CSO LTCP Public Meeting #1
March 31, 2008 7pm-9pm
Bulmer Telecommunications Center, HVCC

Rocky Ferraro: Welcomed all and thanked them for attending the first public meeting for the project. Rocky reviewed the agenda by introducing the speakers and their covered topics. Finally Rocky explained the format for the meeting, requesting that in order to provide everyone with an opportunity to ask questions, please keep comments brief and focused.

Rocky noted that this is the first of several public meetings that are being scheduled for the Long Term Control Plan preparation. As the Plan is in its early stages, the objective of this first meeting is to inform attendees about the study objectives, scope of work and the data collection process. At this time it would be premature to discuss possible solutions or their costs. The reason that the study costs $5.3 million is understand the scope of the problem, identify mitigating measures to solve the problems attributable to combines sewer overflows. Until that time, the solutions or the cost implications are unknown. At future meetings there will be an opportunity to discuss potential solutions and the cost implications.

Rocky then provided general history of the project. The Albany Pool Communities consist of: Albany, Cohoes, Green Island, Rensselaer, Troy and Watervliet. As a condition of their State Pollutant Discharge and Elimination System (SPDES) permit renewals, they are required to prepare a Long Term Control Plan by the fall of 2009. Rather than create separate plans, the communities decided to work collaboratively to create a single plan.

Rocky noted that the first meeting to discuss the opportunities and challenges for working together occurred in November 2003. There are financial implications and challenges in doing this but they are committed to finding the most cost effect measures possible to address the issues present in combined sewer overflows. The Albany and Rensselaer County Sewer Districts have put in tremendous effort and technical support. There have been roughly 50 meetings over the past 5 years, and there has been almost 100% attendance at all meetings.

It was reported that the State has also been supportive to this project; this is a $5.3 million study and the State has contributed $3 million to the project through financial support from DEC and the DOS Shared Municipal Services grant because they recognized the importance of working together. The communities have an in-kind contribution of $2 million. Everyone is interested in seeing the most cost effective outcomes and making sure that the project are not being counter-productive in terms of making our urban centers attractive places to live, work and recreate, keeping in mind that these are 6 urban communities and this is one of many issues that they have to address.

Cheryle Webber, DEC Region 4: CSOs and Regulatory Compliance

The EPA delegates responsibility for pollution discharge and elimination permits to the State. The SPDES permit states how much pollution can be discharges to protect aquatic and human life.

Cheryle explained that Combined Sewers are usually found in older communities built before the 1970s Clean Water Act and before concerns about sewage being dumped into rivers. Combined Sewers are designed to collect rainwater, street runoff, and sewage in the same system. A Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) is a discharge of untreated wastewater and runoff before it reaches the sewer treatment plant. Before the Albany and Rensselaer treatment plants were built, combined sewers sent raw sewage straight to the River – it is hard to believe that it was only 35 years ago that this changed.

Cheryle showed pictures of a Combined Sewer system, collecting sewage from the house. Waters flow down the pipe until they hit a check dam, which directs the water to the treatment plant, this is called the interceptor sewer. In wet weather, water comes off the roof leader, footing drains, and off the street as well as sewage from the house. The interceptor sewer to the treatment plant exceeds capacity, and the sewage/runoff flows over the dam and to the river. This is what happens in the Albany Pool communities pretty much every time it rains.

Cheryle explained that DEC cares about CSOs because of the pollutants that are carried in the CSO discharge. She showed a slide of CSO pollutants and their effects from a 2004 EPA Report to Congress. DEC anticipates, although the data is not all in yet, that pathogens and floatables will be the pollutants of concern in this area. Pathogens affect just about everything except aquatic life; referencing Fecal Coliform and E-Coli. Cheryle showed a picture of typical floatables: a plastic bottle that had been captured in a grate. CSOs impact bathing by causing beach closures, and while there are none here, Governor Pataki mandated that the Hudson River should be swimmable. DEC is studying potential beach sites at Schodack Island and Bethlehem Town Park, and these beaches might be impacted by these CSOs.

