# Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>State and Local Government</th>
<th>Federal and Regional Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Rockville:</td>
<td>DDOE:</td>
<td>EPA Region 3:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Ding</td>
<td>Collin Burrell</td>
<td>Vicky Binetti (phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Water:</td>
<td>Shah Nawaz</td>
<td>Patti Kay Wisniewski (phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Condon (phone)</td>
<td></td>
<td>KR Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fikremariam Tesfai</td>
<td>MDE:</td>
<td>ICPRB:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ying Tan</td>
<td>Robert Peoples</td>
<td>Karin Bencala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax Water:</td>
<td>Lyn Poorman</td>
<td>Curtis Dalpra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Billman</td>
<td>PA DEP:</td>
<td>Carlton Haywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traci Goldberg</td>
<td>Patrick Bowling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Prelewicz</td>
<td>VDH:</td>
<td>MWCOG:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niffy Saji</td>
<td>John Aulbach (phone)</td>
<td>Steve Bieber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Thompson</td>
<td>WV DHHR:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loudoun Water:</td>
<td>Scott Rodeheaver</td>
<td>Other Interested Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beate Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td>Horsley Witten:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Aqueduct:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geraldine Camilli (phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Jacobus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSSC:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Water Research Foundation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Chandler</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kim Linton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Habibian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workgroup and Committee Reports

_**Early Warning and Emergency Response** – Carlton Haywood, ICPRB_

**Colonial Pipeline:**

- The meeting with Colonial Pipeline has been set for July 8 at COG. In advance of the meeting, the Partnership needs to prepare a list of questions we would like them to respond to, identify our geographic area of interest, and confirm that the abandoned Patuxent pipeline is no longer an issue. These items need to be ready by June 5, in preparation for an internal planning call on June 6.
- The DC Water board has expressed interest in learning more about the risk the pipeline poses. Tom Jacobus will keep them informed of our efforts with Colonial.

**Source Water Assessment update:**

- A meeting was held on April 22 to scope out what an update to the original DC source water assessment might look like and how it might be accomplished. (Notes from this meeting were circulated previously.) EPA R3 has some funds to draft a list of tasks the Partnership might consider as part of an update to the assessment. This list will include items identified by members as well as ones considered to be best practices for assessments nation-wide. Horsley Witten is the consultant on this for EPA R3.
- Horsley Witten should have a draft list of tasks for members to review around the middle of June. They are currently tasked to listen in on conversations and determine wish list for the update. They are not currently tasked to do any work on the assessment or the plan as of now. Once this list of tasks is completed, the workgroup will start talking about who will do various parts and how they will be paid for.
- Utility members are more interested in identifying catastrophic/acute threats. We need to come up with better terminology for referring to these threats. We will also need to further define priority concerns.
- The update should include a broad range of contaminants to make sure that we capture all potential sources.
- A major part of this effort will be figuring out how to determine and categorize levels of risk. For instance, how should threats be ranked on health concerns, treatment requirements, likelihood of event, time of travel, etc.
- While the full scope of the effort and how it will be completed has not yet been figured out, an update to the Potential Contaminant Sources inventory is likely to be done at the least.
- The geographic scope for the inventory will be the entire basin. The hope is that a tool can be constructed to assess risk for any intake in the basin.
- There is a recognition that updating the assessment is not what will ultimately help protect source waters. What is really needed is a plan in place to address the identified risks.
- The EPA wants to best serve Potomac suppliers and will do what it can with the available resources. The project will have to take a phased approach. Due to EPA funding rules, each task cannot be longer than one year in length. The amount of money available varies year to year.
- COG received $1.5 million in UASI grant funding for water security. There are four areas where this money can be spent: contaminant detection, source water assessment and alternative source identification, outage planning, and contamination event response. COG’s Water Security workgroup will decide how much of the money will go to each topic. The money will not be available until October at the earliest. This works well with the EPA timeline for drafting the list of tasks.
• Collaborating with the Water Research Foundation (WaterRF) on existing projects could be one way to address some tasks. For instance, there is an effort to identify potential contaminant sources using GIS, areal imagery, and public databases (led by Jeff Rosen). Another possibility would be to apply a national model for prioritizing risks that has been completed to the Potomac basin as a case study.

• KR Young, EPA R3, discussed the 2006 summary of the original Potomac basin source water assessments. At that time, the EPA pulled together all the results from the assessments into a single Excel document. The results were summarized by state and threat category. This compilation can be shared with anyone who is interested.

• MDE recently updated the assessments of 20 groundwater systems. Few new sources of possible contamination were identified. From their perspective, there is greater value in spending time on a source water protection plan than on an updated assessment.

