

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REPORT

WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT PLANNING SERVICES

FOR

FAYETTE COUNTY WEST VIRGINIA



Submitted to:

Mr. David Pollard
County Resource Coordinator
Fayette County Commission
Fayette County Courthouse
Fayetteville, WV 25840-0307

Submitted by:

Environmental Engineers/Consultants

LOMBARDO ASSOCIATES, INC.

49 Edge Hill Road

Newton, Massachusetts 02467

In association with:



**STAFFORD
CONSULTANTS
INCORPORATED**

*Engineering, Design, and Consulting
Planning and Environmental Services*

1105 Mercer Street • Post Office Box 5849
Princeton, West Virginia 24740

June 2004, Rev. February 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. INTRODUCTION.....2
- 2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN3
 - 2.1 Project and Public Meetings 3
 - 2.2 Wastewater Service District Interviews 3
 - 2.3 Homeowner Notification of Needs and Proposed Solutions..... 3
 - 2.4 Project Web Site 4
 - 2.5 Project Deliverables..... 4
- APPENDIX A: PROJECT MEETING MINUTES 6
- APPENDIX B: PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES 22

1. INTRODUCTION

Lombardo Associates, Inc. (LAI) in association with Stafford Consultants, Inc. have been contracted to develop wastewater management solutions to achieve water quality standards to protect tourism industry vital to Fayette County as well as protect public health and safety. The project was initiated in May 2004 and is scheduled to be completed in the spring of 2006. Solutions will be focused on upgrading and expanding the existing sewer system as necessary, developing cluster systems to serve villages throughout the County as appropriate, and repairing and upgrading individual on-site systems.

The project will be comprised by seven main activities.

1. Forming a Project Advisory Committee and Local Coordinator
2. Development of a public participation plan to ensure stakeholders are actively involved in the project as it progresses
3. Reviewing Previous Planning Efforts - reviewing engineering reports, identifying wastewater needs data gaps, and preparing Executive Summary of the issues and wastewater needs of each sewer system and for unsewered areas
4. Assembling Community Profile - describing the population, land use, socio economic and physical (soils, geology, ground and surface waters – quantity and quality, etc.) characteristics of Fayette County.
5. Identifying Existing Wastewater Needs - identifying current wastewater needs for unsewered areas, identifying current wastewater needs for sewerred areas, prioritizing wastewater needs based on watershed quality analyses
6. Identification and Screening of Technology, Management, and Financing Options
7. Evaluation of Options and Preparation of Preferred Capital Improvement Program - solution generation, committee and public review and feedback, generation of county-wide wastewater management scenarios, development of preferred Plan

The goal of the project is to develop a sustainable, long-term wastewater management plan that is both economically and financially viable.

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

Public participation will be a key element of the Fayette County wastewater management planning process. The most effective public involvement is true, two-way communication in which the engineers and Project Advisory Committee present plans and information to a listening public and the public responds with suggestions/comments. An important component of this two-way communication will be scheduling meetings throughout the planning process.

2.1 PROJECT AND PUBLIC MEETINGS

Both project meetings and public meetings will be held to actively involve the public. LAI will organize ten project meetings, including the kick-off meeting at the beginning of the project, and subsequent monthly meetings, with the Project Advisory Committee.

Additionally, four project meetings will be held on the same day as public meetings. During the public meetings the following issues will be discussed:

1. Project kick-off: overall project objectives and schedule and community comments and issues of concern
2. Results of wastewater needs assessment
3. Alternative options
4. Preferred plan and implementation approach

Table 2-1 shows the scheduled time for the project and public meetings. The first meeting was held in May 2004.

Table 2-1: Scheduled Meetings

2004	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec		
Project Meeting					X									
Public Meeting					X									
2005-2006	Jan-05	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec-05	Jan-06	Feb-06
Project Meeting		X		X	X	X	X			X		X		X
Public Meeting							X			X				X

The minutes of the project and public meetings are included in Appendices A and B, respectively.

2.2 WASTEWATER SERVICE DISTRICT INTERVIEWS

The LAI team will interview the wastewater service districts to discuss their wastewater management challenges and issues of concern.

2.3 HOMEOWNER NOTIFICATION OF NEEDS AND PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

LAI will notify all homeowners of their individual wastewater needs and proposed wastewater solutions following the conclusion of the "Identify Existing Wastewater Needs" phase via the project web site and placing information in local libraries.

2.4 PROJECT WEB SITE

LAI developed a project web site to provide internet access to documents, data, meeting materials, reports and other relevant information from the planning process. The web site defines the project objectives, describes the specific tasks that will be completed, provides a schedule for major milestones, and will discuss the final outcomes. As reports are generated, they are posted on the web site. The web site is an important tool to help disseminate information about the project.

Moreover, the names and contact information for all members of the Project Advisory Committee are provided.

The web site is located at:

http://www.lombardoassociates.com/fayette_county_west_virginia.php

2.5 PROJECT DELIVERABLES

The deliverables for each task in the scope of work are summarized in Table 2-2.

