



The Potomac River Basin Drinking Water Source Protection Partnership

Quarterly Meeting, February 6, 2019

Location: ICPRB Offices, Lower Level, 30 West Gude Drive, Rockville, Maryland

Attendees

Utilities

Berkeley County:
Steve DeRidder

City of Rockville:
Judy Ding

DC Water:
John Deignan
Anjuman Islam
Saul Kinter
Mauren Schmelling

Fairfax Water:
Nichole Belleza
Jojean Bolton
Chuck Murray
Greg Prelewicz*
Niffy Saji
Joel Thompson

Frederick Co. DUSWM:
Terri Snyder-Kolovich

Loudoun Water:
Cathy Cogswell
Pam Kenel
Mark Peterson

Washington Aqueduct:
Anna Hayden
Anne Spiesman

WSSC:
Joel Caudill
Martin Chandler
Robin Forte
Jin Shin

State and Local Agencies

DOEE:
Collin Burrell
Joshua Rodriguez

Frederick Co. Division of
Planning and Permitting:
Anne Bradley
Shannon O'Neil

MDE:
John Grace
Saeid Kasraei
Alex McNamee

PA DEP:
Patrick Bowling
Kristina Peacock-Jones

VDH:
Mary Mahoney*

WV BPH:
Brian Carr
Patrick Murphy
Monica Whyte

Federal and Regional Agencies

EPA Region 3:
Beth Garcia
Cathy Magliocchetti

ICPRB:
Renee Bourassa
Claire Buchanan
Curtis Dalpra
Carlton Haywood
Heidi Moltz
Cherie Schultz
Erfaneh Sharifi

MWCOG:
Steve Bieber

USGS:
Matthew Pajeroski

Other

GenOn:
Peter Heimlicher

*Participated via
teleconference

Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

Joel Caudill, WSSC

Business Meeting

1. Recap of Boom Deployment Exercise

Peter Heimlicher, GenOn ([presentation](#))

C. Haywood gave a short background on the topic. The sheen event in 2016 brought the boom front and center with regards to spill recovery. DWSPP members wanted to know how the deployment would work and whether it would be efficient.

P. Heimlicher is the Environmental Compliance Specialist at the Dickerson Generating Station (DGS) in Dickerson, Maryland.

The first unit of the DGS came online in 1959. The sheen event was the first known oil spill since that time. The water withdrawn from river is used for steam electric generation or cooling then returned to the river or out of the cooling stacks. River water does not come into contact with machinery. The average water use is 420 million gallons per day. Only a fraction of that is consumed for cooling purposes. The remaining water is returned to the river. The NPDES permit allows for temperature differentials when the water returns to the river.

Much of the time, the plant runs ~20% capacity due to low electricity demand. When electricity demand is higher, the plant increases productivity. The plant is powered by coal and natural gas.

The plant is upstream of several water intakes in the D.C. Metro Area.

The Oil Pollution Act of 1990 provides the regulatory framework for the boom. The regulation requires the plant be prepared to respond to an oil spill. A trailer sited at DGS houses spill response materials. The guidelines require boom placement within one hour and spill containment within two hours. Containment options include a vacuum truck or a skimmer. The required response capabilities are calculated based on the capacity of the largest tank at the facility. The equipment deployment exercises are required per the regulations. The personnel that would normally operate the equipment must be present and the response equipment must be in good operating condition.

White's Ferry in Dickerson, Md., is the first river access located downriver from DGS. A 1200-foot river boom stored in a trailer at White's Ferry is the primary means of mitigating a release to the river.

A boom deployment exercise was held on December 11, 2018 at White's Ferry. The boom was taken out of the truck and laid along the loading dock so that it didn't catch on the truck as it was being deployed. One end of the boom was attached to two anchor points at the edge of the river on the Maryland side. The other end of the boom was attached to the ferry. The ferry was almost

on the other side of the river when the current pushed water over the boom. Additionally, one of the anchor points pulled out of the ground and the other barely held. There was also concern that the weight of the boom could cause the ferry cable to break or cause other damage to the ferry.

The biggest lesson learned was that an alternative booming strategy is needed. One option is to drop an anchor above White's Ferry and use smaller sections of boom in a herringbone arrangement. In the event of an emergency spill, this would be the current option. Additionally, a shorter boom could be connected to Mason Island (slightly upstream from White's Ferry) to funnel the oil on the narrow side of the river.

In addition to discussing the boom exercise, P. Heimlicher also gave data on bromide sampling (required per the NPDES permit) at NGS.

