

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COUNTY OF HAMILTON
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING

*Hearing to Consider the Lick Run Alternative
volume 3 of 4*

Metropolitan Sewer District
Cincinnati, Ohio

Monday, October 8, 2012
5:42 p.m.

1 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Good
2 evening, everyone.

3 I would like to welcome you to
4 this Special Meeting of the Board of
5 Hamilton County Commissioners for the
6 purposes of a public hearing to consider
7 the Lower Mill Creek Partial Remedy
8 solution.

9 Let me introduce those of us
10 before you tonight. I am Commission
11 President, Greg Hartmann.

12 Over here is Jacqueline Panioto,
13 clerk to the Board.

14 To my immediate right is County
15 Commissioner Todd Portune.

16 To my immediate left is vice
17 president to the Board, Commissioner
18 Chris Monzel.

19 To Commissioner Monzel's left is
20 County Administrator Christian Sigman.
21 And since we've got the flag with us
22 tonight, why don't we say the Pledge of
23 Allegiance prior to our meeting.

24 Please rise.

25

1 (The Pledge of Allegiance was
2 recited.)

3 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: This is
4 one of a series of meetings related to
5 the issue of the Lower Mill Creek
6 Partial Remedy.

7 And why don't we get started by
8 calling forward Executive Director of
9 the Metropolitan Sewer District, Tony
10 Parrott, to, maybe, say a few words
11 about the meeting tonight and some of
12 the things that we've learned thus far
13 in our public hearings.

14 Tony.

15 MR. PARROTT: Good evening,
16 Commissioners. And on behalf of my
17 staff, I want to welcome you to our
18 facility here at the Metropolitan Sewer
19 District.

20 And as you pointed out, this is
21 the third of four scheduled public
22 hearings to discuss the MSD
23 recommendation for the Lower Mill Creek
24 Partial Remedy. And one of the things
25 that we want to talk about tonight is a

1 little bit about the recommendation, but
2 also to address a few issues or respond
3 to a few issues or a few questions that
4 we've received from the Board from
5 previous public meetings.

6 with your permission, though, one
7 thing I want to do, I want to enter for
8 the record, we discussed last meeting
9 some of the issues relative to flooding,
10 and I do have a white paper that I want
11 to enter into the record for the Board.

12 And also, I want to enter into
13 the record an issue that also has been
14 brought up before regarding local data
15 and how that impacts modeling. We want
16 to enter that into the record for the
17 Board.

18 And we also want to, as I've
19 mentioned in previous public hearings,
20 we've had about six or eight weekly
21 technical calls with the Regulators, the
22 County team, and the MSD team. And we
23 want to enter into the record the
24 minutes from our last technical call
25 with USEPA, because I don't think you've

1 received that yet.

2 And then, finally, what we want
3 to enter into the record are some
4 specific questions that were addressed
5 with our discussion last week with
6 USEPA, and specific questions that were
7 brought forth from the Assistant County
8 Administrator, Jeff Aluotto, as a part
9 of that conversation, and the specific
10 responses to those risk criteria that we
11 had presented to the Board in the
12 matrix, or crosswalk, of risk area. So,
13 for the record, I want to enter those.

14 But real quickly, tonight, what I
15 want to do is first of all just recap
16 our alternative, talk a little bit
17 specific about when we say strategic
18 storm sewer separation, what we mean.
19 Talk a little bit about how that local
20 data component comes in, and some of the
21 confidence we have in that output of the
22 results and Regulator feedback that
23 we've gotten so far.

24 As I mentioned in the two
25 previous public meetings, we had two

1 alternatives that we looked at. We
2 recommended to the Board that we look at
3 a more sustainable alternative with the
4 specific watersheds that would achieve
5 up to approximately 2 billion gallons of
6 combined sewer overflow reduction as a
7 part of the Phase 1 requirement.

8 And one of the things that I want
9 to point out is that alternative that we
10 recommended to you -- and this is from
11 the April 2nd preliminary report that we
12 gave you -- I wanted to kind of show you
13 the -- what makes up the alternative.

14 One thing that is very clear,
15 that this is sort of a mix of grey
16 solution and more sustainable, or green,
17 solution. But it contains the best of
18 grey in terms of putting in linear storm
19 sewers. And also it's the -- it
20 represents the water quality and the
21 flexibility and the components of green
22 infrastructure that, you know, kind of
23 brings you the cost control as well. So
24 it is the best of grey and the benefits
25 and flexibility of green in terms of our

1 approach.

2 But one thing to point out, we do
3 have as a part of the mix of projects,
4 we have nontunnel storage. We also have
5 additional storage and stormwater
6 detention basins, and also additional
7 storage up in our King's Run area as
8 well. So we do have a mix of projects
9 as a part of that alternative.

10 We look at this slide, it shows
11 you the existing combined sewer system.
12 And this is just really showing you, as
13 we've said before, we are looking at a
14 combined sewer system. And then up in
15 those watersheds, we have some areas
16 that have separate storm sewers already
17 and some areas that have sanitary sewers
18 that are combined sewers and come into a
19 larger combined sewer, and we have
20 overland flow that comes through the
21 hillside and ravines that get into the
22 existing combined sewer. So this is a
23 very good way of kind of showing you
24 what the system looks like up into the
25 system, up into the hillsides.

1 But as we move forward and start
2 talking about strategic storm sewer
3 separation, what do we mean by that?

4 What we're doing is we're taking
5 the previous slide that showed you the
6 existing storm sewers that are coming
7 into a combined system, we're taking
8 those storm sewers out of the combined
9 sewer. The other thing we're doing is
10 we're removing the downspout connections
11 that are connected to the existing
12 storm, and we're also removing hillside
13 ravines and inlets that are also
14 connected to the combined sewer.

15 So strategically, we're
16 eliminating the large, big-bang
17 connections to reduce inflow into the
18 combined sewer, and we're not really
19 going into private property or
20 house-to-house to make these Tier 1
21 connections, which is really depicted in
22 the lighter blue on the map.

23 As we are doing consent decrees,
24 as other major cities are doing consent
25 decrees, we are required to have a

1 model, and we have a model that we call
2 the little black box, which really is
3 just a USEPA hydraulic and hydrologic
4 modeling software. And there's various
5 inputs that normally go into that black
6 box. It tells how much acreage or how
7 much area is -- and how much rainfall is
8 going to be going, how many pipes and
9 outfalls are a part of it, and how often
10 or how much dry weather flow you have.
11 And that model then gives you flow to
12 the treatment plant, combined sewer
13 overflows, or overland flow to the
14 stream.