Table 2-2: Project Deliverables

TASKS		DELIVERABLES	
#	DESCRIPTION	#	DESCRIPTION
1	Form Project Advisory Committee and Identify Local Coordinator		
1.1	Project advisory committee	1	Project Advisory Committee formed
1.2	Local project coordinator	2	Local office set up
1.3	Task 1 report	3	Task 1 report
2.1	Organize Project Meetings and Public Participation	4	Public participation plan written
2.2	Progress meetings (10), with 4 same as public meetings	5	10 progress meetings with progress reports
2.3	Public meetings (4)	6	4 public meetings
2.5	Interviews with wastewater service districts	8	Summary of interviews
2.7	Project web site	10	Web site with results of needs definition
2.8	Task 2 report: Public part. plan, questionnaire results etc.	11	Task 2 report
3.1	Review previous planning efforts & summarize issues	12	Summary of issues by system
3.2	Review status of package treatment plants	13	Identification of plants that should be field reviewed
3.3	Task 3 report	14	Task 3 report
4	Assemble Community Profile	15	Digital map of soil type countywide
4.1	Digitize soil data for County	16	Estimate of time required to digitize BOH files
4.2	Assess Board of Health files	17	Identification of agencies and obstacles
4.3	Identification of regulatory agencies and obstacles	18	Description of legal authority and relationships
4.4	Description of legal authority for wastewater management	19	Task 4 report (revised)
5	Identify Existing Wastewater Needs		
5.1	Identify Existing Needs for Unsewered Areas		
a	Establish existing development /create GIS parcel maps	20	GIS parcel map for each village, geo-referenced aerial photos for prioritized, aerial photos for rest
b	Identify parcel size	21	Table showing distribution of lot size for each village
c	Identify soil characteristics	22	Map of soil type by parcel
d	Digitize subset of Board of Health files	23	Digitized BOH data for files that can be processed in 3 weeks time
e	Estimate depth to groundwater and bedrock and perc rates	24	GIS maps with depth to groundwater, depth to bedrock, and percolation rates for each village
f	Generate layers of wetlands, floodplains, watersheds etc.	25	GIS maps for each village with: wetlands, watersheds, surface water, floodplain locations
g	Determine which parcels can use on-site vs. need off-site	26	GIS map for each village showing high, medium, low need for off-site solution
5.2	Identify Existing Needs for Sewered Areas		
a	Identify collection and treatment system capacity and flows	27	Table for 26 treatment facilities showing basic design and operational data
b	Identify extent of infiltration and inflow	28	Estimates of I/I
c	Assess treatment plant performance	29	Assessment of treatment plant performance
d	Critically review proposed wastewater facilities improvements	30	Critical review of each treatment system
e	Develop report on each treatment system	31	Report for each treatment system
5.3	Watershed-Level Water Quality Analyses	32	Prioritized list of treatment system needs
5.4	Task 5 report: Wastewater needs definition	33	Task 5 report
6.0	Screen Suitable Technologies		
6.1	Identify and Screen Technology Options		
a	Options for unsewered areas	34	List of technologies for unsewered areas
b	Options for sewerred areas	35	List of technologies for sewerred areas
c	Option screening	36	Short list of suitable technologies for Task 7 analysis
6.2	Identify and Screen Management and Financial Options		
a	Identify management and financial options	37	List of management and financial options
b	Screen options	38	Short list of suitable options for Task 7 analysis
6.3	Task 6 report: Short list of tech, mgmt, financial options	39	Task 6 report
7.0	Detailed Evaluation of Options and Prep. of Preferred CIP		
7.1	Solution Generation	40	List of 3 potential wastewater management solutions
7.2	Committee and Public Review and Feedback	41	Preferred list of solution alternatives
7.3	Generation of County-Wide Wastewater Management Scenarios	42	3 or more wastewater management scenarios
7.4	Task 7 report: Preferred plan	43	Task 7 Report with preferred plan
7.5	Project Executive Summary	44	Executive Summary
Items to be deleted			
#	DESCRIPTION	#	DESCRIPTION
2.4	Homeowner questionnaire	7	Questionnaire
2.6	Homeowner notification of individual needs	9	Notification

APPENDIX A: PROJECT MEETING MINUTES

Meeting 1 – May 18, 2004

In attendance:

Members – M. Ehrnschwender, A. Gannon, E. Morton, B. Novak, D. Pollard, D. Proctor.

Consultant: P. Lombardo, E. Shutt,

Others: L. Crigger

This being the first meeting, general member introductions were made. A review of the scope of work, process, and steering committee's responsibility was presented by Pio Lombardo and a brief Q&A was held.

Initial details (time, place, expectations) for the first public or kick-off meeting were presented. Kick-off meeting to be held May 19th at 7:00, American Legion Building Fayetteville. Public Notice advertised, and letters to key individuals & groups sent.

Mark to assemble member contact list and email to members.

There being no other business the meeting adjourned.

Meeting 2 – February 15, 2005

In attendance:

Pio Lombardo (facilitator), Natalie Brown – Lombardo Associates

Dean Upton, Sonny Berry – Stafford Consultants

Mark Ehrnschwender – Fayette County Water Quality Coalition

Dave Pollard – Fayette County Commission

Philip Perone – Health Department

Gene Kistler – Planning Commission, PAN

Jesse – NPS

Items discussed included:

1. PSD Consolidation

PSD	Option
Ansted	The best option appears to be consolidation with the New Haven PSD.
Armstrong Deepwater	These are collection systems only. They have connected to the Kanawha Falls PSD.
Ansted	This is a smaller facility (package plant). It appears it would also be best if this could be taken over by the New Haven PSD, although, this might be a challenge.

It was also noted that Smithers is in the process of becoming a collection system only and also connecting to the Kanawha Falls PSD.

Dave Pollard recommended that the water resource plan be reviewed and used as a guideline for the wastewater plan.

Action Items:

- Need to obtain jurisdictional boundaries of PSDs.
- Need to obtain current PSD rates

2. PSD Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

SSO/CSO's need to be identified and mapped to the extent possible for the PSD and municipal treatment plants. Estimates of the frequency and quantity of I/I also need to be made. Once this analysis is performed a CIP for each facility will be developed.

Two case studies to be performed were identified.

- a. White Oak PSD – SCI is going to performed a detailed evaluation of the I/I issues for this system. The PSD currently has an aggressive program to eliminate/reduce I/I in the system. It is funded by a reserve fund. There was some discussion how a PSD could buildup a reserve fund. Once the detailed analysis is performed, a corrective program and CIP will be developed.
- b. City of Oak Hill – Oak Hill implemented approximately two years ago a stormwater fee to tackle its I/I problems. It is a fixed fee per connection (amount?). Effectively it has set up a stormwater utility with the goal of separating the sanitary and stormwater flow.

Action Items:

- SCI to validate the state's existing CIP of \$27.56 million to upgrade the wastewater facilities in the County.
- Check what the PSC allows for capital reserve versus O&M.
- Need to look into how the City of Oak Hill established it's program.

3. Package Plants CIP

All the package plants in the County are currently privately owned and operated and regulated under DEP. The condition and performance of the existing systems will be evaluated and a CIP developed for each facility.

Potential future management options include management by a PSD, municipality, or perhaps even the County.

4. On-site Areas CIP

Dave Pollard stated that in 1996 approximately 60 percent of the County was unsewered. Phil said that 150-175 systems are installed per year. Potential options for the currently unsewered areas are cluster systems (i.e. Wionna) or long-term individual systems.

Institutional challenges include:

- a. DEP
- b. DHHR
- c. PSC
- d. Funding sources

All systems with a surface discharge require DEP approval. Any system with a design flow greater than 600 gpd requires DEP approval. All multi-family or non-residential systems require DEP approval. Health Department is the sole approving authority only for single-family residential systems.

A \$30 Groundwater Protection Fee is required for certification of all systems. However, in practice, few homeowners comply with that requirement. Some County's collect the fee for DEP in return for half it's cost. Due to staffing and administrative constraints this is not an option for Fayette County at this time.

