the discussion regarding the memorandum sent to CMAC members from the 3 Rivers Wet Weather (3RWW) Feasibility Study Working Group via mail (a copy of which was also provided during meeting #8). It was also noted that due to ALCOSAN's participation with the FWSG, they received a draft document. Dave Borneman noted that ALCOSAN is meeting with 3RWW management and the regulatory agencies to resolve the schedule concerns. The four major points outlined in the memorandum were: (1) ALCOSAN's Basis of Rates, (2) Scheduling Conflicts, (3) Basis of Design, and (4) Basin Planning.

As a result of this discussion, Tim Rogers and Dave Montz will attend the meeting to present the response to the Feasibility Study Working Group.

3RWW Regionalization RFP: Jan Oliver, ALCOSAN and Dave Bingham, AECOM

Jan Oliver noted that ALCOSAN has had requests from individual municipalities to take over their sewer systems. ALCOSAN recently submitted a proposal to see if regionalization could result in a reduction in cost and increase in services. There were several different options for consolidation which include an all encompassing approach as well as ALCOSAN taking ownership or operating and maintaining selected trunk sewers extending from ALCOSAN's current interceptor. ALCOSAN is interested in the CMAC participating in the stakeholder involvement process. Implementation is not going to occur in 6 months as 3RWW originally scheduled. To fulfil the data collection requirements, ALCOSAN will catalogue existing conditions and see where municipalities are with regulatory compliance.

Additionally, it was noted that 3RWW does not have the funding capacity to grant the \$400,000 request presented by ALCOSAN. 3RWW suggested that ALCOSAN pursue additionally funding sources.

Based on the discussion, the general consensus among the group was that consolidation should not slow the process of working on wet weather problems in the municipalities. Additionally, ALCOSAN noted that there needs to be an internal discussion regarding the stakeholder group/steering committee mentioned in the PowerPoint presentation and ALCOSAN will then report back to the CMAC. ALCOSAN will also consider approaching the Pittsburgh Foundation and the Heinz Endowment for the additional funds needed. Lastly, ALCOSAN will determine the role of its Board of Directors in this process.

Public Outreach: Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN, and Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

Nancy Barylak reported statistics for the October/November series of community meetings. Ten community meetings were held, with a total attendance of approximately 170. The average meeting attendance was about 15 people, with Heidelberg being the outlier since the mayor initiated a door knocking campaign to encourage residents to attend the meeting. The meetings were attended by CMAC members, RSG members, elected officials, municipal staff, general citizens, and representatives of development and environmental groups. Meetings were held at neighborhood fire halls, churches, libraries, and at the Heinz History Center (region-wide meeting), as suggested by each communities' municipal leadership.

The meetings were conducted in an open house format with a scheduled presentation. The meeting format and locations worked well to accommodate busy people. There was little media attention outside of Heidelberg and Etna community meetings.

Based on comments from the public, the general sentiment is that everyone understands the need to address overflows, but do not want the necessary technologies implemented in their neighborhoods. There is also interest in which technologies were employed in other cities, their impacts on surrounding residential communities, and how and when green technologies can be implemented. ALCOSAN also received public comments on the perceived lack of advertising. Advertising for the fall meetings included a mailing to 3,000 contacts; radio PSAs on DUQ and KQV; print ads in the Gateway publications, Pittsburgh Post Gazette, Pittsburgh Tribune Review, New Pittsburgh Courier, and neighborhood papers/newsletters; website postings; and phone calls.

Communicating with Elected Officials & Municipal Managers: Lugene Keys, KCI

Lugene asked the members if anyone had received any comments on the correspondence signed by the CMAC that was sent out to their peers in August. There was no indication from the group regarding comments received from peers. Lugene also asked if there was any information worthy of sharing from anyone who attended ALOM, or the 3RWW Conference. There was no comment in response to this item.

Next Steps: Lugene Keys, KCI

Lugene reiterated the following points, and everyone agreed to:

- 3RWW Feasibility Study Working Group correspondence to CMAC:
 - Develop a response 3RWW Memorandum.
 - Distribute response to memorandum to CMAC for their review and comment.
 - Tim Rogers and Dave Montz will attend the meeting to present the response to the Feasibility Study Working Group.
- Regionalization:
 - Consolidation should not slow the process of working on wet weather problems in the municipalities.
 - Regarding the stakeholder group/steering committee mentioned in the PowerPoint presentation, ALCOSAN will meet to discuss internal and determine the next interim step; ALCOSAN will then report back to the CMAC.

Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org, (412)734-8353
- Peter Thomas, AECOM, Program Manager, peter.thomas@aecom.com, (412) 316-3603.
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, Public Relations Coordinator, jmwilliams@eholdings.biz, (412) 434-6571.

We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, (jmwilliams@eholdings.biz or 412-434-6571) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

ABRIDGED MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting / Number 9
Tuesday, March 1, 2011/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building

Welcome: Arletta Scott Williams, ALCOSAN Executive Director

Arletta welcomed everyone to the meeting and acknowledged that attendance was light. She noted that a meeting was held with the County Executive regarding CMAC membership, and that he was receptive to replacements. Accordingly, there may be four to five new members in attendance at the next CMAC meeting.

Meeting Objectives: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

Janai Williams noted that as always, with respect to the time of all of those in attendance, we would focus on the agenda topics. If anyone wanted a discussion to continue, we would do so with everyone in agreement.

Municipal Advocacy: Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

Janai Williams initiated discussion by asking the members if there was anything in particular that they had heard within their municipalities or amongst their constituents, or wanted to discuss since meeting #8. Discussion ensued.

Dave Montz noted that a managers meeting of all basins was held, and the biggest concern seemed to be the difference in the timeframes over the studies and how ALCOSAN is requesting information and the managers also want information. Dave added that while everyone has calmed down, he is encouraging everyone to cooperate as much as possible for the betterment of all involved. He said that he believes many of the managers are still hung up on the “pay for play” concept. Dave spoke on behalf of CMAC to the attendees at the feasibility study work group noting that they needed to stop being managers and do their jobs as engineers and design the system to take the water out of the system, and the rest will play itself out. At the end of the day we need to find the best way to treat our sewage.

