



POTOMAC RIVER BASIN DRINKING WATER SOURCE PROTECTION PARTNERSHIP

Quarterly Meeting Summary for February 22, 2017

Location: ICPRB, Rockville, Maryland

Attendees

Utilities

Fairfax Water:
Mishelle Noble-Blair
Niffy Saji
Joel Thompson

Leesburg:
Russell Chambers

Rockville:
Judy Ding

Washington Aqueduct:
Alex Gorzalski
Anne Spiesman
Tom Jacobus

WSSC:
Priscilla To
Martin Chandler

Loudoun Water:
Cathy Cogswell

Berkeley County
PSWD:
Steve DeRidder

State and Local Agencies

DOEE:
Colin Burrell
Joshua Rodriguez
Shah Nawaz

MDE:
John Grace

PA DEP:
Patrick Bowling
Lisa Daniels

WV DHHR:
Monica Whyte

VDH:
Susan Douglas
Aaron Moses

Federal and Regional Agencies

EPA Region 3:
Amie Howell
Catherine Magliocchetti
Karrie Crumlish

USGS:
Curtis Schreffler

ICPRB:
Carlton Haywood
Heidi Moltz
Claire Buchanan
Curtis Dalpra
Scott Kaiser
Jim Palmer

MWCOG:
Steve Bieber
Lisa Ragain

Other Interested Parties

Ginny Siemer (MRW)
Steve Via (AWWA)
Kevin Sellner (Hood Coll.)
Tolessa Deksissa (UDC)

2017 Priority Projects

Implement improvements to regional, cooperative spill response

Carlton Haywood, ICPRB

Lessons learned and main takeaways from the recent sheen event on the Potomac. Lisa Ragain and Steve Bieber from MWCOG provided an update on the after action process. MWCOG is currently receiving event timelines from all relevant parties with the next After Action meeting scheduled for March 17th. Several After Action meetings with various groups and agencies have already occurred.

There was overall agreement that the Potomac Spills communication portal, potomacspills@groups.io, was very effective in coordinating communications within the Partnership. A few suggestions to improve the tool include creating a standard file/message subject line naming convention, a standard data entry format, and tagging files with key words. Niffy Saji, Fairfax Water, mentioned the on-going efforts in the monitoring plan work group will incorporate these suggestions for improving the site. Josh Rodriguez, DOEE, reminded the group of the importance to work with other emergency management agencies to make sure they are aware of our communication platform.

Overall, members thought the interagency coordination worked well during the event. Resources requested by utilities and various agencies were acquired in a timely fashion. The quality scientific response was also considered a positive takeaway, however, there was some concern about the urgency to return lab results to drinking water utilities. This is part of a larger concern the drinking water utilities' concerns were not taken seriously by Unified Command.

Steve Bieber and Josh Rodriguez explained the Unified Command is a rigid structure and is determined when emergency management agencies create emergency response plans certified by federal emergency management agencies. However, absence from Unified Command does not preclude anyone from participating in the emergency response. Both Mr. Bieber and Mr. Rodriguez suggested the Partnership become more familiar with existing regional emergency management plans and develop our own emergency response management plan to identify ways in which the drinking water utilities can work effectively within the existing regional plans.

Working with drinking water utilities to form incident management teams was another suggestion. Forming incident management teams would include staff training in emergency response procedures and communication structures and would better position drinking water utilities within regional incident response teams.

A final point made during the discussion was the public information during the event was inaccurate. The group agreed improving communications with PIOs is critical to ensure the correct message is going out to the public and the information is consistent.

The Partnership identified 4 action items:

- Explore additional ways to use the potomacspills@groups.io site.
- Learn more about each utility member's resources and capabilities.

- Educate regional emergency response agencies on the capabilities of drinking water utilities to respond to incidents.
- Plan and conduct a table top exercise to educate regional emergency management agencies that the assumption should always be a contaminant is considered untreatable until proven otherwise

Enhance chemical contaminant knowledge in the watershed

Mishelle Noble-Blair, Fairfax Water

WaterSuite Update -

Governance and user agreements are still in process and working towards a call in the next couple of weeks. The Governance document would identify an “executive group”, “drinking water group”, and “user group” with varying levels of access. This would determine who gets licenses, level of security per user, and what support/annual maintenance agreement. This would also identify procedures for other activities such as updating datasets and adding additional functionality.

A possible subscription formula would be based on population served by the utility. Can have up to 50 licenses

User Access and Security Levels of Users

- Core group with ability to manage data
- Users can submit data requests to the “admin” group

National and State databases will be updated annually by Corona.

QA/QC SOP for state and federal datasets provided by Corona and could be a baseline for regional data management/data integrity plan.

Emergency response assistance could be provided by Corona.

Exploring a possible work session to WaterSuite user capacity with multiple users in multiple locations:

- 2 work sessions before July 1st
- Fairfax Water
- COG

Explore source water protection activities related to toxic and non-toxic algae

Cathy Magliocchetti, EPA Region 3

The group has been meeting since May 2016 and have focused on information gathering and still working towards identifying a specific project.