Per the NGS NPDES permit, twice daily visual checks of the outfall must be conducted. Some examples of log entries from these checks were shared.

The presentation was followed by a general discussion regarding the boom and spill response. A "Spill coop" was suggested by C. Murray. The potentially responsible parties would pay into the cooperative. The fees would pay for administration, materials, etc. In this case, anyone can call the cooperative to respond to a spill.

The point was raised that it would be helpful to know the spill emergency response capabilities of Fairfax County, Va. and Montgomery County, Md.

2. Activity Updates

a. Town of Leesburg Boom

Russell Chambers, Town of Leesburg

R. Chambers was not able to make the meeting but provided the following notes after the meeting:

Lesson #1 – Have a functional boom on-site at all times.

When the sheen event occurred, the Town of Leesburg didn't have a boom. The Leesburg intake is located mid-river and completely submerged. I assume the thinking over the years has been that a boom wouldn't provide any additional protection from a floating contaminant not already achieved by the submerged position of the intake. While this is likely true, the piece of mind provided by the boom, once in place, should not be overlooked.

Lesson #2 – If you have an Oil Spill Response Organization (OSRO) contractor, make sure they visit your site and know what equipment they will need to perform a boom deployment.

EPA and GenOn had their OSRO deliver a boom and deploy at the Leesburg intake as they did at some of the other intakes. The river is shallow at Leesburg and was especially low at

the time of the spill. This was a problem because the OSRO had a relatively large boat with a long-shaft motor. There is no boat ramp at the Leesburg intake and the contractor couldn't launch at other locations and travel by water to our intake. The OSRO decided to body-boot (use waders) to complete the deployment. The OSRO had a very difficult time with the deployment and spent all afternoon working on it. We eventually called the local SwiftWater Rescue team. They were able to hand-launch their inflatable boat and help with the last anchor of the boom.

Lesson #3 – On our portion of the river and depending on what current conditions are like, the boom will require frequent upkeep and adjustments – contractor may need to check daily. At times, it will not be possible to keep the boom in position.

Once the boom was in place, we monitored it and the sheen daily for weeks. Each day we would row out in a 16' johnboat, check the boom and check the river for signs of oil. We quickly realized that there is a constant field of debris that comes floating down the river – even when the river is at very low flows. Debris accumulated on the boom each day. Ice is an even bigger problem. One night the temperatures dropped, and some very thin ice formed; the ice immediately pulled the boom anchor free and positioned the boom neatly on the bank. The OSRO was able to reposition over the next few days.

Future

1. Leesburg inherited the boom and now keep it at the plant.
2. We are working with Loudoun Water and plan to have an agreement with an OSRO or to use a regional contract for an OSRO to protect our intake in future events involving a surface contaminant.
3. The Loudoun Emergency Response team has agreed to assist in the future with boom deployment if necessary, but they do not want to be the first line of defense.

b. WV Table Top Exercise Planning

Cathy Magliocchetti, U.S. EPA Region 3

A satellite DWSPP group, known as the West Virginia Outreach Group, was formed a few years ago. A meeting was held last year regarding funding possibilities. The next meeting will be a table top spill exercise. EPA was able to fund this exercise. Planning started for the spill exercise in December. The 2nd call has been scheduled for February 9. The exercise is tentatively scheduled for May/June of 2019.

The scenario will be an issue of interest to the West Virginia utilities, build on some prior work done in the state, and provide continuing education credits.

c. Forestry Prioritization Project

Renee Bourassa, ICPRB

The Forestry Prioritization Project was developed after utilities had an informational meeting with land conservation groups last August. The project builds on the forest cover research project that was completed last year.

The Forestry Prioritization Project is a GIS-based project that would consist of a land prioritization analysis to develop a map that details areas in the basin that are of importance to maintaining high-quality source waters. ICPRB developed a proposal for the project.

R. Bourassa emailed Peter Stangel at the U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities because they have been enthusiastic about similar projects in the past. He said he was going to check their internal budget and get back to her.

A. Spiesman offered to help continue the momentum of the project. It is possible that a DWSPP workgroup could take on some of the work. They can help develop an objective statement for the analysis and look for additional funding sources.

d. Virginia Forestry and Source Water Forum

Renee Bourassa, ICPRB

The Virginia Forestry and Source Water Forum will be at CityScape in Charlottesville, Va. on June 12-13. June 12 is tentatively scheduled to be a half-day site visit with the Rivanna River Basin Commission. June 13 will be a full-day of presentations and workshops regarding forests and drinking water. The forum will provide a basic understanding of the forestry sector, forest management, the water utility sector and utility management and how the conservation, forestry, and drinking water sectors overlap in the challenges they face. It will also cover areas of opportunity for collaboration, funding sources, and examples of ongoing source water protection efforts in Virginia.

