



Onondaga County Legislature

HASSINA K. ADAMS
Clerk

NICOLE WATTS
Chairwoman

SPENCER BERG
Deputy Clerk

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE MINUTES – AUGUST 18, 2026 GREGG ERIKSEN, CHAIR

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Eriksen, Mr. Garland, Mr. Kelly, Mr. Thompson

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Meaker

ALSO PRESENT: Ms. Denton, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Bush; also see attached list

Chair Eriksen called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m., and previous meeting's minutes were approved.

1. **ONONDAGA COUNTY WATER ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION:** Odean D. Dyer, Commissioner
 - a. Resolution Calling a Public Hearing in Connection with the Proposed Adoption of an Amended Schedule of Sewer Rents for the Onondaga County Sanitary District
 - Proposed change to the Onondaga County Sanitary District sewer unit rents continues work undertaken over the past five years to make the sewer rate structure more equitable and reflective of actual usage
 - Proposal would reduce the assumed annual usage from 85,000 gallons to 70,000 gallons per sewer unit
 - Adjustment intended to better align costs with usage; ensure customers placing the greatest demand on the sanitary sewer system bear an appropriate share of the system's cost
 - Part of the county's ongoing effort to maintain a fair, sustainable, and financially responsible sewer rate structure while continuing to provide reliable sanitary sewer service and support necessary system investments

Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Eriksen: What was the impetus to make this change? Are we seeing different usage patterns that would necessitate this? We made the same move last year going from 100,000 to 85,000; is there a trend WEP is noticing?
- Mr. Dyer: This is all part of the plan; last year was reduced by 15,000 gallons, and this year it's being reduced by another 15,000 gallons. It's part of the overall plan
- Mr. Eriksen: What overall plan is that?
- Ms. Smiley: The goal is that industrial and commercial users, who are the highest users of the system, pay a higher share; one unit was originally about 240,000 gallons, so each household was paying a higher proportion since they weren't using that much
 - The goal has been to reduce the number of gallons per unit down to what a typical household actually uses, so that the users placing the largest burden on the system, industrial and commercial users, bear a greater cost; it's more equitable in terms of what people are actually using
- Mr. Eriksen: We've heard that; I asked about a plan that was referred to. Is there a plan? Is that in writing? We're trying to help set expectations for users so there's a realistic expectation

- Ms. Smiley: We've been doing anywhere between five and 15,000 gallons a year to try to reduce it, so it wasn't a sticker shock to our users, the commercial ones; that's why we've been doing this gradually. We're getting very close to the point where now the average household is, so then at that point there would be no further reductions in the gallons
- Mr. Eriksen: Is there a number anticipated as a more realistic reflection for average users?
- Ms. Smiley: Average household usage is anywhere between 50,000 and 60,000 gallons; I can get you back the number
- Mr. Eriksen: As the we are approaching the 55,000 to 60,000 gallon range, is that when these changes would be expected to slow down or stop?
- Ms. Smiley: Correct
- Mr. Eriksen: Are these units going to be for residential only? Is this for commercial?
- Ms. Smiley: As unit is developed based on so house, there is a structure; one family household is one unit. Apartments, it depends on the number of dwellings and different things like that. Commercial there can be depending on the number of units or based on actual consumption; industrial and commercial users are actually done based on the water meters and what the actual usage is of what they're putting into the system
- Mr. Eriksen: The 70,000-gallon unit, is that would that also apply for commercial folks? They would just presumably have, they might use more of them if it's correct, a laundromat or a car wash or something
- Ms. Smiley: Correct
- Mr. Eriksen: And again, just to be dense, if we're right-sizing this to be more appropriate so that one unit generally approximates what a household uses anyway, it doesn't sound like this would result in much of a revenue change for folks, or I'm sorry, much of an expense change for folks who are a single household kind of in that one-unit area?
- Ms. Smiley: Correct
- Mr. Eriksen: So this is basically the only users this is going to affect are people, entities, businesses who may use several units per year?
- Ms. Smiley: Correct. Got it
- Mr. Kelly: I'd argue, and I don't mean to disagree with the chief financial officer of the county, but this is just a math problem; we're dealing with shifting parts, proportions, and percentages. By right-sizing the quantity of a unit, there's a greater proportion of the system's total cost coming from another source; all else being equal, not to say the rate won't change, definitionally that means fewer costs to the residential user
- Mr. Eriksen: Do we have any expectation about when the commissioner's report on this is going to come out?
- Mr. Dyer: There is a commissioner's hearing that's set; it was advertised in the Post-Standard, believed to be August 27th, and the report will come out shortly thereafter
- Mr. Eriksen: So the report will come out after any opportunity for public comment?
- Mr. Dyer: The opportunity for public comment will be at the commissioner's hearing
- Mr. Kelly: Is that hearing typically well attended?
- Mr. Dyer: Depends on what it is
- Mr. Eriksen: Do you have any idea now what some of the expected findings would be in the commissioner's report?
- Mr. Dyer: Not sure what you're referring to by findings
- Mr. Eriksen: Is the report likely to discuss some of the things that we've just talked about today? Just as far as the reasoning behind the change, creating a more right-sized unit for single houses, is that generally the subject area that you'd expect the report to touch on?
- Mr. Dyer: So what I try to do is to be as consistent as I possibly can; I will utilize this conversation that we're having today and have a similar conversation during the commissioner's hearing, that will then be put together with the affidavit, the posting, and all that, and then sent off to the legislature's address