Basin Planning Report: Dave Bingham, AECOM

Dave Bingham referenced the “Basin Planning Wet Weather Plan Tasks through December 2010” handout. He explained that the chart shows each basin planners status as of December 2010 in relationship to their budgets. The contract status reveals that most are at 75% or more. The basin planners are working on alternatives analysis; a major task that will eventually lead to the development of regional alternatives.

Colleen Hughes reviewed the diagram noting that it is a big picture look at where ALCOSAN wants to be by mid-2012. She noted that the chart begins with the current year (2011) and continues through to the delivery of ALCOSAN’s WWP in mid-2012.

Dave Borneman added that the schedule presents the best opportunity available to get the information needed efficiently and will provide a timely fashion to pull this information and plan together. The regulators have stated that ALCOSAN can make assumptions if needed. At best, this plan (schedule) will just scratch the surface. There will be a timeline before we agree on what we are going to do and before we start designing the improvement.

Wet Weather Plan Update: Colleen Hughes, CDM

Members were presented information via PowerPoint Presentation on the overall program status including flow & precipitation monitoring, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), screening of controls and sites, hydrologic & hydraulic modeling (H & H modeling), and existing conditions.

Members were also provided an update on the following: *Regional integration and system-wide alternative analysis* are currently being assessed and combined on a regional level. These efforts focus on identifying the most cost effective solutions and how the greatest water quality can be achieved.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

ABRIDGED MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting / Number 9
Tuesday, March 1, 2011/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building

Preliminary CSO and SSO control cost estimates (basin-based approach); the CSO Policy requires agencies to consider a range of controls. These controls have been analyzed, with the total cost estimated in the billions of dollars. Regulators would like to see ALCOSAN implement controls that could range in cost of approximately \$4 to \$5 billion; the analysis shows affordability is at \$2 billion, which is an optimistic number.

Colleen stated that this is a critical step, and a lot of thought needs to be given to what can be done. The next slide focused on the potential options:

- Write an affordable 2026 plan that does not meet compliance expectations;
- Schedule extension to a future point in time past 2026
- Phased implementation strategy (a combination of the two previous bullets):
 - 2026 affordable plan with interim milestone targets;
 - longer term implementation schedule for full compliance;
 - Adaptive management approach.
- Water quality standards review and revision (use attainability analysis) (Regulators do not like this).

Colleen concluded with a review of the Wet Weather Planning strategy and steps that are being taken now: to identify best affordable 2026 plan, to identify best long term compliance solution, and to develop phased implementation strategy.

Communicating with Elected Officials & Municipal Managers: **Tim Prevost, ALCOSAN, Dave Borneman, ALCOSAN, and Lugene Keys, KCI**

Members received an update on ALCOSAN requests for information from municipalities in order to effectively report to the regulatory agencies. It was stated that most of the municipalities have responded to ALCOSAN's requests. It was stressed that members should submit any updates and/or changes they are planning for their system in writing. Acceptable forms of communications include email and letters sent via US mail.

Members were asked if they had received any response/dialogue from any elected officials since meeting #8. There was no response or dialogue to report at this time. Members were asked how they would like to continue to reach out to elected officials. The following suggestions materialized from the discussion: (1)ALCOSAN consider approaching and presenting information to the area COGs, (2) Continue writing letters to elected officials with updates on the Wet Weather Program, (3)ALCOSAN to consider allowing CMAC representatives to present to elected officials. Members ultimately agreed, that a letter in the format of an executive summary should be developed to come from the CMAC, and could summarize many of the topics discussed at the meeting, and should focus on Consent Decree requirements and milestones. ALCOSAN was looking at various other public outreach initiatives that would support some of the other communication ideas that had been identified during previous discussions.

Following some group discussion, Dave Borneman was asked to report on the recent meetings with regulators and the 3RWW managers meeting, and the Allegheny County Health Department.

ALCOSAN Regionalization/Consolidation Study: Dave Bingham, AECOM

Dave stated that the CMAC was aware that ALCOSAN decided to consider doing a regionalization study. He explained that 3RWW decided to fund sub-regional studies, so now ALCOSAN is seeking funding from other sources. He stated that Jan Oliver travelled to Washington DC to pursue funding. ALCOSAN is currently organizing background information into databases.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING

ABRIDGED MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting / Number 9
Tuesday, March 1, 2011/ 10:00 AM
ALCOSAN, Customer Service & Training Building

He explained that ALCOSAN is going to have a heavy, stakeholder-driven process to participation in the review of the alternatives and to review the pros and cons. ALCOSAN will work with the stakeholders to determine what options will be evaluated. ALCOSAN asked the CMAC if they would provide a letter of support for this concept. The CMAC members in attendance agreed to this approach after some discussion. It was also agreed that ALCOSAN would draft a letter of support for the CMAC's review. For those managers who are not on CMAC, Tim Rogers suggested getting letters and signatures from those municipalities as well. Tim Rogers and Dave Montz will take the lead in on collecting those letters of support.

Public Outreach: Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN, and Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings

Nancy noted that ALCOSAN is participating in the home shows and that ALCOSAN has a new display that focuses on the technologies, prints of the new ALCOSAN display were distributed.

She also noted that ALCOSAN would be participating in ALOM; ALCOSAN's presentation is scheduled for Friday afternoon, and will be followed by Dick Thornburg. Harry Readshaw is also expected to be there, and will be serving as the new Chairman of ALOM. ALCOSAN will have a booth and work is underway to finalize what the outreach will entail. Input is still being gathered from the survey of municipal officials and those results will be discussed in more detail at next CMAC meeting.

Nancy mentioned the dates for the 2011 Annual ALCOSAN Open House and Summer Science programs, and distributed save the date cards to meeting attendees.

