

Montgomery County Water Quality Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes for October 14, 2014

Member and affiliation	Present		Others in attendance and affiliation
	Yes	No	
Keith Brooks, public-at-large	X		Mark Brackett, WSSC
Mary Campbell, public-at-large	X		
Dan Dozier, public-at-large		X	
Korkud Egrican, public-at-large	X		
Nate Engle, academic/scientific	X		
Beth Forbes, co-chair, public-at-large	X		
Andy Garfinkel, business		X	
Philip Kibak, public-at-large	X		
Paul Hlavinka, co-chair, public-at-large	X		
Christopher Meaney, academic/scientific		X	
Annette Rosenblum, academic/scientific	X		
Scott Roser, business	X		
Linda Silversmith, public-at-large	X		
Phil Wagner, business	X		
Patrick Walsh, environmental	X		
Paul Billingsley, WSSC	X		
Pam Parker, DEP	X		
Mark Symborski, MNCPPC	X		
Agenda Item	Major Points		
7:04 PM Meeting convened	Agenda Approved		
<i>WSSC Capital Budget</i>	<p>Mark Brackett of WSSC presented information on WSSC's proposed 2015-2016 budget. Links to a draft of the proposed budget and the schedule of hearing dates are available WSSC's website at: http://www.wsscwater.com/home/isp/misc/genericNews.faces?pgurl=/Communication/NewsRelease/2013/2013-02-05.html</p> <p>Mr. Brackett provided two handouts which he summarized.</p> <p><u>WSSC FY 2016 – 2021 CIP Highlights</u></p> <p>The overall proposed budget is \$4.2 Billion. The projected system improvements have been broken down into larger pipes (> 16" waterlines and >15" sewer lines) and smaller pipes in the handout.</p> <p>Most of the budget is for system upgrades. Most of the funding comes from bonds. The primary focus is on larger lines. The small diameter</p>		

<p><i>SmartBall's® acoustic sensor passes through the entire length of pipe being surveyed. The sensor can clearly discern the acoustic activity associated with leaks. This data is recorded and post-processed to report the presence and location of leaks.</i></p> <p><i>SmartBall® calculates the locations of leaks by detecting acoustic pulses emitted by the ball at receivers attached to pipe appurtenances. The locations of the leaks relative to the receiver positions are determined by analyzing arrival times of the pulses.</i></p> <p><i>Additional instrumentation in the SmartBall® is used to calculate flow rates along the pipeline and to identify valves, pipe joints and other features of the line.</i></p> <p>http://www.puretechltd.com/products/smartball/smartball_leak_detection.shtml</p>	<p>consent decree improvements are on schedule to be completed in 2015.</p> <p>Going forward there will be a push to rehabilitate laterals which may result in the greatest reduction in Infiltration and Inflow.</p> <p>Access to the improvement sites, necessary permits and required restoration makes up a large portion, as much as \$1M, of the improvement cost. Costs are unprecedented and have delayed actual work. All assessment is complete on consent decree improvements and contracts have all been awarded. Work must be complete by 12/2015.</p> <p><u>Water Pipe Testing</u></p> <p>Acoustic monitoring is occurring on all pipes 48" and larger. Monitoring has begun on 36" and 42" pipes. Smaller pipes must be accessed via robots or tested with <i>SmartBall's®</i>. New access points must be constructed to get monitoring equipment into smaller pipes.</p> <p>WSSC will be looking at inspecting 400 large and repairing approximately 50 miles of waterline per year for foreseeable future.</p> <p><u>Background on Proposed Changes to Customer Bills and Customer Affordability Program</u></p> <p>The second handout covered water use rates and funding. Water use has remained flat although users have gone up. Highest water usage is in the summer; winter water usage defines the baseline. WSSC depends on high summer usage to bring in funds.</p> <p>WSSC's Operating budget is up 3.25% per year. Major rate increases are needed to cover upgrades of old facilities. National trends indicate other metro areas have increases as well.</p> <p>New low flow fixtures and appliances are reducing usage.</p> <p>WSSC proposes to address its budget shortfall by</p>
---	---

Montgomery County Water Quality Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes for October 14, 2014

