

**Final Meeting Summary
Wet Weather Team Meeting #18
Thursday, May 15, 2008
MSD Main Office, Louisville**

The Wet Weather Team (WWT), chartered by the Louisville and Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD), met on May 15, 2008, at MSD's main office. The objectives of the meeting were to:

- Learn about the status of MSD's draft education and outreach plan and the May 2008 Project WIN public meetings.
- Review and discuss a draft post-construction compliance monitoring plan.
- Review the status and process for collecting Wet Weather Team stakeholder feedback on the emergent vision for MSD's Integrated Overflow Abatement Plan (IOAP) that was presented at the April 3, 2008 WWT meeting.
- Review and discuss examples from the technical team's analysis of green infrastructure solutions.

Wet Weather Project Updates and Announcements

The following Wet Weather Project updates and announcements were noted at the meeting.

- Executive Session Idea: Regarding a WWT stakeholder suggestion discussed at the last WWT meeting, Jennifer Tice of Ross & Associates said that MSD had considered the possibility of the WWT meeting in an executive session (without observers), but decided, for a variety of reasons, not to go forward with an executive session at this point. The facilitation team followed up with the stakeholder who had made the suggestion, and the stakeholder was comfortable with MSD's decision.
- Education and Outreach Plan: Angela Akridge of MSD noted that MSD is working on the education and outreach plan for the IOAP; a draft of the plan will be presented at the next WWT meeting. Ms. Akridge also distributed some "how to" manuals on rain gardens to interested participants.
- Project WIN Public Meetings: MSD has hosted a series of Project WIN public meetings in May 2008, and made a number of changes to how these meetings were scheduled, advertised, and conducted (e.g., notice was provided a month in advance, some meetings were held mid-day, and refreshments rather than full meals were provided to save costs). Despite these changes, public attendance has been even lower than it was for previous Project WIN public meeting series. MSD has started taping the public meetings, and plans to show the taped meetings on Metro TV. For the fall public meeting series, MSD may show the presentation on Metro TV before the public meetings.
- MSD Rate Increases: Ms. Akridge said that MSD would soon be submitting a proposal for a rate increase to the MSD Board and to Metro Council. These are MSD's normal operational rate increases for wastewater and drainage services; there will be no change to the Project WIN charges.
- Editorial on Indianapolis Consent Decree: A WWT stakeholder mentioned that there had been a recent newspaper editorial that mentioned the City of Indianapolis' \$1.8 billion consent decree. The editorial mentioned that the community's average wastewater rates were expected to reach \$60 per month by 2025.

Monitoring Plan Discussion

Justin Gray of MSD described the draft post-construction compliance monitoring plan for MSD's IOAP. His presentation included a summary of historical and current monitoring efforts, the objectives of the compliance monitoring plan for the IOAP, and the elements of the monitoring plan. The plan includes:

- "Gray" solution monitoring;

- “Green” solution monitoring;
- Sewer rehabilitation monitoring;
- Behavior change effectiveness surveys; and
- Adaptive management and reporting.

WWT members asked a few clarifying questions and offered some comments, as follows.

- A few WWT stakeholders asked about the time frame for monitoring (e.g., for green infrastructure projects). Gary Swanson of CH2M Hill said that green infrastructure solutions would need several years of monitoring to allow time to increase participation, monitor how well the solutions are being maintained, and evaluate their effectiveness.
- Some WWT participants suggested that monitoring data could be displayed as part of an interpretive center. A display could be interactive and provide real-time data on the temperature of the water, pH, and other water quality and stream flow conditions that MSD monitors.
- A few WWT members commented that MSD may need more than incentives to ensure that some solutions are maintained; some requirements (a hammer) may also be needed. Bud Schardein of MSD responded by noting that when MSD provides stormwater credits for porous pavement, MSD also establishes a system for inspecting the pavement periodically.
- In response to questions about quality assurance protocols, MSD and the technical team said that quality assurance plans will be developed for individual sampling projects, data will be publicly available on a website (so errors may be found more quickly), and sampling results will be compared to the expected ranges for data, as outlined by EPA and the State.
- A few WWT stakeholders observed that habitat monitoring and bioassessment did not appear to be included in the draft IOAP monitoring plan. MSD said that habitat monitoring and bioassessment would continue to be done every two years; this is part of MSD’s requirements under the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) permit.
- Some WWT stakeholders suggested that MSD consider supporting a volunteer monitoring program across the county. Participants noted that there could be some concerns about the validity of data collected by volunteers; however, they indicated that it nevertheless could be useful as a way to get people involved and could help with verifying other data MSD collects.
- Several WWT members suggested that MSD consider strategies for conducting targeted outreach and providing feedback about monitoring results to specific neighborhoods. For example, a display about a green infrastructure project (porous pavement, a green roof, etc.) could describe the project, its expected benefits, and what the results have been.
 - Another suggestion was to establish a recognition program for neighborhood efforts (e.g., something equivalent to a “gold star” recognition).

