

### NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION DIVISION OF WATER COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS ANNUAL REPORT

**PART I. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:** The Combined Sewer Overflows (CSO) Annual Report is consistent with the EPA CSO Long-Term Control Policy requiring permitting authorities to report "Measures of Success" of the policy implementation. Hence, the goal of this report is to obtain information regarding:

- 1. Compliance with the 15 CSO Best Management Practices;
- 2. The condition and operation of the combine sewer system (CSS) components. Most importantly, the end-of-pipe measures that show trends in the discharge of CSS flows to the receiving water body, such as reduction of pollutant loadings, the frequency of CSOs, and the duration of CSOs;
- 3. Receiving water body measures that show trends of the conditions in the water body to which the CSO occurs;
- 4. Overall status of the CSO LTCP, if applicable;
- 5. Key CSO control accomplishments and design and construction progress in the previous year

**Permittee must complete ALL parts of the form and must attach all supporting documents.** Please be aware that this annual report form template highlights the minimum requirement a permittee is expected to submit. Permittee is obligated to complete abatement activities to ensure compliance with the Clean Water Act. This report is also consistent with NYS *6 NYCRR 750-2.1(i)*.

### **Special Instructions:**

- 1. Multiple permittees (for instance NYC and Albany Pool) responsible to develop a single LTCP can submit one form and also complete Section D of this form.
- 2. ALL SECTIONS OF THIS REPORT MUST BE COMPLETED.

MGD

### Part II - CSO LTCP Control Information

### CSO Facility:

Flow:

### SECTION A: CSO LTCP GENERAL INFORMATION

### LTCP Development/Implementation:

Check all that apply:	Describe other controls currently being used or planned. Also describe how the objectives of the CSO Control Policy have been met.
In Development	
Submitted	
Approved	
In Progress	
Completed	
Not Required	

### CSO Controls:

Check all that apply:	Describe other controls currently being used or planned. Also describe how the objectives of the CSO Control Policy have been met under the selected controls	
Source Controls		
Collection System Controls		
Storage Technologies		
Treatment Technologies		
Floatable Controls		
Disinfection		
Туре:		

### Post-Construction Compliance Monitoring (PCCM) Program:

Check all that apply:	Describe PCCM findings, status, updates, and future plan. Attach a separate sheet if necessary <u>and</u> describe if the PCCM confirms that LTCP is meeting the t objectives of the CSO Control Policy
In Development	
Submitted	
Approved	
In Progress	
Completed	
Not Required	

### PERMITTEE NAME: SPDES PERMIT NO.: NY P A G E | 2 Part II - CSO LTCP Control Information

### SECTION B: OUTFALL INFORMATION

List all existing and active CSO the outfalls. Attach extra sheets, if necessary.

Outfall #	Latitude	Longitude	Receiving Water/Classification	# of Regulators Associated with this Outfall	Type of Regulator(s) Associated with this Outfall (Fixed Dam, Float / Dynamic, Elevated Pipe, Wet Well Overflow, etc.)

### Part II - CSO LTCP Control Information

### List all CSO the outfalls that have been closed or separated since LTCP development. Attach extra sheets, if necessary.

Outfall #	Latitude	Longitude	Receiving Water/Classification	Indicate Reason for Closure

SPDES PERMIT NO.: NY-

Page **1** 

### Part II - CSO LTCP Control Information

### SECTION C: CSO EVENTS, DISCHARGE VOLUME, ETC. Provide an estimate or actual data on overflow events. If necessary, use a separate spreadsheet to report all CSO outfalls.

CSO Outfall	No. of overflo the previ	ow events in ous year	Total Annual CSO Volume Discharged (MG)		Total Annual Volume Captured or Diverted to POTW (MG)		# of CSO Outfalls		Indicate type of overflow measurements (e.g. metered, estimated, or modeled).
#	Baseline	Current	Baseline	Current	Baseline	Current	Baseline Curren		<u>If other, please describe.</u>

Permittee	NAME:					NO.: NY-		P A G E <b>  2</b>	_
	1			Part II	- CSO LTCP Cont	rol Information	<u>1</u>		
CSO Outfall	No. of overflo the previ	ow events in ous year	Total Annual CSO Volume Discharged (MG)		Total Annual Volu Diverted to I	ume Captured or POTW (MG)	# of CSO Outfalls		Indicate type of overflow measurements (e.g. metered, estimated, or modeled).
#	Baseline	Current	Baseline	Current	Baseline	Current	Baseline Current		<u>If other, please describe.</u>
TOTAL									

### Part II - CSO LTCP Control Information

### **SECTION D: Collection System Information**

\_\_\_\_\_

	Baseline	After CSO BMP and/or LTCP Implementation	Current
Percentage of the collection system owned by the permittee that is combined.			
Approximate no. of miles of combined sewers in the permittee owned system			
Number of combined sewer outfalls in the permittee owned system			
Average annual no. of CSO events in the permittee owned system			
Average annual CSO volume discharged from the permittee owned system (MG)			
Population served by the permittee's owned system			
Number of satellite system connections			

Use the space below to provide any further relevant information on the collection system. This should include a description of any unique ownership, operation and maintenance agreements or further explanation and description of satellite system connections. (Attach extra sheets, if necessary):

PERMITTEE NAME: Onondaga County

### SPDES PERMIT NO.: NY-002-7081 PAGE | 2

### Part II - CSO LTCP Control Information

SECTION F: Use this section to describe how the implementation of the LTCP development and implementation have met the water quality standards of the receiving stream(s) and also objectives of the EPA CSO Control Policy (attach extra sheets as necessary):

Please refer to the Onondaga County, New York ACJ Fourth Stipulation 2017 Annual Report (see Section 4.0); refer to Table 4-1 ACJ Gray Infrastructure Milestone Schedule; refer to Section 4.1.1 Gray Infrastructure Operation and Maintentance (O&M) requirements; refer to Section 4.3.1 \$\log{S}\$.0 022, 027, 029, 052, 060, 077 and 067 Facility Plan Update.

### SECTION G: Use the following space to summarize other planned CSO control projects (attach extra sheets as necessary):

In 2017, Onondaga County solicited engineering services for the demolition of Newell Street RTF and conveyance modifications for the reduction of overflows from CSO 067. The County has contracted a firm for alternative designs/proposals to be submitted in 2018.

In 2017, Onondaga County solicited engineering services for conveyance modifications for the reduction of combined sewer overflows for CSO 029. The County has contracted a firm to submit alternative proposals in 2018.