- Mr. Kelly: Getting down to brass tacks here, anybody feel free to jump in, but ultimately we want people to pay for their use, for what they're putting into the system, and not pay for what they're not putting into the system
- I understand there's obviously a rationale to doing it in a measured way so we're not giving people the sticker shock that you referenced, but that's all this is; let's make the number make sense to people so they're paying their fair share
- Mr. Eriksen: No, that makes sense; I appreciate the explanation, so the rationale behind this certainly makes some sense
- Ms. Denton: I just wanted a question on, so we're charging per unit which is then we're changing that definition; is there a reason why, is that kind of how we've always done it here in Onondaga County, or is there a reason why we're not doing it directly tied to how much people are using?
- Ms. Smiley: So this is the way the sewer unit charges have been set up in the county for years; one unit per household, it's broken down by apartments, and then commercial industrial users are actually based on consumption; so that is the historic way we have charged sewer units in this county
- Mr. Eriksen: Okay, we did have one proposed amendment to the resolution, which would be changing the date and time of the public hearing and moving it a few days earlier so that it's not overshadowed totally by budget issues; that would be a change from October 6th at 12:45 to October 1st at 4 pm
- Mr. Kelly: I would argue that this is a budget issue, is it not?
- Mr. Eriksen: Yes, and this would give us a chance to discuss and absorb it with a little bit of extra time before more intense budget discussions are had; yes, it absolutely is a budget issue, it 1 million percent is a budget issue
- Mr. Thompson: Can you speak to the impact rate payers will see? Will their bill stay flat, or will they see a decrease?
- Ms. Smiley: We haven't finished calculating the rate yet; currently just changing the gallons per unit, and still working through the 2027 budget process, so can't yet say what the rate per unit will be
- Mr. Thompson: What would the desired outcome be?
- Ms. Smiley: There isn't a set target number in mind; it's about balancing expenses and revenue
- Mr. Thompson: If I understand, we're reducing this number because there's going to be greater demand from industrial users in the system, right?
- Ms. Smiley: Not because of more industrial users; it's who's using it; commercial industrial users are putting more wastewater into the system, so it's trying to transfer those costs from our average household to those that are actually putting the greatest demand on the system
 - We've done it strategically over the last couple of years because we didn't want to take it from 140 gallons down to 85, we'd certainly get some feedback on that; so it's just strategically trying to right-size the rate structure in terms of gallons per unit
- Mr. Thompson: What I meant by an ideal outcome is, when we right-size that, will ratepayers see no real change, or would they optimally see what they're paying go down?
- Ms. Smiley: That depends, that is not an easy question
- Mr. Kelly: All else being equal, this means a smaller chunk of the costs coming from residential users; I think that's a great outcome, since residential users could use all the help we can get at this point
- Ms. Smiley: Did that answer your question?
- Mr. Thompson: Not directly, but I understand the ambiguity; I recognize that in terms of what ratepayers ultimately see, it sounds like ideally it would remain flat
- Ms. Smiley: The rate?
- Mr. Thompson: They won't see a substantial change; that's part of why we're phasing it in more slowly
- Ms. Smiley: For industrial customers, as the gallons per unit go down, if you were five units this year, you'll obviously be more than five units because of the way the math works out, but we try to strategically do it overtime so it's not a shock to the users