Review of the Health Department files is underway to try to establish the failure rate for the on-site systems in the County. The data from the files will assist in the analysis of which systems/areas have well operating on-site systems, which need to be repaired/upgraded, and which are best served by a cluster system.

Legislation is needed to allow the PSC to govern on-site systems.

Some funding sources may require public ownership of the system.

Action Items:

- Complete digitizing of health department files
- Develop list of regulatory changes that would improve the design, siting, installation, and operation of on-site systems
- Check with CVI regarding progress of legislative changes

The sum of the CIP for items 2-4 will give the total proposed CIP for wastewater management in the County,

5. Management

Management options include:

- a. PSDs for existing centralized systems and perhaps some decentralized systems. It was mentioned that Page-Kincaid PSD might be willing to have some decentralized systems.
- b. New Haven PSD for some of the existing PSDs that may be consolidated and decentralized systems
- c. Municipality for centralized systems, decentralized systems?

6. Revenue

Potential revenue sources identified include:

- a. Grants (319, COE, SRF (loan), HUD)
- b. Fees
- c. User Fees

7. Prioritization

The wastewater needs of the County will be prioritized based on a number of factors including public health, water quality problems, financial considerations, acceptability, and use.

The need for flexibility was expressed. The objective of the prioritization will be to provide information that will allow fact-based decision-making.

Misc.

- Need to get URL for IJD website
- Check with Mark about 911 mapping efforts

Future Meeting Dates

March 24, 2005 - Project Advisory Committee and Public Meeting

April 21, 2005 - Project Advisory Committee and Public Meeting

There being no other business the meeting adjourned.

Meeting 3 – April 7, 2005

In attendance:

Pio Lombardo (facilitator), Natalie Brown – Lombardo Associates

Ed Shutt – Stafford Consultants

Mark Ehrnschwender – Fayette County Water Quality Coalition

Dave Pollard – Fayette County Commission

Al Gannon – Public Service Districts

Elbert Morton – WV Department of Environmental Protection

Doug Proctor – Rafting Community

Gary Berti – Canaan Valley Institute

Leo N. Essenthier – USEPA (via phone)

Les Reed – USEPA (via phone)

Jennifer Sincock – USEPA (via phone)

Items discussed included:

USEPA provided introductions and timeline of current grant. The current grant expires on June 30th.

Pio gave a status report for the project and summarized the activities completed to date. The wastewater needs definition is currently in progress. This task includes the identification and evaluation of needs from the following sectors:

1. PSDs/municipal plants
2. Package plants
3. UIC (underground injection control)
4. Unsewered areas
 - a. Probable cluster systems
 - b. On-site systems

The package plant portion is complete. Only three of the fifteen package plants are in good condition and are performing well. The remainder need to be repaired and upgraded.

Potential sites for cluster systems have been identified and visited. Cluster systems (i.e. 10,000 gpd – 40,000 gpd) will be recommended in areas with poor soils and high density that have been identified as being either a threat to public health or source of water quality impairment.

The data gathering effort to inventory of existing PSD and municipal systems is taking longer than anticipated. For various reasons the project team has had difficulty obtaining information on some of the PSD and municipal plants.

Accordingly, an extension will be necessary. It is anticipated that the public meeting for the needs definition will be held in July. This extra time will also allow for a draft report of the needs definition to be sent to each of the PSDs and municipalities for their review and comment prior to the public meeting. Input from the PSDs and municipalities will help refine the needs definition.

The public meeting to discuss the alternatives evaluation and solutions would then be held in late September. The final public meeting discussing the Preferred Plan would be held in December.

USEPA stated that the extension request needs to be made in May (30 days prior to the expiration of the grant).

There was some question why there has been difficulty obtaining the data. Some of the reasons identified were lack of staff, political issues, and skepticism regarding the project. USEPA suggested a MOU with the PSDs and municipalities. The consensus was that this is not necessary since most are cooperating now and their review will be incorporated into the needs definition as discussed above.

Information has also been acquired from WVDEP. WVDEP has provided all facility plans that they have on file. Permit and monitoring data has also been obtained from WVDEP.

USEPA asked if the project team was also coordinating with WVDEP regarding the TMDL development process. The project team has acquired water quality monitoring data from WVDEP. This data is being used in the watershed level water quality analysis with GIS mapping. This project is ahead of the TMDL development for the New River.

USEPA also asked if the County was thinking of adopting the voluntary guidelines for onsite systems. The answer was a resounding yes. There is some question regarding the authority over onsite systems in WV that needs further investigation.

USEPA mentioned that there is a RFP for demonstration projects in the decentralized area that might be of interest to the County. It is due April 22nd. There was much interest. USEPA forwarded the info to Dave Pollard. The possibility of using some of the money for facility planning in Winona was discussed. LAI is going to look further into this.

LAI is going to reissue the public participation plan with a revised schedule. The deliverables from the SOW will be added as well.

LAI will prepare an executive summary of the project that the County can use to pursue funding opportunities.

WVDEP indicated that the Fayetteville SSO will be changed to permitted CSOs.

Future Meeting Dates

May 19, 2005 - Project Advisory Committee Meeting

June 16, 2005 - Project Advisory Committee Meeting

July 28, 2005 - Project Advisory Committee and Public Meeting (tentative)

There being no other business the meeting adjourned.

Meeting 4 – May 19, 2005

In attendance:

Pio Lombardo (facilitator), Natalie Brown – Lombardo Associates

Ed Shutt, Sonny Berry – Stafford Consultants

Mark Ehrnschwender – Fayette County Water Quality Coalition

Al Gannon – Public Service Districts

Elbert Morton – WV Department of Environmental Protection

Doug Proctor – Rafting Community

Randy Boyd – Plateau Action Network

Items discussed included:

Natalie gave update of progress from last meeting, which included the following activities:

- Issued Revised Community Profile (Task 4 report) with expanded discussion of the regulatory, legal, and institutional issues to the Committee
- Issued Draft Package, PSD, & Municipal Wastewater Treatment Facilities Needs Definition Report to the Committee
- Issued each PSD/municipality the section of the report pertaining to their wastewater management system
- Issued Draft Existing Wastewater Needs for Unsewered Areas Report Project website updated
- GIS Mapping
- Two (2) CDs of maps distributed to the Committee
- Book of maps issued to County Commission

Pio described the maps that were prepared. They present the background conditions in the County, existing wastewater management practices, subwatersheds with all wastewater management practices and water quality information, and aerial photographs of the recommended cluster system study areas.

