



POTOMAC RIVER BASIN DRINKING WATER SOURCE PROTECTION PARTNERSHIP

Quarterly Meeting Summary for February 8, 2011

Location: ICPRB, Rockville, MD

Attendees

Utilities

City of Rockville:
Judy Ding

Fairfax Water:
Traci Goldberg
Greg Prelewicz
Niffy Saji

Loudoun Water:
Tom Bonacquisti
Beate Wright

Town of Leesburg:
Russell Chambers

Washington Aqueduct:
Shabir Choudhary

WSSC:
Martin Chandler
M.T. Habibian

State and Local Government

DDOE:
George Onyullo

PADEP:
Patrick Bowling
Joe Lee

VDH:
Wes Kleene

WVDHHR:
Bill Toomey

Federal and Regional Agencies

EPA Region 3:
Bill Arguto
Vicky Binetti
Ellen Schmitt

EPA HQ:
Marjorie Copeland

ICPRB:
Karin Bencala
Carlton Haywood
Curtis Dalpra
Joe Hoffman

MWCOG:
Julie Karceski

Mid-Atlantic Water Program:
Daphne Pee

USGS:
Cherie Miller
Curtis Schreffler

1. Workgroup and Committee Reports

Reaching Out – Curtis Dalpra, ICPRB

The workgroup is still looking for a volunteer to fill the chair position. Please contact Karin Bencala if you are interested in taking this on or learning more.

C. Dalpra and K. Bencala recently spoke with Jerry Schulte who runs ORSANCO's source water protection program. ORSANCO's source water protection measures focus on outreach to dischargers (rail, pipelines, power plants, towing, trucking, transfer stations, etc. but not ag). They have a separate advisory committee of water utilities to address a broader set of water supply issues. The source water committee is made up of ORSANCO, state source water program managers, and one representative from the utility advisory committee. Two and half years ago they started meeting with water utilities (5 regional meetings) to discuss the source water challenges they face. From these meetings they decided to hold educational meetings with the dischargers to let them know about downstream intakes and the issues they face. They plan to continue holding similar meetings in the basin with other sectors that impact water quality. Additional outreach activities include a newsletter aimed at utilities and dischargers, a 2,200 gallon "traveling freshwater aquarium," and an associated 501(c)(3) foundation dedicated to education activities.

A draft of the 2010 Annual Report was distributed to attendees and emailed to all participants shortly after the meeting. The text has gone through a number of revisions since it was last distributed at the annual meeting in October. Please review and send in any comments to C. Dalpra or K. Bencala by Wednesday, February 23.

Early Warning/Emergency Response – Carlton Haywood, ICPRB

COG organized a meeting with Colonial Pipeline, water utilities, EPA, U.S. Coast Guard, and Department of Transportation to discuss spill prevention and pipeline maintenance. The purpose of the meeting was to learn how Colonial manages and maintains their system of pipes and what they are doing to prevent a spill. The utilities also wanted to explain the ramifications in the region if a spill occurs that impacts a water supply intake. While not the main focus of the meeting, emergency response and the possibility of future exercises were discussed. Follow-up meetings were suggested to review Colonial's Integrity Management Plan, further discuss the use of emergency shut-off valves and their locations, and explain the region's water supply system and vulnerabilities to a spill. It was also suggested at the meeting that the Partnership participate in Upper Chesapeake Bay Estuary Area Committee meetings, consider running an exercise with the Coast Guard's Regional Response Team, and contact the NOAA Science Support Coordinator who develops travel time models for the Potomac.

Additional questions were raised by DWSPP members at the meeting regarding the age of the pipe, the need to replace aging portions, and about the region's designation as a High Consequence Area (HCA). As it currently stands, 80% of Colonial's pipeline from Texas to New Jersey runs through HCAs. HCAs not only include critical drinking water areas, but also high population and environmentally sensitive areas. It was suggested that the types of questions

we have cannot be sufficiently addressed through an exercise and that we might be better off continuing to have focused meetings to present specific questions. This may require a facilitator. In the past Colonial has offered to let one or two Partnership representatives come and look at the data they have on the pipeline in our region. The workgroup will find out if we can still take advantage of this.