15 So when you talk about the models
16 itself, there's really three ways -- and
17 this is getting to the local data
18 question that came up last week. Three
19 inputs to the model, or three approaches
20 that we use to local data, one is for
21 inputs, one is to refine the model
22 assumptions, and one is to confirm the
23 model results. And I'll talk briefly on
24 those three points.

25 As far as local data to input

1 into the model, we're talking about pipe
2 sizes and shapes, and we're talking
3 about invert elevations, hydraulic
4 interconnections. But, essentially,
5 you're talking about this is sort of a
6 cross-section look of what we're talking
7 about when we're talking about inputs
8 that we monitor.

9 This is a 19-and-a-half-foot
10 pipe, which is the combined sewer
11 overflow, which is the largest pipe in
12 that Lick Run basin. And so those large
13 pipes are difficult to monitor the
14 sudden severe storms. And there's also
15 access and safety issues that are tough,
16 and I'll tell you how important that is
17 in a second.

18 But in order to update the model,
19 we have looked at specifics in terms of
20 our as-builds, looked at how those
21 specifics, whether the manholes are
22 sealed or whether the shapes and sizes
23 of the sewer updates -- and this is a
24 good example of that Lick Run sewer I
25 pointed out earlier. Sometimes the

1 model assumes that all your pipes are
2 round, and really in some of our system,
3 we have pipes that are shaped like this,
4 and we also have brick pipes in our
5 system. And so we go in and recognize
6 the shape and the size of those pipes
7 and to make sure that the coefficients
8 and all those are modified as we update
9 the model.

10 As far as how we use local data
11 to refine the model, we figure in a pan
12 of aberration. We also figure in soil
13 borings, well over three hundred
14 different soil borings on the ground to
15 confirm soil conditions and groundwater
16 elevation. We talk a lot with our
17 operational staff to gain an accurate
18 and an understanding of the location of
19 the surcharges to make sure we
20 understand how the system is operating.

21 And then we also do a lot of
22 catchment parameters. We look at runoff
23 catchment parameters, not only as a
24 basin area, but also a lot of different
25 subbasins, and I'll talk about that in a

1 second.

2 This is a good map that shows you
3 the catchment areas, particularly in the
4 Lick Run watershed. And we really got
5 down on the ground to look at percent
6 effectiveness. And this just kind of
7 shows you the 85 or 87 different
8 subcatchment areas within Tier 1 of the
9 Lick Run watershed that were really --
10 we didn't rely on regional data or
11 regional studies; we actually got on the
12 ground to measure percent effectiveness.

13 An example of what we mean when
14 we say get on the ground and measure
15 percent effectiveness, you can kind of
16 see here where there's an existing storm
17 sewer connected to the existing combined
18 sewer, so we are going up and we're
19 actually making a disconnect, where that
20 circle is, to take that storm sewer out
21 of the combined system.

22 And the point is, is that even
23 though there was a desktop analysis that
24 showed that there was probably
25 90 percent effectiveness in terms of

1 stormwater catchment, once we went out
2 in the field and we did some field
3 verification, the percent effectiveness
4 on capture was about 82 percent. So the
5 point is, is that we're refining our
6 assumptions and we put those as far as
7 model inputs into our model
8 verification.

9 Here is another one where we went
10 up and we actually saw that the percent
11 effectiveness was increased based upon
12 our on-the-ground analysis. And so we
13 did a lot of boots on the ground and
14 very specific subcatchment analysis to
15 make sure that our assumptions were
16 accurate. And it reflects level of
17 detail field efforts to verify the
18 removal assumptions in the model.

19 The final piece is local data to
20 confirm the model results. This is a
21 slide that really shows you all of the
22 differing flow monitoring data that we
23 have throughout our system for planning
24 and monitoring efforts throughout the
25 service area. And I think it's just --

1 it's really a risk to, kind of, see
2 that, you know, we've always had a lot
3 of flow monitoring data, and we rely on
4 that as we plan projects going forward.

5 The issue at hand is specifically
6 the Mill Creek. And when you think
7 about how we used the local data to
8 confirm the results along the Mill
9 Creek, first we start with our
10 wastewater treatment plant. And these
11 hydrographs kind of show you, based upon
12 what our model says and what our actual
13 data shows, you can see how it kind of
14 rides together to verify the accuracy of
15 what we're seeing at our wastewater
16 treatment plant.

17 We also did the same thing at our
18 auxiliary Mill Creek interceptor and at
19 our Mill Creek interceptor at West Fork
20 and the auxiliary interceptor at CSO 18
21 and also up at CSO 181 and CSO 487.

22 The point is, is to show that
23 each one of these locations, when we
24 compared the model results with the
25 actual results, you can see how the

1 hydrographs ride, pretty much, to
2 confirm the results of our model. And
3 when we talk about modeling, we follow
4 the waPUG standard, where it says the
5 main difference in the levels of
6 verification will be in the number of
7 points at which the model is verified,
8 rather than the exactness of the fit.

9 And so when we talked to the
10 Regulators, they've articulated to us
11 that we -- our approach to use -- we
12 used to model separation is accepted
13 method, and they have confidence in the
14 model for capturing the sewer
15 separation.

16 Specific to the Lick Run data, we
17 have data that we've had from 2011,
18 where if we go back to this point here
19 where we're saying we're going to be
20 disconnecting these larger pipe storm
21 sewers and these larger pipe areas. We
22 have information specific to those areas
23 that really give us the confidence of
24 the local data that we are seeing,
25 particularly with the storm sewers that

1 are being separated in this area,
2 because they, again, are big-bang
3 separations, and the data that we've
4 collected over the 10 months in 2011
5 supported the model's assumptions for
6 the amount of rainfall. And the results
7 were within 1 percent of our stormwater
8 removal assumptions.

9 When we started talking about
10 where we were going with the
11 recommendation, when we submitted the
12 recommendation to the Board in April of
13 this year, as we were concerned about
14 dual spend, we started vetting with the
15 Regulators about additional information
16 or flow monitoring information that they
17 would like to see. And we wanted to go
18 up into the watersheds to make sure we
19 were looking at smaller pipes and also
20 monitoring flows in the upstream areas
21 of the watershed that were no greater
22 than 66 inches in diameter, and maximum
23 velocity is no greater than 12 feet per
24 second to make sure we were getting good
25 monitoring data and to make sure that we

1 weren't having any safety issues in
2 those pipes.