It was explained that when considering bacteria, fecal coliform is usually measured. DEC has standards for the level that can occur in a waterbody without causing human health impacts. The EPA 2004 report showed that untreated wastewater can have between 1 million and 1 billion coliform colonies/100 ml. CSOs have a median Coliform count of 215,000 colonies/100 ml, and treated wastewater has less than 200 colonies/100 ml – and this is the standard in the State - that could be in the water and not impact human health. Looking at this from a load perspective, EPA determined that 76% of fecal coliform load came from CSOs after urban stormwater runoff and this is why DEC is regulating it.

The control strategy comes from EPA. DEC works for EPA. The strategy is two pronged:

1) Best Management Practices (BMPs), which are low cost, technology strategies which the communities are required to do, such as street sweeping; maintaining and inspecting sewer system; prohibit dry weather overflows; public notification by signs at the outfalls, etc.

2) Long Term Control Plan to protect water quality.

Long Term Control Plan, has nine elements and is split into two parts:

1) Study – of the impact; how often do combined sewers overflow; how much rain causes a CSO (and this is actually much more difficult here because there are six communities to study rather than just one). Once the impacts have been determined, then alternatives to fix it are developed and analyzed. Such alternatives might be to store the water and send it to treatment later; make the treatment plants bigger; provide treatment at every outfall; or methods to prevent water getting into the sewer in the first place. Once all the alternatives have been determined after a cost-benefit analysis, the plan has to be implemented. It is called a Long Term Control plan because the communities get to submit the schedule showing how long it will take to implement and as long as it is reasonable and will make progress, DEC agrees – it is a long-term process. At the end there is a Post-Construction Monitoring Program to ensure that the chosen alternatives actually correct the problems, for example, the community could say that the chosen controls reduce the CSOs to less than 4 a year and so there will be no impact, or that they have reduced pollution such that they can have 20 CSOs and there will be no pollution, so the communities have to monitor to prove the claims.

In the Albany Pool, there are 8 SPDES permits: 2 for the sewer districts and 6 for the communities. There are 92 CS Outfalls within the communities. The Albany Pool Joint venture Team is doing the Phase I study, which includes monitoring and modeling and public participation is required. This is the first of the public participation sessions that are required. They will look at the alternative controls and the costs and submit a Long Term Control Plan to DEC by September 2009. At that time DEC will modify the permits. This is not all about money; it is also about the quality of life for the people who live here.

Ray Rudolph, APJVT Leader: LTCP Project Organization

Spoke about the organizational framework and the role of the different team members and groups. The ***Technical Committee*** is made up of the 6 communities, 2 sewer districts, CDRPC, the Joint Venture Team, and DEC. The ***Citizen's Advisory Committee*** is made up of abutting municipalities, other regulatory agencies, EPA, the Hudson River recreation and environmental groups, and citizen groups generally referred to as stakeholders. ***CDRPC*** represents the Albany Pool communities. The ***Joint Venture Team*** is made up of the three consultant firms: Clough Harbor Associates; Malcolm Pirnie; and Camp, Dressler & McKee.

The Technical Committee's responsibilities are to represent their elected officials and electorate to the consultant team and CDRPC. They also take information back to their communities from the Technical Committee. The Citizen's Advisory Committee's role is to advise the Technical Committee. There are several layers of communication for this huge project, representing several million people that live within the watershed, and the

¼ million people living within the 6 communities, so to conduct effect public outreach, certain activities are delegated to committee members.

Ray used a map of the watershed to show the complexities and scope of the problem. This is more than a local problem, a large part of New York State lies within this watershed and the six communities take up a very geographic small area compared to the area impacted. So, water quality within the River is not only dictated by, or impacted by, our 6 communities, it is impacted by everything that goes on upstream: Forests, agricultural property, other urban property, and suburban property.

Mike Miller, APJVT Project Manager: Public Participation
Mike explained that the team has established a robust public participation program and expressed hope the public will embrace and will aid the team. About 1 meeting per month for the Technical Committee and 1 meeting per quarter for the Citizen's Advisory Committee have been scheduled. The process is designed to keep people involved throughout the entire process and encourage early input.