Randy suggested perhaps pie charts be added to the watershed maps showing the distribution of the fecal coliform sampling results.

Pio discussed that public health and water quality will be the top two criteria used to prioritize wastewater needs for the County.

There was general discussion regarding the importance of eliminating CSOs and SSOs and where they should fall in the prioritization. There was some concern about expanding the existing sewer service areas without fixing the problems in the wastewater systems.

Pio discussed that review of the financial information for the PSDs and municipalities shows that many of them are not being properly fiscally managed. The expenses equal or exceed the revenues leaving no money for capital depreciation or repair/replacement funding. They need sustainable asset management.

The idea of charging an impact fee for new development was proposed. It was pointed out that five criteria must be met before that can be done and Fayette County does not meet those criteria. Also, it was mentioned that an impact fee for new development cannot be used to fix existing problems, however synergy may exist to enable solving existing problems at a lower cost.

The fact that the Fayetteville treatment plant is often above its design flow, yet Walmart is being allowed to connect to it adding an additional 31,000 gpd to the system was brought up. Elbert explained that Fayetteville met all the requirements to have their SSOs reclassified as CSOs. There was general discussion regarding the nine control strategies that CSO facilities must implement.

As part of this project, budgetary estimates and some recommendations for how to deal with CSOs/SSOs will be provided.

The need to find funding for the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) that will be developed was discussed. It is likely that the CIP for the wastewater needs of the County will be close to \$100 million dollars. Some funding options suggested were rate increases, grants, loans, and a rafting fee. There was much debate about the rafting fee. Other sources discussed include Small Community Block, HUD, RUS, and money for economic development.

A subcommittee to look forward into the possible financial options was formed consisting of Dave Pollard, Ed Shutt, and Doug Proctor.

The need to involve the public and gain their support was discussed. It was suggested that a series of press releases be prepared prior to the next public meetings. Public meetings will be held in each of the four districts of the County.

Future Meeting Dates:

June 16, 2005 - Project Advisory Committee Meeting
July 26, 2005 - Project Advisory Committee

Public Meetings for Needs Definition (tentative)
July 25, July 26, August 1, and August 2, 2005

Meeting 5 – June 16, 2005

In attendance:

Pio Lombardo (facilitator), Natalie Brown – Lombardo Associates

Ed Shutt – Stafford Consultants
Mark Ehrnschwender – Fayette County Water Quality Coalition
Steve Sparks – Public Service Districts
Elbert Morton – WV Department of Environmental Protection
Randy Boyd, Molly Clendenin – Plateau Action Network
Phil Perone – County Health Department
Jesse Purvis – National Park Service
Les Reed – EPA

Items discussed included:

Natalie gave update of progress from last meeting, which included the following activities:

- Revising Draft Package, PSD, & Municipal Wastewater Treatment Facilities Needs Definition Report based on comments received. Meadow Bridge, Ansted, Page-Kincaid, and Fayetteville have provided comments on the section of the report pertaining to their WWTF. All comments are due Friday, June 17th.
- Project website updated with minutes of last meeting.
- GIS Mapping
 - Refined and clarified CSO and SSO locations.
 - Located UIC permits
 - Located onsite systems permitted by Health Department from 2001 to 2004
 - Revising maps to incorporate comments received

The Alternatives Identification and Screening process is underway. Technology, management, and financial options are being analyzed to produce a short list of options for further consideration in the development of the Preferred Plan.

Additional information on the wastewater management practices for the recreational areas along the New River is being added to the Needs Definition for the unsewered areas.. Moreover, a section briefly describing the septage management practices is being added.

Dave, Mark, Pio, and Natalie met with Geert Bakkker from the PSC on Wednesday to discuss the rates and financial condition of the PSD and municipal WWTFs. It is LAI's assessment that the current rates for many of the WWTFs are too low. Geert stated that elsewhere in the state rates are significantly higher (\$45+ per month) and it would be reasonable for the PSDs and municipalities to increase their rates to similar levels. He offered to review the finances of the utilities in the County and provide assistance in determining what the rates should be. The need for legislation enabling the PSDs to manage onsite systems was also discussed.

Elbert stated that the State has approximately \$38 million dollars of SRF money available per year. He estimated that there is potential for Fayette County to receive approximately \$5 million per year for 10 years.

The need to revise the public participation plan was discussed. Dave had suggested that the July public meeting be changed to meetings with the PSDs and municipalities. It was agreeable to the Committee. It is anticipated that each PSD and municipality will be scheduled for a half hour to discuss their specific needs and concerns. This would be followed by four public meeting in September for the general public to discuss the wastewater needs and recommended solutions for their district. The final public meeting is anticipated to be held in

January to present the Preferred Plan and an Implementation Plan. Dave has offered to write a series of press release to engage the public in the wastewater management planning process.

A draft CIP was distributed to the Committee to show the approximate cost of the County-wide Wastewater Management Plan. First estimates show the total CIP around \$122 million. Onsite systems, cluster systems, and the centralized PSD and municipal WWTFs account for 45, 15, and 40 percent of the total CIP respectively. The onsite systems are a wild card because an accurate inventory of systems does not exist. As the project progresses, the CIP will be further refined.

The importance of obtaining grants and zero interest loans was stressed.

Given the magnitude of the CIP, the need for a phased Implementation Plan was discussed. The first projects will also be selected to show some early successes.

Randy mentioned that the water quality in the New River has been declining over the past 10 years. The CIP will be broken down by watershed as well as wastewater sector to allow for prioritization by watershed. Les commented that the watersheds should be prioritized by water quality degradation issues, which is in agreement with the rest of the Committee.

It was suggested that it would be easiest to start implementation of the Wastewater Management Plan in the unsewered areas. Phil commented that professionals should do all work for the onsite systems (e.g. soil scientists to do the site evaluations). LAI is developing a list of minimum design practices that should be adopted to make sure onsite systems perform properly. In order to implement the onsite portion of the CIP, the legislative barrier needs to be overcome.

It was discussed that the PSDs and municipalities will need to be responsible for implementing their own improvement programs. Steve commented that there are many ways for WWTFs to operate more efficiency if they look for them. White Oak currently sets aside \$20,000 per year for I/I reduction. Elbert said that DEP has overflow monitoring equipment that can be loaned out to interested WWTFs.

Ed stated that privatization or public/private partnerships should be considered for the WWTFs.

Randy talked with Senator Byrd's staff about the possibility of getting some money to start the implementation. Mark and Randy are going to prepare something for the Senator from PAN or the Fayette County Water Quality Coalition.

