Attendees – See attached sign in sheet
Presentation slides attached

Group Meeting Minutes
1. Introductions
   a. Meeting began at 10:00 AM with John Dening welcoming new attendees and introductions.
   b. John Dening opened the meeting with a presentation on food safety, see attached presentation.
   c. John Dening presented a summary of the topics discussed at the previous meeting. John explained the purpose of this meeting and the role of the SCSO team. John opened for questions on prior meeting, but no questions were asked at this time.
   d. John Dening indicated that meeting minutes are posted on the Ridgefield Park website.


3. Discussion and Questions – The following outlines questions that were asked during the presentation and the discussions that followed:
   a. Question: How many overflows per year do we average?
      Answer: It varies by years, using the Typical Year the highest individual outfall would be around 53 with the lowest being 12.
   b. Question: Is there any way to test the overflows we had before compared to what we will have after?
      Answer: The effectiveness of the controls is tested in the model using the Typical Year. This serves as the basis of compliance for the LTCP. Throughout the LTCP there will be periodic requirement for compliance monitoring.
c. Question: Where is the treatment for the water?

Answer: The flow is treated across the river at the BCUA treatment plant in Little Ferry.

d. Question: We share a line with Fort Lee are they also developing a plan? How much flow are they adding and how will this affect us?

Answer: Fort Lee is also developing a plan and their added flow, if any, will be accounted for in the model.

e. Question: Control Program 2 (CSO storage tanks) facilities are dependent on us acquiring the land?

Answer: Yes, but most facilities would be below ground, so it may be possible to continue business above ground, or to repurpose the sites.

f. Question: Would the land next to Rt. 80 be a better fit?

Answer: There’s columns, it’s next to a highway and it is in a more remote location so it is still on the list as potential land to be used but at the end of the day it will all be dependent on if it could be acquired, pricing and feasibility.

Clarification on question e: The VFW post building adjacent to Overpeck Creek is owned by the Village and is abandoned.

g. Question: The alternatives pricings we are seeing is just what Ridgefield Park must pay?

Answer: Yes, the other communities have prepared their own reports which can be downloaded from the NJDEP.

h. Question: What is the annual overflow volume.

Answer: It is a little over 50 million gallons for the typical year, keep in mind this is mostly for rain water, some sewage and whatever is picked up off the streets.

i. Question: Would Control Program 3 (CSO storage tunnels) follow the railroad right of way?

Answer: It would be under Industrial Avenue, parallel to the railroad.

j. Question: For anything underground such as the tunnels would there have to be soil investigation?

Answer: Yes. It is easier to tunnel through rock, so the depth to rock is
important, we would need to know how deep we would have to go to hit rock. If rock is about 50 feet it is probably feasible to place the tunnel in rock. If the depth to rock is deeper like 100 feet or more, it may not feasible and soft ground tunneling which is more difficult would be required.

Comment from Village resident: On the other side of the town to hit rock it was about 175 feet to 250 feet. Not sure what it would be on this side of town, but I would assume it would be similar.

k. Question: You mentioned separation of sewers could bring further costs in the future, doesn’t this make it obsolete?

Answer: Stormwater is a major contributor of pollutants to the watercourse. Currently, the NJDEP requires some level of solids removal. In the future the NJDEP requirements may be stricter depending on regulations. So it is possible that there will be additional costs in the future even if you separate.

l. Question: If we did separate would there be additional costs for links to the new system?

Answer: You wouldn’t be asking individual people to pay for reconnecting their laterals in the street. The cost would be part of the overall project and it would be paid for with taxes or sewer fees.

m. Question: Is the BCUA prepared for the increase in flow from the towns?

Answer: The might have to expand depending on the increase in flow and if that were the case then the towns would be responsible to pay for that expansion.

n. Question: The end of pipe alternatives would cause the least disruption to the citizens correct?

Answer: It appears the impacts would be less than working on every street as would be required by sewer separation.

o. Questions: Are the properties in Industrial Avenue the only ones being considered?