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

Name: N. Cholos A. Capozza	Official Title: Sever Holotmance Fr	glacer	Phone: 315-435-5402
Signature:	Date Signed: 11 13 18	Email: Arche	ipme conbou. Det

Check N/A if not required in the permit, consent order, or LTCP:

1. <b>CSO Maintenance/Inspection</b> 6 NYCRR 750-2.8(a)(2) (EPA NMC: Proper Operation and Maintenance)	YES	NO	N/A
Is there a written program for the operation, inspection and maintenance of the CSS?			
Does the program include procedures for ALL outfalls in the permit?			
Does the program include procedures for ALL regulators in the permit?			
Are inspections conducted at least as frequently as required in the permit (weekly or monthly)?			
Are inspections conducted during dry and wet weather?			
Do the inspection reports indicate visual inspection, any observed flows, incidence of rain or snowmelt, condition of equipment, and any work required?			
Are inspection reports submitted to the DEC regional office with the monthly operating reports?			
Is the written program sufficiently detailed? Indicate which of the following additional components are included in the plan.			
Pump Stations			
Sewer cleaning			
Sewer Manholes and Catch Basins			
Outfalls			
CSO Controls			
Are there inter-municipal agreements which require inspection and maintenance?			
Are any changes planned in the upcoming year for the agreements to make them more effective?			
Is the collection system mapped using GIS?			
Entire system, including manholes and catch basins?			
In the past year, was significant mapping progress accomplished?			
In the upcoming year, is GIS mapping planned?			
Is the collection system monitored using a SCADA system?			
In the past year, was significant progress accomplished in installing or expanding monitoring with a SCADA system?			
In the upcoming year, is installation of a SCADA system planned or being expanded?			
Does the municipality have an asset management plan that includes the collection system?			
Are funds available to carry out the BMP requirements?			
Are any major equipment purchases planned or expected in the next five years related to the BMP requirements? If yes, describe below			
Is the pump inventory, including spare parts, adequate for the upcoming year?			
Is sufficient staff training available?			

Is funding for training adequate and available?			
	YES	NO	N/A
Is sufficient staff training available?			
Is funding for training adequate and available?			
Have any work efforts or problems in the past year resulted in changes in overflows? If yes, describe below			
Fewer events			
Less volume			
Reduction in floatables, settleable solids or oil and grease discharged			
Reduction in industrial pollutants (chemicals)			
Improvement in water quality of receiving waterbody			
In the past year, was the inspection and maintenance program mostly:	·		
Reactive (responding to problems)			
Proactive (focusing on preventative maintenance to avoid problems)?			
If the program is mostly reactive, describe below any plans to shift the emphasis to prevention			

<b>2. Maximum Use of Collection System for Storage</b> 6 NYCRR 750-2.7(f), 750-2.8(a)(2), 750-2.8(a)(5) (EPA NMC: Maximum Use of Collection System for Storage)	Yes	No	N/A
Are CSOs minimized, and flow to the treatment plant maximized?			
Has the hydraulic capacity of the system been evaluated?			
Is there a continuous program of flushing and cleaning to prevent deposition of solids?			
Have regulators and weirs been adjusted to maximize storage without causing service backups?			
In the past year or the upcoming year, have any changes to structures or procedures been made or planned that will improve use of the collection system for storage? Describe below			
Tidegates maintenance/repairs/replacement			
FOG program			
Removal of small systems bottlenecks			
Sewer cleaning and sediment removal			
Removal of flow obstructions			
Regulator or weir adjustment - list locations below			
In-line storage: Inflatable dams or sluice gates			
Wet Weather Operating Plan			
Do the municipalities within the combined sewer system have a water conservation program for homeowners?			
In the upcoming year are there any studies, work, or projects planned (other than routine activities) to improve use of collection system for storage? Describe below.			
DESCRIBE BELOW HOW THIS BMP IMPLEMENTATION HAS MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SPDES PERMIT, AND THE OBJECTIVES OF MINIMUM CONTROLS. (Attach extra sheet if necessary)	THE EPA	Nine	

		1	1
<b>3.</b> Industrial Pretreatment 6 NYCRR 750-2.7(f) and 2.9(a)(4) (EPA NMC: Review and Modify Pretreatment Requirements)	YES	NO	N/A
Has the impact on CSOs from nondomestic users that discharge toxic pollutants been evaluated, and steps taken to minimize such impacts?			
Is there an approved pretreatment or mini-pretreatment program?			
If there is no pretreatment or min-pretreatment program, are there any nondomestic users? If No to both of the previous questions, go to BMP 4			
Is there an inventory of industrial dischargers? Is the following information included?			
Volume of discharge?			
Pollutants in discharge?			
Are any pollutants classified as "persistent toxics" or bioaccumulative?			
Is the location included on the collection system map?			
Are there any industrial discharges that could reach CSO outfalls?			
If yes, have any industrial dischargers been identified as contributing to a water quality impairment?			
If yes, does the industry have a holding tank or EQ tank to store wastewater prior to discharge to the collection system?			
If yes, does the industry have a written plan to store or hold discharges during rain events?			
If yes, has the industry been asked to prepare a written plan to store or hold discharges?			
In the past year, have there been negotiations or changes to agreements with industrial dischargers which will potentially reduce impacts during CSO events? Describe below.			
In the upcoming year, are any negotiations or changes to agreements with industrial dischargers planned which will potentially reduce impacts during CSO events? Describe below.			
DESCRIBE BELOW HOW THIS BMP IMPLEMENTATION HAS MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SPDES PERMIT, AND THE OBJECTIVES OF MINIMUM CONTROLS. (Attach extra sheet if necessary)	THE EPA	NINE	

<b>4.</b> Maximize Flow to POTW 6 NYCRR 750-2.7(f), 2.8(a)(2), and 2.8(a)(5)			
(EPA NMC: Maximum Flow to POTW for Treatment)	YES	NO	N/A
N/A			
In the past year, were the headworks, primary treatment works and disinfection works able to pass the flows specified in the permit for all wet weather flows?			
In the past year, was the secondary treatment works able to treat the flows specified in the permit for all wet weather flows?			
If the answer to either of the above questions was No, has a plan and schedule to accomplish this been submitted to the Department?			
In the past year have there been any physical modifications to the collection system which have allowed more flow to reach the POTW? Describe below.			
Are any physical modifications planned for the upcoming year?			
Are there areas of the collection system, including pump stations that need additional study to evaluate capacity, condition, or to determine if illegal connections (i.e. inflow) exist? List below			
In the past year, have any new problem areas been identified that restrict flow to the plant? List locations below			
In the upcoming year, are there plans to address hydraulic restrictions or bottlenecks?			
Pipe replacement			
Construction of relief sewer			
Construction of overflow tank			
Pump station improvements			
Pump replacement			
Weir adjustment			
Smoke testing, dye testing to identify illicit connections			
Other:			
DESCRIBE BELOW HOW THIS BMP IMPLEMENTATION HAS MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SPDES PERMIT, AND THE OBJECTIVES OF MINIMUM CONTROLS. (Attach extra sheet if necessary)	THE EPA	Nine	

