

MEETING NOTES

DATE: June 27, 2012 (4:00 – 6:45 PM)

SUBJECT: University of Connecticut

Main Accumulation Area EIE

Siting Advisory Committee Meeting #2

ATTENDEES: See attached sign-in sheet

Kristine Baker	Terence Monahan
Patricia Bresnahan	Phil Moreschi
Jason Coite	Linda Painter
Jean de Smet	Ed Pelletier
Fran Gast	Meg Reich
Bill Lennon	Hans Rhynhart
Mike Makuch	Avery Yoshimine
Rich Miller	

The following items highlight the major topics of discussion during Siting Advisory Committee Meeting #2. The objective of the meeting was to follow-up on Meeting#1 issues, introduce the site selection evaluation criteria, review the alternative site locations, and facilitate the selection of additional potential alternative sites. Fuss & O'Neill and University of Connecticut Office of Environmental Policy (OEP) staff presented the majority of this information in a PowerPoint slide presentation. A copy of the slide presentation is attached. Information that was presented during the meeting which appears in the slides is not repeated in these meeting notes.

- 1. Topics Related to Meeting #1
 - The advisory committee noted that the purpose of the committee and basis for evaluation of alternative sites was not included in the meeting notes from Meeting #1. OEP staff explained that the committee purpose and evaluation of alternative sites from previous studies was covered in the slides from Meeting #1, which are incorporated into the meeting materials that are available to the committee on the Fuss & O'Neill FTP site. Information that is presented on the meeting slides is not repeated in the meeting notes.
 - The advisory committee requested that the meeting agenda be sent to the committee prior to each meeting.
 - Concerns over the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act (CEPA) process were raised regarding how many alternatives would be discussed and examined in the Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE). The OEP staff clarified that the CEPA process will examine up to six alternatives that will be included in the EIE. Each alternative will be addressed in varying levels of detail in the EIE, commensurate with the potential environmental impacts of each alternative.
 - The advisory committee distributed copies of the May 23, 2012 letter from Karl Wagener, Executive Director, Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).



MEETING NOTES
June 27, 2012
UConn Main Accumulation Area EIE – Siting Advisory Committee Meeting #2
Page 2 of 4

2. Slide Presentation Discussion

- The Fuss & O'Neill FTP site will be used to disseminate materials from the meetings by emailing a link to the FTP site as soon as possible following each meeting but typically within one week of each meeting.
- It was agreed that the advisory committee members may share the FTP link with members of the public; however, the files will not be available through a separate project website.
- Clarification was made that the CEPA process for this latest iteration of the project, including an early scoping process, has not yet begun. The advisory committee requested that it be made clear in the CEPA early scoping notice that the previous 2004 and 2008 CEPA processes have been abandoned, and that the CEPA process for the project is being re-started.
- Clarification was made by OEP that although it was determined in 2003 that if the
 proposed MAA were to be sited outside of the Fenton River Watershed, the CEPA process
 would not be required, UConn has made the decision to prepare an EIE regardless of the
 Preferred Alternative location, within or outside of the Fenton River watershed.
- Fran Gast from the project team developing the Technology Park Master Plan addressed the potential to site the MAA in the North Campus area. She noted that the team is currently in the "pre-design" phase and has not excluded the option to site the MAA in the North Campus area. She discussed a few issues related to the siting of the MAA in the North Campus area, including buildings proposed for the technology park that house equipment sensitive to vehicle vibration and electromagnetic interference. As shown on slide #7 in the PowerPoint presentation, the orange shading represents areas sensitive to vehicle vibration, and the blue shading represents areas sensitive to electromagnetic vibrations. She mentioned that there are many possible mitigation measures that can be used to protect the equipment to allow uses such as the MAA to co-exist in the technical park.
- Clarifications were made regarding the definition of a contiguous property under the RCRA regulations, including the discussion of the April 30, 2012 letter from CTDEEP. The advisory committee distributed copies of the February 13, 1992 letter from CTDEEP.
- A public safety representative noted that although siting the MAA in the center of campus
 would be close to waste generators, he would prefer the MAA away from population
 centers because of the need to evacuate numerous academic buildings and occupied
 buildings in the event of an emergency. He also indicated that transportation of the waste is
 highly regulated, minimizing the risk of a spill or release during transport to the MAA.
- Site Selection Criteria the proposed site selection criteria are adapted from the site selection criteria used in the 2003-2004 study. The criteria are based on the same 8 major categories used in the 2003-2004 study, with the following modifications to the selection criteria definitions, scoring, and data sources, where indicated:
 - > Environmental/Ecological Impact no changes proposed
 - Public Health Impact propose addition of proximity to health care and day care facilities



