

Meeting Minutes

Drinking Water Advisory Group Meeting

November 9, 2015

Agenda Item	Notes
Clark Halvorson Opening Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Group B legislation is to be introduced this legislative session. • Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) bill will be going back in front of the legislature this year. The bill has support from utilities and many legislators. • Clark updated the group on our future contracting process, which will decrease wait times for approval or revision. • The Office of Drinking Water (ODW) offers preconstruction loans and grants. Some utilities are taking advantage of these funds. • We have emergency response funds that can be processed in one month (as opposed to the 6-9 month turnaround for regular funds). • Drought update: Due to continuing weather conditions, we will continue to discuss the ongoing drought for the next year.
Legislative and rule updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We just completed an Emergency Rule allowing DWSRF to continue service. • Fluoride rule updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – We will meet next week with the State Board of Health (SBOH). – ODW will align with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommendation on fluoride levels. – ODW supports those systems that voluntarily fluoridate. • The Revised Total Coliform Rule (RTCR) will have an informal comment period from November 19 through December 18. • We will not pursue changes to the laboratory rule this legislative session in order to devote resources to other priorities. • Kitsap County is conducting a door-to-door survey of water systems, looking at capacity development.
DWSRF update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two examples of consolidation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Thurston County and Kitsap County used DWSRF funds to take over significantly failing water systems. • We received \$65 million in DWSRF requests, and disbursed \$53 million. • We encourage utilities to speak with ODW about projects that may not previously have scored highly enough to receive funds. • We have \$13 million available in loans and an additional \$2 million available in subsidies. • We are reaching out to applicants from last year to see if they are still interested in using DWSRF funds. • ODW understands that the construction market is more expensive than it may have been at the time of the original bids. We encourage systems to talk with ODW if this is affecting current projects. • The dates for DWSRF loan and grant cycle in 2016: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – January 1-30 for loans – February 1-29 for consolidation grants

<p>DWSRF update (cont.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Pollution Liability Insurance Agency (PLIA) is a small agency that works with gas stations to get insurance to operate and clean up leaking underground storage tanks • We have been having conversations with PLIA about our concerns with storage tanks and source water protection. • PLIA is asking the legislature to partner with ODW to provide \$10 million in loans for tank remediation.
<p>Scott Torpie Needs Assessment Update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scott provided an overview of the definition and importance of Needs Assessment (see handout). • EPA has identified 55 utilities to be reviewed. • Each utility has a staff member assigned from ODW. • Scott provided an explanation of the review process. • So far, we have had 95 percent of projects approved. • Examples of projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Service meters – previously ignored in surveys – Pipelines – 10 percent of pipe can be replaced every year • With more active surveying and a more comprehensive assessment, there is a significant increase in assessed funds. • There has also been a change in the weighting factor of previously assessed systems. Systems that were previously classified as “large” were reclassified based on more accurate population data. • We will finish our work by end of calendar year; February 29 is the end date for EPA. • At the end of 2016 the EPA needs assessment contractor will report to the President and Congress. FY 2018 congressional allocation will be driven by this assessment. • Question: Will EPA assess systems with under 100 users in any meaningful way? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – EPA will make that determination. • Question: Could ODW put together a help manual to merge EPA planning and water system planning? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – No answer. • Question: Will there be a wastewater needs assessment for treatment plants? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – That is a different survey, to be completed next year.
<p>Cross-Connection Control (CCC): Premises isolation for existing multi-tenant facilities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of issue: How do we define premises isolation for existing non-residential, multi-tenant facilities with one or more Table 9 tenants? • Some systems have reported facing challenges when trying to retrofit existing multi-tenant facilities with premises isolation RPBA's to comply with Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 246-290-490 (CCC rules). • We explained Table 9 premises: Table 9 lists typical categories of severe and high-health hazard premises served by public water systems in Washington (see handout) and why they require premises isolation. Table 9 customers pose some of the greatest health risks to public water systems. The Table 9 list isn't all-inclusive; we expect purveyors to supplement the list based on the system-specific customers they serve. • The Annual Summary Report (ASR) data indicates that premises isolation for Table 9 type customers has improved since the early 2000s, but we would like to see further improvements.

<p>CCC (cont.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We discussed what we consider best practice regarding the location of Reduced-Pressure Backflow Assemblies (RPBAs) installed for premises isolation: located on the service line at the meter or right where the service line enters the customer’s facility. • The handout contains approved approaches to premises isolation based on our interpretation of the WAC as well as some alternatives suggested by others. • Participants discussed the different premises isolation approaches identified in the handout: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Most supported options one and two as being the most protective of public health. – Participants also discussed some of the challenges faced with having RPBAs located outside at the meter (freezing, theft) and where the service line enters the customer’s facility (access, difficult to check, plumbing issues). • Participants were encouraged to provide any other feedback to Terri Notestine or Bill Bernier via email.
<p>Revised Total Coliform Rule (RTCR) – What it means for you when the federal rule goes into effect</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We reviewed the purpose and vision for RTCR. • Participants discussed reduction of potential pathways of contamination to distribution systems. • There are some cost savings for small water systems in monitoring requirements. • New items for RTCR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Confirmed total coliform triggers an assessment. – The non-acute Maximum Containment Level (MCL) violation has been removed. – The non-acute MCL public notice is no longer required. – Treatment technique triggers Level 1 and Level 2 assessments – “Sanitary Defects” and “Defects” require a response. – There will be fewer repeat samples for small systems. – <i>E. coli</i> MCL violation will be the same as the acute MCL violation. – Treatment technique violations are failures to do assessments or correct sanitary defects. – Season systems have a new definition and new requirements. • Participants reviewed the above “new items” in greater depth. • Suggestions for preparing for implementation of this rule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Review management practices. – Update Monitoring Plan. – Practice doing assessments with trigger. • There will be no change to routine sampling procedures. • Participants reviewed Level 1 and Level 2 assessment triggers. • Participants reviewed new Treatment Technique Violations. • Participants discussed the occasions when a Public Notice is required under the new rule. • We reviewed timeline for rule making. • ODW will not “approve” any assessment. They may decide that an assessment is “not sufficient” and send it back to system to be recompleted. • We will approve the start-up procedure and corrective action timeline.

Future Topics	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ty Wick wants to discuss the process and fees for Sanitary Surveys, specifically for those that operate multiple water systems.
----------------------	---

Next meeting tentatively scheduled for January 4, 2016.