The Potomac Algae Project Site was launched as an information repository. If you would like to have access to the site, contact Cathy

Work group members have participated in multiple webinars related to HABs.

Working on opportunities for algae identification workshops:

- ICPRB workshop, mostly filamentous green algae
- Other opportunities (Hood College)

West Virginia has a HAB program – this information will be added to the sharepoint repository.

Still working towards identifying a Potomac project, possible candidates are:

- Nutrient Impacts
- CDC new program for reporting OHHABs
- Monitoring efforts across the region

Road Salts

Scott Kaiser, ICPRB

Scott showed examples of updates with Road Salt related information have been added to the website and sent by ICPRB tweets. The City of Rockville is trying to account for road salt application. A question was raised if there is a way we can link salt to damage to drinking water infrastructure? This may be an topic for a future project.

Information Session

Steve Via, AWWA

Steve provided a presentation on possible funding sources for Ag/Forest watershed improvements to protect water quality.

The long-term objective is to get source water protection/drinking water supplies as a permanent part of the Farm Bill

A few projects already on-going in the Potomac basin (Maryland & West Virginia)

- MD to put 100 farms under nutrient management plans
- WV to keep farms in production
- Already willing partners in the watershed that know the game
- Virginia has created a map of priority watersheds under their EQIP program

AWWA has about 6 partnerships moving forward on project proposals

RCPP is designed to work within the existing programs under the Farm Bill

- Do you have a goal or objective in working with the agriculture community
- Geography – target watersheds identified?
- Focus on a particular type of agriculture (e.g. CAFO, nutrients, etc)

- Other project partners (non-profit, agriculture orgs)
- Resources to bring to the table (min 40% match but 1:1 to be competitive)

AWWA will provide example applications.

Is there an opportunity to build on state Bay WIPs?

Annual Report

The 2016 annual report was sent to members prior to the meeting. We are still looking for a new Reaching Out workgroup chairperson. Let Curtis Dalpra know if you or a colleague would be willing to help out.

System Outreach

- Monocacy-Catoctin outreach - John Grace, MDE (10 min)

The Government workgroup continued its outreach efforts to headwaters areas, in this case in the Monocacy River/Catoctin Creek, MD watersheds. A second meeting number was held in January at the Thrumont MD, Public Library. Mark Schweitzer gave a presentation about two spill incidents near Walkersville, MD. Follow on discussion led to a decision to hold another meeting, in Adams County, PA and to conduct a tabletop spill exercise.

- West Virginia source outreach - Monica Whyte, WV DHHR (10 min)

A cover letter and survey was distributed in January to 19 different systems. 14 surveys were returned with 9 saying “yes, we’d like to meet.” A meeting is being planned for March 9th in Romney, WV. Formal letters of invitation have been mailed.

Water Quality Data Workgroup

- Spill Monitoring Plan Development - Niffy Saji, Fairfax Water (10 min)

This effort started as a follow up item from latex spill. A number of conference calls have been held plus an in-person workshop on February 1st. One component of the plan is to try to do monitoring to capture the arrival of the plume to help calibrate ICPRB spill model. A second component is a utility specific plan to help coordinate monitoring and reporting efforts.

Some of the components to be developed include templates of recording forms to use during a spill to streamline communication during an incident (e.g. sample collection, lab results, etc.). Also develop a standard minimum sample monitoring kit/checklist for utilities and others.

The group has developed a draft flowchart to show the regional response process.

When drafts of the materials are ready they will be distributed to the group for comments.

- Spill response outreach effort – Mishelle/Monica/Russell (5 min)

Intend to contact NPDES inspectors to get input on letters to send to facilities of interest.

EPA Region 1 did some outreach after Elk River Spill and Amie can follow-up with more information on these efforts. It was also suggested that Allen Robertson at ASDWA may have a good perspective on this.

Do these facilities have spill notification requirements in their permits (downstream notification)? Or in their existing release response plans?

Try to get input from someone from the compliance side of the equation.

- Forest cover/treatment cost study update – Heidi Moltz, ICPRB (5 min)

Phase 1 of the project was completed in September. Using the calibrated Chesapeake Bay Program model, Phase 5.3.2. The intent is to develop water treatment chemical relationships to changes in forest conservation changes through changes in water quality, specifically TOC and sediment loads.

Phase 2 of the project, a land cover assessment, has also been completed. This looked at where are the forests, who owns them, and what, if any, easements are in place.

Next will be identifying forest tracts and areas where forest conservation opportunities exist and developed prioritization criteria for these opportunity forests.

We are currently building future land cover models for 2030 projected impervious cover changes and 5 land cover scenarios that will be used to create input scenarios for the model runs. Then we will run the model under each scenario and evaluate results.

We will be making a presentation to bay model technical advisory group for feedback.

- Request feedback on the Annual Meeting field trip –Jim Palmer, ICPRB (5 min)

Jim asked for feedback on the field trip held following the annual meeting to the Harpers Ferry Water Treatment Plant; was it useful, beneficial, and is this something we want to consider again for the next annual meeting? Response was “Yes”, it was useful, beneficial, and enjoyable.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.

**Next Quarterly Meeting:
May 16, 2017**