A meeting with the IJDC and the other members of the sewer technical committee is planned for July.

Action Items:

- Mark and Randy to identify location of recreational area wastewater systems
- Natalie to follow-up with Phil regarding septage management practices
- Natalie to obtain rates for all sewer utilities in the State
- LAI to discuss legislation for management of onsite systems with Amy Swann
- County delegate to also follow-up on the above issue
- Set up meeting with IJDC for July

- Arrange meetings with PSDs and municipalities for July 26-27

Future Meeting Dates:

July 27, 2005 - Project Advisory Committee

August 24 or 25, 2005 - Project Advisory Committee (tentative)

July 26-27, 2005 - Meetings with PSDs and Municipalities

Meeting 6 – July 27, 2005

In attendance:

Pio Lombardo (facilitator), Natalie Brown – Lombardo Associates

Sonny Berry– Stafford Consultants

Mark Ehrnschwender – Fayette County Water Quality Coalition

Al Gannon – Public Service Districts

Elbert Morton – WV Department of Environmental Protection

Phil Perone – County Health Department

Doug Proctor – Rafting Business Community

Dave Pollard – Fayette County

Kevin Boles – Town of Ansted Operator

Clarence Christian – DHHR

Items discussed included:

Natalie gave update of progress from last meeting, which included the following activities:

- Revised Community Profile
- Revised Package, PSD, & Municipal Wastewater Treatment Facilities Needs Definition Report
- Revised Existing Wastewater Needs for Unsewered Areas Report (issued shortly)
- Draft Alternatives Identification and Screening (issued shortly)
- Project website updated with minutes of last Project Advisory Committee meeting and revised reports
- Completed revised set of GIS maps
- Met with Amy Swann to discuss management options and needed legislation
- Met with 11 of the PSDs/municipalities to discuss their wastewater management needs and the required CIP to meet those needs

At the meeting with Pio and Natalie, Amy Swann suggested the County take the following actions to start the process to get legislation enabling the management of decentralized wastewater systems.

- Contact the Governor's office
- Contact the Infrastructure Committee in both the Senate and the House
- Talk with the local delegate (John Pino)

Dave requested a copy of other draft legislation (LAI to provide). Pio asked for an anticipated timeline for getting the legislation passed. Dave responded that the legislation probably won't occur until Spring 2007. It would need to go to interims the fall before.

Elbert commented that in the meantime work can continue within the existing framework.

Pio discussed the possibility of creating a RME for PSD and municipal WWTFs. The RME would provide technical, management, and financial assistance, as well as, help identify business opportunities to minimize expenses and generate revenues. Sludge management was identified as one such potential opportunity during the meetings with the individual PSDs and municipalities. The PSDs and municipalities also expressed interest operating onsite systems.

Dave commented that an entity already exists. The County Commission has the authority to apply for and distribute grants.

Pio stated the Advisory Committee has to decide on what management strategy they want to adopt.

Elbert commented that some thought should be given how to sell the "ownership" concept of a level 5 onsite management district to individual home owners. There was general discussion about participation requirements for the onsite management districts.

Clarence commented that it might be possible to get an Executive Order from the Governor allowing existing PSD/municipalities to own and operate onsite systems for demo project to start.

Mark commented that the efforts can be focused on the other wastewater sectors while the legislation for decentralized systems is pursued.

Pio commented that it is likely that at least 75 percent grant will be required for the onsite systems portion of the CIP to be affordable.

There was discussion when to discuss with the County Commissioners the Wastewater Management Plan that is being developed. Dave recommended that the Transition Team give a presentation to them.

As a next step, it was decided that the next component of the public participation should be a joint meeting with all the PSDs and municipalities to discuss opportunities for collaboration between the WWTFs and the possible management of onsite systems.

Action Items:

- Dave to contact local delegates to discuss legislation need
- Invitations to joint meeting with PSDs and municipalities.
- Draft report of Screened Alternatives Analysis and Preferred Plan

Future Meeting Dates:

October 6th, 2005 – Project Advisory Committee meeting

October 6th, 2005 – meeting with all PSDs, municipalities, and state delegates.

Meeting 7 – October 6, 2005

In attendance:

Pio Lombardo (facilitator), Natalie Brown – Lombardo Associates
Ed Shutt– Stafford Consultants
Mark Ehrnschwender – Fayette County Water Quality Coalition
Al Gannon – Public Service Districts
Elbert Morton – WV Department of Environmental Protection
Doug Proctor – Rafting Business Community
Gene Kistler – Planning Commission, PAN
Molly Clendenin – PAN
Leo N. Essenthier – USEPA (via phone)
Les Reed – USEPA (via phone)

Items discussed included:

Pio gave update of progress from last meeting, which included the following activities:

Reports

- Revised Existing Wastewater Needs for Unsewered Areas Report
- Draft Alternatives Identification and Screening
- Draft Preferred Plan
- Draft Executive Summary

Public Participation

- Project website updated with minutes of last Project Advisory Committee meeting and revised reports

Misc.

- Met with Mike Johnson at DEP to discuss funding and management issues

Natalie did a dry run of the presentation for the public meeting that evening.

Elbert commented that Babcock State Park is proposed upgrades to its package plants.

Elbert suggested that a solution for a portion (25 percent) of the currently unsewered systems be to serve them with a centralized system. Use \$15,000 per connection.

Gene asked what thought had been given to the administration of the plan. Discussion ensued regarding the need for a RME for the decentralized systems.

Future Meeting Dates:

These were not discussed during the meeting because many of the attendees needed to leave and prepare for the public meeting.

Meeting 8 – December 12, 2005

In attendance:

Pio Lombardo (facilitator), Natalie Brown – Lombardo Associates
Ed Shutt– Stafford Consultants
Mark Ehrnschwender – Fayette County Water Quality Coalition
Steve Sparks – Public Service Districts
Elbert Morton – WV Department of Environmental Protection
Doug Proctor – Rafting Business Community
Jesse Purvis – National Park Service

Items discussed included:

Pio and Natalie gave update of progress from last meeting, which included the following activities:

Reports

- Revised all project reports based on feedback received to date

Public Participation

- Project website updated with minutes of last Project Advisory Committee meeting, October public meeting with PSDs and municipalities, and revised reports

Revised CIP based on comments received:

- High failure percentage used for onsite sector
- Added connection to sewer as solution for failing onsites
- Estimated CSO/SSO remediation costs based on storage requirements to obtain a more realistic estimate of costs

These changes increased the County CIP to \$247 million from \$87 million (approximately \$61 million increase from the onsite sector and approximately \$100 million increase from the CSO/SSO abatement costs).