• IC Water is a tool we could consider using for spill response. Currently, ICPRB’s model based on USGS dye studies is used to calculate travel times. Using IC Water would require effort to calibrate the generic model to the Potomac basin. IC Water has the advantage of having the NHDplus stream network and a contaminant database built into it but requires ArcMap to run. ICPRB’s model has the advantages of being specific to the Potomac and being easy to use.

Other issues:
• The Partnership’s concerns about flaws in national pipeline regulations have gone un-recognized by the Department of Transportation. The workgroup should consider raising the issue with the EPA. This could be a task under the update of the source water assessment.

• West Virginia
  o Rules are currently being drafted for West Virginia Senate Bill 373.
  o EPA R3 and WV DHHR are discussing a possible workshop to review monitoring technology.
  o The Source Water Collaborative is discussing what products it might produce in light of the West Virginia spill on the need to update source water assessments.

Government Committee – Collin Burrell, District Department of the Environment
The committee is holding a workshop, Tools for Utilities to Prevent Algal Blooms, on May 21, at the Clarion Hotel in Shepherdstown, West Virginia. Approximately 40 people have registered from both basin utilities and state and federal source water agencies. Anticipated utility participation will be from:
• West Virginia: Berkeley County, Hardy County, Moorefield, Petersburg, Romney
• Maryland: Rockville, Washington County, WSSC
• Virginia: Fairfax Water, Leesburg, Loudoun Water, Manassas
Next tasks for the committee are to determine if there is interest from the membership in meeting with the watershed groups again this year and/or in holding an outreach meeting in the Monocacy watershed.

Reaching Out – Curtis Dalpra, ICPRB
• Source water protection statement – The list of best practices for source water protection was completed and is now available on our website. The watershed groups we met with in 2013 who thought this product would be helpful were sent the link. The Potomac Conservancy is interested in having a member author a blog post about the Partnership and the list. Members are going to check internally to see if we can move forward with this. Karin will contact the representatives who helped write the list at the end of May. If there is interest, we will then
figure out who should serve as the author. There was no interest in making this list a more formal document with organization signatures.

- The annual meeting is set for Thursday, November 20. Now is the time to start thinking about where we want to hold the meeting and if there is a theme or field trip we would like to pursue. Pat Bowling is going to see if there is interest from PA DEP in hosting the meeting this year. Fairfax Water offered to host the meeting. Tom Jacobus and Karin Bencala will discuss this more before the next quarterly meeting. Member input and assistance is most welcome.

- Wholesale customers of existing utility members are being contacted to see if they are interested in joining the Partnership.

- Forest Proposal – The proposal was submitted to the U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities in March. Subsequently, Carlton and Karin have had two conversations with Peter Stangel (senior vice president at the Endowment) and Tracy Mehan (consultant with The Cadmus Group). The Endowment’s standard method for grants is to fund part of the total amount requested and look for local stakeholders plus additional outside sources to make contributions. Peter has suggested the Endowment could fund roughly one-third of the total cost of this project. For them, ideally, an additional third would come from other grant sources and the final third would come from the participating utilities/Partnership. They are eager to help raise funds to get us closer to the total amount needed and have started reaching out to their contacts in federal government agencies and private foundations.

  - Members have some concerns about bringing in additional external partners. Concerns center on questions of who will be the ultimate owner of the work and final document.
  - Utilities are willing to explore funding a portion of the project.
  - One possibility is for the Partnership’s utilities to apply for a tailored collaboration grant through WaterRF and have ICPRB be the sole-source contractor. The maximum award possible is $100,000 and requires a dollar-for-dollar cash match. These funds would not be available until January 2015. WaterRF would have a project manager as well as three to five individuals providing advice on the project. They would own, with the partners, the intellectual property.
  - WSSC is more interested in looking at buffers than protecting forest land. 65% of basin is forested already.
  - The results of this study could inform forest protection priorities by other organizations even if members were not interested in purchasing easements following the study.
  - It was suggested that Karin and Carlton write a memo to the utility general managers asking about their willingness to fund the study and if they are willing to partner with the other utilities on a WaterRF grant application.
  - Karin will see if we can review standard agreement language between the Endowment, utilities, and additional partners.

**Urban Issues** – Greg Prelewicz, Fairfax Water

- The workgroup has gathered data from the Chesapeake Bay Program on land use. This summer the data will be analyzed and an update on trends will be provided to the Partnership at a future meeting.

- The four NPDES permits that the workgroup identified as being up for renewal this year are all in Maryland. MDE has been made aware that we are interested in reviewing them, but none have come up yet for comment.