From a goals and objectives perspective, it is very important for to provide municipal officials with public input because ultimately they will be faced with decisions and will need to know what the public thinks so they can weigh that into their decisions. The public participation is being started early in the process and it will go all the way through both tasks. Dialogue between the DEC and the public is encouraged. One of the important things is to provide public education so that the technical aspects can be clear and awareness of the central issues can be developed.

The target audience is the rate payers and residents of the 6 pool communities; the elected and appointed leadership; the environmental and recreational groups; residents of the adjoining communities; and Riverfront development and businesses.

CSS Characterization Phase – is where data is collected to identify how the system is performing and lay the groundwork for developing the Long Term Control Plan.

CSS Mapping, Database & Digitizing
Large volumes of data are coming in from 6 municipalities and the sewer districts, and one of the challenges is to manage this data and efficiently get it out to the team, the communities and people who need access to it. Mike listed some of the types of data that have been collected thusfar. A demonstration of the database ensued, showing the CSS communities and the locations of the 92 overflows. Clicking on a marked point on the map provided access to photographs and other documentation of the location. This database will aid in understanding how the system works.

There are two types of CSOs that dominate the pool communities' systems:
1) In Troy and Rensselaer, it is a simple gravity overflow with a manual gate. Normal flows will enter into the structure and drop down and are diverted through a low flow pipe, which connects to the interceptor and then to the wastewater treatment plant. During high flow conditions, the capacity of the orifice that controls the low flows is

exceeded and the wastewater starts spilling over the top of the dam, through the tide gate and to the River. Although this system can be tweaked a little to allow a little more or a little less flow to the interceptor, this has been done over the years to maximize flows to the wastewater treatment plant.
2) In Albany, the systems consist of three structures. Normal flow comes in and is diverted by a dam either to a secondary regulator structure and then to the interceptor. Or during high flow, as the interceptor fills, a float will rise and restrict the regulator gate. Therefore during peak flows it is used to restrict flows to the wastewater treatment plant to make sure that treatment capacity is not exceeded. These have been calibrated over the years to maximize wastewater treatment.

Greg Daviero, APJVT: Receiving Water Conditions Assessment
Greg gave an overview of the types of data that will be collected over this coming summer. The objective is to determine what the impact of the CSO overflows is to the River, so the data collection is geared to determine what is already in the River and then what the impact of the additional overflows are. The Hudson River and part of the Mohawk will be characterized in dry and wet weather conditions. Greg used the database to demonstrate the locations of the sampling transects that will be used for both dry and wet weather sampling.

Dry weather assessments will be collected at each of the sampling locations, over three months this summer, during 15 different dry weather events to try to characterize the background conditions in the receiving water: what is already there on a dry weather day and how does that relate to this position on the River or its location relative to a sewer treatment plant discharge or a regulator, or a tributary stream?

At the transects water samples will be taken either from a boat, shore, or bridge. The Route 9 bridge is the upper limit of the Albany Pool area and will be used to assess pre-existing conditions of the Mohawk River as it enters the Pool area. At each of the transects, samples will be taken at each bank and the center of the river. The sample teams will consist of APJVT with a lot of municipal help. On the Hudson River, the upper limit is located at Transect 3, just north of the Troy municipal boundary. In addition to the River transects, discrete samples will be taken at strategic tributary locations along the Hudson River to get a comprehensive set of data in the timeframe allowed. At the lower reaches, there are two sampling locations at potential beach sites south of Albany.

Wet Weather sampling is more complicated. It is important to know what is happening in the River during a rain event. The plan is to collect samples during 4 wet weather events and sample the CSO impact on the River. Each one of the sampling locations will be sampled and revisited during the course of the storm. So as the storm begins, data will be collected more frequently to characterize what is called the “first-flush.” During the first flush a lot of pollutant loading appears so it is necessary to be more proactive about collecting data at that time. And, over the course of 48 hours these sites will be revisited to collect samples so that each site’s response can be monitored over the course of a storm. Bacteria will be sampled: Fecal Coliform and E-Coli. Because this study is

focused on Combined Sewer Overflows, these are the pathogens that are of concern. One of the challenges with this sampling is that there is a very short holding time for the samples, giving a window of 6 hours between taking the sample and the lab beginning to analyze the sample. If the 6 hour window is exceeded, the sample cannot be used. A local lab will be used for the project, but the logistics and timing are challenging.