Elbert said that computing the CSO/SSO remediation costs based on required storage above design flow is conservative because most WWTFs can handle peak flows for about 3 days without problems. It was agreed upon that a range of costs will be given for the CSO/SSO remediation and onsite components of the CIP.

Two scenarios for County-wide CIPs were presented in the draft Preferred Plan, based on feedback from the committee. Scenario II which includes implementation of all the cluster systems and only the Page Kincaid Phase II and Pax sewer extension projects will be the Preferred Plan.

Dave Pollard will meet with Congressman Rahall in January to discuss funding options and the financing plan.

Pio said that the financing plan will be a combination of grants, rate increases, etc.

Ed Shutt said that the funding needs will have to be addressed on a project specific basis because a greater level of detail will be required and each funding source has its own specific requirements.

For the public outreach and participation component of the project the following activities will be done:

1. Newsletter prepared with project summary and public meeting information
2. Dave Pollard will write newspaper articles describing the project
3. Newspaper notice for the public meeting
4. Project libraries with all of the project reports will be setup in the following locations: Fayetteville library, Oak Hill library, Ansted library, Montgomery library, Meadow Bridge library, and the NPS
5. Add link from County website to the project website
6. Public meeting on February 16th

Jesse suggested that some examples of success stories be presented at the February meeting. Pio mentioned an EPA video on decentralized systems that could be shown.

Future Meeting Dates:

February 16, 2006 – Project Advisory Committee meeting

February 16, 2006 – Public meeting at Midland Trail High School (Mark to check on school availability)

Meeting 9 – February 14, 2006

In attendance:

Pio Lombardo (facilitator), Natalie Brown – Lombardo Associates
Ed Shutt, Sonny Barry– Stafford Consultants
Mark Ehrnschwender – Fayette County Water Quality Coalition
Al Gannon – Public Service Districts
Elbert Morton – WV Department of Environmental Protection
Doug Proctor, Jerry Porter? – Rafting Business Community
Jesse Purvis – National Park Service
Phil Perone – County Health Department
Dave Pollard – Fayette County Resource Coordinator

Items discussed included:

Pio and Natalie gave update of progress from last meeting, which included the following activities:

CIP

- Revised CIP based on discussion at our last meeting
 - High and low estimates of onsite sector CIP, but presenting a range of failure rates (35% to 50%) and a range of unit costs for the repair/replacement (\$8,000 to \$12,000)

- High and low estimates for CSO/SSO control from \$58.9 to \$117.7 million.

County CIP for the Preferred Plan ranges from \$155.7 million to \$249.3 million dollars.

Reports

- Revised All Project Reports And Issued Final Reports.

Public Participation

- Project website updated with minutes of last Project Advisory Committee meeting and all final reports
- Newsletter prepared and distributed giving project background and conclusions
- Binders with all project reports distributed to all County libraries, National Park Service, County Commissioners, and Courthouse

There was some discussion how the public meeting would be run.

Jesse stated that a County in Washington has implemented a water quality protection fee that might be something that Fayette could emulate.

Shirley Love has introduced legislation to give the PSC authority to manage alternative wastewater systems, which will help with the management component for the onsite and cluster system sectors.

Dave gave a brief overview of the funding paths he will pursue. He plans to present the Plan to WV American Water and the IJDC. He intends to set up a meeting with the IJDC prior to the July 1st application date so that they are familiar with the pr goal is to obtain \$20 million in capital for the coming year.

Ed inquired how the funds secured would be allocated. The response was that the projects would be matched with the funding sources.

Dave said he will use the same approach for funding the wastewater project as he used for funding the first years of the water project.

Mark said that when he Dave met with the County Commissioners, the Commissioners said they would support the need for PSDs and municipality action.

Enhancement District being pursued in Greenbrier County. Fayette County to wait to see how their effort goes to learn from the process and decide how an Enhancement District could be implemented. Discussions indicated that the legislation exists for Enhancement Districts, but none have been known to be implemented yet in West Virginia. oject. The

What's next?

1. Continued public education in the media and schools (need to get involvement in the WET project)

2. Cost of service analysis for Winona
3. County Commission adoption of Plan
4. Form Citizen's Advisory Committee
5. Use sewer bills as a means to communicate with public

APPENDIX B: PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

Meeting 1 – May 19, 2005

In Attendance:

Steering Committee Members – M. Ehrnschwender, A. Gannon, B. Novak, D. Pollard, D. Proctor, R. Boyd.

Consultant: P. Lombardo – *Lombardo Associates*, S. Berry – *Stafford Consultants*

Others: Pete Hobbs – *Mayor of Ansted*, Howard Hughes – *Mayor of Pax*, Joe Ortiz – *White Oak PSD*, Dan Miller of *Ansted*, Gene Kistler – *PAN*, Matt Wender and Ken Eskew – *Fayette County Commission*, Rose Mary Gannon – *Glen Jean*

This is the first of four public meetings planned during the plan development. The plan will include those providers of wastewater services, who wish to participate.

Mark Ehrnschwender provided a brief introduction on the development of the plan and its funding to date. It was announced that there were still a few openings on the steering committee, if anyone was interested.

A PowerPoint presentation on the goals and objectives, scope of work and the process was presented by Pio Lombardo with Q&A held during and after the presentation.

Discussion points included:

- Obtaining snap shot of current conditions at the wastewater facilities in Fayette County. The type of information needed includes - I & I reports, SSO information (dry flows and wet flows) and locations, By-pass detail, DMRs (Daily Monitoring Reports). M. Ehrnschwender to begin touring PSDs and interested municipalities to collect data.
- Consolidation – this issue is contentious, but needs to be discussed in terms of economies of scale (FTM (Financial, Technical, & Management) efficiency, customer base or critical mass, standardization, etc.)
- The mixing of wastewater technologies (Centralized, Cluster, and on-site systems) based on cost effectiveness
- Randy Boyd pointed out Congressman Rahall's interest in the plan and his financial support to date and hopefully in the future.
- The low turn out may be attributed to it being a Wednesday night. Another thought was bad attitudes due to previous meeting on the then proposed plan.
- Modifying the goal to put public health and safety before water quality protection was forwarded and agreed upon.

Overall the meeting went well. Though disappointed by the PSD turnout, the fact that two municipalities were there is encouraging. Discussion was lively, articulate and for the most part congenial. Initiating the consolidation dialogue was key and having members of the public discuss wastewater treatment in business model terms was also refreshing.

