



RiverRenew Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting Summary

Meeting No. 4 / June 20, 2019

Meeting Attendees:

RiverRenew Stakeholder Advisory Group	Alexandria Renew Enterprises	City of Alexandria
Andy Duncan	John Hill	Erin Bevis-Carver
Dan Bradfield	Bill Dickinson	Abigail Harwell
Erik Olson	Jonathan Rak	
Ivy Whitlatch	Karen Pallansch	
Kate MacKenzie	Liliana Maldonado	
Karen Halbrecht	Caitlin Feehan	
Kathy Dismukes	Jimena Larson	
	Sheeva Noshirvan	
	Lisa Van Riper	
	Consultants	
	Justin Carl	
	Doug Chapin	
	Susan Mitchell	
	Kasey Kraft	
	Amber Ahles	

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

Ms. Feehan asked the SAG members to share their outreach efforts and experiences since the last SAG meeting on May 1, 2019.

Ms. Feehan provided details about the recently released Environmental Assessment (EA), upcoming Community Listening Sessions (listening sessions), and the National Park Service (NPS) public comment period.

Ms. Feehan discussed the RiverRenew Development Special Use Permit (DSUP) application status and upcoming Planning Commission and City Council Public Hearings.

Justin Carl, RiverRenew Program Advisor, presented on the adaptability and resiliency of RiverRenew to climate change. Highlights of the presentation included:

- How RiverRenew is planning for increased rainfall, and
- How RiverRenew is planning for sea level rise.

Mr. Carl and Amber Ahles, RiverRenew Environmental Specialist, discussed historic operations in the vicinity of Outfall 001, and soil and groundwater impacts at the site.

Mr. Carl reviewed the preferred alternatives identified in the EA.



Doug Chapin, RiverRenew Third Party Manager, walked through to the discussion boards that will be shared with the public at the upcoming listening sessions.

Ms. Feehan concluded the presentation with an overview of next steps for the SAG prior to the listening sessions.

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

Kathy Dismukes asked if comments submitted online to NPS are limited to a particular length.

Ms. Feehan confirmed comment length is subject to the author.

Ivy Whitlatch asked if community outreach had been conducted to notify Alexandrians about the EA and upcoming listening sessions.

Ms. Feehan noted that the RiverRenew team posted advertisements for listening sessions in multiple local newspapers and on DASH buses, provided promotional materials to community recreation centers, libraries, and local businesses and restaurants, sent email notifications, canvassed door-to-door in impacted areas with flyers and doorhangers, and requested that SAG members reach out to existing networks to get the information out.

Erik Olson asked what “existing and proposed civil-site plans” means in relation to the DSUP.

Ms. Feehan explained it relates to the land at Outfalls 001, 002 and 003/4. “Existing” refers to the existing conditions of the site before construction including topography, building utilities, and other site features. “Civil-site plans” are the engineering plans for any infrastructure that will be built at the site.

Ms. Dismukes asked if the data RiverRenew is using to model climate change impacts obtained from the Army Corps of Engineers and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is the most recent data available.

Mr. Carl confirmed RiverRenew is using current data from both sources.

Karen Halbrecht asked what happens to the RiverRenew system in the event of storms greater than 100-year storms.

Mr. Carl explained that, in a rain event greater than a 100-year storm, the tunnel would reach maximum capacity and would overflow to the Potomac River at Outfall 001.

Ms. Dismukes asked if the outfall sites are at or above ground level.

Mr. Carl confirmed that the diversion facilities would be constructed below ground. The final ground level would be raised slightly higher than existing to account for sea level rise.

Ms. Dismukes asked how high of a flood has AlexRenew seen since the facility was built.

Karen Pallansch, AlexRenew General Manager, said AlexRenew has not experienced a flood.

Mr. Olson asked how AlexRenew would handle flooding if there were to be a 100-year flood at the predicted level in year 2100.

Mr. Carl explained that a protective wall or other structure would need to be built as part of resiliency planning.

Ms. Whitlatch asked how the RiverRenew system works within the City of Alexandria's future flood mitigation plans.

Mr. Carl noted that the tunnel system will not have an impact to the City's Waterfront Flood Mitigation Project.

Ms. Dismukes asked if the soil sampling data used to analyze soil impacts is recent.

Ms. Ahles confirmed both historical and recent soil sampling data was analyzed as part of the environmental studies conducted for the program.

Ms. Dismukes asked about the soil sampling activities schedule and anticipated completion.

Ms. Ahles noted the boring program and collection of environmental data are currently anticipated to be complete in September 2019.

Ms. Whitlatch asked why soil sampling is not being conducted near the standard oil site.

Ms. Ahles explained that borings and the collection of environmental data are being performed where the proposed tunnel system will be built.

Mr. Olson asked if there will be ongoing monitoring of soil as it is excavated.

Mr. Carl indicated that during construction the soil will be monitored as it is excavated.

Mr. Olson asked how the groundwater will be disposed.

Ms. Ahles explained that groundwater would be treated on site (if necessary) through standard construction practices prior to being discharged to the sewer system for treatment at AlexRenew.

Ms. Dismukes asked if AlexRenew is prepared to treat soil if hazardous.

Ms. Ahles noted soils identified to date are non-hazardous.

Ms. Whitlatch asked about impacts to the community gardens in Jones Point Park.

Mr. Carl noted that no impacts are anticipated. All construction and fencing is proposed to be south of the community gardens and Jones Point Drive.

Mr. Olson asked if Pendleton and Union Streets will be closed for construction at 001.

Mr. Carl noted that the Preferred Alternative for 001 is not anticipated to require closure of Pendleton and Union Streets.

Ms. Dismukes asked why a larger tunnel is not needed for Outfalls 003/4.

Mr. Carl explained that the 001/2 tunnel acts as a storage tunnel, while the 003/4 pipeline acts as a conveyance system (pump and treat).

Ms. Dismukes asked about the NPS preferred method for public comments on the EA.

Mr. Carl confirmed that NPS prefers comments be submitted electronically.

Ms. Dismukes asked if listening session attendees are encouraged to read the EA.

Mr. Carl noted that the purpose of the listening sessions is to walk through the content of the EA.

Ms. Whitlatch asked if an archaeological firm is "on call" if any archaeological resources are discovered.

Mr. Chapin noted that protocol for archeological discoveries and documentation is being developed in partnership with several agencies (including the City).



RiverRenew Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting Summary

Meeting No. 4 / June 20, 2019

Dan Bradfield asked if the diversion facility at Outfall 002 is on “previously disturbed” ground.

Mr. Chapin stated that portions of ground at 002 is previously disturbed due to the Woodrow Wilson Bridge project.

Ms. Whitlatch recommended the RiverRenew team research whether or not the “Jamieson” of Jamieson Avenue has any relation to the historic Jamieson Bakery.

Other discussion points:

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

The next SAG meeting will be scheduled and announced on <https://riverrenew.com/sag>.