Answer: On the report we showed others, but this seemed to be the most promising candidate based on location. Other factors will play into the final siting.

p. Question from John Dening: What community group meetings could we attend to share this information with people?
Answer from SCSO Team and resident: Is the goal to reach hundreds of people? That is not going to happen at community group meetings.

Response: The idea is to talk to as many people as we can, then those people can talk to other people and the message is spread.

Suggestions: The Village newsletter is a great place to post this information and it would be smart to hold a meeting on the day that all the community groups meet at the municipal building or you can also invite all community groups to one big meeting in the municipal building instead of meeting just one group individually.

q. Question: You said it is likely that with a separation of sewer we will have further costs in the future, but would this be the case with the other alternatives as well?

Answer: With any alternative there is potential for them to come back in the future and make you spend more.

r. Question: What is meant financial capability analysis?

Answer: The DEP doesn’t want to bankrupt cities over this, they want cities to spend a reasonable amount. The financial capability analysis compares the costs of alternatives to thresholds set by the EPA to see how much should be spent.

s. One of the SCSO Team members discussed distributing material on CSOs at the Village’s street fair. John Dening stressed that public participation is an important part of the process and that it is not limited to the SCSO team. He asked for an email detailing what was done at the street fair, so it could be documented in the upcoming report.

4. John passed around handouts that included the Summary section of the Development and Evaluation of Alternatives Report. He focused on the information that indicated how the rating for each alternative came about. He specifically requested input on the ratings applied to the Public Acceptance. He requested that the attendees will comment on it in the next week or two.

5. Meeting concluded at 11:40 AM.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Rolak</td>
<td>Mott MacDonald</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.rolak@mottmac.com">john.rolak@mottmac.com</a></td>
<td>973-912-2521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Dening</td>
<td>Mott MacDonald</td>
<td><a href="mailto:John.dening@mottmac.com">John.dening@mottmac.com</a></td>
<td>973-912-2464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Mott MacDonald</td>
<td><a href="mailto:donna.gregory@mottmac.com">donna.gregory@mottmac.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flo</td>
<td>Muller</td>
<td>Ridgefield Park Shade Tree Commission</td>
<td><a href="mailto:flogmart@nj.rr.com">flogmart@nj.rr.com</a></td>
<td>201-814-9019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td>Chairman, Green Team</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark-olson@verizon.net">mark-olson@verizon.net</a></td>
<td>201-440-5989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Quinn</td>
<td>Ridgefield Park Environmental Commission</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephencquinn@aol.com">stephencquinn@aol.com</a></td>
<td>201-440-5652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Quinn</td>
<td>Ridgefield Park Environmental Commission</td>
<td><a href="mailto:linda.quinn125@gmail.com">linda.quinn125@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>201-440-5652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Ponticorvo</td>
<td>Wanda Canoe Club</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jponticorvo@aol.com">jponticorvo@aol.com</a></td>
<td>201-803-3643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>O’Grady</td>
<td>Village of Ridgefield Park DPW</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aog560@aol.com">aog560@aol.com</a></td>
<td>201-440-4606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>Village of Ridgefield Park DPW</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ed81563@gmail.com">ed81563@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>Rodriguez</td>
<td>Mott MacDonald</td>
<td><a href="mailto:diego.rodriguez@mottmac.com">diego.rodriguez@mottmac.com</a></td>
<td>973-262-1523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development and Evaluation of Alternative Controls

Village of Ridgefield Park
Supplemental CSO Team
Meeting #9

September 24, 2019

Safety Topic
September is Food Safety Month

Stats
In the U.S.
76,000,000 cases a year
325,000 hospitalized
5,000 deaths

1 Chill
Within 2 hours
40°F of colder
Thaw in Fridge

2 Clean
Wash hands 20 sec
Cutting boards
Countertops

3 Cook
Check temperature
Stir
Boil – soups, sauces and gravies

4 Separate
Meat
Cutting boards
Shopping Carts
Prevent dripping

http://safetytoolboxtopics.com/
Ridgefield Park Supplemental CSO Team

Meeting No. 9 Agenda

Refresher – In meeting #8 we covered:

- Submissions Status
- Public Participation Status
- Development and Evaluation of Alternatives
  - Coordination with BCUA
  - Future Baseline
  - Preliminary Alternatives
- Upcoming Schedule
Ridgefield Park Supplemental CSO Team

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Minutes

Ridgefield Park: The Future of our Waterways is in Your Hands

Dry Weather

Heavy Rainfall Event

For More Information See these Important Links

- Environmental Protection Agency
- https://www.epa.gov/protectourwater

Ridgefield Park’s Storm Team also provides education on things that you can do to reduce your impact on the waterways.