There being no other business the meeting adjourned.

Meeting 2 – July 26-27, 2005

July 26-27th LAI held meetings with the PSDs and municipalities with WWTFs in Fayette County to discuss their wastewater needs and CIP to address those needs. All PSDs and municipalities were contacted to participate in these meetings. Meetings were scheduled with eleven of the fourteen WWTFs in the County. Deepwater, Oak Hill, and Smithers elected not to participate.

Participating from the Project Advisory Committee were the following members:

- Pio Lombardo, Lombardo Associates, Inc.
- Natalie Brown, Lombardo Associates, Inc.
- Mark Ehrnschwender, Fayette County Water Quality Coalition
- Elbert Morton, WVDEP

The below table presents the schedule of meetings and the attendees from each PSD/municipality. Note that Montgomery did not show.

Date	Time	PSD/ Municipality	Attendee	Title
7/26	8:30 – 9:00	Pax	Will Bailey	Operator
	9:00 – 9:30	Kanawha Falls	Duane Tyree Billy Priest	Chief Operator General Manager
	9:40 - 10:10	Armstrong	David Sayre	Chief Operator
	10:20 – 10:50	Page-Kincaid	Bart Jackson	General Manager
	11:00 – 11:30	Arbuckle	Fred Hypes Bob Zimmerman	Engineer (Dunn Engineers) Operator
	11:40 – 12:10	White Oak	Al Gannon Steve Sparks	Board member Operator
	7:00	Meadow Bridge	Bo Wood Bob Vandall	General Manager Council Member
7/27	9:00 – 9:30	Mt. Hope	Kermit	Operator
	10:20 – 10:50	Ansted	Don Miller Kevin Boles	Sanitary Board Member Operator
	11:00 – 11:30	Fayetteville	Ralph Davis Randy Atwell	City Manager Operator
	11:40 – 12:10	Montgomery	No show	

Following is a summary of the key points from each of the meetings.

Pax

- ✓ Has Engineering Plan for sewer extension to serve an additional 97 residences
- ✓ DEP previously denied WLA application for the sewer extension because of ammonia; however, that criterion has since been removed.
- ✓ Will to provide ES-59s for flow analysis.
- ✓ Overall consolidation of this WWTF does not make sense because of its location. However, if consolidation was considered, consolidation with Bradley PSD of Raleigh County would make the sense.
- ✓ Will thinks the Town would be interested in the oversight of onsite systems.

Kanawha Falls

- ✓ Upgrade of the plant eliminated the frequency of SSOs
- ✓ Receptive to the addition of telemetry where appropriate. Wireless would be good in the area.
- ✓ I/I from the Armstrong collection system causes many problems for the Kanawha Falls system, which are difficult to remedy because they do not manage the Armstrong system.
- ✓ The collection systems consists of much old, terracotta pipe that needs to be replaced.
- ✓ All of the Glenn Ferris service area is below the river level so the houses have sump pumps and some are suspected of being tied into sewer system.
- ✓ If given the money, they will gladly make the necessary improvements.
- ✓ Billy and Duane are to provide a "wish list" that will be included in the County-wide CIP
- ✓ Elbert suggested they request to be designated as a combined sewer system if they meet the criteria.

Armstrong

- ✓ David started working for the PSD in April 2005 and has found few records.
- ✓ Adena Village has many illegal connections
- ✓ It was recommended that Armstrong PSD install a flow meter to record how much flow they are sending to Kanawha Falls.
- ✓ David is working with Kanawha Falls to help reduce the I/I.
- ✓ There is no sewer system map.
- ✓ The backwash from the water plant goes directly into the sewer system.

Page-Kincaid

- ✓ The PSD just received funding for the Phase I (\$6 million) extension to the Hamilton-Wriston areas. It is anticipated to start construction in the Fall of 2006 and will consist of a new 60,000 gpd package plant.
- ✓ Phase II is a \$5 million project and will consist of a 40,000 gpd plant.
- ✓ The Loop Creek WWTF has a STEG system.
- ✓ The Beards Fork WWTF has a grinder pump system.

Arbuckle

- ✓ Fred stated that the big overflow issue is the interceptor from Oak Hill.
- ✓ Arbuckle has petitioned DEP for a somewhat permitted overflow for that location and would like to install a COPA screen and control the discharge into the stream.
- ✓ The Oak Hill residents pay a tariff based on a 1970s contract with Arbuckle PSD.
- ✓ Arbuckle will submit a request to DEP to be designated a combined sewer system.
- ✓ Arbuckle is discussing with the County Commission changing its jurisdictional boundaries.
- ✓ The PSD has requested a rate increase from the PSC.
- ✓ LAI to provide WWTF summary for review and comment.

White Oak

- ✓ The SSO is at the plant.

- ✓ There is an existing \$1.8 million CIP for the WWTF; however, a better definition of the allocation of funds is needed for inclusion in CIP.

Meadow Bridge

- ✓ When school is out the dry weather flow is 12,000-17,000 gpd and when school is in session the dry weather flow is 45,000-50,000 gpd. However, when it rains in the spring, the flow is approximately 150,000 gpd.
- ✓ The I/I is more inflow than infiltration.
- ✓ Bo eliminated many of the sources of inflow, but there were 19 illegal connections he could not get corrected.
- ✓ He needs labor help to with the I/I.
- ✓ There is an existing CIP (\$2 million) to extend the sewer service to approximately 100 new customers. Bo thinks a cluster system approach might make more sense than extending the existing sewer system.
- ✓ Meadow Bridge needs better sludge handling facilities.
- ✓ Meadow Bridge is interested in opportunities to generate more revenue – receive septage, managing onsite systems, etc.

Mount Hope

- ✓ Need to eliminate SSOs
- ✓ Gave Kermit copy of WWTF summary for review and comment

Ansted

- ✓ They are in the process of gathering information to reduce the I/I. They have performed camera work on about 60 percent of the Town.
- ✓ Ansted is looking at a rate increase for this coming year.
- ✓ They only use their belt press about one day per week and have some interest in the possibility of becoming a receiving facility.
- ✓ All the pump stations have 10 hp duplex pumps.
- ✓ Construction costs to upgrade/replace? the 001 pump station were estimated at approximately \$50,000.
- ✓ If the I/I is eliminated from the 001 pump station, they could extend service to the Shade Creek area (approximately 56 homes).