- Mr. Eriksen: The reason for this is to basically, like you said, to right-size it as opposed to being a revenue generator. It's a way to make things perhaps more straightforward for users who are the vast majority of whom are in that area of one unit
- Ms. Smiley: Correct
- Mr. Eriksen: Are these units for residential only? Is this for commercial?
- Ms. Smiley: A unit is developed based on the structure; one family household is one unit. Apartments, it depends on the number of dwellings and different things like that. Commercial can depend on the number of units or based on actual consumption; industrial and commercial users are done based on the water meters and what the usage is of what they're putting into the system
- Mr. Eriksen: Would the 70,000-gallon unit also apply to commercial folks, such as a laundromat or car wash
- Ms. Smiley: Correct
- Mr. Eriksen: If we're right-sizing this to be more appropriate so that one unit generally approximates what a household uses anyway, it doesn't sound like this would result in much of a revenue change for folks who are a single household in that one-unit area? The only users this is going to affect are people, entities, businesses who may use several units per year?
- Ms. Smiley: Correct
- Mr. Kelly: I'd argue, and I don't mean to disagree with the chief financial officer of the county, but this is a math problem; we're dealing with shifting parts, proportions, and percentages. By right-sizing the quantity of a unit, it means that there's a greater proportion of the system's total costs coming from another source; all else being equal, not to say the rate won't change, definitionally that means fewer costs to the residential user
- Ms. Smiley: Correct
- Mr. Eriksen: Do we have any expectation about when the commissioner's report on this is going to come out?
- Mr. Dyer: There is a commissioner's hearing that's set; it was advertised in the Post-Standard, I believe it to be on August 27, and the report will come out shortly thereafter
- Mr. Eriksen: The report will come out after any opportunity for public comment?
- Mr. Dyer: The opportunity for public comment will be at the commissioner's hearing
- Mr. Kelly: Is that hearing typically well attended?
- Mr. Dyer: Depends on what it is
- Mr. Eriksen: Do you have any idea now what some of the expected findings would be in the commissioner's report?
- Mr. Dyer: Not sure what you are referring to by findings
- Mr. Eriksen: Just to get a preview, is the report likely to discuss the reasoning behind the change and creating a more right-sized unit for single households; is that generally the subject area to expect the report to touch on?
- Mr. Dyer: I try to be as consistent as I possibly can; I'll utilize this conversation and have a similar conversation during the commissioner's hearing, then put it together with the affidavit and the posting and send it off to the legislature
- Mr. Kelly: Getting down to brass tacks here, anybody feel free to jump in, but ultimately we want people to pay for their use, for what they're putting into the system, and not pay for what they're not putting into the system
 - I understand there's a rationale to doing it in a measured way so we're not giving people the sticker shock referenced, but that's all this is; let's make the number make sense to people so they're paying their fair share
- Ms. Smiley: Correct
- Mr. Eriksen: No, that makes sense, and I appreciate the explanation; the rationale behind this certainly makes some sense

- Ms. Denton: We're charging per unit which is then we're changing that definition. Is there a reason why? Is that how we've always done it here in Onondaga County, or is there a reason why we're not doing it, directly tied to how much people are using?
- Ms. Smiley: This is the way the sewer unit charges have been set up in the county for years. One unit per household. It's broken down by apartments, and then commercial/industrial users are actually based on consumption. That is the historic way we have charged sewer units in this county
- Mr. Eriksen: I propose an amendment to the resolution, changing the date and time of the public hearing to a few days earlier so that it isn't overshadowed by budget issues, moving the hearing from October 6th at 12:45 p.m. to October 1st at 4:00 p.m.
- Mr. Kelly: I would argue that this is a budget issue, is it not?
- Mr. Eriksen: Yes, and this would give us a chance to discuss and absorb with a little bit of extra time before more intense budget discussions are had; it absolutely is a budget issue

