Appendix D. LRCA, SRBC, and PADEP Meeting Record

This appendix reproduces the LRCA, SRBC, and PADEP meeting record available in the Project source folder. LRBC references in older notes are treated as LRCA references for this PAD.

Outlook

RE: Old Forge Thoughts Post Meeting

From Bernie McGurl <Director@LRCA.ORG>
Date Thu 5/12/2022 2:50 PM
To Clark, Tom <tclark@srbc.net>; Adam Rousselle <arousselle@reaggregators.com>; Johnnie Johnson <jjohnson@reaggregators.com>; Paul Davis <LRCATech@LRCA.ORG>; Bernie McGurl <Director@LRCA.ORG>
Cc King, Andrew <aking@srbc.net>; Malesky <tmalesky@pa.gov>; pawebb@pa.gov <pawebb@pa.gov>; Bradley, Brian J <brbradley@pa.gov>; Green, John <jodgree@pa.gov>

Adam, Tom,

I agree with Tom's assessment. We need to build for the capacity to treat flows up to 100 MGD. We can work on getting the Duryea flow over there presently in due time. The public interest is best served by having the capacity at hand to treat both flows plus a reasonable high flow margin. BTW we recorded flows in excess of 120 MGD for several weeks until high flows from the Tropical Storm Lee event ripped out our transducers in 2011. Flows above 100 MGD will do to the rivers ecosystem what they will do regardless of what we do or don't do. But I do think we need to take on both AMD flows and some reasonable storm margin above that.

I joined Congressman Cartwright and Senator Casey on Monday in Scranton for an announcement on the Streams Act amendment that will set aside some AML|AMD funds long term for O &M on AMD facilities. That can help support this project in the long term as well. Here is a link to a video of that event: https://youtu.be/nocTX-i2V5w

I'd also like to revisit having an LRCA/501c3 component as part of the mix for long term O&M and to facilitate work with DEP and REA and others to get the Duryea flow over for treatment. That could relieve REA of some long-term responsibility and liability and have a range of other community benefits.

I think there is plenty of room for interim to mid-term onsite or nearby storage for the sludge until market uses can be obtained or developed.

I look forward to more discussion on these items. Bernie

From: Clark, Tom <tclark@srbc.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 5, 2022 11:30 AM
To: Adam Rousselle <arousselle@reaggregators.com>; Bernie McGurl <Director@LRCA.ORG>
Cc: King, Andrew <aking@srbc.net>; Malesky <tmalesky@pa.gov>; pawebb@pa.gov; Bradley, Brian J <brbradley@pa.gov>; Green, John <jodgree@pa.gov>
Subject: Old Forge Thoughts Post Meeting

Adam and Bernie,

Meant to get this out sooner, but spring has been very busy. Will try to keep this short and sweet.

1. 45 MGD Plant is way too small. I think Old Forge averages 65 MGD and Duryea another 20 MGD or so. You have to size the plant to be able to treat the high flow discharges, particularly post a stream returning to normal flows after a precip event because there will be a lag between the stream decreasing in flow and the discharges decreasing in flow, which will take longer. If you don't have the capacity to treat during that time, you will lose all the gains you have made during normal flow events.

Appendix D. LRCA, SRBC, and PADEP Meeting Record, page 1.

2. Sounded to me that Duryea needs to be a pump/conveyance project outside the main Old Forge/Hydroelecytric Project Team since a HDD permitting timeline to get under the river is untenable. As long as the plant is sized in a way that it can adequately treat Old Forge and Duryea together, then there are people like me who would be interested in assisting where needed on the Duryea Pump/Conveyance Projects side. Lackawanna will not be restored unless both are treated.
3. What will be done with the sludge produced as I don't think I caught that during the meeting if it was spoken about?

Let me know where I can assist,

TC

Appendix D. LRCA, SRBC, and PADEP Meeting Record, page 2.