



MEMO TO: See List of Attendees Below
FROM: Bob Albright Jr., P.E.
CC: Michael Cunningham
Dick Elander, P.E.
Bob Kukenberger, P.E.
Bob Palladine Jr., P.E.
RE: Meeting Minutes / Clinton CSO Facilities Planning / Meeting with City of Syracuse Regarding Sewer Separation on October 10, 2001 at 10 a.m.
DATE: October 18, 2001

Attendees:

John Clare - LIPO
Sue Miller - LIPO
Steve Martin - OCDDS
Vince Esposito - City of Syracuse DPW
Don Geisser - EEA
Bob Albright - CDM/C&S

The following summarizes the discussion during the meeting.

- The intent of the meeting was to address any additional areas where sewer separation may be cost effective within the Clinton Combined Sewer Service Area as required by the ACJ.
- The service area tributary to CSO 026 was separated in 1988 and is no longer listed on the County’s SPDES Permit. The area tributary to CSO 037 is part of the Army Corps Sewer Separation Project. These are the only areas that EEA feels could be considered a part of the Clinton Combined Sewer Service Area in addition to CSOs 027 through 036.
- EEA estimates that it will cost \$136,000,000 to completely separate the Clinton Combined Sewer Service Area versus \$52 to 56 million to construct a regional treatment facility (RTF) at either the Clinton Station Site or the Gifford Site.
- OCDDS and EEA requested input from the City as to those areas within the Clinton Service Area where problems exist that might benefit from sewer separation. The City responded that the only area with storm water problems is in the vicinity of the County Sheriff’s Building, which is located within CSO 030 on the east side of Onondaga Creek. The City has no records of drainage problems in the vicinity of Armory Square. The City is not aware of any persistent drainage problems on the west side of the creek.
- The City recommends replacing the check valves located along the existing connections to the combined sewer, for those buildings with problems within the vicinity of the County Sheriff’s Office.

- EEA evaluated groupings of combined sewer service areas that could be separated to reduce the size of the RTF and conveyances. Approaches 2 & 3 were presented as two of the most viable CSO abatement approaches at the public presentation. Approach 2 consists of an RTF at one of the preferred sites with separation of all the combined sewer service areas to the west of Onondaga Creek. Approach 3 consists of an RTF with sewer separation of those combined sewer service areas located west of Onondaga Creek and north of Tully Street.
- EEA pointed out that the Clinton Station Site would receive greater benefit from Approaches 2 and 3 than the Gifford Street Site because one or two of the creek crossings would be eliminated. However, it was agreed that neither approach would result in a significant reduction to the proposed size of the RTF.
- The City advised that they would support the current plans regardless of whether the Clinton Station or Gifford Street Site is chosen.
- CDM/C&S noted out that no costs were presented for Approaches 2 & 3 during the public presentation at the OnCenter. The fact that these alternatives were discussed will create an expectation that a cost/benefit analysis will be provided as required in the ACJ. Once a site has been selected, EEA will develop the cost estimates and perform the cost/benefit analysis.
- The City agreed that if CSO Abatement Approaches 2 or 3 demonstrated that sewer separation for these approaches was cost effective to implement, the City would support this finding. On the other hand, if CSO Abatement Approaches 2 and 3 demonstrate that sewer separation for these approaches is not cost effective to implement, the City would support this finding as well.