Next Steps: Lugene Keys, KCI

Key points of the meeting:

- 1) CMAC letter of support to be drafted as soon as possible, shared with CMAC to get signatures. The purpose of this letter is to express CMAC's support of ALCOSAN's approach to regionalization, and search for funding.
- 2) Dave Montz and Tim Rogers will take the lead in securing the signatures of other officials who support ALCOSAN's regionalization approach and will add them to the CMAC letter.
- 3) Communication in the form of an executive summary will be developed sometime after ALOM to communicate with the municipal officials regarding a project update – information shared at CMAC on the wet weather plan, affordability analysis, regionalization, etc. This can be put on web, and carried in the newsletter to expand reach of communications.
- 4) Next meeting May 10. Ideas for inclusion on agenda:
 - Regionalization
 - Affordability
 - Mary Ellen Ramage to speak on Etna Borough's Downspout Disconnect Program.

Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org, (412)734.8353
- David Bingham, AECOM Water, Vice President, Project Director, david.bingham@aecom.com, (412) 316-3615.
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, Public Relations Coordinator, jmwilliams@eholdings.biz, (412) 434-6571.

We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, (jmwilliams@eholdings.biz or 412-434-6571) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 10
Tuesday, May 10, 2011, 10AM
ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room

The following summarizes the *attendance, key points, and follow-up items* from the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) meeting #10 held on May 10, 2011.

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Members in attendance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chuck Arthrell, Borough of Churchill 2. Robert Callen, Borough of Crafton 3. John Ciangiarulo, McKees Rocks Borough 4. Art Gazdik, Ross Township 5. Michael Lamb, City of Pittsburgh 6. Ken LaSota, Heidelberg Borough 7. Dave Montz, Borough of Greentree 8. Steve Morus, Borough of Forest Hills 9. Mary Ellen Ramage, Borough of Etna 10. Gino Rizza, Borough of Dormont 11. Tim Rogers, Shaler Township 12. Stephen Simcic, PWSA 13. Casey Shoub, Borough of Trafford 14. Jeaneen Zappa, Allegheny County | <p>ALCOSAN Staff :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Arletta Scott Williams 2. Nancy Barylak 3. Dave Borneman 4. Joe Day 5. Douglas Jackson 6. Michael Lichte 7. Dan Lockard 8. Jan Oliver 9. Tim Prevost <p>Consultants:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dave Bingham 2. Tamaira Binion 3. Colleen Hughes 4. Lugene Keys 5. Jada Shirriel |
|--|--|

KEY POINTS:

- **Municipal Advocacy: Communicating with Elected Officials & Municipal Managers**
 - There were no municipal advocacy comments or concerns for the record.
 - Nancy reported on the ALOM 2011 spring conference.

- **Public Outreach**
 - The 2011 fall community meetings will be the final series of public meetings before the Wet Weather Plan is finalized.

- **Open Discussion: Etna Borough Downspout Disconnect Program Presentation.**
 - Mary Ellen Ramage presented on the Etna Borough Downspout Disconnect Program.
 - CMAC members discussed the Etna project costs, how the program was received by Etna residents, similar problems in other municipalities and the importance of source control.

- **Wet Weather Planning Update**
 - Tim Prevost reviewed customer municipalities that are completely, partially and not at all compliant with ALCOSAN’s information requests.
 - CMAC member comments and concerns include the lack of communication between municipal managers and engineers—suggesting that ALCOSAN alert managers to any lack of compliance with information requests.
 - CMAC members asked how they can help facilitate the receipt of any outstanding information requests. Arletta will provide direction if necessary; ALCOSAN has existing measures in place to work directly with municipalities.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 10
Tuesday, May 10, 2011, 10AM
ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room

- **ALCOSAN Regionalization/Consolidation Study**
 - The Allegheny Conference will lead the public relations and stakeholder process for the regionalization/consolidation study to add legitimacy to the process.
 - 4 stakeholder meetings will be held over the next 18 months to complete this study of potential regionalization/consolidation options.
 - CMAC member comments and concerns included the cost of the study, strategic ways to solicit foundation support, other ways to position the project in order to make it more attractive to potential funders and clarification of the difference between CMAC and the 3RWW stakeholder group.

- **Funding Efforts**
 - There is currently no federal funding available to support ALCOSAN's Regionalization/Consolidation Study; however, there is federal legislative support of ALCOSAN's efforts and ALCOSAN will continue to keep the congressional members informed of progress.

TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING AGENDA (Meeting #11 scheduled for August 2, 2011):

- Update on Municipal Coordination
- Update on the Regionalization/Consolidation Study Activity
- Update on 5 Key Wet Weather Issues

MEETING #10 HANDOUTS:

1. Meeting #10 Agenda
2. BPC Meeting #10 Schedule
3. CMAC Meeting #10 Evaluation Form

NEXT MEETING

- Meeting #11 is scheduled for Tuesday, August 2, 2011 @ 10:00 AM. The meeting will be held at the ALCOSAN Customer Service & Training Building.

Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org, (412)734-8353
- Dave Bingham, AECOM Project Director, david.bingham@aecom.com, (412) 316-3615
- Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings Public Relations Coordinator, jmwilliams@eholdings.biz, (412) 434-6571

We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, Ebony Holdings, (jmwilliams@eholdings.biz or (412) 434-6571) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this timeframe, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 11
Tuesday, August 2, 2011, 10AM
ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

The following summarizes the *attendance, key points and follow-up items* from the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) meeting #11 held on August 2, 2011.