V. Binetti suggested that we bring the pipeline issues up with the National Capital Region Homeland Security Program. She also indicated that she can bring it to the attention of the EPA's Homeland Security program.

Urban Issues – Greg Prelewicz, Fairfax Water

The workgroup is looking for more members to actively participate in workgroup activities. Contact G. Prelewicz (gprelewicz@fairfaxwater.org) or K. Bencala if you are interested.

The workgroup has been collecting a lot of information on alternative deicing chemicals and practices. A priority for the group this year is to continue educating state highway agencies and other stakeholders on alternatives either via presentations or a webinar. Greg appreciates all the articles and information that people have been sending him on the issue and encourages everyone to continue to do so.

Another priority for the workgroup is to track regional issues and initiatives, including the Chesapeake Bay TMDL and WIP process. The workgroup would like to identify one project that may have source water protection benefits that the Partnership could get involved with. There may be some potential to get involved with stormwater projects. This might be easier once the Phase II plans are developed as they will focus more on local level reductions. The workgroup will likely hold an information session this year on MS4 permits in the region. The Mid-Atlantic Water Program is planning to run a series of webinars on TMDL implementation this year. We could look into using this format if we wanted to reach a larger audience.

Following on the information session organized by the workgroup last year on Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act integration, the group might consider using the Chromium-6 issue as an example of the benefits of such integration.

Vicky Binetti mentioned that the Chesapeake Bay Program has expressed interest in knowing where intakes are in the basin to promote public health and the connection to water supply in the region. EPA plans to take drinking water data, such as number of intakes/wells and the population served by public water systems and display it as a GIS layer by HUC12 watershed. This may present an opportunity to talk about how protecting surface water can also help protect groundwater and drinking water. If anyone would like a CD of intake density by HUC 12, contact EPA's Marjorie Copeland (copeland.marjorie@epa.gov).

M.T. Habibian brought up the issue of stormwater as a legacy contaminant issue in older areas where stormwater is not really being addressed. He suggests the workgroup consider this as an issue for future activities.

Ag Issues – Ellen Schmitt, EPA Region 3

West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources' David Smith has volunteered to co-chair the Ag Issues workgroup. Thanks Dave!

A priority for the workgroup is to develop an outreach strategy for the ag community. One of the first steps in doing this was organizing a webinar on the links between *Cryptosporidium* and drinking water for the "Manure du Jour" webinar series in Pennsylvania last July. The hope was to use this recording of the webinar with other groups but there were audio problems that are forcing the group to re-record the presentation. A key part of the original presentation was a survey for participants to help the group better understand existing knowledge of *Crypto* and how best to reach the intended audience. E. Schmitt distributed a summary of the responses from the survey. When the presentation is re-recorded, the survey questions will be made separate from the presentation itself. This will allow the presentation to be used for a more diverse audience and will allow the group to change the survey as needed.

The workgroup is considering distributing intake density information to ag agencies such as NRCS and FSA. Other EPA regional offices have had success in getting these agencies to incorporate this information into their models that help prioritize activities and funding. This is one way to get drinking water considerations taken into account as the ag agencies cannot share their information with us. This information could also be provided to federal and state transportation departments. West Virginia already makes this type of information available to other state agencies through a GIS web portal, but it is not known if or how the data is used. This could serve as a way to assist with implementation of water quality-related aspects of the Farm Bill. Some concerns were raised about the cost of doing this and how much of an impact it would have. Ellen does not think the cost would be great and she already has some of the contact information she would need. If you have any concerns with the workgroup doing this contact Ellen (schmitt.ellen@epa.gov).

A number of conservation opportunities have come up in the Chesapeake Bay and Potomac basin. For the most part, getting involved would mean partnering with multiple other organizations to come up with matched funding for conservation easements. One example of this is in Adams County, Pa., where a number of tracks of land are available and the county is looking for partners. E. Schmitt brought this up to see if there was interest from the Partnership in exploring these types of projects. Discussion at the meeting centered on whether or not the benefits from this to water quality can be quantified and how the cost of land is usually prohibitive to utilities.