DWSPP members are invited to attend. DWSPP could think about sponsoring the event. The planning committee has not given a specific ask, but maybe DWSPP could sponsor the breakfast or a small amount.

J. Deignan thought it would be a great idea to sponsor a breakfast or break and provide a presentation on DWSPP.

The next planning call will be on February 14.

e. Va. DEQ's Salt Management Strategy

Dr. Heidi Moltz, ICPRB

The Accotink Chloride TMDL was completed in 2017. The implementation plan for that is planned to be a Northern Virginia Salt Management Strategy (SaMS) with a robust Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) process already underway. A training for the SAC was held early in the process (May 2018). The third SAC meeting will be this coming May.

There are 6 workgroups. Each workgroup has met at least once. The second round of meetings are currently being scheduled. The Water Quality Monitoring Workgroup put together a survey to collect information on monitoring efforts for chlorides and other ions.

Virginia DWSPP members are encouraged to complete the survey. They would like to build a model on the origin, fate, and transport of salt. The Education and Outreach Workgroup is working on a pilot project on public messaging and the current level of public knowledge regarding salt application.

For more information, Va. DEQ maintains a [website](#) with detailed information on the SaMS process.

f. WSSC's Dec 18 Road Salt Summit

Jin Shin/Joel Caudill, WSSC

There was a Salt Summit held on December 18 at WSSC. It was held because of the recent water quality changes at WSSC's water intakes, including an increase in chloride, manganese and other ions and resulting customer complaints. The impacts of Watts Branch was of particular interest during this event.

Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), MDE, DOT agencies, Howard County, Prince George's and Montgomery County representatives attended. The SHA has adopted a salt management strategy and reported that it is making progress in reducing salt application rates through a variety of efforts including data-based benchmarking, equipment and technology, enhanced strategies, education/training, and water quality monitoring at selected sites. MDE reported on their involvement in monitoring salts in surface and groundwater and how salt impacts are being addressed through the MS4 program

The group agreed on a regional approach to reach out to residents to bring awareness about the impacts of salt on the environment and water supply. There will be a follow-up meeting in April.

C. Murray noted that this issue is of the utmost importance since salt has an impact on the distribution system by altering the corrosivity of the water. J. Caudill says he was encouraged by the presentation by SHA which reflects a commitment by the agency to improve salting operations and how SHA's efforts could eventually pay greater dividends as the SHA strategies are adopted by county and municipal roads agencies in Maryland. S. Bieber noted that they are making data-driven changes to their operations. He said that for every \$1 spent on salt, there is \$15 worth of damage to infrastructure.

3. Follow-up from Drought Exercise

Carlton Haywood, ICPRB

Each year, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin's Section for Cooperative Water Supply Operations on the Potomac (CO-OP) holds a drought exercise. Last year's exercise was held November 30 at the Griffith Water Treatment plant in Lorton, Virginia. It focused on the Low Flow Allocation Agreement (LFAA). The LFAA was executed in 1978 to establish a formula for equitable water distribution among Fairfax Water, WSSC, and the Washington Aqueduct in the case of a severe drought. It was a Congressional mandate.

Subsequently, in 1982, the Water Supply Coordination Agreement was created to ensure processes were put into place so that the LFAA would never need to come into play.

ICPRB commissioned a study of the LFAA in 2017 to see if it needed to be updated or revised. One recommendation was to test the LFAA.

The drought exercise was attended by 58 individuals from water utilities, state agencies, and local governments, state health departments, offices of emergency management, and other organizations.

The exercise consisted of following a 2-year-long drought (using a model developed by CO-OP staff) with stops for discussions on how the various organizations would respond at different points in time. Eventually, the drought in the exercise was so severe that the LFAA was invoked. The consequences of not having enough water were discussed extensively. There was some discontinuity in what actions Maryland, Virginia, and MWCOG would take and when. There was also uncertainty about what is possible during a severe drought. More data are needed on this matter.