Combined Sewer System (CSS) Monitoring Plan
The CSS will be characterized with a Combined Sewer Network Model. For the data collection phase, it is necessary to make sure that the tool that simulates the behavior of the combined sewer system has been tested it in a way that allows for it to update and make predictions. The only way to do that is to collect sufficient data.

The database to showed the locations of sewer system monitors to collect flow data over the 12 week period. The monitor locations have been strategically chosen to collect data on the largest contributing areas in a cost effective way. Additionally there are sewer flow monitors that were already installed and used by the Sewer Districts. The data will be used to supplement the data being collected for this project to characterize the system.

Typical pollutant loads are from each of the largest contributing areas will be identified. Within each community the largest contributing areas were identified and sampling will be done as well during wet weather events. This will be taking place simultaneously with the Receiving Water Sampling, over the same 48 hour cycle. Four samples will be taken in each community in 4 rainfall events at each of these locations.

At the conclusion of monitoring the receiving water, the conditions assessment, the flow monitoring and the CSS characterization data collections phase, at the end of this coming summer, there will be enough data to feed into hydraulic and hydrologic models to assess potential solutions.

Dan Durfee, APJVT: Waste Water Treatment Plant Capacity Studies
Two additional tasks are involved in the characterization of the sewer systems. The first is the ***Wet Weather Capacity Study*** that looks at the three sewer treatment plants that are servicing the 6 communities in the Albany Pool. There are two plants owned by the Albany County Sewer District: the South and the North plants; and then the Rensselaer County Sewer Plant. The database was used to show the locations.

The goal of the capacity study is to identify upgrades to the treatment plants to maximize the hydraulic and the process capacity during wet weather events, thus minimizing CSOs. In doing this, the existing capacity of each of the plants will be documenter through process and hydraulic modeling. System bottlenecks and reasonable methods that can increase the capacity of the plants will be examined, thereby reducing the overall costs of satellite treatment facilities upstream on some of these CSO locations. The original design data and the performance data of the treatment plants have been reviewed over the past several years, and the future flows and loadings are being established. This information will be used to develop both process and hydraulic models. At the

conclusion of the capacity evaluation recommendations will be developed in a capacity report, which will be part of the Long Term Control Plan.

The second task is the CSS Modeling. A lot of the monitoring work the Greg detailed will be used to support the modeling. The modeling plan was prepared in the fall of 2007, and was submitted and approved by DEC. It is utilizing the EPA SWIM IV modeling software. Four models will be developed of the combined sewer systems: 2 on the west side of the River for the North and South plants, and 2 on the east side of the River for the City of Troy and the City of Rensselaer. Models are under construction using fieldwork from the fall of 2007. The hydraulic models will incorporate not only the 92 Combined Sewer Outfalls, but also the interceptors, principal trunk sewers, and the pumping stations and will extend all the way to the headworks of the treatment plants, where they will end because there will be separate models for each of the treatment plants themselves. The information Greg talked about collecting from flow monitoring will be used to calibrate the models. The models will be set up this summer, and by the time the flow monitoring data is available, probably in July, model calibration will start so that they reflect actual events found out in the field. Then they can be used to simulate conditions such as 1 year storm events, 5 year storm events, and so on.

The models themselves will serve as the backbone to the study, so there are a lot of costs that go into creating these models and there is a lot of use that will be got out of them. They will be used to predict the frequency of CSOs, the volume, to assess various water quality conditions, and ultimately aid in choosing the control alternatives that will be included in the Long Term Control Plan.