ATTENDEES:

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Members:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chuck Arthrell, Braddock Hill 2. Robert Callen, Crafton Borough 3. John Capor, Monroeville Municipal Water Authority 4. Art Gazdik, Ross Township 5. Vanessa Johnson-McCarthy, Wilkinsburg Borough 6. Michael Lamb, City of Pittsburgh 7. Ken LaSota, Heidelberg Borough 8. Cheryl McAbee, Churchill Borough 9. Dave Montz, Greentree Borough 10. Steve Morus, Forest Hills Borough 11. Gino Rizza, Dormont Borough 12. Casey Shoub, Trafford Borough 13. Stephen Simcic, PWSA 14. John Thompson, Wilkinsburg Borough 15. William Zachery, Braddock Borough 16. Jeaneen Zappa, Office of Allegheny County Executive | <p>ALCOSAN:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nancy Barylak, Manger of Public Relations 2. Dave Borneman, Dir. of Engineering & Cons. 3. Joe Day, Government Relations Specialist 4. Michael Lichte, Manager of Planning 5. Dan Lockard, Manager of Capital Projects 6. Jan Oliver, Dir. of Regional Conveyance 7. Tim Prevost, Manger of Wet Weather Programs <p>Consultants:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Janette Campbell, E. Holdings 2. Colleen Hughes, CDM 3. Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings |
|--|---|

MEETING KEY POINTS

Municipal Advocacy: Janai Michelle Williams

- There were no municipal advocacy comments or concerns offered by members.

Wet Weather Planning (WWP) Update: Colleen Hughes

Colleen presented the Wet Weather Plan schedule and noted that ALCOSAN is currently developing the ALCOSAN Control Strategy and the draft Wet Weather Plan. She explained that there will be a six (6) month municipal comment period in 2012 and in January 2013, the Wet Weather Plan will be submitted to the regulatory agencies for review. Colleen discussed that the regional alternatives will move, treat, store, and/or remove flow from the collection/conveyance system. She explained that it is important that ALCOSAN and the municipalities stay connected throughout this process and collaborative efforts will result in the best plan. She presented three analyzed control strategies: a basin-based control alternative, a tunnel based control alternative, and a regional integration & optimization alternative.

Components of the basin-based and the tunnel-based approaches will be evaluated in order to develop the best and most cost-effective solution to prevent overflows. The regional integration & optimization alternative is a hybrid of the basin-based and tunnel-based alternatives. Each alternative will result in substantial improvements to prevent overflows and will make a large impact on improving water quality.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 11
Tuesday, August 2, 2011, 10AM
ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room

Water Quality Benefits/Regulatory Framework

Protecting the region's water quality is the ultimate objective of the Wet Weather program. ALCOSAN has monitored CSO pollutants by sampling various locations and has also developed water quality models to predict the water quality improvements from the alternative overflow control strategies. Colleen discussed the regulatory water quality framework to include an explanation of the various designated uses.

Colleen explained that the "water contact sports" protection criteria for fecal coliform bacteria levels during the recreation season and non-recreational seasons. During the recreation season, which is May through September, there is a maximum geometric mean of 200 coliforms per 100 ml. Additionally, the coliform level cannot exceed 10 percent (400 coliforms per 100 ml.). For the remainder of the year, the maximum geometric mean is 2,000 coliforms per 100 ml.

Based on these standards, ALCOSAN developed a series of water quality benefits analysis maps that illustrate the recreational season water quality in the ALCOSAN service area. Colleen explained that each map varied by condition and illustrates the percent of sample set with a joint exceedance for each waterway.

Members posed important questions regarding pre-existing water quality conditions, progress of municipal plans and plan cost estimates, the Marcellus Shale impact, and the impact of CSOs and SSOs on drinking water quality.

Municipal Cost Update

As a result of a coordinated effort between ALCOSAN and municipalities, the initial municipal cost estimate is complete. It considers the following:

- For future conditions, it assumes that all flows will go to ALCOSAN;
- Pipes will be upsized to convey flows; and
- Assumes 4-6 CSOs per year and 2-year SSO control

Colleen presented the municipal cost estimates, both the initial and refined cost estimates, which reflect the estimates received from the municipalities. She explained that these estimates do not include operations and maintenance or renew and replacement costs.

Financial & Implementation Analysis

The EPA guidelines for determining the affordability metric is the Metric Residential Indicator (MRI). The MRI is calculated by dividing the area's annual wastewater cost by the median household income. Annual wastewater costs that exceed 2 percent of the median household income (MRI) constitute high burden impact. Colleen explained that financial capability is based on the permittee's financial ability to implement. She displayed the preliminary cost performance curves for the basin and tunnel-based controls, that depict what the region can afford versus the estimated improvement costs for various levels of control. ALCOSAN estimates \$2 billion in new capital expenditures with 2010 dollars. The uncertainty range, based on economic variable assumptions is between \$1.0 and \$2.3 billion. Based on the preliminary cost estimates and the estimated \$2 billion dollar region's affordability, all of the alternatives evaluated thus far exceed the high burden affordability threshold. ALCOSAN is discussing these concerns with EPA.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

**Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 11
Tuesday, August 2, 2011, 10AM
ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

Additionally, Colleen presented maps that detailed by census tract the current residential indicator conditions and the \$2.0 billion plan residential indicator projection. According to the 2026 projections, the residential indicator for many census tracts increases above the 2 percent threshold, particularly the tracts adjacent to the main rivers.

Plan Implementation Concerns

Colleen presented some options and concerns for consideration: 1.) the WWP is affordability limited; 2.) ALCOSAN's ability to finance as well as ALCOSAN's ability to maintain a favorable financial rating; and 3.) the potential construction capacity limits to include limited local resources and the impact of increased demand on construction costs.

Competing Needs

Colleen concluded her presentation with a discussion on the competing needs the region must consider during the development of the Wet Weather Plan. She discussed three major areas:

1. Program Elements – eliminating SSOs and controlling CSOs
2. Program Objectives – realizing water quality benefits and planning for economic and population growth
3. Schedule Challenges – eliminating SSOs in Chartiers Creek by 2019 and the Consent Decree mandates that implementation be complete by 2026.

ALCOSAN Regionalization/Consolidation Study: Jan Oliver

Jan Oliver announced that the first stakeholder group meeting will take place in September 2011. If additional information becomes available before the next quarterly meeting, the members will be notified via email.