3 The flow monitoring, as we moved
4 forward, over the last eight weeks that
5 we've been vetting with the Regulators,
6 kind of gives you additional monitoring
7 that will support beyond 30 percent
8 design and going into preconstruction
9 and final design and postconstruction
10 monitoring. And the Regulators have
11 indicated that they're comfortable with
12 this approach.

13 So when you talk about the risk
14 relative to the flow monitoring data
15 that we have so far, we believe we've
16 collected a plethora, or a wealth, of
17 local data that has been data that is
18 sophisticated and used by current
19 modeling technology that is very
20 sophisticated. And one of the things
21 that's clear is that the Regulators have
22 indicated that the model that we're
23 using, there are no red flags.

24 The agency has made a
25 comprehensive effort to review all of

1 the 87 subcatchments in the watershed.
2 We have leading experts that have looked
3 at the model input, including the
4 independent expert that the County hired
5 to look at it as well, Tetra Tech. And
6 we also know that our model is correct,
7 due to the validation and accordance
8 with the waPUG standards upstream and
9 downstream of the CSO 5 location.

10 And we have confidence in the
11 stormwater removal volumes, and the
12 existing local data provides good
13 understanding of the quantities that
14 will be removed.

15 So as we conclude, just real
16 quickly, we've had a lot of
17 discussions -- and I'm pretty sure Jeff
18 Aluotto, who has just been very helpful
19 in our discussions with the
20 Regulators -- the Regulators have
21 articulated that our model, or our
22 approach used to model separation, is an
23 accepted method. The Regulators have
24 confidence that our CSO model is
25 effectively capturing sewer separation.

1 Robin Corathers.

2 MS. CORATHERS: Good evening.

3 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Good
4 evening.

5 MS. CORATHERS: My name is Robin
6 Corathers. I'm the executive director
7 of Groundwork Cincinnati Mill Creek. We
8 were formerly called Mill Creek
9 Restoration Project.

10 We have both a local and a
11 national mandate to work in the Lower
12 Mill Creek watershed, and we have a
13 special focus on economically depressed
14 neighborhoods in the City of Cincinnati.

15 We have actively participated in
16 MSD's public meetings and workshops.
17 We're a member of the Communities of the
18 Future advisory committee, and we have
19 reviewed the Lower Mill Creek Partial
20 Remedy report.

21 And given that participation and
22 our understanding of the issues,
23 Groundwork Cincinnati Mill Creek fully
24 endorses the Phase 1 sustainable
25 approach, which probably is not a

1 surprise. And we believe that it is
2 watershed based, it's holistic in scope.
3 It concentrates on source control, which
4 Tony was talking to a few minutes ago.
5 The source control will help keep the
6 stormwater and the natural flow of
7 streams out of the combined sewers and
8 effectively reduce the combined sewage
9 overflows to Mill Creek and the
10 tributaries to Mill Creek.

11 We also support the use of
12 strategic green infrastructure
13 approaches, whether it's through
14 forestation, wetlands, rain gardens,
15 bioswales. We believe these approaches
16 are fiscally, as well as economically --
17 I'm sorry, ecologically sound, and that
18 they will provide multiple benefits for
19 the public.

20 We understand that additional
21 grey infrastructure will be needed to
22 help meet all of the terms of the
23 consent decree, and that reality is
24 called the sustainable hybrid
25 alternative in the partial remedy

1 report.

2 Over the past three years, MSD
3 could have focused solely on building a
4 far more expensive deep tunnel. The
5 public would never see it. The public
6 would never see it, but their rates
7 would continue to go up every year, and
8 we also think that it would have a
9 higher life cycle cost, and the energy
10 costs would be far higher to operate and
11 maintain it for many years to come.

12 So we commend the County
13 Commission, the City, and MSD leadership
14 for the foresight in really developing a
15 viable alternative to the deep tunnel.
16 It will save dollars, it engages diverse
17 public and private partners, and it uses
18 sewer improvements as a catalyst for
19 economic reinvestment in Lower Mill
20 Creek neighborhoods that really need it
21 the most.

22 Two very quick specific comments.
23 One has to do with Chapter 12, Butler
24 County impacts on water quality. We're
25 very concerned that the report states

1 that even if all of the CSOs in the
2 County of Hamilton are eliminated that
3 we would still not meet water quality
4 standards because of bacteria levels
5 coming from Butler County sources.

6 we believe that this is a
7 critical issue for public health. It's
8 an issue for water quality, and it
9 really impacts the ultimate net benefit
10 of the investment under the MSD consent
11 decree. So we believe that this may
12 require political leadership, as well as
13 additional regulatory controls.

14 Our second specific comment deals
15 with recreational use in Mill Creek in
16 the lower reaches of the river.

17 The report points out that
18 because of channelization and sewage and
19 industrial transportation uses,
20 recreational use is pretty limited at
21 present time. However, we believe that
22 as we continue to create the Mill Creek
23 Green-and-White Trail, we continue to
24 make ecological improvements, we bring
25 back parks and recreational facilities

1 and amenities, and as MSD continues to
2 reduce the sewage getting into the
3 river, that Mill Creek neighborhoods,
4 and actually everyone in the City and in
5 this area, will want to come to Mill
6 Creek, and there will be more
7 recreational use in time.

8 So I just wanted to stress that
9 water quality is a high priority for
10 economically disadvantaged and also
11 disproportionately impacted
12 neighborhoods in the City of Cincinnati.

13 Thank you.

14 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Thank
15 you. Thank you very much for being
16 here.

17 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE:
18 Mr. President?

19 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN:
20 Commissioner Portune.

21 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: Robin,
22 before you leave the podium, just want
23 to ask a quick question, if I could.

24 Getting back to the Butler County
25 issue and potential additional

1 regulatory control that you're calling
2 for, can you be more specific on that?
3 Do you have anything in mind in
4 particular, and what would be the focus
5 of that? Are you calling for regulatory
6 control to apply to a sewershed or
7 watershed basis, meaning it would have
8 impact on Butler County, or are you
9 calling for increased controls in
10 Hamilton County that would require
11 additional expense for us and for County
12 ratepayers?

13 MS. CORATHERS: I can tell you
14 that I'm not referring to additional
15 expense and measures that would be taken
16 in Hamilton County, but I am concerned
17 that the report says that because of
18 these sources from Butler County -- and
19 I assume it's the Butler County
20 Wastewater Treatment Plant.