	<p>Increasing the account maintenance fee from \$11 to \$13.50 per quarter. Add new Infrastructure Investment fee component to the fee that would service debt of +/- \$48 per year. Looking at what WSSC can even propose. Once fees approved budget must stay within rate schedule.</p> <p>There are 16 rate tiers.</p> <p>Affordability does not go into rates. There are other programs to address disadvantaged customers.</p> <p>Wind Farm, solar panels and digester waste gas reuse energy generation has been implemented to cut long term costs. 30 year debt payback in lieu of 20 year cuts annual costs. Savings are used to directly pay for additional improvements. Budget has not been formally proposed Two counties must approve and agree on budget House assessment proposal would set Montgomery County rates higher.</p> <p>Info on how to save is distributed in Bill inserts and via email.</p> <p>WSSC does not know if upgrades to 55 miles of lines per year is the correct answer.</p> <p>Some mains last 80 years, others in acidic soils have only lasted 7 years.</p> <p>Installation problems can cause breaks. The failed Rock Creek water pipe was installed over a rock WSSC believes they are upgrading the worst of the worst. Targeted /prioritized upgrades Soil, pipe type, leak history GISs map and consent decree sewer pipes.</p> <p>Mark did not know offhand the length of pipe in each county</p>
--	---

Montgomery County Water Quality Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes for October 14, 2014

<i>Minutes</i>	Correct minutes to microconstituents
<i>Action Items</i>	Send action items within 10 days
<i>MS4 Permit – Pam Parker</i>	<p>The County is in its final year of a 5 year NPDES permit. Most of the County drains to the Potomac and Patuxent Rivers. Permit only covers the county jurisdictional area minus park land and Federal land. Other areas have their own permits. MDE and environmental groups negotiated the permit conditions.</p> <p>The County must assess watersheds and implement restoration to the Maximum Extent Practicable which is 1” of treatment under this permit.</p> <p>A plan is required to show how to meet the permit goals and progress must be tracked and reported.</p> <p>A lot of mapping has been done to identify projects. Programs include illicit discharge identification and control, SWM Facility Maintenance and Inspection, and Trash Management and Litter reduction. Street sweeping provides a credit. MCDOT is investigating ways to reduce road maintenance pollution such as applying brine pre-storm to reduce salt and eliminating sand spreading.</p> <p>All watersheds must be assessed and 1/5 of the county’s watersheds are bio-monitored per year.</p> <p>Problems and opportunities have been studied and ranked. Improvements include a SWM facility on NIH property that treats Bethesda runoff, conversion of dry ponds to wet ponds, nonstructural retrofits, stream restoration library site retrofits, and green streets. Street retrofits are coordinating with sidewalk upgrades. The rainscapes program pays for LID on private property in some watersheds. One acre of control is credited for each 100 feet of stream restoration.</p>

Montgomery County Water Quality Advisory Group
 Meeting Minutes for October 14, 2014

	<p>TMDL's vary and are difficult to track. The County is only responsible for its part of the impervious contribution in the permit</p> <p>TMDL = WLA +LA+MOS Waste load allocation Load Allocation (w/o permits) Margin of Safety</p> <p>The County's Plan was submitted in 2011 and approved in 2012. It showed that the permit goals could be reached if everything in plan is completed. In reality 548 acres were retrofit by 2013, 182 acres are under construction and 2425 acres under design. This sums to 3158 acres out of 3976 required. It has been difficult to ramp up such a large set of projects in the short period.</p> <p>Significant time is required to obtain permits, there are numerous utility conflicts and the easy projects have already been utilized</p> <p>Retrofits have not resulted in large reductions in pollutants.</p> <p>ESD costs approximately \$200K per acre. The existing permit is still under challenge and was remanded back to MDE. Other permits have also been challenged that they are not stringent enough.</p> <p>Phil - What is cost of stream restoration? Restoration is much more cost effective.</p> <p>Stream restoration gets nitrogen phosphorous and sediment TMDL credit; however it is difficult to monitor effectiveness of stream restoration.</p> <p>Work done to meet the MS4 permit conditions can apply toward TMDL's and vis-versa.</p>
<i>Future Meetings</i>	Steve Shofar to talk in December, Pam to see if he is available.
<i>Triclosan</i>	

Montgomery County Water Quality Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes for October 14, 2014

Microcystin	WSSC study group - no updates as of yet. Cold weather reduces the problem.
Other topics Deicing Materials	Winter road treatment state of the art Accounting for Growth process is still held up but draft Regs could possibly come out by early next year. If the Regs get further delayed, update info may be coming out. Nutrient trading is related to this as a possible way to address nutrient increases resulting from growth.
Meeting adjourned at 9:04	The next WQAG meeting will be Monday November 10, 7PM

Action Items

- Letter to State and County regarding coordination of water quality data.
- Phil Wagner agreed to take notes during the next meeting but subsequently indicated he would not be able to attend or take notes.
- Presentation by new WQAG member Korkud E. on contaminants in county streams.
- Mark S. to contact MNCPPC regarding the Bethesda Sector Plan.
- Paul B. to contact WSSC Budget group.