- There is still interest from the workgroup in developing a questionnaire to determine the constituents for which member utilities would like to see a Public Water Supply criteria set. The group hopes to circulate this over the summer.
• States reported near record use of road salt this past winter. The workgroup would like to be able to track the amounts used and make the information available on the DWSSP website. Rockville had 24 snow events that required snow and ice control and used a record amount of salt. The city is considering doubling its salt storage capacity. The continuous conductivity meter on the Anacostia recorded levels higher than sea water following some snow events. DDOE has asked DDOT to try to reduce their salt usage if possible. There is a salt management plan in place. New Hampshire has been using an outreach strategy to try to get drivers to slow down during snow and ice conditions. During events, road signs read “Drive slow or die.”
• The workgroup is hoping to hold an information session on MS4 permits for the August 27 quarterly meeting.

Emerging Contaminants – Martin Chandler, WSSC
• The EPA has not released additional UCMR3 monitoring data since January. Those data were reported on at the March 6 quarterly meeting. The workgroup will continue to compile the data as it becomes available.
• Tracking of relevant legislation continues. DEA’s Final Rule for drug take backs is undergoing OMB review but appears to be delayed. The bills relating to bulk chemical storage are also moving along through Congressional committees.
• The April 2014 issue of the Journal of the American Water Resources Association is focused on contaminants of emerging concern. Articles are all available for free download.
• The workgroup is going to start tracking algal toxins as an emerging issue. The EPA has recently announced that they will develop health advisories for microcystin-LR and cylindrospermopsin. Both of these are already on the contaminant candidate list (CCL). Anatoxin-a is also on the CCL but will not receive a health advisory. Algal toxins will also be reviewed through the UCMR4 process.
• Mohammad Habibian, WSSC, provided an update on WaterRF project 4494, Evaluation of Current and Alternative Strategies for Managing CECs in Water. A two-day workshop was recently held in Germany to examine the European Union’s and individual countries’ approach to regulating CECs.
• CVS has a program in place to take back medication.
• The workgroup would like to get an updated list of NPDES permits to update their maps of possible pharmaceutical discharge locations. The group will also explore the idea of reaching out to some of these dischargers with the source water protection message.

Ag Issues – KR Young, EPA Region III
• There is a draft of a toolkit to facilitate integration of Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act programs that is circulating through state agencies for comment. It should be publically available this summer.
• The grant application period is open for the NRCS Regional Conservation Partnership Program. Learn more about the application process here.
• There may be a small project in Pennsylvania funded by the Chesapeake Bay Program Implementation Grants program.

Water Quality Data – Niffy Saji, Fairfax Water
• The workgroup is pulling together a summary of the of alkalinity data collected by member utilities for the website.
• Niffy will reach out to Dr. Kaushal to see if he has overlapping research interests with Partnership members.
The list of parameters member utilities monitor for has been updated.

Workgroup members are going to reach out to state agencies in Maryland and Virginia to better understand what monitoring data is available.

Fairfax Water is no longer collecting extra samples for perchlorate. Paw Paw is no longer collecting data either; the EPA’s related study was published.

Fairfax Water’s pharmaceutical monitoring program is on-going, though it will be scaled back this year.

### Issue Updates

#### Marcellus Shale –

- Patrick Bowling, PA DEP – Between January and May 2014, 1,223 unconventional well permits had been issued out of a total of 1,734 permits. During the same period, 438 unconventional wells have been drilled. Since 2008, the total number of permits issued each year has generally decreased but the proportion of unconventional wells generally has increased. There are a total of 7,003 unconventional wells drilled in the state and 3,911 wells have been fracked to date. Production from these wells is steady.

DEP recently released its first ever oil and gas annual report.

There are proposed revisions to surface activity subchapter in the Oil and Gas regulations. The public comment period for this has been extended twice and 24,000 comments have been received.

The state has leased significant portions of forest land for drilling. Approximately 1.5 million acres of the state’s 2.2 million are underlain by Marcellus shale. 44% is available for gas development. The Bureau of Forestry released its first shale gas monitoring report in April. The impact on surface water appears to be minor. Over 90% of specific conductance results were below 100 microsiemens.

- Scott Rodeheaver, WV DHHR – Between January and April of 2014, 194 horizontal permits have been issues. There is little drilling in the Potomac basin.

- Lyn Poorman, MDE – The state’s moratorium still stands and the advisory committee is still looking into the issue. The recommended best practices for drilling in the Marcellus Shale is still under development.

#### Administration

- We continue to spend at a high rate this year. It is not clear if this will continue in future years. Workgroup chairs were asked to think about their 2015 workplan and advise Karin of any planned workshops or other activities that may require additional support.

- The wholesale customers of existing members are being invited to join the Partnership.

### Next Quarterly Meeting:

**August 27, 2014**