Ray Rudolph, APJVT: LTCP Development Process

This is a particularly complex problem, because of the size of the watershed; there are micro climates, 2 major rivers, the Sacandaga Reservoir (which makes the flow variable, independent of rainfall events), tidal effects, and abutting communities discharging sewage and/or stormwater from their communities through our communities to the River.

There are questions facing the CSO problem- how big is it? Is there a problem? When is there a problem? And what is the impact of the problem? The problem must be defined before resolutions can be discussed. Most of this year is going to be spent getting those answers. Once those answers are derived, discussions about alternatives will start, both quantitative and qualitative; not only is it unknown if there is a problem, but what is the impact of this perceived problem is on human health, on fish life and on aquatic life overall.

Without understanding the magnitude of the costs of the solutions, any plans would be remiss. The schedule will also be outlined and then the preparation of the report, which is basically the 5 Ws and an HM: Who, What, Where, When, Why and How Much?

On the alternatives, again, in developing the strategy, that is the 30,000 foot level, there is going to be lots of different ways to develop, lots of different, plausible strategies in how to meet the EPA regulations. Then we'll look at different technologies; different

solutions have different combinations of technologies then going right to this "preferred technology" it is really the 80-20 rule, trying to find the most impact for the least cost. The financial impact and affordability is established by the EPA in an affordability index. But all 6 of these communities are old, the CSOs are not the only piece of infrastructure that has suffered from deferred maintenance; all those other projects also have monetary needs. Understanding the needs as a whole and how this project and the costs of this project fits in to those municipal needs is going to be critical.

With reference to the schedule, half way through 2008, is where the problem is going to be defined and then the work to start to solve the problem will begin. Lastly, three more public meetings have been planned: the first one was an introduction to the LTCP Development process – that is today. Once the problem has been defined, the second meeting will be held to explain what the problem is and the findings. Round three will focus on discussing proposals for alternatives on how the communities can meet the EPA requirements. The Fourth will be the final plan, with the schedule and the costs.

Mayor McDonald, Albany Pool TC:
Recognized and thanked elected officials and others for coming. This could be one of the largest projects that most people will never see. Elected officials normally answer the calls about garbage, potholes - when are you going to pave my road? That is what they are worried about: are the police there, and the firemen. Infrastructure projects like this are not sexy projects. This is a project that is very complex as the consultants have pointed out. He noted that it has taken many meetings to become fully aware of the complexity of the CSO issue and that it will take some time for the public to appreciate the issues involved. The size, complexity and collaborative nature of the project were emphasized. Each community could individually have spent millions of dollars and would not have come up with a sound and just solution to meet the goals the EPA has set out and left to DEC and the communities to work out and establish. The Mayor commended all of the elected officials and communities for stepping forward.

Mayor McDonald emphasized that the Hudson River is a National treasure. Next year is the 400th anniversary of Henry Hudson's trip up the River, identifying this resource. It has played a large role, not only in the current recreational opportunities and specifically for Cohoes in development opportunities along the waterfront, but it played a large impact in the area's industrial development for centuries. That development has had an impact throughout this country, which should not be lost sight of. The Mayor noted that when he was a child, the Hudson River was looked at as a very dark, murky, dangerous body of water. He credited the visible challenges to the River with motivating elected officials to get involved. 30-35 years ago, 85% of the funding was provided by the federal and State government to address that visible problem. He commended them and thanked them for that because that has led to the opportunities on our waterfront today, but at the same time he stated that the area is now dealing with a less than visible problem that may have a larger financial impact. He encouraged the federal government to become engaged, no only in regards to the promulgation of rules, but also to support the project so the common goal for this National resource can be met.

The Mayor noted that $5.3 million is a lot of money, but by the same token it is money he believes will be well spent in diagnosing what the best solutions are for this situation.

The Mayor listed three things the project needs. One is patience – patience to make sure that everyone can understand what is going on. Two is Time – time is going to be something that will be needed in the long-term to really implement whatever findings and recommendations are made. The third is money. He noted that we are seeing great revitalization throughout these urban communities; in the Albany Pool communities and that should not be stymied. He is also concerned about the impact that it has on the surrounding communities because they are contributing in one way or another.