21 Is that correct, Tony?

22 MR. PARROTT: I think it's a
23 combination of a lot of different
24 contributing factors upstream, north
25 of --

1 MS. CORATHERS: So it could also
2 be stormwater runoff, it could be --

3 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: I think
4 the fact is when the water hits our
5 border, it already has certain levels of
6 contaminate, is what the problem is.

7 MS. CORATHERS: Exactly.

8 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: And absent
9 a watershed or sewershed approach,
10 you're going to have clean water issues.

11 MS. CORATHERS: That's -- that's
12 true. And I think there needs to be a
13 close look at the controls on the
14 wastewater treatment plant in Butler
15 County. There needs to be a look at all
16 of the nonpoint sources that could be
17 contributing to the bacteria levels
18 coming in to Hamilton County.

19 So, again, I think it's both a
20 political conversation, as well as a
21 regulatory conversation.

22 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Thank you
23 very much.

24 MS. CORATHERS: Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Charles

1 Young.

2 MR. YOUNG: Good evening,
3 Commissioners.

4 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Good
5 evening.

6 MR. YOUNG: My name Charles
7 Young, vice president of South Fairmount
8 Community Council. And I've come before
9 you many times stating the same
10 reasoning for being here, and I will
11 represent it again. Mainly it's because
12 of the economic impact to my community,
13 and also the costs of the ratepayer for
14 this project.

15 I did want to echo some of the
16 comments that was made by the previous
17 speaker, which is something I want to
18 address a little bit today. And I do
19 concur with the findings that she has
20 represented, because there's probably a
21 lot of you who have never been down to
22 CSO 5 like I have and seen an overflow
23 event, strategic, like I have, because
24 usually people don't want to be out in
25 the rain, something I'm used to doing.

1 But a lot of my concerns with
2 that and some of our people in the
3 community, what they have with that CSO
4 overflow is whether or not you can do
5 some containment. I don't know if you
6 want to call it a flooding control with
7 that whole area, once we do do the SI,
8 if that's what you guys want to do.

9 But my observation is, pretty
10 much, the same as what has been said
11 from Butler County all the way down,
12 that once the Mill Creek fills, what
13 happens to the Mill Creek and how does
14 it affect any project we do?

15 What I saw in the past, and most
16 recently a few weeks ago, is the same
17 I've always said: when the Mill Creek
18 overflows or rises, there's a potential
19 to actually get into the CSOs or maybe
20 overflow and go back to the treatment
21 plant. And nobody never talks a lot
22 about that.

23 What we have a problem with in
24 the community is where is the guarantee
25 that that wouldn't happen, even if we do

1 a project either way, that that water
2 would never get to a level where it
3 could get inside the new project that
4 we're talking about today. So I want
5 you to consider that as well.

6 And the second reason why I'm
7 here tonight is because there's been a
8 little more talk about the historic
9 preservation of buildings in our
10 community and whether or not the
11 relationship between the Ohio Historic
12 Preservation Office and MSD has rendered
13 any good things for us to do from the
14 community. So far we haven't heard
15 anything from them that says that
16 they're looking at preserving a lot of
17 our historic buildings on our behalf,
18 and I was interested to find out where
19 are we going to go with that, because
20 everybody is worried about having
21 historic buildings preserved in our
22 community as well.

23 Thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Thank you
25 very much for being here tonight,

1 Mr. Young.

2 Hershel Daniels.

3 MR. DANIELS: Hi. Name is
4 Hershel Daniels. I'm representing
5 Hargrove Engineering.

6 And just a short report that
7 we'll be giving to you in more detail in
8 writing on Wednesday as a followup to
9 our meeting in Washington, D.C. with the
10 African Scientific Institute for a
11 chance to present a paper as a
12 Constituency for Africa 2012, Ronald H.
13 Brown, African Affairs Series,
14 strategies for engaging the diaspora
15 through the African Scientific Institute
16 forum, whose theme this year was
17 Engaging the African Diaspora with
18 Africa's Energy Development.

19 This is a followup to the U.S.
20 State Department's meeting in June here
21 in Cincinnati. And what it's all about
22 is what we did in June of 2011 when we
23 approached Mr. Parrott to establish an
24 alliance that talks about creating a
25 center of excellence here in Hamilton

1 County on sewers.

2 Now, as many people know, we have
3 an alternative, we're an engineering
4 firm. We have an alternative to -- I
5 guess you could say the alternative to
6 the default. What we are tasked to do
7 from administration is to prove the
8 science of the cost-effectiveness of
9 this. You should know, as of
10 September 25th, our partner in this,
11 National Community Investment Coalition,
12 became a nationwide community
13 development financial institution. And
14 what we are about with South Fairmount
15 Community Council is sustaining the
16 community, keeping business in Hamilton
17 County by lowering the total cost of the
18 project, and to be able to provide
19 future jobs, because we would then
20 become the center worldwide for sewers
21 and next-generation centers.

22 In 2010, Tony Parrott's
23 organization issued the first municipal
24 sewer sustainability report. We're on
25 track here in the South Fairmount

1 Community Council to be the first
2 community ever to issue its own
3 sustainability report that actually
4 leaves no one behind.

5 Thank you very much.

6 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Thank you
7 very much for being here.

8 Let's go now to comments and
9 questions from Commissioners.

10 Before I do, I'll formally accept
11 the documents that Executive Director
12 Parrott has offered for us.

13 We've also distributed a document
14 tonight that's been authored by a
15 Mr. James Karl (phonetic). I'll
16 formally receive that for the record, as
17 well, and I will move at this point to
18 receive those documents for the official
19 public record.

20 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: Second.

21 MS. PANIOTO: Commissioner
22 Hartmann?

23 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Yes.

24 MS. PANIOTO: Commissioner
25 Monzel?

1 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: Yes.

2 MS. PANIOTO: Commissioner
3 Portune?

4 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: Yes.

5 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Let's go
6 now to comments and questions by
7 Commissioners.

8 Commissioner Monzel.

9 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: Thank you,
10 Mr. President.

11 I just have a few comments -- I
12 guess questions tonight in regards to, I
13 guess, one of the issues I faced coming
14 to this hearing, and that's traffic. I
15 know it's an issue that is felt
16 throughout our region, but I know it's
17 something that's been specifically in
18 the South Fairmount area. And just
19 having gone down that way just last week
20 to take my youngest boy to a birthday
21 party over in Western Hills, there is
22 quite a bit of traffic that flows
23 through the community.