### SPDES PERMIT NO.: NY-

5. Wet Weather Operating Plan (WWOP) 6 NYCRR 750-2.8(a) (EPA NMC: None)	YES	NO	N/A
Has a WWOP been developed, specifying procedures for unit operations, to maximize treatment during wet weather events while not diminishing effluent quality or destabilizing treatment upon return to dry weather operation?			
In the past year, did treatment of wet weather flows cause any effluent violations or destabilize treatment upon return to normal service?			
Has the WWOP been developed in accordance with the DEC guidance, "Wet Weather Operating Practices for POTWs with Combined Sewers"? If no, describe changes needed.			
Has the WWOP been submitted to the Regional Office and Bureau of Water Permits (Albany) for review and approval?			
If the collection system or plant has been modified or upgraded, has the WWOP been modified to reflect new flow rates or new procedures?			
If yes, has the revised plan been submitted to the Regional Office for approval?			
Does the plan identify the maximum flows through preliminary, primary, secondary treatment, tertiary, and disinfection units?			
In the upcoming year, are changes to the plan expected?			
DESCRIBE BELOW HOW THIS BMP IMPLEMENTATION HAS MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SPDES PERMIT, AND THE OBJECTIVES OF MINIMUM CONTROLS. (Attach extra sheet if necessary)	THE EPA	NINE	

FOG program

I/I Control program

Leaky tidegates

Auxiliary power

Other, list below

Has additional staff training been provided?

Pumps

below.

Removal of illicit connections

Adjustment and/or repair of regulators

Elimination of hydraulic bottlenecks

**MINIMUM CONTROLS.** (Attach extra sheet if necessary)

Adequate dry weather flow capacity at the treatment plant

Has the likelihood of future dry weather overflows been eliminated? If not, describe additional information

DESCRIBE BELOW HOW THIS BMP IMPLEMENTATION HAS MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SPDES PERMIT, AND THE OBJECTIVES OF THE EPA NINE

NO

N/A

PART III - CSO BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	
6. Prohibition of Dry Weather Overflows 6 NYCRR 750-2.7 and 2.8(b)(2) (EPA NMC: Eliminate Dry Weather Overflows) N/A	YES
In the past year, were there any dry weather overflows? If no, skip to BMP 7.	
Were all dry weather overflows reported in accordance with 6 NYCRR Part 750-2.7 (incident reporting)?	
If dry weather overflows occurred, indicate which procedures or equipment have been improved or replaced	
Schedule for routine inspections	
Management, operation and maintenance program	
Modification of existing or issuance of new inter-municipal agreements	

FART III - CSO DEST MANAGEMENT FRACTICES				
<b>7.</b> Control of Floatables and Settleable Solids 6 NYCRR 750-2.8(a)(4) (EPA NMC: Control of Solid and Floatable Materials in CSOs)	🗌 N/A	YES	NO	N/A
In the past year, were did any outfalls discharge floating solids, oil and grease, or solids of sewag	e origin?			
Have BMPs been implemented to eliminate or minimize the discharge of floatables and settleabl	e solids?			
Have any of the following measures been implemented (either existing from previous years, in the or will any be implemented in the upcoming year? If significant progress has been made in implet these, or if significant improvements have occurred, describe below.	ne past year) ementing			
Floatables quantification				
Booming and skimming of open waters				
Source controls (street cleaning, public education, household hazardous waste collection collection, recycling, and/or composting of lawn/leaf/roadkill deer)	n, solid waste			
In-line netting				
Screens				
Catch basin hoods				
Other:				
Are any changes needed or planned for the upcoming year? Describe additional information bel	ow.			
DESCRIBE BELOW HOW THIS BMP IMPLEMENTATION HAS MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SPDES PERMIT, AND THE MINIMUM CONTROLS. (Attach extra sheet if necessary)	HE OBJECTIVES OF 1	HE EPA	NINE	

|--|

	,		
8. Combined Sewer System Replacement 6 NYCRR 750-2.10(i) (EPA NMC: None) N/A	YES	NO	N/A
In the past year, were any combined sewers designed or constructed that were not approved by DEC?			
If yes, was the combined sewer replaced by separate sanitary and storm sewers to the greatest extent possible?			
If yes, were the separate sanitary and storm sewers designed and constructed simultaneously but without interconnections to the maximum extent practicable?			
Is the combined portion of the collection system completely identified on maps or GIS?			
Are there any plans or current projects to separate combined sewers into sanitary and storm sewers?			
Is there an approved engineering plan for this project?			
In the past year, how many areas of combined sewer were separated? acres			
In the upcoming year, how many areas of combined sewer are scheduled to be separated? acres			
Are the sewer replacement projects on schedule? If no, describe below.			
Overall, has the implementation of this BMP resulted in fewer overflow events and/or less volume discharged? Describe below.			

### PART III - CSO Best Management Practices

FART III - COO DEST MANAGEMENT FRACTICES			
9. Combined Sewer Extension 6 NYCRR 750-2.10(i) (EPA NMC: None) N/A	YES	NO	N/A
In the past year, were any combined sewers extended not using separate sewers?			
Were sanitary and storm sewers extensions designed and constructed simultaneously but without interconnections?			
Were any new sources of stormwater added to a separate sewer anywhere in the collection system?			
If separate sewers were extended from combined sewers, was it demonstrated that the sewerage system had the ability to convey, and the treatment plant had the ability to adequately treat, the increased dry-weather flows?			
If determined necessary by the Regional Water Engineer, was an assessment made of the effects of the increased flow of sanitary sewage or industrial waste on the strength of CSOs and their frequency of occurrence, including the impacts upon best usage of the receiving water?			
Has a recent combined sewer extension resulted in increased discharge from a CSO?			
Has a recent combined sewer extension resulted in increased flow to the POTW? Describe any CSO impacts below.			
Is any development planned upstream of a combined sewer?			
If yes, has a sewer extension plan been submitted for review and approval?			
If the approval contained a flow credit requiring removal of I/I, what was the requirement or ratio?			
Does the plan include any flow retention structures?			
DESCRIBE BELOW HOW THIS BMP IMPLEMENTATION HAS MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SPDES PERMIT, AND THE OBJECTIVES OF THE MINIMUM CONTROLS. (Attach extra sheet if necessary)	ιε ΕΡΑ	Nine	

