



Hamilton County

County Administrator

Board of Commissioners

Greg Hartmann
President

Chris Monzel
Vice President

Todd Portune

County Administration Building
138 East Court Street, Room 603
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Phone (513) 946-4400
Fax (513) 946-4444
TDD/TTY (513) 946-4719
www.hamilton-co.org

Administrator

Christian Sigman
Phone (513) 946-4420

Summary of Hamilton County Public Hearings on Lower Mill Creek Preliminary Remedy (LMCPR)

Hearing #1

Date: September 26, 2012

Location: Hamilton County Board of County Commissioners Hearing Room

Length of Time: approximately 1.5 hours

The Board introduced the Public Hearing. MSD Director Parrot made a brief presentation on the elements of MSD's recommended LMCPR alternative proposal, known as the Sustainable Infrastructure (SI) alternative. The County Monitor identified potential risks associated with the SI alternative. Public Comments were made by eight individuals representing business and civic organizations and personally. The Commissioners then made comments and raised questions.

Topics addressed by Public:

- Cost control/certainty
- Potential new (non-MSD) alternative
- Phase 1 costs as they relate to the entire project
- Water Quality
- Benefits of SI
- Concerns over SI
- Appreciation of BOCC July resolution
- Ineffective public input process

Topics addressed by Commissioners:

Need to account for updated modeling in scope of default and alternative

Costs and cost control

Transparency in spending

Decisions based on sound data

Hearing #2

Date: October 3, 2012

Location: Hamilton County Board of County Commissioners Hearing Room

Length of Time: approximately 2 hours

The meeting opened with a statement from County Administration. MSD Director Parrot gave a brief presentation on risk. Public Comments were made by seven individuals representing local government and civic organizations and personally. The Commissioners then made comments and asked questions, with Director Parrott answering.

Topics addressed by Public:

- Cost estimate increases and threats to Phase 2
- Cost controls
- Historic preservation of existing buildings in SI areas slated for demolition
- Rate increases
- Lack of public involvement
- Benefit of SI's watershed approach
- Divisions among South Fairmount community on SI
- SI but control spending

Topics addressed by Commissioners:

- Cost and performance certainty risks
- Need for local performance data
- 100-year flood control standard
- Cost increases above \$244M estimate in WWIP
- Risks of less proven, new technologies/approaches
- Costs and liabilities of new stormwater discharges/systems
- Risks of EPA action in future

Hearing #3

Date: October 8, 2012

Location: MSD Administration Office Presentation Room

Length of Time: approximately 1.25 hours

The meeting began with an introduction by the Board, followed by brief presentation by Director Parrot on the SI alternative. Public Comments were made by three individuals representing civic organizations and a business. The Commissioners then made comments and asked questions, with Director Parrott answering.

Topics addressed by Public:

- Support for SI with green infrastructure for water quality
- Bacteria background levels in Mill Creek from Butler County
- Costs and rates
- Flooding/inflows to combined sewer system
- Historic preservation of existing buildings in SI areas slated for demolition
- Potential new (non-MSD) alternative

Topics addressed by Commissioners:

- SI potential traffic impacts and costs to be paid by City/others, not MSD
- Amenities (what and why funded / not funded in SI proposal)
- Hargrove Engineering Company's alternative idea
- Need for SI alternative proposal which uses updated MSD modeling volume

Hearing #4

Date: October 10, 2012

Location: Hamilton County Board of County Commissioners Hearing Room

Length of Time: approximately 1.75 hours

MSD Director Parrot began the meeting with a brief presentation regarding the SI alternative's surface features/amenities, an illustration of a potential suite of SI alternative projects using MSD's updated modeling, and transportation costs. The Commissioners commented on the presentation. Public Comments were made by 11 individuals representing business, civic groups and environmental groups and personally. The Commissioners then made comments and asked questions, with Director Parrott, the County's MSD Monitor, and the County's outside legal counsel responding.

Topics addressed by Public:

- Expiration of 1968 County-City Agreement on MSD
- Funding risk to Phase 2
- Potential impact on bond ratings, rates, and costs
- SI dislocation of local business
- Types and costs for surface features/amenities of SI
- Cost certainty/uncertainty of SI
- Divisions among South Fairmount community on SI
- Traffic disruptions/street closures
- Benefits of SI alternative
- Misuse of MSD acquired buildings
- Water quality features in uplands
- Risks/costs of future stormwater regulation
- Improve communication

Topics addressed by Commissioners:

- Flood control standard choice and costs
- Cost and scope creep
- Business impacts
- Costs of future stormwater regulation
- Amenities (what and why funded / not funded in plan)
- Traffic impacts
- Risks/costs of SI performance problems
- Need for additional local data
- Status/use of MSD acquired buildings
- Cost/spending controls and reporting
- MSD's updated modeling and Regulator position