24 And so my questions tonight are
25 kind of dealing with the project and the

1 impact of that on the traffic patterns
2 in South Fairmount and the costs related
3 to that.

4 So -- and I guess my first
5 question is, did MSD go and have
6 discussions with our Ohio Department of
7 Transportation or the Cincinnati
8 Department of Transportation in regards
9 to the impact on traffic patterns with
10 regards to this project?

11 MR. PARROTT: Commissioner, I can
12 tell you that, you know, the conceptual
13 planning and the discussions that we've
14 had, not only from MSD, but also as part
15 of our Communities of the Future
16 Advisory Committee, we did have
17 representation on our advisory committee
18 from Cincinnati Department of
19 Transportation and also from ODOT. As
20 we started to get into beyond just the
21 conceptual discussion, we've had
22 involvement from Cincinnati Department
23 of Transportation.

24 From what I understand, there's
25 also been some funding, or grants, that

1 are being pursued by -- I think it's
2 through OKI to look at some improvements
3 for the corridor. And I'm not sure if
4 that grant has been received yet, but I
5 do know that the Cincinnati Department
6 of Transportation and OKI did apply --
7 through OKI -- did apply for a grant.

8 We have looked at how, at least
9 conceptually, through the level of
10 design that we've had how that would
11 impact certain corridor -- the
12 transportation in the corridor. One
13 specific impact, we do know that when we
14 looked at the layout of Beekman Street,
15 for example, is one street that may be
16 impacted and may be relocated or
17 rerouted or eliminated. I know
18 Cincinnati Department of Transportation
19 has looked at the feasibility of looking
20 at whether they would do some type of
21 boulevard through there.

22 And so but to answer your
23 question specifically, we've been at the
24 table with Cincinnati Department of
25 Transportation, and ODOT has also been

1 at the table as well as we've moved this
2 project out to --

3 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: So in the
4 planning stagings --

5 Mr. President, if I can continue.

6 -- how far do you think -- you're
7 not even in design phase on this, you're
8 still just in the conceptual with
9 regards to the traffic layout, correct?
10 You haven't put any designs in place for
11 how that would -- the flow would be
12 impacted yet?

13 MR. PARROTT: Basically, at
14 30 percent design, we're assuming --
15 we're assuming -- we're assuming that
16 the traffic patterns are going to pretty
17 much stay the way they are, unless
18 there's some recommendation from
19 Cincinnati Department of Transportation
20 based on the grant that they're pursuing
21 to do a different layout of traffic
22 patterns.

23 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: So with the
24 length of this project, how long will it
25 take to get the project from first shelf

1 on the ground to completion? In this
2 area, in the South Fairmount area.

3 MR. PARROTT: From a schedule
4 standpoint, from a sequencing
5 standpoint, we're looking at a period of
6 three to four years of construction.

7 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: And that
8 would be impacting other traffic
9 patterns in the area during that time,
10 potentially.

11 MR. PARROTT: Potentially there
12 would be some issues that we would have
13 to address through CDOT and through ODOT
14 and coordinate any type of work that may
15 be going on with the western Hills
16 viaduct as well.

17 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: And do we
18 have any cost estimates yet in regards
19 to those modifications that will be as a
20 result of the project on those streets?

21 MR. PARROTT: There's -- when we
22 look at -- there's certain estimates
23 that are in our base design, but as I
24 mentioned, I do know that converting, or
25 changing, the layout of the streets,

1 CDOT is going through that grant
2 application process.

3 And I forget. I think it's about
4 a \$7 million grant, if I'm not mistaken.

5 What was the grant amount?

6 I'm sorry; I'll let Mary Lynn
7 address that.

8 MS. LODOR: Yes; the grant amount
9 was actually the City Transportation and
10 the Hamilton County Transportation
11 District applied for a grant through OKI
12 to OKI for about 6 -- I think it was
13 about \$6 million for design, and then
14 potentially some implementation of a
15 potential boulevard and concept.

16 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: Do we have
17 an idea of the total costs of just --
18 for that streetwork itself?

19 MS. LODOR: And, again, this is
20 for the boulevard concept, or just
21 specifically for the components of the
22 traffic re-engineering to allow for the
23 valley conveyance system?

24 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: Well, I
25 guess for both. If you can give me what

1 both costs are.

2 MS. LODOR: Yeah, I don't have
3 those at the top of my head right now
4 with regards to what's within the
5 internal components, if you will, of the
6 valley conveyance system. There's some
7 traffic re-engineering that needs to
8 happen in order to allow the valley
9 conveyance system to function. Because
10 what we're doing is putting water above
11 ground. So, of course, we have roadways
12 that are between there, so we have some
13 bridgework that needs to be done, some
14 rework of the transportation system to
15 allow for that open-water system.
16 That's incorporated into the project
17 design cost that we have, and we can get
18 that for you. The County Monitors do
19 have that information, and they have had
20 that information.

21 But then on the boulevard, that's
22 an estimate of approximately \$26 million
23 that the Hamilton County Transportation
24 Improvement District, or CDOT, is
25 actively pursuing other funding for.

1 we've made it very clear to them that
2 that is not something that MSD is going
3 to fund, because it's not something
4 incremental or instrumental to the
5 valley conveyance system.

6 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: So in the
7 \$317 million price tag, that 26 million
8 is not in there at all.

9 MS. LODOR: It's not, because
10 it's not necessary to the primary
11 project. Now, there are traffic
12 components that are within the
13 \$317 million.

14 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: And you
15 don't have a number for that.

16 MS. LODOR: I don't. But, for
17 example, that would be, like, white
18 street, for example. If there's some
19 changes to white street or Keblar,
20 Grand, Quebec, Beekman, State Avenue;
21 those are all street intersections that
22 we do have the costs and we do have
23 those budgeted within the design.

24 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: The
25 317 million.

1 MS. LODOR: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: Okay. And
3 if we're off on those costs, who picks
4 up the overage? Is that picked up by
5 the City of Cincinnati, or will that be
6 picked up by the MSD ratepayers for
7 those that you've already put in for
8 these streets that are affected -- that
9 we don't have the number right in front
10 of us today -- but if there is a change
11 in that cost, how is that addressed down
12 the road?