Public Outreach: Nancy Barylak

Nancy Barylak announced that the public outreach updates will be distributed to the members in advance of the next meeting.

TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING AGENDA

The following topics were suggested by members for the next meeting:

1. A discussion on financing the Alternatives to include a review of the municipal cost and the cost to municipalities;
2. A discussion on municipal outreach efforts and participation - how to engage municipal leadership;
3. An update on the Alternatives Analysis process, to include: 1.) providing any available information on other alternatives that are under evaluation; and 2.) a discussion on the possible impact(s) the alternatives will have on the public and the environment.
4. A discussion on phasing the controls and its impact on water quality benefits.

NEXT MEETING

Meeting #12 is scheduled for Thursday, November 10, 2011 @ 10:00 AM at the ALCOSAN Customer Service & Training Building.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) Meeting # 11
Tuesday, August 2, 2011, 10AM
ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room

Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Public Relations Manager, nancy.barylak@ALCOSAN.org, (412)734-8353
- Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings Public Relations Coordinator, jmwilliams@eholdings.biz, (412) 434-6571

We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings, (jmwilliams@eholdings.biz or (412) 434-6571) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this timeframe, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) / Meeting # 12
Thursday, November 10, 2011/ 10AM
ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room

The following summarizes the *attendance, key points and follow-up items* from the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) meeting #12 held on August 2, 2011.

ATTENDEES:

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Members:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chuck Arthrell, Braddock Hill 2. Robert Callen, Crafton Borough 3. John Ciangiarulo, McKees Rocks Borough 4. William Easton, Neville Township 5. Art Gazdik, Ross Township 6. Ken LaSota, Heidelberg Borough 7. Steve Morus, Forest Hills Borough 8. Tim Rogers, Shaler Township 9. John Thompson, Wilkinsburg Borough 10. William Zachery, Braddock Borough 11. Jeaneen Zappa, Office of Allegheny County Executive | <p>ALCOSAN:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Arletta Scott Williams 2. Nancy Barylak 3. Dave Borneman 4. Joe Day 5. Doug Jackson 6. Michael Lichte 7. Dan Lockard 8. Jan Oliver 9. Tim Prevost <p>Consultants:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Karen Brean 2. Dave Bingham 3. Darby Neidig 4. Colleen Hughes 5. Janai Michelle Williams 6. Janette Williams |
|--|---|

MEETING KEY POINTS

Municipal Advocacy: Janai Michelle Williams

The CMAC members presented the following questions or concerns for discussion and comment from ALCOSAN:

- Tim Rogers noted that a few municipalities have contacted ALCOSAN regarding Biological Oxygen Demand/Total Suspended Solids (BOD/TSS) issues that needed to be reviewed. He provided the ALCOSAN contact person and expressed his concern about reaching a resolution in the near future. Arletta Williams acknowledged that ALCOSAN received the requests and assured Tim that she would look into the matter and get back to the municipalities with an answer.
- Tim Rogers expressed his concern about governance and that several municipalities are concerned that there is limited suburban municipal representation on the ALCOSAN Board of Directors. He suggested that the board should have a suburban representative from each basin and that this is an issue the CMAC can explore.
- Tim Rogers requested a status update on consultant spending to-date, to include an ultimate resolution of work. The dashboard handed out in previous meeting was very informative. ALCOSAN agreed to update the Basin Planner Wet Weather Plan Tasks dashboard and distribute it to the CMAC.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) / Meeting # 12
Thursday, November 10, 2011/ 10AM
ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room

- Art Gazdik suggested that ALCOSAN provide the CMAC with an update on the Financial Capability Analysis. He also suggested that ALCOSAN release the Analysis to its customer municipalities for review and comment prior to ALCOSAN submitting the draft WW plan to the regulatory agencies. Art shared that the municipalities may have meaningful comments or input for ALCOSAN to consider before finalizing the draft plan. Arletta Williams shared that the Financial Capability Analysis is a simplified analysis that was generated because of ALCOSAN's preliminary discussions with the regulatory agencies about their treatment plant expansion plans.
- Additionally, Art recommended that ALCOSAN consider making the cost information transparent to inform the public and to increase awareness. Other members recommended that ALCOSAN consider developing a "grassroots" PowerPoint and present to each community.
- Jeaneen Zappa asked that ALCOSAN provide ways in which the municipalities can help increase awareness.
- A CMAC member expressed trepidation that Pennsylvania American Water will no longer send bill residents and the municipalities were given a 180 day notice. Ken LaSota shared that Heidelberg may not have the capacity to generate and collect water/sewage bills. Arletta Williams confirmed that ALCOSAN will not go back into the "billing" business.

Question: Has there been any discussion with the EPA on financial affordability?

Response:

Question: Where do you design to, as it relates to a cost/dollar amount?

Response: ALCOSAN is looking at reducing costs, and priority/an agreement on what gets built first.

Comment: If in the end, it comes down to cost, then we should get that out in the open now; let the shock of it set in now for the public and deal with it. ALCOSAN should not wait until the last minute to release this information. Currently, there is just not enough information getting out. Let's get the public ready to deal with it, by maybe sending out a quarterly newsletter that addresses these issues.

Draft Municipal Feasibility Studies: Tim Prevost, ALCOSAN

Tim Prevost updated members on the current activities taking place with the municipalities and them getting their specific data to include in the overall wet weather plan. There are over 400 Points of Connection (P.O.C) throughout the system. A few community sites are considered usable. ALCOSAN is looking at which connections within the system would be the "game changers" and how to work with those. There are upwards of 48 complex issues that need looked at throughout the system.

Question: Define complex connection(s) as it relates to sewer sheds?

Response: A complex connection as it relates to a sewer shed would be considered something so big that we could not afford to not understand the future of these basins and what they offer. Tim then went through the seven (7) Basins for the members and how many of these complex watersheds each of the basins are dealing with. They are as follows:

1. Chartiers Creek-8



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) / Meeting # 12
Thursday, November 10, 2011/ 10AM
ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room

2. Lower Ohio Girty's Run-2
3. Main Rivers-8
4. Saw Mill Run-8
5. Turtle Creek-8
6. Upper Allegheny-10
7. Upper Mongahela-4

Comment/Suggestion: Councils/Authority Boards need to be approached to get the message to a lower level; and not throw the message(s)/information out when it is received.