PART III - COU DEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES			
10. Connection Prohibitions 6 NYCRR750-2.9(a)(5) (EPA NMC: None) 🗌 N/A	YES	NO	N/A
In the past year, were any sewer connections approved, in spite of a notice from DEC to prohibit further connections due to documented, recurrent instances of sewage backing up into house(s) or discharges of raw sewage onto the ground surface from surcharging manholes?			
Are new connections prohibited by the DEC? If no, skip to BMP 11.			
Is this due to basement backups?			
Is this due to surcharging manholes?			
In the upcoming year, is any work planned to either increase capacity or reduce hydraulic loading? Describe below			
DESCRIBE BELOW HOW THIS BMIP IMPLEMENTATION HAS MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SPDE'S PERMIT, AND THE OBJECTIVES OF MINIMUM CONTROLS. (Attach extra sheet if necessary)	THE EPA	NINE	

11. Septage and Hauled Waste 6 NYCRR750-2.7(f) and 2.8(a)(1) (EPA NMC: None) N/A	YES	NO	N/A
In the past year, has there been any discharge or release of septage or hauled waste into the collection system upstream of a CSO?			
Does the facility have authorization from DEC to accept hauled waste or septage at a location other than the POTW? Describe below.			
Are any of these locations upstream of a CSO?			
Are there any agreements with haulers to accept waste at a location other than at the POTW?			
In the past year, was any hauled waste or septage accepted at a location other than at the POTW?			
What was the total volume received at locations other than the POTW?			
Is there a dedicated location to discharge septage at the POTW?			
Are there restrictions on when the plant accepts hauled waste or septage?			
Have there been any changes to the POTW's policy on septage and hauled waste in the past year? Are any changes needed or planned in the upcoming year?			
DESCRIBE BELOW HOW THIS BMP IMPLEMENTATION HAS MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SPDES PERMIT, AND THE OBJECTIVES OF MINIMUM CONTROLS. (Attach extra sheet if necessary)	тне ЕРА	NINE	

### PERMITTEE NAME: Onc

Onondaga County

SPDES PERMIT NO.: NY-002-7081

PART III - CSO BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES			
12. Control of Run-off 6 NYCRR750- 2.1(e) (EPA NMC: None) N/A	YES	NO	N/A
Is sediment in runoff from construction zones entering catch basins in the combined sewer system?		/	
Is there adequate communication between the local municipal department that enforces local stormwater codes and ordinances and the collection system staff regarding stormwater runoff?			
Do the municipalities within the combined sewer system have adequate storm water pollution prevention programs to reduce pollutants in stormwater?		•	
Annual household hazardous waste collection	~		
Autumn leaf collection			
Lawn clippings			
Christmas tree pickup			
Roadkill deer composting		~	
Fertilizer and pesticide management			
Enforcement of litter laws		~	
Public education programs on composting	~		
Are any changes needed in the implementation of this BMP to reduce the number of CSO events, the volume discharged, or pollutants in the discharge? If yes, describe below.		•	
DESCRIBE BELOW HOW THIS BMP IMPLEMENTATION HAS MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SPDES PERMIT, AND THE OBJECTIVES OF MINIMUM CONTROLS. (Attach extra sheet if necessary)	тне ЕРА	NINE	

The City of Syracuse is the responsible party for MS4 in the collection system.

Onondaga County is working on public outreach and inter-municipal cooperation to capture floatable debris before it enters the collection system. Please refer to "Connect the Drops" Litter Reduction Outreach Program Section 5.2.1 in the Onondaga County, New York ACJ Fourth stipulation 2017 Annual Report.

BMP 12 Control of Runoff

PART III - CSC	<b>D</b> BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
----------------	------------------------------------

13. Public Notification 6 NYCRR 750-1.12 (EPA NMC: Public Notification) N/A	YES	NO	N/A
Have identification signs been installed and maintained at all CSO outfalls owned and operated by the permittee?			
Are all signs placed at or near the outfall?			
Are the signs easily readable by the public?			
Are the signs a minimum size of 18" by 24"?			
Do the signs have white letters on a green background?			
Do all the signs contain the following information:			
SPDES permit number			
Outfall number			
Permittee name, contact name and phone number at business office or NYSDEC Division of Water regional contact address and phone number			
For waters that are Class B or higher, is a public notification program implemented to inform citizens of the location and occurrence of CSO events?			
Does this program include a mechanism (public media broadcast, standing beach advisories, newspaper notice, etc) to alert potential users of the receiving waters affected by CSOs?			
Does this program include a system to determine the nature and duration of conditions that are potentially harmful to users of these receiving waters due to CSOs?			
Were there any problems in the past year with missing or damaged signs? Describe below.			
Is there a written public notification plan?			
Does the plan list all methods used to notify the public of CSO events?			
Does the plan list outfalls where signs are posted?			
DESCRIBE BELOW HOW THIS BMP IMPLEMENTATION HAS MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SPDES PERMIT, AND THE OBJECTIVE MINIMUM CONTROLS. (Attach extra sheet if necessary)	S OF THE EF	A Nine	

### Ν.

14. Characterization and Monitoring (6 NYCRR 750-1.11(a), 2.5(a) and 2.7(g)) (EPA NMC: Monitoring)	YES	NO	N/A
If required in the permit, has the combined sewer system been characterized to determine the frequency of overflows, and identify CSO impacts?			
Was a baseline sampling program established as part of the LTCP development?			
Are all outfalls monitored during discharge events for:			
Flow Volume:			
Frequency:			
Duration:			
If all outfalls are not monitored, explain how sufficient data is obtained to document the success of the BMPs.			
List locations of rain gauges or the source of data, below.			
Has a Post Construction Modeling and Monitoring plan been submitted to the Department for review and approval?			
Has the Department approved the Post Construction Modeling and Monitoring plan?			
Has post construction monitoring and modeling of the receiving water begun? Attach results if this has not already been provided.			
MINIMUM CONTROLS. (Attach extra sheet if necessary)		TUINE	

15. Annual report 6 NYCRR 750-2.1(i) N/A (EPA NMC: None; Required in LTCP permit)	YES	NO	N/A
Is this report being used to satisfy BMP 15, Annual report, and the BMP checklist?			
Is existing documentation of implementation of the BMPs included?			
Is this annual report submitted by January 31 to the Regional Office and the Bureau of Water Permits (Albany)?			
Attach any additional information necessary to document the implementation of BMPs in the past year or list plans for the upcoming year.			
Overall, was implementation of the BMPs effective in controlling and minimizing CSO discharges?			
If no, list any improvements needed that have not been described elsewhere			

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

DESCRIBE BELOW IN DETAIL OTHER "MEASURE OF SUCCESS" ABOVE AND BEYOND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SPDES PERMIT. DESCRIBE HOW ADDITIONAL PROJECT(S) HAS HELPED TO MEET THE OBJECTIVES OF THE EPA NINE MINIMUM CONTROLS POLICY. (Attach extra sheet if necessary)

### SECTION D: For Multiple Permittees Only

Permittee Name	SPDES Permit Name	SPDES Permit No

### SECTION E: GLOSSARY/ACCRONYMS

For the purposes of this annual report, the following terms and acronyms are described below:

Baseline: Conditions before the development and/or implementation of CSO BMPs and/or LTCP.