Fayetteville

- ✓ The City passed an ordinance assessing an impact fee for developers of \$1,000 per unit to increase the capacity of the WWTF.
- ✓ They desire to sewer the Nickelville area.
- ✓ They are installing a 325,000-gallon surge tank at the plant for excess flows. It is the same capacity of the other tanks and can be converted to a treatment tank if needed in the future.
- ✓ They use their belt press about 2 days per week, but don't have the storage capacity to handle more sludge.
- ✓ They are receptive to discussion to take in more sludge and become a Class A facility.
- ✓ New bonds require that reserve accounts be funded.

Meeting 3 – October 6, 2005

In attendance:

See attached sign-in sheet

Presentation:

Lombardo Associates, Inc. (LAI) gave a presentation, which included an overview of the major tasks in the project and their status, CIPs developed for each of the wastewater management sectors, and funding issues. A copy of the presentation is available on the project website.

Questions (Q) and Comments (C):

Q: How did you determine that the package plants are beyond their useful life?

LAI: Better O&M could the life some, but the treatment process being used is not appropriate. Also, review of their monitoring reports and site visits also indicated they should be replaced. Professional judgment, they are 20+ years old.

Q: Did you consider consolidation of the package plants?

LAI: Yes, only for Hill 'n Dale and Briarwood with the Summerlee community and connection to Oak Hill WWTF make economic sense.

Q: Did you consider extending the package plant service areas?

LAI: Not at this time. It is a consideration that should be pursued in any facility planning effort.

Q: Are you talking about a ~\$60 per month sewer bill?

LAI: Yes. It is typical for sewer bills to be ~\$600 per year.

C: Do not want to raise rates, because 90 percent of residents are on a fixed income.

LAI: There are programs to help people with connection fees. Also, the County CIP will be at least a 10 year program so the implementation costs will be spread out.

Q: Can ability to pay dictate user charge?

LAI: No.

C: Western Family restaurant will be dismantled and connected to the Town of Fayetteville system. Also, Fayetteville is installing a holding tank and treatment pond. They are also looking to sewer Nickelville Road.

LAI: Thanks. Fayetteville to provide LAI additional detailed information available.

LAI: Do any of the potential business opportunities (sludge handling, technical, management, and financial assistance/sharing of skills & resources, septage pumping, onsite systems pumping, alternatives to proposed sewerage projects) appear real? Are you ready for rate increases?

C: White Oak is interested in outsourcing sludge management.

Q: Would it make sense to incinerate the sludge in the County?

LAI: No. Transporting sludge is expensive. It would not be cost effective.

LAI: Any interest in the management of onsite systems or package plants?

No response.

Q: How can PSDs and municipalities combine their buying power?

LAI: Cooperative agreements. The County Commission or a PSD/municipality could take the lead to get the benefits of economies of scale for materials. Mark Ehrnschwender agreed to compile list of chemicals/materials used most and other purchase information provided by interested PSDs and municipalities to facilitate getting the process started.

Q: Are there any legal concerns with taking onsite business away from private entities?

LAI: No. The proposed business opportunity does not conflict with private entities.

NAME	ORGANIZATION	PHONE	EMAIL
Judith Wallace	ARMSTRONG PSD.	442-8302	
Don Navarro	ARMSTRONG PSD	442 5647	
Quane Tyree	Kanawha Falls PSD	779-2855	
Donald F. Miller	ANSTED NYO.	658-5302	
AL GANNON	WOPSD	469-4642	
MARION R. Zimmerman III	Arbuckle R.S.D.	465-8600	
DAVID DUNCAN	Arbuckle P.S.D.	465-1250	
Terry Keffe	Arbuckle PSD	469 2251	
Howard Berry	Starrons	465-9535	
Carl Smith	Town of Fayetteville	574-2101	
Randy Atwell	Town of Fayetteville	574 462	
Verneicea Woodson	Arbuckle PSD	465-8600	
Mary Humphrey	Arbuckle PSD	465-8600	
Gary Starn	TOWN OF ANSTED	640-3922	
MARK EHRSCHWENDER	FAYETTE COUNTY	574 1993	
PIO LOMBARDO	LOMBARDO ASSOC.	667 967 2924	
NATALIE BROWN	LOMBARDO ASSOC	667 967 2924	

Meeting 4 - February 14, 2006

In attendance:

See attached sign-in sheet

The meeting was also covered by news channel 4.

Items discussed included:

The meeting began with a brief introduction by Mark E.

Next County Commissioner Matt Wender spoke about how the project was initiated after the flood of 2001. He acknowledged the community members that served on the Project Advisory Committee for their time and dedication to the project.

Pio Lombardo then gave a presentation describing the planning process and the final conclusions. The County wastewater management capital improvement program (CIP) is estimated to range from approximately \$150 million to \$250 million. The two wildcards on the onsite septic systems and the CSO/SSO abatement costs. Different funding sources were presented.

Q: What is the difference between a water quality protection fee and increased rates?

A: In this case, there may not be much of a difference. There may be legal and institutional issues in WV that would make them for all practical purposes the same thing.

Q: What if I cannot afford to pay more/do not want to pay?

A: Affordability is an issue that is taken into consideration. Grants and low interest loans can help offset some of the project costs and make the projects more affordable.

Dave Pollard spoke regarding the funding and implementation issues. He used a football analogy to saying through the planning process the County has collected the necessary data, put a game plan together, and identified the players necessary to be able to implement the Plan. Moreover, the County is in a position to anticipate the future rules and direction of the game to be able to successfully carry out its game plan.

Dave stated the County's goal for the first fiscal year is \$20 million in capital. He anticipates that \$10 million may come from a private/public partnership and the other \$10 million from traditional funding sources.

Dave also stated that there is a bill out of committee that will pass, which will give the PSC jurisdiction over alternative wastewater systems.

Q: How do we prioritize?

A: The Plan will be used to help prioritize projects, but the availability of funding sources available for specific projects will play a major role in which projects are implemented when. It is likely that the Winona cluster system will be the first project implemented.

Q: With better wastewater management will the zoning change?

A: Good question. It is something that could be considered. The two acre zoning was in part based on public health issues.

Q: Has the PSC ever forced a PSD to raise rates?

A: Yes.

Q: When will the Plan be presented to the Commissioners for adoption? What is the timeline going forward?

A: The Plan will be presented as soon as the Commissioners have had a chance to digest the information. The County intends to set up a meeting with the IJDC prior to their July 1st application date to familiarize them with the project.

Q: Is non-traditional wastewater management used in other areas of the state?

A: Tucker County is starting to look at it. Barbour County is setting up an onsite management district where a PSD will manage onsite septic systems.

The meeting was adjourned.