The biggest lesson from the exercise is that running out of water is a catastrophe. Suggested follow-up actions include building additional utility operational constraints into CO-OP's drought model, gathering more evidence of what is possible, reaching out to industrial customers to discuss reducing use during a drought, and looking at the environmental flow-by. The CO-OP's current operations allow for a large margin of safety, with better forecasts and better models, that margin of safety could be reduced. Travilah Quarry was mentioned as an option to help supplement during a severe drought. In addition, it was noted that Jennings Randolph Reservoir holds half of its water for water quality storage. Making some of the water quality storage available during times of drought might help alleviate the shortfalls.

The report on the 2018 drought exercise will be out soon.

4. 2D Potomac Spill Model Project

Cherie Schultz, ICPRB ([presentation](#))

Currently ICPRB maintains a 24/7 spill response line. When a spill alert comes in, ICPRB runs the emergency spill model and sends an email out to the listserv on Groups.io. The spill model is based on USGS dye studies done in the 1970's. The model works well but has limitations. It does not account for floating contaminants or transverse migration within the river.

C. Schultz is working on securing funding for a 2D Potomac Spill Model Project. It will be based on NOAA's GNOME model. The objective of the project is to predict longitudinal and transverse transport of floating contaminants in the mainstem of the Potomac. Phase 1 of the project is to collect LIDAR bathymetric data for the Potomac mainstem and construct a steady flow GNOME model. Phase 2 would be to construct an unsteady flow model and couple it to the GNOME model.

GNOME is a model from NOAA's Office of Response and Restoration. It predicts fate and transport of oil on water bodies. It includes currents, wind movements, and chemical/physical weathering of oil over time. It requires bathymetric data. ICPRB has worked on two GNOME models: WSSC's Rocky Gorge Reservoir and Fairfax Water's Occoquan Reservoir.

ICPRB is currently discussing potential Potomac mainstem LIDAR bathymetric data with USGS. ICPRB is looking for additional scientific applications, partnerships, and funding sources for this project. Other possible partners include Homeland Security, EPA, National Park Service, and others.

S. DeRidder would like to see the bathymetric data go as far upstream as the I-81 bridge in Hancock. C. Schultz said that if funding allows, the data will go up to that point and possibly up the Shenandoah River.

5. Potomac River Basin Comprehensive Water Resources Plan and the Data Inventory, Mapping, and Exploration (DIME) Project

Dr. Heidi Moltz and Dr. Claire Buchanan ([presentation](#))

The Potomac Basin Comprehensive Water Resources Plan was put together by an advisory committee and ICPRB staff, with broad stakeholder participation. The Plan was adopted by the Commissioners in June 2018. The Plan is available on the ICPRB [website](#). Major sections of the Plan include introductory materials, Potomac basin description, challenges and recommendations, implementation, and a strategy for implementation. The document also contains several stand-alone documents, including [Simple Actions We Can do to Make a Difference](#) and [Recommendations by Challenge Areas](#).

The advisory committee put together a list of challenge areas that are of basin-wide and/or interstate concern. These include: protect ecological health, ensure sustainable water use and supplies, protect and improve water quality, manage human land use for sustainability, and cross-cutting challenges. The cross-cutting challenges include floods and droughts, climate change, water-energy nexus, and source water protection.

The strategy for implementation of the plan includes a series of milestones based on 2-year and 5-year goals. A review of the milestones occurs every 5 years. Every 15 years there will be a holistic review of the entire plan. The first 5-year review will take place in 2023.

The stakeholder roll-out is underway. It includes a webpage, social media, press releases, and presentations.

Implementation activities recommended in the plan have already begun. A couple of examples include: 1) preparing for workshops to identify roles and responsibilities for basin organizations, 2) evaluating basin-wide water uses, projected demands, and consumptive demands, 3) quantifying unreported water uses, and 4) the Potomac Data Inventory, Mapping, and Exploration (DIME) project. The DIME project was then discussed in more detail.

The DIME project will be a portal to diverse Potomac-related data and information. The idea of this project is that there will be quick access through ICPRB's website, it will draw from both online databases and ICPRB in-house datasets and have interactive tools to view and download data. It can be used by ICPRB as well as other water resource professionals. It can also promote information and data sharing and more interdisciplinary, integrative analyses of the basin's waters.

There are similar online databases, including Water Quality Explorer and the [Water Quality Data Inventory](#). DIME will be a comprehensive, interactive tool for water quality data. It could even include biological data such as benthic macroinvertebrates and mussel species.