**Best Management Practice (BMP):** Permit condition used in place of or in conjunction with effluent limitations to prevent or control the discharge of pollutants. May include schedule of activities, prohibition of practices, maintenance procedure, or other management practice. BMPs may include, but are not limited to, treatment requirements, operating procedures, or practices to control plant site runoff, spillage, leaks, sludge or waste disposal, or drainage from raw material storage.

**Bypass:** A discharge of wastewater, stormwater, or combination of both, around a treatment unit designed for the removal of pollutants.

Catch Basin: A chamber usually built at the curbline of a street, which admits surface water for discharge into a storm drain

**Collection System:** A wastewater collection system which conveys sanitary wastewaters (domestic, commercial and industrial wastewaters) and stormwater through a single pipe to a publicly owned treatment works for treatment prior to discharge to surface waters.

**Combined Sewer:** A sewer designed to carry wastewater and stormwater runoff.

**Combined Sewer Overflows (CSO):** A discharge of untreated wastewater from a combined sewer system at a point prior to the headworks of a publicly owned treatment works. CSOs generally occur during wet weather (rainfall or snowmelt). During periods of wet weather, these systems become overloaded, bypass treatment works, and discharge directly to receiving waters.

**Combined Sewer System (CSS):** A wastewater collection system that conveys sanitary wastewaters and storm water through a single pipe to a publicly owned treatment works for treatment prior to discharge to surface waters.

**Demonstrative Regulatory Approach:** Control approach where a permittee develops and implement an LTCP that meets the state water quality standards. A permittee could develop an LTCP that would provide for attainment of water quality standards, or it could use a total maximum daily load (TMDL) to *demonstrate* that water quality standards can be attained through a combination of CSO controls and other controls.

**EPA:** Environmental Protection Agency

**EQ Tank:** Equalization Tank often used to smooth hydraulic peaks to a POTW or WWTP.

### Fats Oil & Grease (FOG)

**Geographic Information System (GIS)** is a computer-based tool for mapping and analyzing features in the environment. GIS support a wide range of activities including water quality modeling, watershed planning, and wetlands permitting and mitigation.

**GI:** Green" Infrastructure

**Infiltration/Inflow (I/I):** Rainwater, snowmelt, or groundwater flowing into separate sanitary or combined sewers, typically introduced via connected roof downspouts and/or building footing drains or infiltrating into the pipe through cracks in the pipe walls or joints.

This Period: Period covering the last 12 months from January to December

Last Period: Activities covering the 12 calendar months prior to the end of the current period

**Long Term Control Plan (LTCP):** An engineering document that characterizes and assesses CSO discharge to a receiving waterbody. The goal of the Plan is to comply with the water quality standards of the receiving waterbody.

**Million Gallons per Day (MGD)** is a unit of flow commonly used for wastewater discharges. One mgd is equivalent to 1.547 cubic feet per second.

**Multiple Permittees** here is described as when a group of permittees (e.g. Albany Pool) is responsible to develop a single LTCP or when a single LTCP is required for multiple SPDES permit under a single permittee (e.g. NYC).

**Nine Minimum Controls (NMC)** provide information on nine minimum technology-based controls that permittees are expected to use to address CSO problems, without extensive engineering studies or significant construction costs, before long-term measures are taken.

NYSDEC: New State Department of Environmental Conservation (interchangeably uses as DEC)

Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW): Also commonly referred to as "treatment facility, WWTP (Wastewater Treatment Plant)

**SPDES Permit:** State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit. A permit issued by DEC, authorized under the federal Clean Water Act, to discharge treated wastewater to waters of the United States.

**Overflow Events:** An event starts once an overflow starts from an outfall, and ends once the overflow stops and the pumpback to treatment facility have ended.

**Presumptive Approach:** The presumption approach is based on the assumption that an LTCP that meets certain minimum defined performance criteria. The "presumption approach," under which achievement of certain performance criteria (i.e., 4-6 untreated overflow events or 85 percent by volume capture) would be presumed to provide an adequate level of control to attain water quality standards

Raw Sewage: Untreated sanitary sewage.

Sanitary Sewer Overflow (SSO) is an untreated or partially treated sewage discharge from the sanitary sewer collection system.

Separate Sewer (SS): A pipe or conduit intended to convey only sanitary sewage to a wastewater treatment facility.

**SPDES:** State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

**Sewer System:** A public or privately owned wastewater collection facility designed and used to convey or treat sanitary sewage or sanitary sewage and storm water. Sewer system does not include an on-site wastewater treatment system serving one residential unit or duplex.

**Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)** is a complex computer system that provides automatic control of stormwater storage and overflows at various locations within the sewer system.

Volume Discharged: Total discharge volume for the event (in millions of gallons) from each CSO outfall within this reporting period.

**Volume Captured:** Total discharge volume for the event (in millions of gallons) that were either captured via an offline treatment facility before discharge or diverted to the WWTP for treatment.

**WWOP:** Wet Weather Operating Plan

Water Quality Standards (WQS) are regulations that establish the uses for which surface waters of the state are protected and include numeric and narrative criteria to protect those uses.

BMP 15 Annual Report

Appendix A

Syracuse Sanitary Combined Sewer System Maintenance Repair Totals (2017)

SYRACUSE SANITARY COMBINED SEWER SYSTEM

# MAINTENANCE REPAIR TOTALS FOR 2017

					1
Misc	Maintenance	Misc. Hours	0	0	
Inspection		Insp. Hours	600	2115	
Bucket	chine	Cu Yds Grit	0	0	
Power	Mac	Feet	. 0	0	
CCTV	Inspection	Feet	4675	30586	
ination	caner	Cu Yds Grit	85.5	45	
Comb	Cle	Feet	42350	11400	
	Sewers		Intercepting Sewers	Trunk Sewers	

Notes:

1. Grit Chamber Totals are included in Cubic Yards of Grit under Intercepting Sewers

## **GRIT REMOVAL TOTALS FOR 2017**

	Cubic Yards Grit	239	0	168	221
-	Facility	Clinton Storage Facility	Hiawatha RTF	Lower Harbor Brook Storage Facility	Midland Regional Treatment Facility