Leif Engstrom, CDRPC Moderator: Q & A
Leif referenced the project website listed on the back of the brochure. On that website are all of the PowerPoint presentations from tonight and all the PowerPoint presentations made to the Citizens' Advisory Committee. The Scope of Work and the Addendums (the more detailed plans that were submitted) are also on the website, as well as minutes from key meetings.

He asked the audience to return the comment sheet to provide feedback so as alternatives are discussed, the process can be as inclusive and effective as possible.

He then opened up the floor for questions and comments

Question: Asked if there is a map of the CSO locations.

APJVT: The database is still a work in process, that map will be posted on the CDRPC website when completed.

Question: Asked if you supposed to be able to see the CSO outfall signs from the River, from the land, or from both? Because he hasn't been able to locate them.

DEC: The communities' permits require that the signs be visible from both sides: the landside and the riverside. She asked to be notified if the signs are not up.

Question: Asked why are communities that contribute flow to the CSS not involved in this and how come they aren't part of the Pool communities.

APJVT: The communities involved currently are the ones that are regulated under the CSO regulations and until there is a much better understanding of how those flows contribute and what their impact is, it is really too early. The other communities are part of the CAC (Citizens' Advisory Committee) so there is some involvement and education regarding the program.

Question: How can the Patroon Creek interceptor take all the pipes that are going to it without having any overflows into the Patroon Creek?

APJVT: There aren't any overflows currently on that interceptor. Part of the study will assess the capacity of that interceptor. Generally, there is a lot of elevation change in that interceptor, so with the elevation change you get a lot more capacity.

Question: Is the Patroon Creek Interceptor designed with CSOs? Do the pipes that go into that interceptor go into it with no opportunity for it to overflow?

APJVT: There are a number of meters that Albany County Sewer District maintains for the purpose of billing generally. They will be used to characterize the influence of the areas contributing to the North Treatment Plant, which is where the Patroon Creek goes. While this is a combined sewer overflow project, if you look at the entire tributary area where sewage is developed it is larger than just the combined sewage area. The Patroon Creek is being considered because it is the major conveyance structure carrying primarily sanitary sewage to the North Plant.

Question: So there is no stormwater in that interceptor?

APJVT: Not by design.

Question: Is the first flush mostly captured by the WWTP, thus dealing with many pollutants and floatables that would otherwise discharge in a separate storm sewer system?

APJVT: There is an on-going debate right now with regulatory agencies as to just how much separation is going to be ultimately beneficial and how much the combined sewers can actually benefit in some manner because they do provide some level of treatment from storm sewers that does get conveyed to the treatment plants during less intense wet weather events. There seems to be somewhat of a paradigm shift, or at least an openness to explore this.

Question: Questioner expressed concern that there is not much public awareness about this issue, and that within in the City of Albany there is little attention being paid to how the implementation will be paid for. Asked what could be done to improve both public and official awareness.

CDRPC: There has been some good public input thus far. The project has good public relations with the Press- be it the printed media as well as the television stations. There has been some exposure. The website is another form of exposure that is taking place. Also, the members of the Technical Committee provided feedback to their elected officials. The project team will be more than glad to meet individually with the City Councils and other leaders to have more in-depth discussions. As the Mayor pointed out, the problem is not as visible as it was forty years ago. The project team is trying to get a head start on this, so people are aware of it.

Question: Who in the end, through EPA or DEC is going to ultimately be responsible for paying for this, is it only going to be the Cities and Green Island, or is it going to be the

Counties or all the municipalities. Development in Glenmont and Town of Bethlehem has occurred in areas that used to be wetlands and other areas to help absorb water that now has become runoff and may enter our system. They going to be included in some of the early stages but are they going to be included financially too?

CDRPC: That is the challenge of inter-municipal cooperation. Just to get to where the program is now, has been difficult because there are 6 different municipalities at the table and they all have to agree on the path that they are willing to take. Add to that that there are tributary communities that are contributing sanitary sewage to the problem and the process becomes even more complex. So that will be addressed in the Long Term Control Plan, but the process is not at that point yet. The problem needs to be accurately identified before discussions can take place about how costs are divided or if they are divided at all.