- The Storm Team
- https://www.ridgefieldpark.org/green-team

Meeting Minutes

CSO Meeting 1 - May 25, 2017
CSO Meeting 2 - September 13, 2017
CSO Meeting 3 - December 18, 2017
CSO Meeting 4 - March 12, 2018
CSO Meeting 5 - June 11, 2018
CSO Meeting 6 - October 1, 2018
CSO Meeting 7 - January 22, 2019

Mott MacDonald | Presentation
Meeting No. 9 Agenda

- Submissions Status
- Development and Evaluation of Alternatives
  - Control Programs
  - Performance
  - Cost
- Financial Capabilities Analysis
- Selection and Implementation of Alternatives
- Public Participation
- Upcoming Schedule

DEP review status thru – July 1, 2019 submittals

- **Consideration of Sensitive Areas Report:** Approval Letter dated 4/8/19.

- **Baseline Compliance Monitoring Program Report:** Approval letter dated 3/01/19.

- **System Characterization Reports:** Approval letter dated 03/11/19

- **Public Participation Process Report:** Approval letter dated June 26, 2019.

- **Development and Evaluation of Alternatives Control Report:** Submitted June 2019 Currently under review by the NJDEP.
Ridgefield Park Supplemental CSO Team

What does the permit say about Development and Evaluation of Alternatives?

The permittee shall evaluate a reasonable range of CSO control alternatives that will meet the water quality-based requirements of the CWA.

The Development and Evaluation of Alternatives Report shall include a list of control alternative(s) evaluated for each CSO enabling the permittee, …to select the alternatives to ensure the CSO controls will meet the water quality-based requirements of the CWA.

The permittee shall evaluate the practical and technical feasibility of the proposed CSO control alternative(s), and water quality benefits and give the highest priority to controlling CSO discharges to sensitive areas.

The permittee shall select either the Demonstration or Presumption Approach.

Ridgefield Park Supplemental CSO Team

Range of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green Infrastructure</th>
<th>Storage</th>
<th>Treatment Plant Expansion</th>
<th>Infiltration / Inflow Reduction</th>
<th>Sewer Separation</th>
<th>End-of-Pipe Treatment</th>
<th>WWTP Bypass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Range of alternatives, different levels of control, numerous combinations.
Costing
Cost Estimating Procedures

Order of Magnitude Estimate (Class 5)
Planning Level Cost Estimate – True Cost is within -50%+100% of Estimated Cost

- Capital Costs
  - Design = 10% of Construction Costs
  - Construction Management = 10% of Construction Costs
  - Administrative/Legal = 5% of Construction Costs

- O&M
  - Only routine costs – no large-scale overhauls or replacements due to 20 yr planning period

- NPW
  - n=20 years i=2.75%
  - PW from O&M costs used the following:
    - \( (P|A, i\%, n) = \frac{((1+i)^n-1)}{(i(1+i)^n)} \)

Alternatives Evaluation
Control Program 1 - Elimination of Outfall 006A
Small overflow volume at 006A

- Feasible to combine 005A and 006A, at low cost, to reduce burden on other alternatives
- Model shows additional upgrades required to the downstream system if 006A is eliminated
- Will require further review of the system to see if there is a cost-effective solution, i.e. diverting connected catchbasins to existing storm sewers.
Alternatives Evaluation

Storage – Tanks and Tunnels

Temporary storage tunnels and tanks reduce and delay overflows

Alternatives Evaluation

Control Program 2 - Consolidated Tank Storage

Tanks retain overflows and return them to sewer and WWTP

Consists of:
- Diversion structures with fine screens;
- Consolidation piping
- An offline below grade tank equipped with a flushing system and odor control;
- Tank overflow to an outfall;
- Dewatering pumping station; and
- Discharge connection back to the interceptor.