A motion was made by Mr. Garland, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to amend the resolution to change the public hearing date and time from October 6th at 12:45 p.m. to October 1st at 4:00 p.m.; Ayes: 3 (Eriksen, Garland, Thompson) Noes: 1 (Kelly). MOTION CARRIED.

A motion was made by Mr. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Garland, to approve this item as amended; Ayes: 4 (Eriksen, Garland, Thompson, Kelly). MOTION CARRIED.

- b. Authorizing the County Executive to Enter into a Utility Work Agreement with the New York State Department of Transportation for Highway and Bridge Improvements
 - WEP has a storage structure along a boulevard that is directly in conflict with proposed I-81 construction; authorizes New York State DOT to move the structure so I-81 corridor work can continue
 - New York State DOT will perform the relocation itself; all permits associated with the relocation will also be done through DOT
 - WEP and the county will be responsible for providing information on the structure, such as as-built drawings, and will review and approve the relocation plan, since the county takes control of the system once construction is complete
 - WEP will have representation on site during construction and will be involved in progress meetings for full awareness
 - County will provide final sign-off on the construction at completion

Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Kelly: Are there mechanisms in place to shield the county from liability associated with the state's work?
- Mr. Dyer: I believe yes; it will be fully vetted by the Law Department, and they've reviewed these agreements before sending them to your attention
- Mr. Garland: Was this work already included in the FEIS, or is it something that just came up?
- Mr. Dyer: I'm not sure, but I can say this has been in the works for some time; it's not something that was recently found and we had to make adjustments
- Mr. Eriksen: Is State DOT doing the actual work on this?
- Mr. Thompson: Correct
- Mr. Eriksen: It's not county personnel doing the work?
- Mr. Thompson: Correct
- Mr. Thompson: This is beyond the scope of this conversation, probably, but I was struck by a story today about how, in order to secure federal funding, New York State had to drop certain PLAs related to the labor working on this

- I wonder if that gave any pause to the decision-making process, given some of what was built into this project having to be taken away in order for it to continue; my concern is about the folks in this area doing the labor on this project

- Mr. Dyer: I can't speak to that, unfortunately; I'm unsure of any PLA agreement

Deputy County Executive, Cydney Johnson for Physical Services

- Ms. Johnson: That wouldn't be in our purview. This is part of the contract that exists; this is one of several the state has done with us wherever there is a crossover to parts of the infrastructure. What the commissioner is putting in front of you would be part of the standard project requirements because of the cross-infrastructure, but we couldn't comment on that

A motion was made by Mr. Garland, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to approve this item; Ayes: 4 (Eriksen, Garland, Thompson, Kelly). MOTION CARRIED.

- Mr. Thompson: I was corresponding recently with Deputy County Executive Johnson, and she said you might have some good news for me. You've done the flow meter testing on Bronson Road, and the data was being put together; do you have anything you want to share with me today?
- Mr. Dyer: What I can say is, yes, the physical flow metering has been completed; the draft report has been created, and we're going through a review of that draft right now. Since the final report isn't finalized, I don't want to say too much on it before it's a final version
- Mr. Thompson: Do you have an anticipated date for that final draft?
- Mr. Dyer: Hoping the final draft will be ready sometime in mid-September
- Mr. Thompson: Just for someone on the outside, tell me what the process is that would take that long to put together a final draft
- Mr. Dyer: Once the original draft comes to our table, we send it through several in-house engineers, and I have to look at it as well. We send it back to the engineers with our comments; they go through and comb through it, make adjustments, and come back to us if they don't think we should go a certain way
 - It's a lot of back-and-forth, not as simple as just adding comments here and there, but at the end of the day we're being as thorough as we can, to make sure whatever is recommended will work for the constituents