Emerging Contaminants – Pat Bowling, PADEP

A priority for the workgroup this year is to identify pharmaceutical manufacturing plants in the basin. A study recently identified wastewater coming from wastewater treatment plants with pharmaceutical manufacturers directly discharging to them with high chemical concentrations.

The workgroup continues to follow regulation related to chemicals and the disposal of them. There may be an effort to revive the Toxic Substances Control Act in this session of Congress. The Safe and Secure Drug Disposal Act was signed into law last year making it easier to have take back events and requiring the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to develop rules for doing so. Some DWSP members have been involved with interagency efforts to help the DEA with these rules.

The next DEA take back event is scheduled for April 30. A couple members are likely to help out again at specific take back locations in the basin. If you are interested in helping at a certain location contact Marjorie Copeland (copeland.marjorie@epa.gov). The Partnership will continue to help with outreach for this event including posting information on the website.

Text for a webpage on proper pharmaceutical disposal in the basin has been drafted. The intent is to have something on the topic on the Partnership's webpage and to refer individuals to their jurisdiction's preferred means of disposal. The draft text was distributed at the meeting and emailed to all members shortly after. Please send in any comments to K. Bencala by Wednesday, February 23, 2011.

Meeting participants were interested in learning more about some of the monitoring efforts that are currently going on in the basin and at water intakes. Some water utilities noted that they liked having USGS data available that they could refer customers to when asked questions about emerging contaminants. Cherie Miller, Ellen Schmitt, Vicky Binetti, and Pat Bowling offered to help track down information on current research efforts.

Disinfectant By-product Precursors – Mohammad Habibian, WSSC

The DBP studies are on-going. WSSC is tracking progress to see if results will be useful to the Partnership.

Utility Committee – Mohammad Habibian, WSSC

The committee has drafted a letter and comments in response to an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) issued by the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration (PHMSA) regarding on-shore pipeline safety. Comments focus on a need for tiered levels of risk within the High Consequence Area designation, transparency in the evaluation process, and independent technical review standards. It was emphasized that while preparing for coordinated response to emergencies is appropriate and needed, attention must also focus on proactive actions to minimize the potential for pipe failures. The committee is working toward having one letter, signed by all the general managers, go out under the heading of the Metropolitan Area Utility Source Water Protection Committee. A version of the Partnership's logo is being amended to include the name of the committee so the logo can be used as the letterhead. The letter will also likely be sent to the Department of Homeland Security and the EPA.

Government Committee – Wes Kleene, VDH

Committee members briefed the Partnership on activities they are considering for this year. This includes meetings to reach out to systems in other parts of the watershed. The committee may follow a similar approach to what ORSANCO used.

2. WV Source Water Protection Plans

Bill Toomey with the West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources walked meeting participants through an example of the source water protection plans that are being developed for individual systems by consultants within West Virginia. The plans that are being developed within the Potomac basin include a section on the possibility that the individual systems participate with the Partnership. Systems are required to have an approved source water protection plan as part of the alternative monitoring waiver program within West Virginia.

3. Emerging Contaminants workshop

M.T. Habibian updated the group on Water Research Foundation (WaterRF) project #4169. A meeting was held a couple of weeks ago to review progress. He passed out a couple of handouts showing some progress on a framework for dealing with emerging contaminants. There is likely to be a workshop in April to test the framework using the Potomac basin as an example.

4. Chromium 6

The issue of hexavalent chromium recently being detected at a number of water supply intakes across the country was discussed. V. Binetti outlined the expedited process that the EPA is using to determine if it should be regulated. A number of participants stressed the need to identify and limit the amount that is released from known point sources. Other concerns were raised about the monitoring the EPA is currently requiring. EPA Region 3 is looking into known sources of chromium 6 from NPDES and superfund records. They may be able to present this information at a future meeting.

