The meeting convened at 7:00 p.m. Caitlin Feehan, RiverRenew Program Manager, welcomed the Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) and public attendees.

Ms. Feehan provided a brief presentation on the current status of RiverRenew. Highlights of the presentation included:

- A discussion of the SAG members’ roles as RiverRenew ambassadors and experiences thus far.
- An update on the Environmental Assessment (EA) and City Development Special Use Permit (DSUP) processes.
- An overview of the planned SAG meeting topics through November 2019.

Justin Carl, RiverRenew Program Advisor, and Amber Ahles, Environmental Specialist, provided a technical update on the program. Highlights of the presentation included:

- A status update on the proposed Waterfront Tunnel routes.
- An explanation of the ongoing environmental studies being conducted as part of the Program.
- An overview of estimated haul routes and haul rates during construction.
- A summary of potential community impact mitigation techniques.

Jeff Theerman, RiverRenew Senior Advisor, provided an overview of proposed AlexRenew sewer rate adjustments. Highlights of the presentation included:

- An overview of “One Water” costs in the City of Alexandria.
A presentation on the City of Alexandria’s stormwater utility fees from Jesse Maines, Division Chief, Stormwater Management.

A summary of the proposed AlexRenew two-year sewer rate increases for FY 2020 and FY 2021.

Ms. Feehan concluded the presentation with an overview of upcoming community engagement opportunities for RiverRenew.

The following is a summary of the questions asked by the SAG members and the answers provided by the RiverRenew team.

- **Ivy Whitlatch asked how the program schedule is impacted by the National Park Service (NPS) and release of the EA.**
  
  Ms. Feehan noted that RiverRenew is working in tandem with NPS throughout the EA process, and the EA is anticipated to be released in Spring 2019, between late April and early May.

- **Geoff Goode asked about territorial lines in the Potomac River.**
  
  Mr. Carl explained that the water column inside the Alexandria pierhead line is owned by Virginia and outside the pierhead line the water column is owned by the District of Columbia. The NPS owns the riverbed inside and outside of the pierhead line in Alexandria.

- **Dan Bradfield asked about vibration levels underneath streets and how long the tunnel boring machine (TBM) will take to move through the ground.**
  
  Mr. Carl noted that typically vibrations from the TBM are not perceptible at the ground surface and that the machine moves at a speed of approximately 40 feet per day.

- **Ms. Whitlatch asked if the TBM will impact wildlife in Jones Point Park.**
  
  Mr. Carl explained that the TBM is not anticipated to impact wildlife, as it will be over 100 feet below the ground surface.

- **Bill Hillner asked if inspections will be done before and after construction for homes along the tunnel route.**
  
  Mr. Carl indicated that pre- and post-construction surveys are typically conducted for structures within the tunnel buffer area. The tunnel buffer area is preliminary estimated to be 200 feet wide – 100 feet to each side of the proposed tunnel centerline.

- **Erik Olson asked if groundwater has been tested yet as part of the program’s environmental studies.**
  
  Ms. Ahles noted groundwater testing is part of RiverRenew’s Phase B boring drilling activities, which are currently underway. The historic data was reviewed as part of Phase A boring drilling activities.

- **Mary Ann Burnstein asked if contamination will be a concern in wet material.**
  
  Ms. Ahles noted that exposure to contaminants can occur via three routes - inhalation, ingestion, or dermal contact. Dust could be a concern via ingestion. Groundwater is shallow in many of the
excavation areas. Dust is a limited concern while digging in the wet material and most of the shaft locations will be excavated below the water table.

- **Mr. Hillner asked how many of the vehicles counted as part of the traffic counts were heavy trucks near Outfall 001.**
  
  Mr. Carl indicated that approximately 10 to 20 vehicles per day were heavy trucks based on the traffic counts conducted in January 2019.

- **Ms. Whitlatch asked if hauling could be paused during high-traffic times.**
  
  Mr. Carl explained that a level of service analysis is being conducted to determine if proposed truck hauling would degrade current traffic conditions. If the analysis shows an impact, RiverRenew will work with the City to establish mitigations.

- **Karen Halbrecht asked if haul route totals include workers coming to and from construction sites.**
  
  Mr. Carl explained that haul route totals include construction worker traffic and some construction sites may require construction workers to be bussed to and from the site.

- **Mr. Olson asked for a rough estimate of dirty dirt estimated to be excavated at the Outfall 001 construction site.**
  
  Mr. Carl indicated that an estimated 2,700 cubic yards of dirty dirt are anticipated to be excavated from the Outfall 001 construction site.

- **SAG members asked several questions about barging and whether it is under consideration as an alternative hauling method.**
  
  Mr. Carl explained that a barging alternative was analyzed, which requires a 500-mile round trip to Shirley Plantation for disposal. This poses several project risks, including schedule impacts, dredging of Potomac River bed, pier stability, additional permitting requirements, and added cost.

- **Kathy Dismukes asked where the “dirty dirt” will be dumped.**
  
  Ms. Ahles responded that the dirt would be hauled to a landfill.

- **Mr. Olson asked if heavy-duty diesel emission controls are being considered for the trucks.**
  
  Mr. Carl noted that requirements for hauling trucks have not yet been determined.

- **Mr. Olson asked why ratepayers are not charged for usage above 4,000 gallons.**
  
  Liz Birnbaum explained that it is difficult for the average residential user to exceed the 4,000-gallon cap. If their usage does exceed, that water used is most likely being used to water a lawn, garden, etc., and therefore is not necessarily being used and treated as wastewater at AlexRenew.

- **Ms. Whitlatch asked if there is legislation in place that places a cap on how much of a rate increase can be passed on to ratepayers.**
  
  Mr. Theerman explained that combined sewer systems are a legacy issue across the country, and therefore, rate increases are standard for these programs.
• **Ms. Whitlatch asked about average levels of participation in rate payment relief programs.**
  Mr. Theerman indicated that participation in rate payment relief programs is typically low.

• **Mr. Olson asked if AlexRenew plans to pay for RiverRenew with bonds.**
  Mr. Theerman noted there are ongoing discussions about payment options, including state and federal funding programs (i.e. the EPA’s Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act program).

• **Ms. Dismukes asked how exact dollar amounts for the proposed two-year rate increases were determined.**
  Mr. Theerman explained that the $4.66 and $4.71 increases proposed for FY 2020 and FY 2021, respectively, are based on the current conceptual level of design, which allows for estimation through FY 2021. Total program costs will be much clearer ahead of FY 2022.

• **Ron LaFond asked if rates could potentially decrease after construction is complete.**
  Mr. Theerman noted that the program incurs a long-term debt. Regulations for water utilities will continue to change and infrastructure will continue to need upgrades.

**Other discussion points:**

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

The next SAG meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 1 from 7 – 9 p.m. at the AlexRenew Environmental Center.