2. **ONONDAGA COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY:** Jeffrey Brown, Executive Director; Geoffrey G. Miller, Executive Director of Operations; Andrew Weiss, Director of Technical Services
 - a. **INFORMATIONAL:** Overview of OCWA's Role in Supporting Micron-Related Growth

(Attachment No. 1: OCWA PowerPoint Presentation)

- Authority took over operations of the Lake Ontario water supply system from the county in 2017; since that time, and continuing through 2028, the Authority has made or will make approximately \$125 million in investment in the system
- Example improvement project: at the Lake Ontario Water Treatment Plant in the Town of Oswego, replaced old clarifier technology with contact basins to improve the filtration process
- Current system capacity for the Ontario system ranges from 48 to 62 million gallons per day, depending on the part of the system
- Current average day water withdrawal from the lake is about 18 million gallons; maximum day demand in the middle of summer is 33 million gallons
- System is projected to need to reach 60 million gallons per day by 2037, driven by Micron and other regional demand
- Currently has 15 million gallons of excess capacity, but will need approximately 12 million more gallons per day to meet projected growth

- System draws from three water sources: Lake Ontario, Otisco Lake, and Skaneateles Lake; Skaneateles Lake supplies a small amount, about 3-4% of demand, sourced from the City of Syracuse, with the remainder split roughly evenly between Ontario and Otisco
- Planned projects to accommodate growth from Micron and other regional development include:
 - Replacing three large raw water pumps at Lake Ontario with larger equipment and better drives and valves to increase capacity, without needing to build an additional structure
 - Building a parallel water main, most likely 48 inches, along the roughly two-mile route from the lake to the Lake Ontario Water Treatment Plant, addressing a current choke point limiting capacity to 62 million gallons a day
 - Replacing the plant's undersized, outdated finished water storage tanks ("clear wells") with two larger concrete tanks to allow adequate time for the disinfection process
 - Expanding the drying bed and the backwash tank that washes the plant's filters, which runs by gravity
 - Modifying pumps, drives, and valves at the clear water pumping station, and building a partial parallel clear water line requiring about eight miles of additional parallel piping, running from the terminal campus in Clay to allow for additional flow
 - Improvements at the terminal campus, located across from the Great Northern Mall, including low-grade piping work and a new flow control structure to handle additional flow coming in from a second pipe; the pump station itself was recently upgraded with six pumps and can currently handle 62 million gallons
 - Paralleling the Eastern Branch Transmission Main, which runs from the terminal campus to the White Pine Commerce Park, along with related water service connections; this work is currently under construction
 - Eventually relocating the Eastern Branch pipeline to allow for additional development of the White Pine Commerce Park

Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Garland: With larger pumps producing more pressure, and running parallel lines, will the existing lines be able to handle the new pressure, or will pressure be the same across each line?
- Mr. Brown: With parallel lines, pressure will actually be reduced, which is part of what allows the system to pump more water
- Mr. Kelly: I'm looking forward to you heading my way to do some sampling on the Eastern Main. I've also had a lot of conversations all down the 31 corridor of people who'd like the ability to tap into that system, and I know there are plans down the road; I don't know if that would be an additional line, but could you speak to what the future plans are to provide service to that corridor, where we know we'll see a lot of development?
- Mr. Brown: Now is the right time to have that conversation; as the second parallel line is built out, it's a good opportunity to accommodate new connections, and OCWA is willing to discuss what can be done to help
- Mr. Brown: This is a Spectrum News article that talked about how we don't have an issue with PFAS as it's currently regulated in the water supply served by OCWA. Two of our three water sources, Skaneateles Lake and Otisco Lake, have a non-detect for PFAS; that's because they don't have a lot of industrial construction, buildings, or manufacturing around them
- Mr. Eriksen: What does that mean?
- Mr. Brown: With current technology, no level of PFAS can be detected; current best available technology can detect down to about 1.8 parts per trillion, while the regulatory standard, which takes effect in 2029, is moving to four parts per trillion, which is within the ability of current technology to detect
- Mr. Thompson: So to summarize what you just said, the regulation calls for under four parts per trillion; is that what the regulation dictates?
- Mr. Brown: Yes; federal regulation, maximum contaminant level is going from 10 parts per trillion to four parts per trillion