DIME architecture would build online interactive tools to:

- view maps of sample locations
- learn which parameters were collected, by whom, and how often
- create simple time series plots and “heat maps” on the fly
- use point-and-click to identify a location's upstream catchments
- select and download data, GIS layers, and associated data documentation

C. Buchanan is looking for datasets to include in DIME, including raw water data from the water suppliers.

6. Frederick County Agricultural Land Preservation Program

Anne Bradley, Frederick County ([preservation](#))

The Frederick County agricultural land preservation programs encompass a variety of programs to give landowners many different options to choose from when conserving farm land. They are all voluntary programs. The program goals include permanently preserving land from development, purchasing development rights so future uses on the property are limited, ensuring land is available for agricultural purposes, and preserving natural resources for environmental benefits such as water quality and wildlife habitat.

Frederick County has 61,000 acres of preserved land in 438 easements. There are no specific environmental requirements such as stream buffers, however, the landowners are required to have an up-to-date Soil Conservation Plan.

The Maryland Agricultural Land Preservation Program and Frederick County Installment Purchase Program are for preserving productive agricultural land (single-purpose easements). The Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) is dual-purpose for agricultural use and natural resources. CREP is funded by Md. Department of Natural Resources with local administration. The program targets permanent buffer protection and is an option for farms that have more natural resources as opposed to prime farmland. It protects significant buffers in perpetuity.

The Rural Legacy Program was established in 1998. It targets protection of lands that are important to resource-based industries. The program involves no soil or size requirements. The Rural Legacy Program is funded by a state grant with matching funds from the county. The property must be within the Rural Legacy Area. It preserves agricultural land with mandatory permanent buffers along waterbodies.

Frederick County has an [online GIS program](#) with layers that include these programs.

7. Workgroup Updates

Agricultural Issues

Pam Kenel, Loudoun Water ([presentation](#))

The workgroup is focused on four main areas:

1. Communication Messaging: Understand where we can make a difference; identify mutually beneficial goals and talking points
2. Partnerships: Identify and collaborate with other standing groups
3. Projects: Leverage activities of other organizations and programs
4. Funding Opportunities: Bring money through funding pathways

The action items include:

- Developing talking points for further conversations with agricultural producers, potential partners, and funding organizations
- Capturing contact information from watershed meetings, research on partner organizations and funding organizations. Maintaining a list of funding opportunities for reference
- Organizing an information session/workshop for ourselves that focuses on funding SWP activities for Ag activities
- Using Samepage.io to collect information

The 2018 Farm Bill has specific funding for source water protection, specifically \$4 billion over the next 10 years. USDA will be working with utilities to identify and prioritize areas. Working with NRCS is key to tapping these resources. AWWA recommends the workgroup connect with state conservationists and join the State Technical Committee or Local Work Groups to get involved.

The next workgroup meeting is on February 11. The group will discuss advancing dialogue with state conservationists, identify projects for discussion, and discuss the development of a workshop to advance relationships with NRCS and understanding of approach to funding SWP actions.

B. Garcia noted that the Source Water Collaborative has a [toolkit](#) to collaborate on source water protection. Pennsylvania and West Virginia each have an ongoing National Water Quality

Initiative pilot project. Sharing GIS data layers of source water areas with NRCS is a good step to start the collaboration.

Contaminants of Emerging Concern

Martin Chandler, WSSC ([presentation](#))

The workgroup has been focusing on three main topics:

- UCMR4 tracking:
 - Monitoring in progress since Spring 2018
 - Data from water utilities is posted to the EPA's Safe Drinking Water Accession and Review System
 - The first data set from EPA's National Contaminant Occurrence Database was available in October 2018
 - Filtered data sets for Potomac River water utilities are available for 4 states and the District of Columbia
 - Data for metals, cyanotoxins, and haloacetic acids have been reported (and no algal toxins have been detected)
- PFAS:
 - Primarily a groundwater concern with a few exceptions
 - Detection was rare for UCMR3 testing (1 detection out of 1,470 tests)
 - WSSC continued to monitor when the UCMR3 testing period ended. They monitored from 2013-2018. PFAS was not detected in any test
 - Health advisory for PFOA, PFOS was set by EPA in May 2016
 - Federal proposals to regulate the chemicals are currently in process
 - There is a new ASTM method for PFAS testing (from the article, [Application Note: Improved Analysis of Polyfluorinated Alkyl Substances \(PFAS\) in Environmental Samples Using Optimized ASTM Method 7968/7979](#), published in SelectScience on February 1, 2019)
 - DC Water and Washington Aqueduct are beginning a regional effort to create a risk plan and/or talking points per a request by DOEE. The CEC workgroup is working on this in collaboration with the Reaching Out workgroup
- Microplastics
 - They are of increasing interest and potential concern
 - They are ubiquitous and more commonly found as fibers, not microbeads
 - Several recent webinars and conferences covered this topic
 - The workgroup is tracking the Water Research Foundation research on drinking water and wastewater treatment
 - There are possible ecological effects
 - Webinars and other resources will be uploaded to Samepage.io

Dulles is the biggest known source of PFAS in the Potomac River region. It was suggested that DWSPP work with representatives of Dulles Airport to learn more about their PFAS practices. Maybe the Dulles representatives can come to talk at a DWSPP meeting or DWSPP members could arrange for a tour of their facility.