5. Invoices went out to member utilities in December. If you haven't seen yours or need another copy, contact Karin.

6. Strategic Plan update

K. Bencala provided a brief update of the discussion of the strategic plan at the annual meeting in October. Essentially, at the annual meeting it was decided that each workgroup would propose their own updates to the plan. These proposals will be reviewed at the spring and summer quarterly meetings and formal approval will be made at the next annual meeting. It would be ideal if each member organization could commit to helping one workgroup with the update process. In order to meet this deadline, the workgroup chairs have agreed on the following schedule:

- February and March – workgroups work internally to draft updates

- April 4 (three weeks before quarterly meeting) – Send Karin draft updates.
- April 11 (two weeks before quarterly meeting) – Karin will send out compiled drafts to members and participants.
- April 26 – Review at quarterly meeting. Take comments for one additional week.
- May and June – Workgroups incorporate comments received on first draft and make changes.
- June 20 – Send Karin draft updates.
- June 27 (three weeks before quarterly meeting) – Karin will send out compiled drafts to members and participants. Please try to get a high level review within your organization before the quarterly meeting.
- July 19 – Review at quarterly meeting. Final comments can be submitted for one additional week.
- July and August – Workgroups make changes taking comments into account.
- August 8 – Send updated version to Karin.
- August 15 – Karin will send out compiled update to members and participants. Please review for approval within your organization. Submit any concerns as soon as possible.
- September 9 – Deadline to submit final comments.
- October 4 – Formal presentation and approval at the annual meeting.

There were also a number of issues on the table from the annual meeting. Meeting participants decided that the Pathogens workgroup would be dissolved and the issue would be taken up by the Ag Issues and Urban Issues workgroups as appropriate. Regarding the creation of new workgroups, forming a Non-point Source or Nutrients workgroup was not supported.

The usefulness of creating a Water Quality workgroup is going to be explored by members. E. Schmitt and K. Bencala will organize a meeting to find out what water quality data are already being collect by utilities; federal, state, and local agencies; and other researchers in the Potomac basin. From this meeting the purpose and scope of such a workgroup will be proposed for review at the spring meeting. It was stressed that we needed to have an explicit reason for creating this group and identify the questions it would help the Partnership answer.

The standalone issues that are of interest but do not fit into the current workgroup structure will be handled by ad hoc groups as they come up. The strategic plan will be amended to allow for temporary groups to be formed to look at specific issues. After an initial investigation of an issue it can be folded into an existing workgroup, a new workgroup can be created, or the issue can be tabled pending future developments. The issues that fit into this category raised at the annual meeting were Marcellus Shale, potential for uranium mining in Virginia, invasive species (zebra mussels and water chestnuts), and the TMDL WIP process. It was generally agreed that the best way to decide if we need to address an issue would be to first educate ourselves. We will start by having an information session at the next quarterly meeting on the Chesapeake Bay TMDL and state WIPs and then address the other issues as appropriate.

Additional meeting handouts:

Climate Resilience Evaluation and Awareness Tool (CREAT) – A software tool that can assist drinking water and wastewater utility owners and operators in understanding potential climate change impacts and in assessing the related risks at their utilities.

<http://water.epa.gov/infrastructure/watersecurity/climate/creat.cfm>

Tabletop Exercise Tool for Water Systems (TTX Tool) – This tool introduces users to the potential impacts of climate change on the water sector while addressing an all-hazards approach to emergency preparedness and response. The tool contains 15 scenarios that include natural hazards, man-made incidents, and potential climate impacts.

http://yosemite.epa.gov/ow/SReg.nsf/description/TTX_Tool

Climate Ready Water Utilities Toolbox (CRWU Toolbox) – A searchable toolbox that contains resources supporting all stages of the decision process, from basic climate science through integration of mitigation and adaptation into long-term planning.

<http://www.epa.gov/safewater/watersecurity/climate/toolbox.html>

EPA's Blind Spot: Hexavalent Chromium in Coal Ash

<http://earthjustice.org/sites/default/files/CoalAshChromeReport.pdf>