Appendix B

Service Area Summary Report ("City of Syracuse") 2017

POTW	Metropolitan Syracuse	Metropolitan Syracuse	Metropolitan Syracuse	Metropolitan Syracuse	Metropolitan Syracuse
Cause	Heavy rags partially restricted flow in the sewer, resulting in overflow from manhole.	Grease and rags restricted flow in City of Syracuse owned lateral resulting in lateral overflowing into CSO 078.	Sanitary lateral for Laundromat was installed and benched through CSO 078 outfall pipe before it is tied into the sanitary sewer. Debris restricted flow and caused flow to go over bench wall and into Harbor Brook.	Sink from 400 Leavenworth was tied into CSO 066 outfall pipe.	Over 3.5 inches of rain in two days combined with deteriorated force main resulted in approximately two linear feet of force main crown failure.
Receiving Water	South Ley Creek Watershed	Harbor Brook	Harbor Brook	Onondaga Creek	Onondaga Lake
Volume Gallons	5,000	600	100	10	4,482,000
Duration (hours)	8.20	2.50	0.10	0.50	8.30
Date Ended	01/10/2017	03/30/2017	08/22/2017	10/02/2017	10/30/2017
Date Began	01/09/2017	03/30/2017	08/22/2017	10/02/2017	10/30/2017
Facility	County owned South Eastwood Trunk Sewer	CSO 078 Outfall	CSO 078 Outfall Pipe	CSO 066 Mattbie Street	County owned Ley Creek Force Main
Service Area / Municipality	City of Syracuse	City of Syracuse	City of Syracuse	City of Syracuse	City of Syracuse
₩ Type	oss	CSO	CSO	cso	SSO
Overfloi ID	419	426	431	435	437

Service Area Summary Report

And 1/1/18

For service area: \*City of Syracuse\*

For overflows between: 1/1/17

Page 1 of 2

02/27/2018

		[
POTW	Metropolitan Syracuse	Metropolitan Syracuse
Cause	High flows from rain combined with deteriorated force main resulted in approximately two linear feet of force main crown failure.	Air bleed point to allow air to escape during start up of 42-inch Ley Creek force main that was drained for emergency repair.
Receiving Water	Onondaga Lake	Ground in Onondaga Creek Watershed
Volume Gallons	2,142,000	2,000
Duration (hours)	11.90	0.30
Date Ended	11/02/2017	11/15/2017
Date Began	11/02/2017	11/15/2017
Facility	County owned Ley Creek Force Main	Air Bleed point for Ley Creek Force Main Startup
Service Area / Municipality	City of Syracuse	City of Syracuse
ж Туре	oss	oss
Dverflı ID	438	439

02/27/2018

Page 2 of 2

Appendix C

Floatables Control Report (2017)

### ONONDAGA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF WATER ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION 2017 FLOATABLE CONTROL SUMMARY REPORT



January 2018

### **Table of Contents**

Subject	Page
Overview	1
Table 1: 2013-2017 Rainfall Comparison	1
Floatable Control Facility Operation	2
Table 2: 2017 Floatable Control Facility Debris Disposal Summary	2
Table 3: 2013-2017 Floatable Control Facility Operation Comparison	3
Skimmer Boat Operation	3
Table 4: 2017 Summary of Skimmer Boat Operation	4
Table 5: 2017 Summary of Skimmer Boat Debris Disposal	5
Table 6: 2013-2017 Skimmer Boat Operation Comparison	6
Green Infrastructure Maintenance	6
Floatable Control Facility Plan Update	6
Table 7: Catch Basin Cleaning and Retrofit Devices Installed	7
Public Education and Outreach Program for Litter Reduction	8

### 2017 FLOATABLE CONTROL SUMMARY REPORT

### **OVERVIEW**

This report summarizes the efforts to address floatable material in the areas impacted by the combined sewer overflow (CSO) system within the Onondaga County Consolidated Sanitary District.

Onondaga County currently operates five (5) floatable control facilities (FCF). These include the Burnet FCF, Butternut FCF, and Maltbie FCF net bag facilities tributary to Onondaga Creek, the Harbor Brook FCF net bag facility within Harbor Brook and the Teall FCF combing screen facility tributary to Teall Brook. In 2017, a total of 40.16 tons of debris was collected from the net bag facilities.

The County has contracted services to operate a skimmer boat providing floatables debris collection and disposal in the Inner Harbor of Syracuse, along the mouth of Onondaga Creek, as well as the near-shore portions of Onondaga Lake within 1,000 feet of the mouth of Onondaga Creek, with an option for the skimmer boat service to Onondaga Lake shorelines east and west. In 2017, a total of 15.18 tons of debris was collected by the skimmer boat operation.

In addition, the County conducts green infrastructure maintenance which includes several scheduled and corrective work procedures related to the control of floatable debris. These include general trash clean up, catch basin filter insert cleaning, and porous pavement vacuuming. In 2017, the green infrastructure maintenance program collected 369 bags of trash from our green space, cleaned 452 catch basin filter inserts and vacuumed approximately 601,300 square feet of porous pavement.

Rainfall amounts, as well as intensity, are monitored as part of the effort to address floatable material in the areas impacted by the combined sewer overflow system.

Year	Total Rainfall (inches)
2013	41.78
2014	39.83
2015	42.33
2016	39.64
2017	46.10

### Table 1: 2013-2017 Rainfall Comparison



Metro WWTP rain gauge

### FLOATABLE CONTROL FACILITY OPERATION

Onondaga County personnel, at a minimum, perform weekly inspections of the floatable control facilities (FCF) regardless of the weather that has occurred. After each wet-weather event, County personnel inspect each floatable control facility to evaluate system performance, identify problems, clean and schedule net bag replacement, as warranted. When net bags reach approximately 30%-40% of capacity (or as otherwise needed), replacement is scheduled. Based upon the inspections conducted during and after wet-weather events, it appears substantial floatables are removed from wet-weather flows at each facility.

Date of Disposal	Debris (tons)
1/23/17	3.22
2/24/17	1.09
3/23/17	1.96
4/14/17	3.93
4/27/17	1.25
5/12/17	2.71
6/12/17	3.50
6/22/17	2.31
7/7/17	2.81
7/13/17	1.66
8/4/17	1.94
8/29/17	2.30
10/19/17	5.95
10/26/17	2.32
11/3/17	2.08
11/9/17	1.13
Total	40.16

### Table 2: 2017 Floatable Control Facility Debris Disposal Summary



Net bag removal and example of debris collected

	Burnet F	ĊCF	Butternut	FCF	Maltbie H	FCF	Harbor Broo	ok FCF
Year	Net Bags	Debris						
	Replaced (#)	(tons)						
2013	78	10.19	104	13.84	39	5.19	3 *	0.38 *
2014	90	9.94	102	13.25	39	4.52	36	4.10
2015	96	9.85	128	13.13	45	4.78	42	4.48
2016	108	10.80	144	14.45	51	4.90	54	4.90
2017	96	12.82	128	17.08	36	4.56	42	5.70

 Table 3: 2013-2017 Floatable Control Facility Operation Comparison

\* A Honeywell Corporation project required by-pass of Harbor Brook FCF from 2/22/13-12/4/13

### SKIMMER BOAT OPERATION

Under the terms of the contract with the County and depending upon weather conditions, the skimmer boat is typically operated 1 day (8 hours) per week during April, May, September, October, and November, and 2 days (16 hours) per week during June, July, and August. The contractor's work is coordinated with Inner Harbor events (pre and post cleanup operations). In 2017, work commenced on April 5th and ceased on November 29th.