Update on the Emergent Vision of MSD’s Integrated Overflow Abatement Plan

Rob Greenwood of Ross & Associates gave an update on WWT responses to a survey about the emergent vision for the IOAP. Following the April 3, 2008 WWT meeting, stakeholders on the WWT were asked to complete a worksheet that asked for feedback on several particular items mentioned in the IOAP vision presentation from the April WWT meeting. Mr. Greenwood said that seven WWT members had not yet responded to the survey, so the facilitation team decided not to share the comments that had been received at this meeting.

Overall, based on the initial responses, Mr. Greenwood noted that there was a solid base of general comfort with the twelve items in the survey. This indicates that the draft vision is fairly stable, although it remains “emergent” since it is still being developed and refined. With regard to items WWT members

rated as “uncomfortable,” “very uncomfortable,” or “unsure,” these included requests for additional explanation or clarification of elements in the vision and comments that the current wording did not accurately reflect the reality (e.g., there were possible overstatements).

Rob Greenwood proposed a process for moving forward with the emergent vision; steps included (a) getting responses from the seven WWT members who had not yet responded, (b) conducting one-on-one follow up with WWT members who had comments or were uncomfortable about items in the vision, (c) discussing the comments with MSD and the technical team, (d) writing a draft narrative version of the emergent vision, and (e) distributing the draft vision text to WWT members for review before the June WWT meeting. All participants present were comfortable with this proposed approach.

Green Infrastructure Status Report Presentation

At the start of this session, Gary Swanson of CH2M Hill described a diagram outlining the sequence of steps in technical team’s process for evaluating and selecting projects to address a particular combined sewer overflow (CSO) or sanitary sewer overflow (SSO) problem, including showing how programmatic and site-specific green alternatives are compared with and/or integrated into “gray” solutions. This flow chart was developed in response to a WWT request for a relatively simple visual representation of the technical team’s analytic process.

John Lyons of Strand Associates and Gary Wolnitzek of Human Nature gave a presentation on the status of the green infrastructure team’s work to identify and evaluate programmatic and site-specific green alternatives for the IOAP. The presentation reviewed examples of the sewershed analysis and a site concept plan presented at a previous meeting, walked through the steps in the regional analysis of green infrastructure opportunities, and showed examples of several particular study areas, each consisting of multiple sewersheds and neighborhoods. The regional analysis included examining geology, soils, historical maps, hydrology, green space, rights of way, and land cover. The technical team has also analyzed the tree canopy coverage in certain neighborhoods. Mr. Strand said that other communities have implemented site-specific green infrastructure solutions; however, few, if any, others have taken a regional approach to identify green opportunities as MSD and the technical team are doing.

Mr. Lyons noted that MSD will be searching for green opportunities that will provide early successes in the IOAP. Green projects being evaluated include rain gardens, dry wells, sinkhole projects, green alleys/streets, green parking lots, and offloading flows to natural systems. In addition to specific projects, the technical team is evaluating green infrastructure programs to encourage downspout disconnection, rain barrels, rain gardens, and vegetated roofs.

WWT members asked a number of clarifying questions in response to the presentation and also provided the following comments.

- Several WWT stakeholders asked for more information about the effectiveness of green infrastructure solutions (e.g., websites or other resources with that information) and asked whether other communities had experienced any issues with their green infrastructure efforts. Chicago’s Green Alley Program was specifically mentioned. John Lyons said that the City of Chicago hasn’t had complaints about the green alleys; however, the City does not inspect building foundations.
- A few WWT members suggested the following two specific green opportunities (both would involve collaboration with other entities):
 - At the intersection of Grinstead and Lexington Road, MSD could potentially work with the Kentucky Department of Transportation to redirect flows from the interchange into a wetland.
 - MSD could work with Metro Parks to collect stormwater into a cistern at Beringer Spring.

- Several WWT members commented on relationship of green infrastructure programs and projects in the IOAP and other community environmental initiatives that MSD does not control. Participants noted that the MS4 stormwater permit could provide some leverage, but suggested that MSD also explore partnerships with other entities.
 - In particular, a few WWT stakeholders suggested that MSD should convene a group of local authority figures (e.g., the mayor, the president of the University of Louisville, and others) to coordinate and work collaboratively on community environmental improvement initiatives. A good time for a meeting like this might be in the summer, when more of the details of MSD’s draft IOAP are known.
- A few WWT participants asked whether MSD’s monitoring program would be broad and flexible enough to evaluate the effects of other water-quality improvement efforts and use that information for right-sizing future projects. The technical team replied that monitoring program would track those changes in water quality and flows.
- A few WWT participants suggested that the technical team consider where in the county there were problems with seepage and backups during the 1997 storm. It may be useful to avoid known problem areas. A MSD participant observed that soils are currently very saturated from recent rainfall events.
- Some WWT members noted that they appreciated the regional perspective of the analysis and were encouraged by the number of opportunities being identified.