Comment: Everyone needs to get on board to pull the plans together. There will then be one (1) year in which to drill out the best plan.

Question: How do you handle complex sewer sheds that are owned by ALCOSAN?

Response: Take into consideration ALCOSAN cost and municipal costs; it would also be helpful if other Basins are sure of what they are planning to do.

Comment: some municipal schedules cannot be worked out; they are now waiting for ALCOSAN to make the first move.

Dave Borneman stated that the municipal engineers need the understanding for what ALCOSAN is talking about as it is related to cost.

Question: What do the figures in the CSO/SSO Control Capital/Annual Costs reflect? Is this what was concluded?

Response: Costs represent improvements pre assumption. Annual Cost is calculated over the life cycle of the system. The preliminary costs is the actual cost.

Question: Does the team know why 59% of the municipalities chose not to respond to O&M costs?

Response: Clarification/correction made that 59% of the municipalities did respond and 8% did not.

Comment: It is easier to estimate O&M and not R/R.

Wet Weather Planning (WWP) Update: Darby Neidig

Darby Neidig provided an update of on the Municipal Wet Weather Cost Estimates (MWWCE). The MWWCE considered 3 types of costs:

- **Capital Costs** – the data for capital cost was taken from the Draft Municipal Feasibility Studies and 92 percent of municipalities submitted capital cost information. If no costs were provided, ALCOSAN used the “conveyance of all flows” assumption. For the conveyance data received from municipalities of all flows assumption, the costs were estimated using the ACT tool and assumes there will be a new pipeline from overflow to ALCOSAN system.
- **Operation and Maintenance (O&M)**-(expanded programs on existing systems, new wet weather control facilities)
- **Renewal and Replacement Costs (R/R)** -(expanded programs on existing systems, new wet weather control facilities)



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) / Meeting # 12
Thursday, November 10, 2011/ 10AM
ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room

Question: Has/Is the assumption that ALCOSAN will own critical mains accounted for?

Response:

Question: Will ALCOSAN raise rates in 2011?

Response: ALCOSAN will raise rates by 7% in 2011.

Question: How are municipal costs incorporated in proposed costs?

Response: Includes preliminary assumption; costs do not include R & R and O & M.

Question: When meetings are held with the regulatory agencies, who is representing the municipalities?

Response: ALCOSAN

Response: We/Municipalities are not comfortable with ALCOSAN representing us at the table with the regulators.

Clarification: ALCOSAN is not representing the municipalities in the sense of their individual Consent Decree Orders, but they are representing them as it relates to the overall Wet Weather Plan and how the municipalities play a part in ALCOSAN's direct Decree.

Question: How or can CMAC assist in collecting O & M costing information from the municipalities?

Response:

Question: What was the result of downspout elimination or incorporating green infrastructure in to the Wet Weather Plan?

Response:

Question: If you are in a community that is ok and a neighboring community has a wet weather issue, do you have to share the cost of getting the issue fixed with this community?

Response: No.

ALCOSAN Regionalization/Consolidation Study: Jan Oliver

Jan informed the members that the Regionalization Review Panel (RRP) has been formed and held its first meeting on 9/26/11 and a second meeting was held on 11/2/11.

Question: How were the members chosen for the Regionalization Study Committee?

Response: Allegheny Conference was responsible for identifying and setting up the Regionalization Review Panel (RRP). ALCOSAN was not involved with this process. The panel is being chaired by Jared Cohen, of XXX. This committee will be responsible for identifying the pros and cons associated with the WWP options identified.

Comment: There seems to be a sense that some municipalities want to get out of the sewer business; smaller sewer systems operations seem more manageable.

Response: Jan stated that for as long as she has been with ALCOSAN, this request has come from municipalities who would like ALCOSAN to take over their sewer systems.

Question: Does that also include municipalities that have lines under ground?

Response:

Question: Will the Regionalization Study Group have an impact?



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) / Meeting # 12
Thursday, November 10, 2011/ 10AM
ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room

Response: Yes, ALCOSAN believes they will. They are just a panel that will review suggestions options from municipalities and provide feedback and suggestions on those options.

Comment: Not certain they are doing anything that ALCOSAN is not already doing

Comment: There is some concern about excessive redundant studies; the money that was awarded to CONNECT should have been given to ALCOSAN.

Comment: Municipalities should not be in the sewer business; there is a possibility that the municipalities could miss something that would help reduce source control.

Comment: There is a presentation out there of a study done by Philadelphia on green infrastructure. The study shows that Philadelphia is targeting deeded property.

Response: Philadelphia owns its Waste Water Plant and the land around it, ALCOSAN does not.

Jan concluded here Regionalization Study Update by letting the members know the RRP will be analyzing the options in terms of Structure (who owns, operated and maintains) and Functional Responsibilities (local sewers, trunk sewers, regional conveyance, treatment, etc.).

A series of RRP meetings will be held in December; these meeting will help shape the criteria for evaluating the options.

Public Outreach: Nancy Barylak

Nancy informed the members of the efforts of ALCOSAN to inform elected officials of their Wet Weather Planning outreach efforts. There have been publications specifically created for elected officials that highlight pertinent information and updates. Additionally on October 19, ALCOSAN hosted a Town Hall Briefing specifically for elected officials. The purpose of this meeting was to provide elected officials with the opportunity to preview the information that will be presented to the public at the town hall meetings as well as to ask questions or receive clarification. The meeting was designed under the assumption that once constituents become involved and attend the town hall meetings, they may have questions for their elected officials and may also encourage increased participation by the elected officials. Nancy acknowledged that ALCOSAN is opened to suggestions from members on how to get the elected officials more involved.