The debris collected typically consisted of the following elements:



- Leaves, grass and brush
- Tree limbs and logs
- Plastic styrene food packaging
- Plastic containers, bottles, aluminum cans
- Playground equipment (balls, sneakers, etc.)
- Pharmaceutical bottles, blister packs and syringes
- Sanitary items
- Construction barricades, pallets and lumber
- Dead fish

Skimmer boat at work

The skimmer boat collection is supplemented by hand raking and netting of floatables in the dock area, as well as hand raking and pushing the floating materials to the boat's conveyer system in on-shore and near-shore areas. The quantity of debris collected after heavy prolonged rain events was larger than dry weather periods.



Inner Harbor after heavy prolonged rain event (~3.5 inches 10/28 - 29/17)

Table 4:	2017	Summary	of	Skimmer	Boat	Operation
----------	------	---------	----	---------	------	-----------

Month	<b>Operation Days</b>
April	4
May	5
June	9
July	9
August	9
September	4
October	4
November	7
Total	51



Examples of debris collected by the skimmer boat

Table 5:	2017 Sui	nmarv	of Ski	mmer H	Boat I	Debris	Disposal
1001001		January J			Jour		- sposal

Date of Disposal	Debris (tons)
4/19/2017	1.89
4/27/2017	1.99
6/21/2017	2.77
7/6/2017	1.95
11/1/2017	2.65
11/3/2017	2.22
12/7/2017	1.71
Total	15.18

Year	Debris (tons)*	<b>Operation Days</b>
2013	25.96	59
2014	10.11	55
2015	8.91	56
2016	23.57	57.5
2017	15.18	51

Table V. 2013-2017 Skinner Dual Operation Comparison	Table 6:	2013-2017	<b>Skimmer Boa</b>	t Operation	Comparison
--	----------	-----------	--------------------	-------------	------------

\*Totals include Inner Harbor and lake front debris

### **GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE MAINTENANCE**

Onondaga County performs maintenance as part of their green infrastructure program. The County owns and operates several types of green infrastructure including, but not limited to rain

gardens, bioretention areas, cisterns, infiltration trenches, enhanced tree plantings, porous pavements, and green roofs. To keep our facilities operating as intended, maintenance must be performed on a regular basis. We have developed a maintenance program that specifically targets preserving the function of our green facilities. As part of this program, maintenance procedures include several scheduled and corrective



Catch basin filter insert

work orders related control of floatable debris. This includes general trash clean up, catch basin filter insert cleaning, and porous pavement vacuuming. In 2017, we collected 369 bags of trash from our green space, cleaned 452 catch basin filter inserts and vacuumed approximately 601,300 square feet of porous pavement.

### FLOATABLE CONTROL FACILITY PLAN UPDATE

Onondaga County submitted a floatable control facility plan to NYSDEC on November 16, 2010 and a revised plan on April 28, 2011, however, based on the regulatory comments provided, the County reassessed their approach to floatables control and prepared a floatable control facility plan amendment which was submitted to NYSDEC on March 12, 2013 and received conditional approval on January 26, 2015. Under the amended plan the County proposed to augment the City of Syracuse's current municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) program consisting of street sweeping, targeted trash receptacles and catch basin cleaning, including the installation of missing catch basin hoods in the CSO sewer sheds. This effort is in addition to the catch basin work addressed under the Green Infrastructure Maintenance Program. The County also proposed to develop and implement a targeted public education and outreach program to address floatables, both street litter and flushables, in the CSO sewer sheds and continue interim operations such as the Inner Harbor skimming boat and Harbor Brook FCF to provide floatables capture. The status of the catch basin efforts through the end of 2017 is included in Table 7. All the catch basins in the CSO sewer shed areas addressed in the amended floatable control facility plan have been located and logged into the County Geographic Information System (GIS). It is anticipated cleaning, inspection and hood installation for catch basins in the Onondaga Creek and Harbor Brook areas will be complete in 2018.

Table 7: Catch Basin Inspect	ted, Cleaned and	<b>Retrofit Devices</b>	Installed
------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------	-----------

	2017 Catch Basin Summary					
CSO Area	GPS Located	Inspected	Claanad	Debris Removed	Device	
			Cleaned	(cuyd)	Installed*	
Harbor Brook (2017)	0	62	62	36	0	
Harbor Brook (Total)	769	213	144	109	132	
Onondaga Creek (2017)	0	670	670	708	99	
Onondaga Creek (Total)	1,072	1,000	1,000	961	589	
Totals	1,841	1,213	1,144	1,070	721	

\*Includes filter inserts and catch basin hoods



Combination cleaner vacuum truck used to clean catch basins

### ECONNECT. Save the Rain

The Connect the Drops education and outreach campaign is focused on street litter because the previous assessment has demonstrated that approximately 98 percent of trash reaching the water of Onondaga Lake and its tributaries is street-born litter (2013 Floatables Assessment available in the Arcadis report at http://savetherain.us/reducing-litter/).

The Connect the Drops campaign was launched in Spring 2016 and has continued through 2017.

The campaign is focused on making that connection between "drops" of litter and rain "drops" that can carry litter downstream, entering catch basins and/or tributaries. Part of the messaging is that if you miss the trash can by just an inch, you may be missing it by miles when trash is carried from tributaries into Onondaga Lake.

Traditional media outreach has included 30-second radio spots on three popular local radio stations – Hot 107.9, Y94, and 93Q. A total of 1,115 Connect the Drops and Block Litter radio spots were placed during 2017, starting in June and continuing through October.