- Mr. Thompson: The technology we have currently can detect levels as low as about 1.8 parts per trillion
- Mr. Brown: 1.8 to two; and quite frankly, that's somewhat sketchy as to whether that's even accurate based on our understanding of the technology. We send that out to a separate analytical facility to do that testing; it's very expensive technology
- Mr. Thompson: The first version of that sounds very encouraging; if we have technology sensitive enough to pick out 1.8 to two, and the threshold is at four, that sounds reassuring. But what you said at the end is that the technology itself, you're not sure how reliable it is
- Mr. Brown: That's a true statement; some testing can get to 1.8, others can only get to 2.0, that's just the current state of the technology
- Mr. Thompson: I'm not putting words in your mouth, but if we wanted to be more sure, we might want to be mindful about the technology being used to assess these levels; that might be something to be mindful of, if I'm inferring correctly from what you're laying out
- Mr. Brown: To put in context, citing the EPA website, one part per trillion is roughly equivalent to one second in 32,000 years; these are very small amounts of contaminant, though still a contaminant

Presentation Continued:

- Two currently regulated types of PFAS: PFOA and PFOS
- Has done more testing than is required over the years; since 2020, testing every month
- These are the average levels seen in the water for both contaminants, and the maximum amount measured for both contaminants
- This is just in the raw water coming into the plant; does not take into account the best available technology to remove PFAS, which is granular activated carbon
- This is before even hitting it with granular activated carbon

Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Eriksen: Can you describe that process, how it works, what kind of results are typical? For example, if water that has two parts per trillion of PFAS is treated with granular activated carbon
- Mr. Brown: The challenge is that current technology cannot measure levels that low, so it isn't possible to say precisely what the treatment is doing to it at that level
- Mr. Kelly: Outside the sensitivity of the instrument
- Mr. Eriksen: Tell me if I'm wrong here, is granulated carbon treatment more aimed at water with higher levels of PFAS, to bring them down from excessively high to something lower and safer?
- Mr. Brown: Below the MCL, the maximum contaminant level, yes; but we still have it, we've had it for 20 years, it is there
- Mr. Thompson: It being the technology for granular activated carbon?
- Mr. Brown: Exactly
- Mr. Eriksen: Is it used to treat other contaminants?
- Mr. Brown: Everything; it's our main source of filtering the water. Turbidity being one of the main things it deals with; when the water is stirred up by wind, it eliminates turbidity
- Mr. Thompson: Just to circle back, forgive me if you've answered this, but you said this is the best technique we have for reducing this, the granular activated carbon, but we don't have sensitivity enough to know how low it gets in the measuring instruments
 - For instance, we might be able to measure taking it from six to four, but we can't measure taking it from three to 1.5; so how do we know this is the best of what we have at present?
- Mr. Brown: I'm not sure how to characterize that
- Mr. Thompson: Me too; if it goes below the level of sensitivity of the instruments, I'm just wondering if that's encouraging enough
- Mr. Brown: We have the best available technology; it's been there for 20 years, and it's below detection limits. I'd say that's a positive thing for the customers of OCWA