Observer Comments

An MSD contractor described the educational displays that were posted in the hallway outside the WWT meeting room. The displays were some of the products produced as part of an MSD-sponsored educational challenge involving seventeen local high schools. (Two videos shown during the dinner break at the WWT meeting were also produced for the challenge.) The participating high schools were informed of the objectives of Project WIN and the types of behavior changes that Project WIN promoted, and then the high schools developed advertising and marketing campaigns to address youths of their age. In addition to posters, the student groups submitted t-shirts, rap songs, and radio and TV commercials.

A few WWT members expressed positive comments about the Project WIN educational challenge and suggested that this type of activity should be done again in the future. One opportunity mentioned was Public Health Week, which focuses on a different topic each year (climate change was a recent focus).

Wrap Up and Next Steps

- WWT members who have not yet submitted comments on the emergent vision for the IOAP should send their survey responses to the facilitation team at Ross & Associates as soon as possible.
- The facilitation team will follow up with WWT members individually regarding the IOAP emergent vision to learn more about participants’ responses to the vision survey and how to address any areas of discomfort or confusion.
- Working with MSD and the technical team, the facilitation team will use the WWT’s feedback on the emergent vision to develop a draft vision statement that will be shared by the June WWT meeting.
- Potential topics for the WWT’s next meeting on June 19, 2008 include:
 - Update on the emergent vision for MSD’s Integrated Overflow Abatement Plan;
 - Draft education and outreach plan; and
 - Introduction to the programmatic evaluation of alternatives for the IOAP, including the “knee of the curve” (financial stewardship) analysis of a preliminary ranked list of projects.

Meeting Participants

Wet Weather Team Stakeholders

Mike Ballard (alternate for Judy Nielsen), Louisville Metro Health Department
Steve Barger, Labor
Susan Barto, Mayor of Lyndon
Samantha Davis (alternate for Tina Ward-Pugh), Louisville Metro Council, District 9
Allan Dittmer, University of Louisville
Faye Ellerkamp, City of Windy Hills
Arnita Gadson, West Jefferson County Community Task Force and Kentucky Environmental Quality Commission
Tom Herman, Zeon Chemicals
Rick Johnstone, Deputy Mayor, Louisville Metro Mayor's Office
Bob Marrett, CMB Development Company
Lisa Santos, Irish Hill Neighborhood Association
Bruce Scott, Kentucky Waterways Alliance
David Tollerud, University of Louisville, School of Public Health and Information Sciences
David Wicks, Jefferson County Public Schools

MSD Personnel

Angela Akridge, MSD Regulatory Policy Manager
Brian Bingham, MSD Regulatory Management Services Director
Derek Guthrie, MSD Director of Engineering/Operations and Chief Engineer
Bud Schardein, MSD Executive Director

Facilitation and Technical Support

Gary Swanson, CH2M HILL
Rob Greenwood, Ross & Associates Environmental Consulting
Jennifer Tice, Ross & Associates Environmental Consulting

Meeting Observers

Tony Bischoff, Hydromax USA
Jim Bruggers, Louisville Courier-Journal
Henry Cubero, The Cubero Group
Justin Gray, MSD
David Hackworth, CH2M Hill
Greg Hendricks, The Cubero Group
Christine Horn, The Cubero Group
Clay Kelly, Strand Associates
Tim Kraus, O'Brien & Gere
John Lyons, Strand Associates
Paul Maron, Strand Associates
William Marshall, Tetra Tech
Julia Muller, MSD
Sarah Provancher, Pro Communications
Gary Wolnitzek, Human Nature

Meeting Materials

- Agenda for the 5/15/08 WWT Meeting
- Summary of the 4/3/08 WWT Meeting
- Compliance Monitoring Plan Presentation
- Project Evaluation and Selection Process Diagram
- Green Infrastructure Status Report Presentation

Reference Materials (Updated May 2008)

- WWT Meeting Schedule
- WWT Contact List
- Acronym List
- Definitions of Key Terms
- WWT Charter
- WWT Ground Rules

Idea Lists (Updated May 2008)

- Consensus Items List
- Solution Ideas List
- Education and Outreach Ideas List
- Data Requests and Monitoring Suggestions List