Nancy provided an update on this year's Annual Open House where ALCOSAN welcomed slightly less than 1,500 people. She noted that over the past 9 years, ALCOSAN has welcomed over 15,000 guests!

Nancy concluded by discussing the ALCOSAN Town Hall meeting series which is currently underway. She notes that despite advertising, there continues to be a low turnout at the meetings. A question ALCOSAN is consistently asked at the public meetings is, "why aren't more people involved?" ALCOSAN's response is to thank those individuals in attendance and encourage them to spread the word to neighbors, family, friends, etc.

Nancy Barylak announced that the public outreach updates will be distributed to the members in advance of the next meeting.

Several members provided closing suggestions for ALCOSAN to consider the following:

- Allowing a CMAC member or alternative representative attend information sharing meetings between ALCOSAN and the regulators;



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) / Meeting # 12
Thursday, November 10, 2011/ 10AM
ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room

- Participating in the upcoming Local Government Agency sessions;
- Enlisting a well-known spokesperson to increase public awareness; and
- Inviting representatives from Philadelphia to discuss the Philadelphia Control Program.

TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING AGENDA

The following topics were suggested by members for the next meeting:
Conversations/Meeting updates with the following regulatory agencies

1. Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)
2. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
3. Department of Public Health

NEXT MEETING

Meeting #13 is pending. Members will be polled via email for their availability for 2012 Quarterly meetings. Once 2012 meetings are determined, members will receive information via email.

Information, Questions, and Feedback should be submitted to:

- Nancy Barylak, ALCOSAN Manager of Public Relations, nancy.barylak@alcosan.org, (412)734-8353
- Karen Brean, Brean Associates, karen@breanassociates.com, (412) 244-3445
- Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings, janai.smith@eholdings.biz, (412) 434-6571

We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding or further explanation important to the purpose of the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee and the meeting is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Janai Michelle Williams, E. Holdings, (jmwilliams@eholdings.biz or (412) 434-6571) within five (5) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this timeframe, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING POST-MEETING SUMMARY REPORT

**Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC)
Meeting # 13
Tuesday, March 20, 2012 / 10AM
ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

The following summarizes the *attendance, follow-up items and evaluation form results* from the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) meeting #13 held on March 20, 2012.

ATTENDANCE

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Members:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chuck Arthrell, Braddock Hills 2. Robert Callen, Crafton Borough 3. John Capor, Monroeville Municipal Water Authority 4. John Ciangiarulo, McKees Rocks Borough 5. Art Gazdik, Ross Township 6. Joe Kauer, Borough Manager of Heidelberg on behalf of Ken LaSota, Heidelberg Borough 7. Cheryl McAbee, Churchill Borough 8. Mary Ellen Ramage, Etna Borough 9. Tim Rogers, Shaler Township 10. Stephen Simcic, PWSA 11. Jeaneen Zappa, Office of Allegheny County Executive | <p>ALCOSAN Staff :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Art Tamilia 2. Nancy Barylak 3. Dave Borneman 4. Joe Day 5. Doug Jackson 6. Michael Lichte 7. Dan Lockard 8. Jan Oliver <p>Consultants:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Karen Brean 2. Dave Bingham 3. Colleen Hughes 4. Janai Williams Smith 5. Janette Williams |
| <p>Members not in attendance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. William Easton, Neville Township 13. Amanda Ford, Swissvale Borough 14. Dan Kinross, Ross Township 15. Michael Lamb, City of Pittsburgh 16. Vanessa Johnson-McCarthy, Wilkinsburg Borough 17. Dave Montz, Greentree Borough 18. Steve Morus, Forest Hills Borough 19. Pat Schaefer, Edgewood Borough 20. Casey Shoub, Trafford Borough 21. William Zachery, Braddock Borough | |



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING POST-MEETING SUMMARY REPORT

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC)

Meeting # 13

Tuesday, March 20, 2012 / 10AM

ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room

TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING AGENDA

Due to the time constraints two agenda items were postponed until the next CMAC meeting. The Municipal Information Update (Dan Lockard) and the ALCOSAN Regionalization/Consolidation update (Jan Oliver) will be added to the next meeting agenda.

Additionally, there were no suggested agenda topics offered by the members for the next meeting. The members will be notified of the next meeting date, time, and location.

FOLLOW-UP/ACTION ITEMS FOR ALCOSAN

1. ALCOSAN will provide meeting date and time for the next CMAC meeting.
2. ALCOSAN will solicit feedback from the members on the draft WWP release as well as other ALCOSAN 2012 Public Outreach efforts.
3. ALCOSAN will provide a copy of the Wet Weather Program Update PowerPoint presentation presented by Colleen Hughes.

FOLLOW-UP/ACTION ITEMS FOR CMAC MEMBERS

1. Members will provide ALCOSAN feedback on the draft WWP release as well as other ALCOSAN 2012 Public Outreach efforts.

SUGGESTED ACTION ITEMS

The following items were re-introduced as suggested action items:

1. CMAC to consider addressing its concerns about ALCOSAN Board Governance and representation (one suburban representative from each basin on the Board);
2. ALCOSAN to consider releasing the Financial Capability Analysis to municipalities for review and comment in the form of a report/document that the municipalities could use as a gauge for their individual plans;
3. ALCOSAN to consider making the cost information transparent to inform the public and to increase awareness; and
4. ALCOSAN to consider allowing a CMAC member, or alternative representative, to attend information sharing meetings between ALCOSAN and the regulators.