MEETING NOTES
June 27, 2012
UConn Main Accumulation Area EIE – Siting Advisory Committee Meeting #2
Page 3 of 4

- ➤ Public Water Supplies for the groundwater sub-category, propose use of 500 feet rather than 400 feet from mapped Level A boundary based on the groundwater reclassification guidance to GB groundwater, which references the 500 foot distance to the GB boundary. Also propose the use of 1,000 feet as an additional threshold for distance from the mapped Level A boundary, and elimination of the Level B boundary threshold used in the previous study since Level A mapping has now replaced the former Level B preliminary boundary.
- Public Safety/Security and Accessibility propose the addition of potential flood damage threat and more quantitative scoring thresholds
- ➤ Planning Consistency and Land Use propose more quantitative scoring thresholds and updated planning documents
- Operational Efficiency & Cost propose more quantitative scoring thresholds; the addition of cost efficiencies associated with impacts on existing infrastructure, facilities, or land use; and elimination of staff oversight from proximate locale since the proposed facility concept includes on-site offices regardless of location
- > Traffic Safety/Circulation propose more quantitative scoring thresholds
- > Regulatory Requirements no changes proposed

The advisory committee suggested the following additional modifications to the site selection criteria:

- ➤ Environmental/Ecological Impact no further changes suggested
- > Public Health Impact
 - Remove "future" considerations
 - Break this category up into 2 subcategories (a) residential buildings/land uses and (b) academic buildings/land uses; allow subcategory weight percentages to be decided by advisory committee in lieu of averaging the scores.
 - o The infirmary should be considered an academic building since it is not a 24-hour care facility
- Public Water Supplies
 - Again, the advisory committee suggests that subcategories should have separate weighted percentages such that e.g., groundwater may be considered more than surface water (or vice versa) in lieu of averaging the scores
- ➤ Public Safety/Security and Accessibility- no further changes suggested
- > Planning Consistency and Land Use
 - The advisory committee has concerns that not all of the available planning documents are being considered here – especially the 2010 Windham Regional Land Use Plan.



MEETING NOTES
June 27, 2012
UConn Main Accumulation Area EIE – Siting Advisory Committee Meeting #2
Page 4 of 4

- o The Draft Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) should be considered as well as the 2005-2010 POCD.
- > Operational Efficiency & Cost no further changes suggested
- Traffic Safety/Circulation no further changes suggested
- > Regulatory Requirements no further changes suggested
- Review of Alternative Sites
 - The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Zones are outdated and may unfairly discount the Science Quad alternative site location; therefore, it was decided that if one of the two highest ranked alternatives are within a floodplain, a more detailed study will be undertaken.
 - ➤ Additional sites considered include "W Lot," "F Lot," and "Motor Pool." A member of advisory committee would like to remove the Motor Pool from consideration since it is unknown if the facility will be moved to Depot Campus.
 - ➤ A paper copy of an aerial map was examined to identify additional sites. Some were discussed, although Rich Miller was able to discount several suggested sites based on his first-hand knowledge of applicable environmental site constraints or other factors.
 - ➤ The advisory committee agreed to look at the mapping before Meeting #3 to identify potential sites.

3. Next Steps

- Fuss & O'Neill will provide the advisory committee a copy of the slide presentation, meeting notes, a PDF of the 24x36 aerial map that Jason Coite produced, and a large-scale PDF map of the main campus with resource area and land use constraints to assist the advisory committee in narrowing the potential site locations for the MAA.
- The next siting advisory committee meeting, Meeting #3, which will include site visits of the alternative sites, will be held between July 23 and August 3, 2012. The exact date for the meeting will be confirmed via email correspondence. The meeting will begin in the Facilities conference room (same room as Meetings #1 and #2). The committee will then proceed on foot to examine the alternative sites and carpool to the current MAA location.