ACSD: Commented on the complexity of the issue and complemented CDRPC for keeping the project on track. The plants have a dry weather design, and a wet weather capacity. The system does not overflow every time it rains. There needs to be a level of precipitation that causes the system to surcharge and that causes an overflow. The goal with the existing infrastructure and treatment plants, is to maximize capacity. The plants are designed for 35MGD but they treat instantaneous flows of up to 115 MGD and still meet primary treatment. This study is going to define what level of precipitation causes overflows.

Question: What can the development community expect over the next several years while this study is going on regarding regulatory requirements, or investigative requirements, for new developments?

DEC: This refers to some more recent guidance that DEC put out to the Regions with respect to inflows or significant sewer extensions upstream of CSOs. What is required is that an assessment tool be in place to identify the impact of the additional sewage that will go to the municipal systems. It is unknown what type of impact that will have on the Hudson River, so its develop an assessment tool to be able to do that. There may be other infrastructure improvements that could be realized that may offset the new flows. For example, it could be possible that the additional flow might be mitigated by an interim improvement, like removing a bottleneck or pinch-pint to allow the development to continue. It is very basic infrastructure drainage planning.

Question: At this point in time we don't know what to do about that because the study hasn't been completed, correct?

DEC: That should be taken up with the engineers to see what their state of knowledge is of the hydraulic modeling tools. This has been a kind of broad-brush view of the operation of all the drainage systems and how they operate during wet weather but the state of information for each of these sub-drainage areas isn't all the same. Developers will have to work with the down-stream community to determine what what can be done now. Sewer extensions are usually approved by a County Health Department or DEC's

Regional office. It may be that something could be planned out for the future to allow the development to continue as originally planned with some future commitment to mitigate the sewage flows

Question: Will the impact study be done as part of this study or will that be a second one?

DEC: It would be ideal to have all the modeling tools in place. Totally stopping development is not a realistic position. If there are any ways of committing to future offsets as part of connecting those flows that would allow DEC to approve those flows. Going in blind, accepting the flows, without any knowledge of the impacts or any plan for mitigation is not a responsible thing for to do when DEC is pushing these communities to get the CSOs eliminated.

Question: Is there any type of a standard or a policy that can be issued in the interim?

DEC: There has been some internal guidance to the regional water engineers in that outlines this policy approach and the modeling tools to assess the impacts. In the interim development of mitigation or offsets is allowed, but what that mitigation or offset would be can only be determined by an engineering study and those practices are pretty standard.

Question: Asked about the occasional stench that occurs in North Albany near the Hudson River. Had been told by DEC that it may have something to do with sewer overflows. Asked for the project to investigate the odors and the impact on the local communities. Asked how the members of the community will be able to know that this project is the place to go to get some answers about their concerns. Since the Sewer District is also in the South End, asked that some light be shed on how people will come to understand how this actually impacts not just pollution for the River but also how the air is also impacted.

CDRPC: There is not a plan to study existing odors in this project.

ACSD Director: Asked that the questioner call him directly any time that she is noticing an odor. He would need to see when it is and what else is going on when she are noticing those odors.

Question: Hopes that air pollution is not something that is missed while all of the money is being spent on this project. That is question that the community would be asking– are you going to address this issue?

DEC: Noticed the smell up by the Hudson too, by the Menands line. Does not think it is the treatment plant – not sure what that it but one of the things about CSOs is that they don't smell nice, and when it is low tide and the sediments are deposited on the river bank they may smell. The answer is yes, it will be addressed because the objective of the plan is to minimize CSO discharges in the first place. So if CSO discharges aren't

happening as often, or there is not as much volume, or as much sedimentation settling on the river bank, then the odor will be less.

CDRPC: Please do fill out the comment forms, even if you have just one or two things to say. Please place it on the table in the hallway. The website has contact information for any further questions.

Meeting adjourned.