New suggested action items:

5. ALCOSAN to consider making interim planning reports and documents publicly accessible (on a public website);
6. ALCOSAN to consider presenting, to the regulatory agencies, the region's affordability in two tiers. The intention would be to show the cost impact on ratepayers at the low end of the median household income range as opposed to ratepayers at the high end of the median household income range.
7. ALCOSAN to consider identifying the role of source control in each of the \$2B plan alternatives.
8. ALCOSAN to consider completing and releasing an analysis of the impact of the implementation of the WWP on job creation, identifying both type and duration.
9. ALCOSAN to consider presenting the draft WWP at the fall 3RWW conference.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING POST-MEETING SUMMARY REPORT

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC)

Meeting # 13

Tuesday, March 20, 2012 / 10AM

ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room

MEETING #11 HANDOUTS & ITEMS TO BE POSTED TO THE ECM:

1. Meeting #13 Agenda
2. Updated Basin Planning Summary Progress Report (June 2011 through December 2011)
3. CMAC Meeting #13 Evaluation Form
4. Meeting #13 Sign-in sheet (posted to the ECM only)

NEXT MEETING

The date and time for the next meeting is pending.

FEEDBACK FROM EVALUATION FORMS

The following feedback was provided by members:

1. It would be extremely helpful to receive the slides that are presented at these meetings. (Jeaneen Zappa).
2. Wasn't able to cover the entire agenda. (Jeaneen Zappa)
3. Why can't these (meetings) be set forth in advance and some opportunity for participants to indicate good/bad time? (Jeaneen Zappa)
4. We need more time or more to be presented via email in advance or more frequent meetings. (Jeaneen Zappa)
5. Put in sound system (Charles Arthrell)
6. Need to leave at 10:30 (therefore not able to complete entire survey (Bob Callen))



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING POST-MEETING SUMMARY REPORT

**Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC)
Meeting # 14
Wednesday, May 23, 2012 / 10AM
ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room**

The following summarizes the *attendance, follow-up items and evaluation form results* from the Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC) meeting #14 held on May 23, 2012.

ATTENDANCE

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Attended</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chuck Arthrell, Braddock Hills 2. Robert Callen, Crafton Borough 3. Hon. Michael Lamb, City of Pittsburgh 4. Cheryl McAbee, Churchill Borough 5. Mary Ellen Ramage, Etna Borough 6. Pat Schaefer, Edgewood Borough 7. Tim Rogers, Shaler Township 8. Casey Shoub, Trafford Borough 9. Stephen Simcic, PWSA 10. Jeaneen Zappa, Office of Allegheny County Executive Office | <p>ALCOSAN Staff:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Arletta Scott Williams 2. Nancy Barylak 3. Dave Borneman 4. Joe Day 5. Doug Jackson 6. Michael Lichte 7. Dan Lockard 8. Jan Oliver 9. Tim Prevost <p>Consultants:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Karen Brean 2. Dave Bingham 3. Colleen Hughes 4. Tom Schevtchuk 5. Janai Williams Smith 6. Janette Williams |
| <p>Members not in attendance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. John Capor, Monroeville Municipal Water Authority 12. John Ciangiarulo, McKees Rocks Borough 13. William Easton, Neville Township 14. Amanda Ford, Swissvale Borough 15. Ken LaSota, Heidelberg Borough 16. Vanessa Johnson-McCarthy, Wilkinsburg Borough 17. Dave Montz, Greentree Borough 18. Steve Morus, Forest Hills Borough 19. William Zachery, Braddock Borough | |



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING POST-MEETING SUMMARY REPORT

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC)

Meeting # 14

Wednesday, May 23, 2012 / 10AM

ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room

TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING AGENDA

There were no agenda topics offered by the members for the next meeting. The members will be notified of the next meeting date, time, and location.

FOLLOW-UP/ACTION ITEMS FOR ALCOSAN

1. ALCOSAN will poll members on their availability for a joint meeting with the Regional Stakeholder Group on either July 24 or July 30.
2. ALCOSAN will solicit feedback from the members on the draft WWP release as well as other ALCOSAN 2012 Public Outreach efforts.
3. ALCOSAN will incorporate feedback received from members into the Elected Officials/Municipal Managers letter and redistribute the letter to members by May 24 for final review.
4. ALCOSAN will solicit feedback from the members not in attendance on the Elected Officials/Municipal Managers letter.
5. ALCOSAN will distribute Elected Officials/Municipal Managers letter on behalf of CMAC members in early June.

FOLLOW-UP/ACTION ITEMS FOR CMAC MEMBERS

1. Members will provide ALCOSAN feedback on the Elected Officials/Municipal Managers letter.
2. Members will suggest organizations, clubs, and groups for ALCOSAN to conduct the ALCOSAN Grassroots presentation.

SUGGESTED ACTION ITEMS

The following items were offered from the members as collaborative suggested action items:

1. Based on feedback on the resolution proposed by ALCOSAN at the municipal solicitors meeting, ALCOSAN should consider having representation at the future meetings.
2. ALCOSAN to consider providing the elected officials a similar to the WWP presentation conducted at the CMAC meeting to include the comparison on control alternatives cost.
3. ALCOSAN to consider capturing elected officials' briefing on video and posting to the local cable and television networks.

MEETING #11 HANDOUTS & ITEMS TO BE POSTED TO THE ECM:

1. Meeting #14 Agenda
2. Draft Elected Officials/Municipal Managers letter
3. CMAC Meeting #14 Evaluation Form
4. Meeting #14 Sign-in sheet (posted to the ECM only)
5. Basin Planning Report dated May 2012
6. Wet Weather Plan Update PowerPoint presentation

NEXT MEETING

Members will be polled via email for the next meeting to identify the best date for the Wet Weather Plan preview meeting. The meeting will be July 24 or July 30.



ALCOSAN BASIN FACILITIES PLANNING POST-MEETING SUMMARY REPORT

Customer Municipality Advisory Committee (CMAC)

Meeting # 14

Wednesday, May 23, 2012 / 10AM

ALCOSAN CS&T Training Room

FEEDBACK FROM EVALUATION FORMS

The following feedback was provided by members:

1. ALCOSAN efforts continue to be evident, that they are making every professional effort possible. (Tim Rogers)
2. Please send slides via email. (Patricia Schaefer)
3. Big agenda. (Patricia Schaefer)
4. Handouts and Power Point-excellent! The problem is they are impossible to share with elected, etc as they can't be read. (Mary Ellen Ramage)