- 2 Consolidated Tanks for 001A & 002A and 003A-006A
- Consolidation - pros and cons to individual outfall storage
- Challenges of large-scale construction in an urban area
Alternatives Evaluation

Control Program 2 - Consolidated Tank Storage Contd.

Tanks retain overflows and return them to sewer and WWTP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overflows per Year</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost ($ Million)</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M Cost ($ Million)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Worth ($ Million)</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$34-$84 M (Class 5 Cost Estimate: -50%+100%)

$1.1-1.7/gal of CSO removed during typical year.
Alternatives Evaluation

Control Program 3 - Consolidated Tunnel Storage

All outfalls will be consolidated into one, central tunnel

- Results in only one outfall near current 002A
- Consists of:
  - Consolidation piping from Outfall 006A
  - Diversion piping from each outfall
  - Control Gates
  - Drop shafts along Industrial Avenue and at intersection of 2nd Avenue, and Bergen Turnpike.
  - Deaeration chambers
  - A dewatering pumping station
  - Grit and screening facilities
  - Force main connection back to the BCUA Main Trunk Sewer.
  - A tunnel overflow with tide gate
- Issues are typical with large-scale urban construction, though tunnels introduce further complications
  - Mining and construction across the entire route
  - Complexity in tunnel management

Consolidated Tunnel Map
Alternatives Evaluation
Control Program 3 - Consolidated Tunnel Storage

All outfalls will be consolidated into one, central tunnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overflows per Year</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost ($ Million)</td>
<td>$88.4</td>
<td>$72.3</td>
<td>$72.3</td>
<td>$67.3</td>
<td>$62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M Cost ($ Million)</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Worth ($ Million)</td>
<td>$118.5</td>
<td>$98.6</td>
<td>$98.6</td>
<td>$92.5</td>
<td>$86.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$86-$118 M (Class 5 Cost Estimate: -50%+100%)

$2.20-$2.40/gal of CSO removed during typical year.

Alternatives Evaluation
Control Program 4 - Consolidated End of Pipe Treatment

Similar to EOP storage, but overflow is not returned to interceptor

- Treatment capacity governed by flow, not volume like the storage tanks
- Treatment process:
  - Fine Screening for floatable and coarse particles
  - Pump Station
  - High-rate primary treatment (i.e. ActiFlo)
  - Disinfection by peracetic acid
  - Storage of underflow
- Similar pros and cons to consolidation as storage
- Large-scale urban construction
Alternatives Evaluation
Control Program 4 - Consolidated End of Pipe Treatment

$60-$87 M (Class 5 Cost Estimate: -50%+100%)

$1.30-$1.70/gal of CSO removed during typical year.
Alternatives Evaluation
Control Program 5 - Sewer Separation

Effectively removes the Village from being a CSO community

• Pros:
  − Work in public right-of-way; no new land needed
  − Opportunity for current system renewal and reconstruction
  − Elimination of outfalls
• Cons:
  − Highly disruptive to roads and traffic
  − Need to redirect every sanitary service connection on the street
  − Need for stormwater controls and treatment in the future
• Issues are general for large-scale construction in urban areas
• Pollutant loads (excepting some pathogens) to receiving water will increase 40%

$193M (Class 5 Cost Estimate: -50%+100%) $3.8/gal of CSO removed during typical year
Alternatives Evaluation
Control Program 6 - Green Infrastructure

Distributed storage or detention throughout the village

- Bioswales selected as representative GI
  - Anticipated GI would consist largely of bioswales and permeable pavement
- Site suitability was a major issue
  - Land-use, impervious cover, hydrologic soil group (HSG), and publicly owned land
- Maximum of 4% of total impervious area directed to GI
- Minimal institutional/implementation issues

Alternatives Evaluation
Control Program 6 - Green Infrastructure

Distributed storage or detention throughout the village

$2.7-$12 M* (Class 5 Cost Estimate: -50%+100%)