Connect the Drops sidewalk messaging appears only when wet

The County continued the eye-catching streetlevel messaging strategy launched last summer with stenciling of Connect the Drops messaging on sidewalks in Downtown Syracuse near local businesses and attractions with a waterproof spray that causes the messages to appear only when wet. This calls attention to the messaging on a rainy day to help make that mental connection between dropping litter and the raindrops that can carry that litter into the sewer or a local waterbody. The County received positive feedback from people excited to talk about this unique form of Connect the Drops messaging both via social media and while tabling at events. Digital and social media has included a variety of messages, graphics, and videos. Graphics shared on social media have been related to local events such as the Earth Day cleanup, Taste of Syracuse festival in Downtown Syracuse, and rainy days when the sidewalk messaging appears. We continued to utilize the three Connect the Drops videos developed last year. The first video tells the Connect the Drops story and follows a person's dropped litter to the lake. The second video helped launch the rain-activated sidewalk messaging. The third Connect the Drops video built on the storytelling of the first video, but follows litter in reverse from the Lake to the person dropping the litter and urges viewers to choose to connect the drop of litter into a trashcan instead of littering. A new video with a "block litter" call to action to take the pledge was also developed, garnering 20,725 views on Facebook and 22,300 views on YouTube in November and December 2017. Another new digital and social media tactic introduced this year is weatherbased advertising on Google and Facebook which resulted in a total of 1,460 visits to the Block Litter website during the months of October and November. Collectively, the videos have over 63,600 views on Facebook and over 281,197 views on YouTube during 2017.

Social media has been a tremendously active component of this Connect the Drops campaign. Through advertisements on Facebook and YouTube, social media messaging is geographically targeted to local social media users to show them Connect the Drops videos, graphics, and direct them to the Connect the Drops landing page on the Save the Rain website (http://savetherain.us/drops/). The Block Litter landing page, blocklitter.com was also developed to facilitate participation in the initiative. The page had nearly 3,200 visits and over 650 people took the Block Litter pledge.

Onondaga County has also partnered with various organizations to increase the reach of Connect the Drops. The County has an ongoing partnership with Onondaga County Resource Recovery Agency (OCRRA) under the Connect the Drops initiative, to launch the Block Litter campaign.

On June 19, the County Executive hosted a press conference along with the leaders of OCRRA, the Downtown Committee, Visit Syracuse, and two Syracuse Common Councilors, Joseph Carni and Chad Ryan, to announce the Block Litter initiative. This is a marketing campaign under Connect the Drops aimed at engaging the community to take part in small, frequent litter cleanups on their block. Over the course of the summer and fall, over 650 took the pledge to "block litter" in their neighborhood. Participants received starter kits in the mail with safety tips, social media sharing suggestions, stickers, and invitation cards to engage their neighbors in cleaning up their block.

Syracuse Downtown Committee is another organization that has partnered with the County on the Connect the Drops campaign. The Downtown Committee is responsible for all of the trash cans in Downtown Syracuse. In summer 2017, the County worked with the Downtown Committee to implement trash can wraps with Connect the Drops and Block Litter messaging along high-traffic pedestrian corridors in Downtown Syracuse. Trash cans in downtown Syracuse have been wrapped with Connect the Drops and Block Litter ads at twenty locations, with messaging such as "putting trash in HERE keeps it out of THE LAKE," with the Connect the Drops/Save the Rain logo, and "BLOCK LITTER, Litter is lame, lend a hand to block it. Take the pledge at blocklitter.com."

Another Connect the Drops partner has been Onondaga Earth Corps (OEC), a conservation corps program that hires and trains youth and young adults from the City of Syracuse to work in the green job sector – including litter reduction and green infrastructure maintenance. This year, Onondaga County continued to support their "clean streets" efforts with the "Connect the Drops Crew," working to clean up litter in several heavily trafficked pedestrian corridors and to educate younger children about the importance of cleaning up litter.

The County also sought opportunities to speak to various groups about Connect the Drops including rain barrel workshops, the CNY Home & Garden Show, and other community meetings. The County reached thousands of people this year with Connect the Drops messaging while tabling at events and continued social media efforts over the course of the summer – including the Rosamond Gifford Zoo, the Downtown Syracuse Farmer's Market, one day of the New York State Fair in the Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Mathematics (STEAM) exhibit in the Science and Industry Building, and the annual Save the Rain Clean Water Fair. A Connect the Drops PowerPoint presentation was also given to a variety of groups from April to September.

Onondaga County will continue to develop messaging and methods of disseminating that messaging based on the success in reaching the target audience of Syracuse residents and businesses within the combined sewer area of Syracuse. The Connect the Drops education and outreach campaign is focused on street litter because the previous assessment has demonstrated that approximately 98 percent of trash reaching the water of Onondaga Lake and its tributaries is street-born litter (2013 Floatables Assessment available in the Arcadis report at http://savetherain.us/reducing-litter/).

### Appendix D

### Onondaga County Water Environment Protection

Matrix for Sanitary Sewer Offsets

### Onondaga County Water Environment Protection Matrix for Sanitary Sewer Offsets

The Following Criteria will be utilized for separate sanitary sewer areas within the Onondaga County Consolidated Sanitary District that will require offsets.

- 1) Service areas currently under consent order by New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.
- 2) Service areas subject to wet weather Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs). This is inclusive of SSO's that are due to either pumped or gravity overflows.
- 3) Service areas that exceed four times their three year average base flow during wet weather events.

This criterion is to be utilized for all pump stations, treatment facilities and sewers regardless of ownership.

As such the following facilities (trunk sewer, pumping station and treatment plant) are affected by wet weather driven criterion that meet the matrix as set forth above and their corresponding tributary service areas will be deemed to require a minimum offset plan of a one to one (1:1) ratio for added sewer flows as outlined in section 20. <u>Capacity Constraints</u> Section B. of Local Law No. 1, 2011.

### Facilities Requiring Offset Plans

- Westside Pumping Station service area
- Ley Creek Pumping Station service area
- Meadow Brook Wastewater Treatment Plant service area
- Davis Road Pumping Station service area
- Liverpool Pumping Station service area
- Electronics Park Trunk Sewer Area
- Areas Tributary to Active Combined Sewer Overflows

1/14/2014

Infiltration					
Proble	т Туре	Contribution (gpm)	Reference		
Barrel Section		Heavy – 1,584 gpd Moderate – 935 gpd	A.S.C.E Manual of Practice No. 92		
	Paved Areas	Minor- 390 gpd	1140000 110. 72		
	Barrel Section	Heavy - 6,625 gpd	A.S.C.E Manual of		
	Leaks - Unpaved	Moderate – 3,310 gpd	Practice No. 92		
Manholes	Areas	Minor-1,585 gpd			
	Low Lying Manholes surface	5,760 gpd	Value approved by the NYSDEC For Eric County		
	infiltration		Division of		
initiation,			Sewerage		
			Management		
Sewer Lining, Replacement or Rehabilitation		To be determined on a case by case basis based on C.C.T.V. or flow monitoring.			
Lateral Repair of Replacement		500 gpd			
* Roof Leader Disconnection		(Area of roof ft.) x 0.62 = gpd credit			
Other I/I Reduction Projects		To be determined on a case by case basis			

### Table 1 Partial List of Available Offset Credits

\* Based on 1 year 2 hour return frequency rainfall = 1 inch of rain.

Updated: 1/14/14

1/14/2014