M. Pajerowski mentioned that USGS is working on a project that involves bioremediation of PFAS chemicals.

Early Warning & Emergency Response

Carlton Haywood, ICPRB

Carlton Haywood, who has served as the workgroup chairperson, will be retiring soon. J. Caudill thanked him for his service. The new chairperson of the workgroup will be Joel Thompson of Fairfax Water.

Reaching Out

John Deignan, DC Water

- The workgroup is currently working on the annual report. A draft version will be sent out to the workgroup chairs for approval in the next few weeks.
- Materials for reaching out to small utilities are being finalized.
- The workgroup is working on revising a bookmark that promotes source water protection and DWSPP to the public.
- This year, workgroup members are focusing on increasing membership of smaller utilities.
- The PFAS talking points (as mentioned under the CEC workgroup) will be presented at the May DWSPP meeting.
- The workgroup may be contacted to assist with salt management strategy messaging.

Urban and Industrial Issues

Greg Prelewicz, Fairfax Water

The UI WG members reviewed two NPDES permits recently. The Allegheny Energy Supply Company (R. Paul Smith Power Station) closed industrial solid waste disposal facility and surface impoundment for the storage of coal combustion by-products. Both Fairfax Water and the Town of Leesburg wrote a comment letter regarding the permit. The Rockwool permit was discussed but it was agreed that the constituents of the permitted wastewater were typical of waste streams sent to municipal wastewater facilities.

The workgroup continues to monitor NPDES permits across the basin. Relevant information is uploaded to the Samepage.io website.

The workgroup continues to track information for WaterSuite. There is a user's conference on February 19th.

Fairfax Water is participating in a Water Research Foundation's pilot project that is related to a source water risk management framework. The pilot project is closely related to WaterSuite in that it assesses risk and characterizes potential threats within the watershed.

G. Prelewicz reminded everyone that this is a good time of year to take photos of poor salt application practices. These photos can be used for future outreach efforts.

Water Quality

Niffy Saji, Fairfax Water

- The workgroup continues to update the DWSPP Utility Spill Response Plan, specifically the lab capabilities section. The updated document will be shared with the group.
- The Response Plan will be presented at the National Capital Region Laboratory Capabilities Workshop on February 12 at the Fairfax Water Griffith Water Treatment Plant in Lorton, Virginia.
- The workgroup also works with the Va. DEQ SaMS Water Quality Monitoring workgroup who put together a survey to gauge water monitoring efforts for ions in the northern Virginia region. The next SaMS Water Quality Monitoring meeting will be held on February 14.
- N. Saji noted that MW COG recently produced a draft document, *Executive Summary Potomac River Water Quality in the Metropolitan Washington Region*, that notes the enormous effort by local governments and utilities on water quality improvements.

8. Administration Updates

Renee Bourassa, ICPRB

April 2019 will be the 15th Anniversary of the Partnership.

The Annual Meeting will be held at the USGS MD-DE-DC Water Science Center in Baltimore, Maryland. The meeting will be followed by a tour of the science center and mobile lab. There was a conflict with the original annual meeting date of November 6. R. Bourassa asked the group if November 13 was a good alternative. She asked that the group let her know by March 1 if there are conflicts with that date. If no one objects, the meeting date will be November 13.

An Outlook/Google “Save the Date” calendar invite for the DWSPP meetings will be sent out, but it was noted that this is not the RSVP system. Please complete the Eventbrite RSVP sent out a few weeks prior to each meeting.

The invoices were sent out to DWSPP members last December. Most of the payments have been received.

If members have a topic of interest or an article or webinar for the newsletter, please share it with R. Bourassa.

There was extensive discussion among the members regarding recent changes to the Framework Revision that happened last fall regarding non-member participation at the meetings. It was agreed that this issue should be revisited in the May meeting.

Upcoming Events

Meeting Dates for 2019:

- Wednesday, May 1
- Wednesday, August 7
- Wednesday, November 13 (tentatively)