$5.80 - $9.10/gal of CSO removed during typical year

*For controlling 2.5%-10% of Village impervious area with GI, estimated a maximum of 4% could be feasible controlled.
Table 8-1: Summary of CSO Volumes for Typical Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Program</th>
<th>2017 Baseline (MG)</th>
<th>Level of Control / Overflows During Typical Year (MG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Eliminate CSO-006</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consolidated Tank Storage</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tunnel</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consolidated End of Pipe Treatment</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sewer Separation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8-3: Summary of Frequency of Overflows for Typical Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Program</th>
<th>2017 Baseline</th>
<th>Level of Control / Overflows During Typical Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Eliminate CSO-006</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consolidated Tank Storage</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tunnel</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consolidated End of Pipe Treatment</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sewer Separation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8-4: Summary of Percent Capture Achieved by Each Control Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Program</th>
<th>2017 Baseline</th>
<th>Level of Control / Overflows During Typical Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Eliminate CSO-006</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consolidated Tank Storage</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tunnel</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consolidated End of Pipe Treatment</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sewer Separation</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costing

NPW Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Program</th>
<th>Cost per Gallon Volume CSO Reduction ($/gal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Control</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Eliminate Outfall 006</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Storage (Consolidated)</td>
<td>$84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Tunnel</td>
<td>$118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Treatment (Consolidated)</td>
<td>$87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Sewer Separation</td>
<td>$193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Reduction for Impervious Area Managed (MG)</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>$9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control Program | NPW Summary - Overflows per Year ($M) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Control</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Eliminate Outfall 006</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Storage (Consolidated)</td>
<td>$84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Tunnel</td>
<td>$118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Treatment (Consolidated)</td>
<td>$87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Sewer Separation</td>
<td>$193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPW Summary - % of Impervious Area Managed ($M)</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternatives Rating

Rating Procedure
Control Programs rated 1 (Worst) to 5 (Best) on several categories and a weighted average found

• Cost
  - Normalized by $/gallon
  - Based on 4 overflows per year and 5% GI
  - 25% weight

• CSO Reduction
  - Overall reduction of CSO volume in Typical Year
  - Reduction in CSO Events
  - 15% weight each

• Institutional Issues
  - Ranked according to possibility of permitting delaying project six (6) months or more
  - 15% weight

• Implementability
  - Ranked according to project being delayed by other factors for six (6) or more months
  - 15% weight

• Public acceptance
  - Ranked according to how we think the public would welcome and support the plan
  - 15% weight

Alternatives Rating

Ranking – NO SELECTION MADE AT THIS PHASE!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Program</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>CSO Volume Reduction</th>
<th>CSO Frequency Reduction</th>
<th>Institutional Issues</th>
<th>Implementability</th>
<th>Public Acceptance</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Eliminate CSO-006A</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consolidated Tank Storage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tunnel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consolidated End of Pipe Treatment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sewer Separation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighting</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Participation Comment Letter

Proposed:

- Continue SCSO Team Meetings
- Seek additional SCSO Team Members
- Present to Commissioners – Oct 3rd
- Newsletter Article – Topics?
- Public and Community Group Meetings – Suggestions; groups, dates and content?
- Earth Day 2020

Ridgefield Park Supplemental CSO Team
Long term control plan submission and NJDEP review status

Step 1.

- Baseline Compliance Monitoring Program Report – NJDEP Approval on 3/1/2019
- Consideration of Sensitive Areas Report – NJDEP Approval on 4/8/2019
- Public Participation Process Report – NJDEP Approval Pending

Step 2.

- Development and Evaluation of Alternatives – Due on 7/1/2019

Step 3.

- Selection and Implementation of Alternatives Report
- Final LTCP – Due on 6/1/2020
BCUA CSO Group Supplemental CSO Team

Upcoming Schedule

Late September 2019
DEAR Comment from NJDEP
Supplemental CSO Team Meeting

Fall 2019
Finalize: Approach, Alternatives and FCA
Supplemental CSO Team Meeting

December 2019
Finalize Regional Coordination
Public Meeting

March 2020
Approval by Municipalities/BCUA
Supplemental CSO Team Meeting

June 1, 2020
Selection and Implementation Report due to NJDEP
Public Meeting

Final Questions?
Thank You?