

# Scoping Meeting Summary

## EIS for a proposed water treatment residuals management process

### Date and Location

The scoping meeting was held on Wednesday January 28, 2004 from 7:00pm to 9:00 pm at the St. Patrick's Episcopal Church and Day School. The school is located at 4700 Whitehaven Parkway NW, Washington, DC, close to the Georgetown Reservoir and the Dalecarlia Treatment Facility.

### Public Notification

The project Notice of Intent (NOI) appeared in the Federal Register on January 12, 2004.

A display advertisement ran in both *The Washington Post* and the *Northwest Current* on January 22, 2004.

A personal invitation was mailed by the Washington Aqueduct on January 14 to 63 individuals interested in Washington Aqueduct environmental issues.

A project web page was on-line as of January 28:  
<http://washingtonaqueduct.nab.usace.army.mil/aqueduct.htm>

### Format and Content

The scoping meeting was conducted as a public open house. Participants were able to attend at any point during the two-hour period of availability and view a series of eight exhibit boards illustrating different aspects of the project. Each of the exhibits was staffed by an employee of the Washington Aqueduct and its consultant who were knowledgeable about that particular aspect of the project. Summary handouts were available to participants. A stenographer was available to record statements from individuals wishing to have their comments incorporated into the project record.

Click on the pull down menu for this section to see the Scoping Meeting poster boards.

### Summary of Public Comments

Fifteen people attended the scoping meeting. Two individuals chose to include comments for the public record. Three individuals provided comments through the project web page. The potential impact of truck traffic in the neighboring communities emerged as a dominant theme of the comments. Additional comments focused on processing technologies, non-trucking alternatives, and concerns related to continued river discharge.

## Comments Received During the Scoping Period

All of the comments described below will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). This document will be available for public review in December 2004. In the DEIS, comments from the scoping process that suggest and describe alternatives to be evaluated will be addressed in Chapters One and Two, which will describe the alternatives identification and screening process. Comments related to potential impacts of various alternatives will be addressed in Chapters Four and Five, which will describe the full range of potential impacts associated with the selected alternatives and the decision process used to determine the preferred alternative.

In late May 2004, the Washington Aqueduct will host a public forum to discuss the alternatives that will be evaluated in detail in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

- Strike the no-action alternative from the research agenda.
- Evaluate plasma technology for its potential to reduce the volume of residuals necessary for final disposal.
- Improvements to river water quality must not come at the expense of air quality.
- Energy costs must be proportional to benefits, disposal at Blue Plains affords opportunity for energy economies of scale.
- Air-drying the sludge before removal by truck via an access road direct to the Clara Barton Parkway may be more environmentally and fiscally sound than constructing and supporting a dewatering plant at the Aqueduct.
- Please compare the costs of various alternatives and their impact on rates.
- The barge in the C&O canal was offered as a joke, do not put much emphasis on its research.
- Consider applying the dehydrated sediments on sod farms in upper stretches of Montgomery County.
- Do not truck residuals out of Georgetown Reservoir through the central heart of the Palisades; please evaluate piping it to a central handling point.
- Consider the environmental impact that trucking would have on communities involved including the near neighbors.

- Consider hardening Little Falls Parkway so that it can handle trucks carrying the sediment to avoid residential areas of the Palisades.
- Consider mixing the material with WASA biosolids for use as fertilizer.
- Consider and provide to the public the anticipated total volume of sediments generated on a weekly basis and monthly basis and determine the number of trucks required for trucking options.

Several of the comments received during the Scoping Process are not directly relevant to the project's purpose and need and will not be addressed in the EIS. These comments are provided below along with the Washington Aqueduct response.

- The MOU between EPA and the US Army Corps of Engineers prohibits discharge during spawning, but fishermen report that discharge occurred during spawning season last year. What is the truth?

Response: The Federal Facility Compliance Agreement between the Environmental Protection Agency and Washington Aqueduct provides for discharge of residuals to the Potomac River while an alternative management process is planned, designed and constructed, except during the spring spawning season. The spring spawning season is defined in National Pollutant Discharge Permit DC0000019. Washington Aqueduct has not discharged residuals to the Potomac River during the spring spawning season since the referenced permit was reissued in March 2003.

- Please make discharge notification available to the public.

Response: Washington Aqueduct will post notification of any discharge during the spring spawning season to the Washington Aqueduct website:

<http://washingtonaqueduct.nab.usace.army.mil/>

- What effect will the city-wide concern about lead in drinking water have on the residuals management project?

Response: The activities that Washington Aqueduct will undertake to modify its corrosion control treatment will not affect nor will it be affected by the residuals management project.