13 So we'll throw out a number,
14 let's say it's X, you know, dollars that
15 it's going to cost to do that. If it's
16 X plus Y, who is paying for that,
17 because that's above the \$317 million
18 project total.

19 MR. PARROTT: Obviously, as we
20 put those together, we work closely with
21 CDOT, and, obviously, there's
22 contingencies in everything they're
23 building into those estimates.

24 So from that perspective -- and
25 I'll just use Harrison Avenue as an

1 example. Recently we do construction
2 coordination. We work with CDOT on
3 Harrison Avenue. And the bids that came
4 in on that particular job came in
5 30 percent under estimate.

6 So, I mean, just based on that
7 and based upon the history, we're
8 seeing -- we're not seeing things come
9 in over, we're actually seeing bids that
10 are better than what the estimates.

11 But there are contingencies that
12 are built in. By law, we can only award
13 a contract up to a certain amount over
14 the engineer's estimate. So if the
15 traffic component of that drop is higher
16 than -- I think it's the law is
17 10 percent of the engineer's estimate,
18 so we can't award a contract anyway. So
19 we do have a ceiling, or a control,
20 there.

21 But if there are -- costs that
22 are going to -- we would have to come to
23 the Board to award that contract if it
24 was above 10 percent, or rebid the work.

25 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: That's all

1 the questions I have right now,
2 Mr. President.

3 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Thank
4 you. Thank you, Commissioner Monzel.

5 And, Director Parrott, I thank
6 you for supplementing the responses from
7 the prior public hearing. I think that
8 it goes without saying that you're
9 always welcome to add information that
10 you don't have at your ready tonight to
11 us, which we can then disseminate to the
12 public as we go through this process.
13 So I do appreciate that.

14 Commissioner Portune.

15 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE:

16 Mr. President, thank you.

17 First of all, Director, I do want
18 to thank you for the supplemental
19 materials we got tonight. Obviously,
20 we're going to have to digest that from
21 this evening; have not had an
22 opportunity to review any of it.

23 I sort of foreshadowed some
24 issues that I would like to raise this
25 evening at the last public hearing and

1 dive right into it, and that has to do
2 with the various amenities that are
3 depicted in the South Fairmount. And I
4 think it's actually referred to as an
5 urban renewal plan in some documents, or
6 documentation, with respect to this
7 particular proposal in terms of what --
8 what is funded and what is not funded
9 and on whose dime are those amenities
10 funded.

11 Getting back to the whole concept
12 of the Federal livability principles
13 that were adopted by HUD, by the
14 Department of Transportation and by EPA
15 back in 2009, I think everyone would
16 agree that the concept of that is good,
17 but certainly the concept suggested
18 there are contributions from a variety
19 of parties, and as it would relate to
20 this particular proposal, that the MSD
21 investment should leverage other
22 investments, as opposed to the entire
23 project, and amenities are on MSD's
24 dime.

25 So to the extent that there are

1 elements within this program and that
2 are within the -- or outside of the 317,
3 are you able to identify for us, or do
4 we have access somewhere to a line-item
5 by line-item description of looking at
6 the amenities in total, which ones there
7 currently are funding for, which ones
8 there is not funding identified for yet.

9 And with respect to either, which
10 of that is falling due to MSD's dime or
11 on another party's dime, and how are
12 those decisions made or determined?

13 MR. PARROTT: Very good question,
14 Commissioner. And as you pointed out,
15 the six liveable principles is something
16 that we've been talking about as part of
17 our Community Advisory Committee for
18 about 18 months. And as a part of this
19 project and other projects, we have been
20 pursuing grants, and whatnot, to bring
21 in those other resources or those other
22 funds.

23 Specific to this project and the
24 amenities, or the accoutrements, we have
25 discussed at issue, not only in this

1 context with the Board, but also with
2 the County Administration and also with
3 the Regulators. There has been a
4 specific discussion or a specific
5 document that we've provided in response
6 to those questions from the Regulators
7 that kind of outline the specifics of
8 the amenities. And we've had dialogue
9 with the Regulators as to what -- or
10 we've identified the reasons why we
11 think those certain amenities are
12 necessary for CSO mitigation and also
13 for water quality enhancement.

14 If I'm not mistaken, the County
15 Administration and the County Monitor
16 team are privy to that document, but we
17 do have a specific document that
18 outlines those specific issues, and we
19 can make that available to the Board.
20 If you -- if you -- if you have not
21 received that yet.

22 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: It's my
23 understanding that of the amenities that
24 are funded, that comprises about
25 \$36 million of the 317. Is that roughly

1 right? Do you know?

2 MS. LODOR: I'm not sure where
3 you're getting that \$36 million from.
4 The -- I think the valley conveyance
5 system is closer to -- with regards to,
6 you know, conveying the water through
7 the valley, I think the valley
8 conveyance system is probably, I think,
9 in the neighborhood of, perhaps,
10 \$70 million.

11 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: How much?

12 MS. LODOR: 70. But that is --
13 that is to convey --

14 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: Seventy,
15 seven-zero.

16 MS. LODOR: -- the 100-year flow
17 in order to address some of the issues
18 of not allowing that flow to get back
19 into our combined sewer system and to be
20 able to safely convey this water to the
21 Mill Creek.

22 And then we do have the document
23 that Mr. Parrott mentioned is then those
24 additional features to address the water
25 quality components or maintenance or

1 safety, those actually may total closer
2 to approximately probably closer to less
3 than \$10 million in order to address
4 safety, maintenance, water quality
5 within the valley conveyance system.

6 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: I have
7 seen a document that has certain
8 line-item descriptions for things like
9 bike racks, for example, are included in
10 the MSD cost column, as it were. And
11 without going through them one-by-one or
12 item-by-item, it's those types of
13 amenities that, I'll be honest with you,
14 I don't understand how the decision was
15 made or why or what justification
16 supports something of that nature being
17 a ratepayers' expense, as opposed to
18 some other expense.

19 Can you help elaborate on that?

20 MS. LODOR: Sure, I can try to
21 elaborate on that.

22 The Lick Run watershed solution
23 was something that we developed and had
24 brought to the community through a
25 series of community design workshops.

1 So we got lot of public feedback about
2 the solution, as well as trying to
3 integrate an alternative wet weather
4 solution within the community.