- Mr. Thompson: Follow-up question; you mentioned we were talking about the measurements in Skaneateles and Otisco Lakes, and you pointed out that those lakes don't have industry on them the way the Ontario watershed does. Where Micron's going to be, its footprint so to speak, are there plans to have more robust testing in or around the watersheds that Micron will be adjacent to?
- Mr. Brown: That wouldn't be a question I could answer; that would be for the Department of Environmental Conservation
- Mr. Thompson: Fair; is that something you would encourage?
- Mr. Brown: There's nothing wrong with testing; as we said, we do more testing than is required, and we support testing
- Mr. Eriksen: As far as testing is concerned with PFAS and PFOA, my understanding is there are multiple chemical compounds that can be considered PFAS or PFOA; does current testing account for the full range of those compounds?
 - One of the concerns I've been hearing is that people are worried about new compounds being developed a little ahead of where testing is; how encompassing of the range of chemical compounds is our current PFAS and PFOA testing?
- Mr. Brown: I'm not a scientist, but my understanding is testing has been getting better and better over the years. What's encouraging is that PFOA levels have stayed consistent even as testing gets more robust, and PFAS has actually been going down; we're very encouraged by that
- Mr. Kelly: That's a great point; it's not like we're uncovering bad surprises, it's actually good news
- Mr. Thompson: Can you speak to the extent you're proactively seeking out new testing capabilities? I know standards are set by the DEC and EPA; one concern we frequently hear from constituents is that regulators do just what's required and no more
 - I understand the anxiety tied up in that, but I also recognize it's like saying I drive the speed limit but not less than it; those limits are there for a reason
 - So could you speak to how you're proactive in seeking out testing capabilities or other protections for the water sources we're talking about here, since this issue has gotten a tremendous amount of attention and concern recently. Any opportunity that we can to be ahead in the conversation helps everyone
- Mr. Brown: We are restricted by what we are able to do as far as the testing is concerned; it's a very expensive test to have your own equipment. We are doing testing on a monthly basis as opposed to the required annual testing; if we see an issue, we will deal with it, but we are just not seeing an issue with PFAS
 - As far as it creeping up, the general consensus is that industry has been regulated to some degree over the past 20 years; the same level of PFAS is not entering Ontario as it was 20, 30 years ago, and we're seeing that in the levels slightly dissipating
 - We are always ready to look at what we can do
 - We have the best available technology and will continue to monitor, as we've been monitoring for many years
- Mr. Kelly: I don't mean to interrupt, but I think this is a perfect slide that captures the fact that we're not skirting by on the bare minimum; it's borne out in the data that we're not only meeting existing maximum contaminant levels, but levels that haven't even been reduced yet, we're well within those regulations. I think that's very encouraging
- Mr. Thompson: I'd agree, and I think this is an opportunity to thank you for the work that you're doing and for you to be able to promote the work that you're doing. The last question I have on that, in terms of proactivity, is, have you looked at other parts of the country or even the world where institutions like Micron have built chip fabricating factories; you're doing a fantastic job now, but with Micron coming in the future, what have you learned from what other places around the country and the world have done to address the potential increase in PFAS?

- Mr. Brown: I think we rely on our state regulators; every state is different in the amount of regulation they have. I used to work at the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, and I think they have a very robust regulatory scheme
 - As utilities we need to rely at least partially on the regulators; we've told you what we're doing on our side to monitor it, but we have regulators in place too that do their job, and I think collectively we're working to protect the residents of our community
- Mr. Eriksen: Thank you for that; and thanks for being here and for the work you've done and continue to do. Building on the fact that there are other agencies and entities who also have a role here, and just to help me and the public get our heads around the bigger regulatory scheme, I don't need you to speak for other agencies, but can you talk about where OCWA interacts with the DEC, where OCWA interacts with the EPA, just to give the public a flavor for the bigger regulatory picture
- Mr. Brown: OCWA interacts extensively with other agencies; one major area is wetlands, since this work will disturb some wetlands, requiring wetland mitigation permits. OCWA also holds an SPDES outfall permit for Lake Ontario, does not need air permits, and is working through a variety of other permits, most critically wetland and disturbance permits
 - Also working with the Department of Transportation on crossing Route 31 for the new lines, and with archaeological review as pathways are cleared for the parallel lines

C. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Garland, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to adjourn the meeting; Ayes: 4 (Eriksen, Garland, Thompson, Kelly). MOTION CARRIED.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



HASSINA K. ADAMS, Clerk
Onondaga County Legislature

ATTENDANCE

COMMITTEE: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DATE: AUGUST 18, 2026

NAME (Please Print)	DEPT/AGENCY/ORGANIZATION
Andrew Weiss	OCWA
Adam Dyer	OCDEP
Jess Brown	OCWA