Montgomery County Water Quality Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes for Dec 8, 2014

Member and affiliation	Present		Others in attendance and affiliation
	Yes	No	
Keith Brooks, public-at-large	X		
Mary Campbell, public-at-large	X		
Dan Dozier, public-at-large	X		
Korkud Egrican, public-at-large		X	
Nate Engle, academic/scientific	X		
Beth Forbes, co-chair, public-at-large	X		
Andy Garfinkel, business	X		
Philip Kibak, public-at-large	X		
Paul Hlavinka, co-chair, public-at-large	X		
Christopher Meaney, academic/scientific	X		
Annette Rosenblum, academic/scientific	X		
Scott Roser, business		X	
Linda Silversmith, public-at-large	X		
Phil Wagner, business	X		
Patrick Walsh, environmental	X		
Paul Billingsley, WSSC	X		
Pam Parker, DEP	X		
Mark Symborski, MNCPPC		X	
Agenda Item	Major Points		
7:05 PM	Paul Billingsley shared a WSSC Project flyover demonstrating work zone sediment control measures.		
7:14 PM Meeting convened	October Minutes Approved Agenda Approved		
Discuss Letter <i>Re: Comparability and Use Assessment of Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection Stream Monitoring and Maryland Biological Stream Survey Data</i>	Linda Silversmith started the discussion, stating that we should thank Mark Symborsky for his work in preparing the letter. Linda then suggested that when a mini committee is formed to prepare a letter, there should be a leader of the mini committee to keep tasks on track. Linda provided many comments, including punctuations and adding sentences. Keith questioned whether the letter should be sent to MDE or the County Executive. Pam will follow up to make sure it is appropriate for the letter to be sent directly to MDE. Christopher suggested that the letter needs to provide more emphasis on why the data needs to be used by MDE, e.g., inefficient use of tax money, stream quality determination. Linda suggested that we follow up in April to see what feedback was received from the letter.		

Montgomery County Water Quality Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes for Dec 8, 2014

<p>Motion By Dan Dozier (Unanimous)</p>	<p>The letter <i>Re: Comparability and Use Assessment of Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection Stream Monitoring and Maryland Biological Stream Survey Data</i>, be sent to the County Executive and MDE (If ok, Pam?) incorporating all the comments and corrections from the discussion. The April Agenda will include a review of any results from, or responses to, the letter.</p>
<p>Future Agenda Items Discussion</p>	<p>There is interest in Bethesda Sector Plan Eco-District, and it should remain on a future agenda. DEP budget should be discussed after January presentation by Steve Shofar, DEP. Many commented that there are fewer trash bags as a result of the bag tax. The 2015 County Stormwater Management Permit should be discussed in a future meeting. Plaintiffs are challenging the public involvement portion of the Permit. Pam will update us about public involvement when the information is available. Paul Billingsley discussed the plans for a microcystin group in WSSC- possible future presentation. Brief discussion of an article which stated that Chesapeake bay streams are warming lead to the topic of climate change. There was discussion of HABs, which are increasing with the rising water temperatures. Does the sustainability working group and climate protection plan include plans for increased runoff and higher temperatures? Linda informed the group that the league of women voters will be interviewing the climate protection plan group on Dec. 18, and she will provide a fact sheet. Dan discussed having WSSC discuss how they deal with higher water temperatures. Fracking upstream of Montgomery county is a concern and may be a future discussion item. Paul Hlavinka would like to hear about watershed monitoring from DEP. Pam to check to see when results are released. Dan suggests we have someone from soil conservation discuss how agriculture runoff is handled. Office of Sustainability should come in to discuss how they are handling increased runoff from storms. Possible budget item?</p>

Montgomery County Water Quality Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes for Dec 8, 2014

	<p>Pesticide Legislation is an area of interest. Christopher may have a contact who can provide more info. Linda has information about the proposed legislation but may not have time to share.</p> <p>Future meeting agenda items were agreed upon through April below. The above discussion items will be revisited in future meetings.</p>
<p><i>Future Meetings</i></p>	<p>January: Pesticides – Julie Taddeo & DEP Budget – Steve Shofar, DEP February: Climate Change, April: Bethesda Sector Plan Eco-District – Tina Schneider, MNCPPCT.B.D.: Emerging Contaminants in Drinking Water Sources – Korkud Egrican</p>
<p>Meeting adjourned at 8:35</p>	<p>The next WQAG meeting will be Monday January 12, 7PM</p>

Action Items

- Mary Campbell agreed to take notes during the January meeting.
- Dan Dozier agreed to take notes during the February meeting.
- Pam Parker to check on propriety of sending a copy of the MBSS letter to MDE.
- Linda Silversmith to send links to League of Women Voters site
- Paul Billingsly to report at next meeting status of WSSC's mycrosystin workgroup.
- Andy Garfinkle to prepare draft 2014 annual report.
- Pam Parker to check on any stream restorations that removed paved channels.
- Chris Meaney to check with Takoma Park Safe Grow Zone as future presentation.