5 And so there was -- you know,
6 some folks, you know, wanted to be able
7 to create an amenity that people could
8 enjoy. And as it relates to the Phase 2
9 stormwater regulations, a good part of
10 that is about public education and
11 public involvement. And so if we are
12 taking water out of our combined sewer
13 system and doing it in such a way that
14 is creating what an average person might
15 just see as a public park, it's really
16 providing something much more
17 significant and valuable from CSO
18 control.

19 So as it relates to having this
20 integrated within the community, we're
21 taking away, in some cases, the
22 connectivity of the one side of a
23 neighborhood, if you will, from another.
24 So in order to have this fit within an
25 integrated system, that's just what was

1 incorporated from the public feedback of
2 the community design workshops and the
3 master plan.

4 But that's really just a small
5 cost of the overall solution, that it's
6 certainly not going to change the
7 overall cost so much and -- but we, you
8 know, I think there's -- there's within
9 the community integration component,
10 there's less than, probably, about
11 \$500,000 worth of features like that
12 that other funding sources could be
13 sought for things like bike racks, and
14 things like that.

15 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: Again, I
16 use that as an example, not as the
17 exhaustive list of everything.

18 And you just mentioned that there
19 were \$70 million worth of amenities that
20 are included in that number, so --

21 MS. LODOR: No. No. It's not
22 \$70 million worth of amenities, it's the
23 cost of conveying the stormwater and
24 then the drainage --

25 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: well,

1 that's what my question was about, was
2 amenities.

3 MS. LODOR: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: All right?
5 And that's what you responded to me, is
6 saying that my number was wrong, that it
7 was actually \$70 million.

8 MS. LODOR: In terms of
9 amenities, specifically for community
10 integration, it's, actually, closer, I
11 think, to about \$600,000.

12 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: That's it?

13 MS. LODOR: Yes; of community
14 amenities. Other features, or
15 components, of the valley conveyance
16 system are necessary for maintenance or
17 safety or stormwater quality improvement
18 and/or potentially replacement of
19 infrastructure. You know, in order for
20 us to convey all this water, there may
21 be some existing basketball courts, for
22 example, that are in the way of us to,
23 you know, be able to make all of these
24 connections happen. So there might be a
25 replacement of infrastructure like that.

1 But it's -- \$70 million is the
2 overall whole valley conveyance system.
3 The amenities is less than a million
4 dollars that are not, you know, critical
5 to CSO control, might be more related to
6 public education as it relates to the
7 Phase 2 stormwater regulations.

8 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: We'll have
9 to sit down and go through that list
10 line item by line item, because I've
11 seen some things that talk about traffic
12 islands, and other things. And the
13 numbers, I've said, is a lot greater
14 than -- certainly closer to the number I
15 quoted than -- and I'm not talking about
16 the 70 million, I'm talking about the
17 \$36-million figure now, as opposed to
18 \$600,000.

19 I guess I wanted to get back,
20 though, and ask, really, two other areas
21 of questions, Mr. President, if I may.

22 One is to follow up on
23 Commissioner Monzel's questioning with
24 respect to traffic congestion mitigation
25 and traffic improvements. And it is

1 correct that there are grants that are
2 being pursued by the County
3 Transportation Improvement District.
4 We've been asked, actually, to advance
5 those by City DOTE and are cooperating
6 and very willing to help out and to do
7 that.

8 But if those grants don't
9 materialize, I mean, they aren't in hand
10 yet. And so if that funding does not
11 materialize, what then? What happens,
12 then, with respect to those necessary
13 traffic improvements? Who is going to
14 pay for them and what happens to the
15 project if there is no funding for them?

16 MR. PARROTT: Well, if I recall
17 the original response on it, the -- CDOT
18 is pursuing the grant, because they want
19 to pursue a boulevard feature. And
20 we've made very clear that as far as our
21 base project, we don't want to foot the
22 bill for a boulevard system. So if the
23 grants do not go through as planned, and
24 I think it's scheduled to be more of a
25 three-phased approach to the \$24 million

1 improvement. If those grants fall
2 through or they don't go through,
3 obviously that changes the way in terms
4 of the boulevard approach as opposed to
5 the straight approach that we see,
6 pretty much, at this point.

7 The traffic costs, or the traffic
8 improvements, that we have within our
9 estimates are more of those things that
10 are being interrupted or disconnected as
11 a part of the valley conveyance piece.
12 And so there's a number of streets that
13 are going to have to have street
14 crossings over the valley conveyance
15 system.

16 But in terms of the boulevard
17 proposal that CDOT is going after, that
18 is not a part of our base design. We've
19 made it very clear that we don't want to
20 pay for that.

21 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: Okay. So
22 all other traffic-related expenses,
23 then, are either paid for or are not
24 essential to the project. Is that what
25 you're saying?

1 MR. PARROTT: Anything that we've
2 determined to be essential to the
3 project and it would be justified
4 because of the interrupting of network,
5 street networks, or the fact that there
6 may need to be some type of way to
7 traverse across the conveyance system,
8 those costs are in the project
9 estimates.

10 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: On MSD's
11 dime or on City DOT?

12 MR. PARROTT: It is in the
13 estimate for the MSD project costs.

14 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: And that's
15 justified because there would be some
16 traffic impact no matter what you do?
17 Is that the answer?

18 MR. PARROTT: I think there would
19 be some impact, particularly with a
20 valley conveyance system to where you
21 would have to look at not only just
22 making sure that folks have access to
23 certain streets or certain approaches,
24 but then there's the issue of making
25 sure that if there's a fire, you know,

1 or safety -- for safety reasons, then
2 also -- and there's only a handful of
3 streets that are a part of that inner
4 conveyance piece. But that's what we
5 have in our project estimate.

6 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: Last
7 question. And I think this will take a
8 lot more followup outside of tonight, so
9 I just want to put the issue out there
10 and get an initial response, and I'll
11 just leave it and not follow up on it.

12 But I think this is now the -- I
13 don't know how many meetings that we've
14 attended where Mr. Young and
15 Mr. Hargrove have been here talking
16 about this other proposal. I believe
17 that they made a formal presentation to
18 County Administration where there was
19 some discussion about if the -- if what
20 they're proposing meets EPA
21 considerations or if the science is
22 approved, it would be worth considering
23 or worth pursuing further, or something
24 to that effect. I'm paraphrasing here;
25 I wasn't in the meeting, I'm getting

1 this information secondhand.

2 Is there anybody who is actually
3 vetting that proposal? Either by MSD or
4 County Administration such that we are
5 going to get an actual report and/or
6 recommendation on what it is that they
7 have brought to us?

8 MR. SIGMAN: Commissioners --
9 Christian Sigman, Hamilton County
10 Administrator.

11 I did meet with Mr. Charles Young
12 and Mr. Daniels on their proposal. I
13 did ask MSD to give it a technical
14 review. MSD has tried several times to
15 gain the necessary information to do
16 that technical review.

17 As the Board will recall, the
18 first presentation of the alternative
19 was in the form of, I think, probably 15
20 to 20 binders, lots of work over a
21 multiyear period. The document that I
22 saw in my briefing was spread out across
23 a table, one big piece of paper, and
24 nowhere near the volume of work or data
25 necessary to make a technical release.

1 Definitely not on my part. It's not my
2 area of expertise, but I believe MSD has
3 asked for -- and is still awaiting --
4 the necessary information to make a
5 determination if it's a viable
6 alternative.

7 Based on my conversation with the
8 group going on six to eight weeks ago,
9 there has been no application of this
10 technology to the size and scope needed
11 to address the mandate in this wet
12 weather plan. So it's viability, I
13 think, is suspect at this time without a
14 clear, convincing, scientific case
15 backed by EPA approval.

16 And based on what I've seen so
17 far through the regulatory discussions
18 with the County/City teams, I think that
19 would be a stretch at this time.

20 MR. PARROTT: Just to, kind of,
21 add on to Mr. Sigman's statement,
22 there's two point-of-contacts;
23 obviously, one is Mr. Charles Young. We
24 have not been able to coordinate a
25 meeting yet, and I think that's probably

1 part of his busy schedule and my busy
2 schedule.

3 The second part is when we did
4 reach out to meet with the Hargrove
5 representatives, we were communicated
6 that we had to sign a nondisclosure
7 agreement and that the meeting could not
8 occur until after they had had
9 discussions with folks in D.C.

10 So that's kind of where we are.
11 We have not, and we won't, sign a
12 nondisclosure agreement, and I have not
13 been contacted since their discussion in
14 D.C.

15 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: We're not
16 going to have a big back-and-forth on
17 the technology angle at this point.
18 That's not the proper forum for that.
19 However, there will be continued
20 followup, I think by Commissioners, and
21 we'll proceed in that manner, if that's
22 okay.

23 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: Yeah. As
24 I said when I asked the question, I just
25 wanted to put the issue out there and

1 get -- obviously, there's a lot more
2 that needs to occur on this in order for
3 us to understand it one way or the
4 other. But I didn't want to get into
5 all that back-and-forth tonight, just to
6 get an initial response back.

7 And thank you.

8 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Thank you
9 very much. Thank you very much for
10 that, Commissioner Portune.

11 Administrator Sigman.

12 MR. SIGMAN: Administrator.

13 If I could just follow up, since
14 I was at that meeting and I was
15 representing the Commissioners at that
16 meeting, any time a community group,
17 vendor, or other entity approaches
18 County government and proposes
19 approaches and technologies that would
20 save money and claims at the time were
21 approximately a hundred million dollars,
22 create jobs, centers of excellence, and
23 all kinds of other positive things, I
24 think it's incumbent upon us to figure
25 out exactly what it is and if it

1 applies.

2 It is unfortunate that I'm
3 hearing back channels that there's the,
4 perhaps, a perception in the community
5 that the administration is approving
6 that approach, endorsing that approach.
7 The administration is nothing more
8 asking than our experts in MSD to take a
9 look at it to see if it's something we
10 would explore. That would be no
11 different than any other vendor or group
12 proposing something to the County for
13 savings.

14 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Thank you
15 very much for that.

16 Commissioner Portune?

17 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: That's
18 all.

19 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Thank
20 you.

21 Tony, no questions from me.
22 Thank you for the feedback that you've
23 gotten.

24 And one request, I know there
25 have been discussions with the

1 Regulators related to the volume and
2 what this remedy is going to provide,
3 the discussions about, perhaps, reducing
4 it to the 1.78 billion number. And
5 would like to, at this point, formally
6 request of you to provide us with an
7 option that will come in under
8 \$244 million, assuming that that
9 1.78 billion is the volume being used in
10 that.

11 And also as part of that
12 request -- I'm doing it on behalf of all
13 three of us, to have that as an
14 option -- but as part of that request,
15 would also ask you as that proposal and
16 as that option is given to us, that you
17 work with our team in that proposal. So
18 it's had the opportunity to be vetted
19 once that is presented to us as an
20 option, assuming the whole time that the
21 Regulators are involved in the
22 discussions that we're currently having.

23 MR. PARROTT: Commissioner, you
24 know, I think we've said it as part of
25 the previous public hearings that, you

1 know, those ambiguities, such as
2 schedule or budget, are things that
3 obviously we were, kind of, waiting for
4 the Codefendants to, kind of, signal
5 what direction they wanted us to go.

6 We've always presented something
7 that would get up to 2 billion gallons
8 of removal.

9 And I appreciate your inquiry and
10 your request, and we will respond to
11 that. There's a lot of different ways
12 to get there, and we'll take a look at
13 that and we'll be working with your team
14 to bring that forward for your
15 consideration.

16 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Thank you
17 very much for that. That's all I have
18 tonight.

19 Having seen no other public
20 speakers' cards, at this point I'll move
21 that we close the public hearing.

22 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: Second.

23 MS. PANIOTO: Commissioner
24 Hartmann?

25 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Yes.

1 MS. PANIOTO: Commissioner
2 Monzel?

3 COMMISSIONER MONZEL: Yes.

4 MS. PANIOTO: Commissioner
5 Portune?

6 COMMISSIONER PORTUNE: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER HARTMANN: Thank
8 you, Executive Director Parrott.

9 And thank you all for being here.

10 (This concludes the special
11 Meeting to consider the Lick Run
12 Alternative.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE

2 I, COLLEEN R. O'CONNELL, the
3 undersigned, a Registered Merit Reporter for the
4 Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas, do hereby
5 certify that at the same time and place stated
6 herein, I recorded in stenotype and thereafter
7 transcribed the within 64 pages and that the
8 foregoing Transcript of Proceedings is a true,
9 complete, and accurate transcript of my said
10 stenotype notes.

11 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my
12 hand this 9th day of November, 2012.

13
14 _____
15 Colleen R. O'Connell
16 Registered Merit Reporter
17 Court of Common Pleas
18 Hamilton County, Ohio
19
20
21
22
23
24
25