



The April 11th, 2013 meeting will be a Conference Call Only.

There is **NO** General Tri-TAC Meeting in April. The Water Committee and Land Committee will be holding separate conference calls.

The Outlook Invitation was sent out separately from Molly Ranes at mranes@casaweb.org - for participants to RSVP. If you accept the meeting invitation, you will receive the conference call in number.

9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Water Committee

Land Committee

Next Meeting:

May 9th, 2013 at Orange County Sanitation District



TRI-TAC MEETING

CONFERENCE CALL ONLY

THURSDAY, April 11, 2013
9:30 A.M. – 12:00 P.M.

GENERAL MEETING

There is **NO** General Tri-TAC Meeting in April. The Water Committee and Land Committee will be holding separate conference calls only. The 2013 Meeting Schedule is attached.

The Outlook Invitation was sent out separately from Molly Ranes at mranes@casaweb.org - for participants to RSVP. If you accept the meeting invitation, you will receive the conference call in number.

9:30 A.M. – 12:00 P.M. – COMMITTEE MEETINGS

1. Land Committee Agenda (P. 7)
2. Water Committee Agenda (P. 8)
3. Land Committee Issue Summaries (P. 26)
4. Water Committee Issue Summaries (P. 30)

TRI-TAC ATTENDANCE ROSTER
THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 2013
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS AND INTERESTED PARTIES WERE PRESENT:

Layne Baroldi, Synagro
Vince DeLange, EBMUD
Lorien Fono, PME/BACWA
Levi Fuller, DSRSD
Dan Gallagher, DSRSD
Bob Gillette, Carollo Engineers
Sharon Green, LACSD
Beverly Hann, Carollo
Zachary Kay, City of Santa Rosa
Greg Kester, CASA
Melody LaBella, CCCSD
Bobbi Larson, CASA

Adam Link, CASA
Jason Lofton, SRCSD
Phil Markle, LACSD
Tom Meregillano, OCSD
Terrie Mitchell, SRCSD
Mitchell Mysliwicz, LWA
Don Nessler, Yosemite Vista Estates
Monica Oakley, RMC
Melissa Thorne, Downey & Brand
Natalie Sierra, RMC
Debbie Webster, CVCWA

TRI-TAC MEETING LOCATION & SCHEDULE 2012

TRI-TAC MEETING DATE ¹	LOCATION/HOTEL	COMMENTS
NOVEMBER 8, 2012	Carollo Engineers 2880 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 300 Sacramento, CA 95833 916-565-4888	
DECEMBER 13, 2012	Boy Scout Council 1001 Davis Street San Leandro, CA 94577 510-577-9000	Holiday Luncheon and Tri-TAC Retreat @ Pardee Valley Springs, CA
¹ If you would like to add an agenda item or schedule a presentation for an upcoming meeting, please contact one of the committee co-chairs at least 14 days before the designated meeting date ² If you would like an "after Tri-TAC" meeting noted in the agenda package, please contact Terrie Mitchell at least ten days before the designated meeting date. ★ Air Committee will meet.		

PROPOSED TRI-TAC LOCATIONS & SCHEDULE 2013

TRI-TAC MEETING DATE ¹	LOCATION/HOTEL	COMMENTS
January 10, 2013	Telecom	CASA – January 16 - 18 Indian Wells, CA
FEBRUARY 14, 2013	Boy Scout Council 1001 Davis Street San Leandro, CA 94577 510-577-9000	CASA D.C. Conference February 25 – 27
MARCH 14, 2013	Carollo Engineers 2880 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 300 Sacramento, CA 95833 916-565-4888	
APRIL 11, 2013	Telecom Contact Molly Raney at mranes@casaweb.org for info.	CWEA – April 16-19 Palm Springs, CA CASA – April 24-26 Newport Beach, CA
MAY 9, 2013	Orange County Sanitation District 108 44 Ellis Avenue Fountain Valley, CA 92708 (Shuttle bus offered from John Wayne Airport at about 8:40am)	

TRI-TAC MEETING DATE ¹	LOCATION/HOTEL	COMMENTS
JUNE 13, 2013	Carollo Engineers 2880 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 300 Sacramento, CA 95833 916-565-4888	
JULY 11, 2013	Boy Scout Council 1001 Davis Street San Leandro, CA 94577 510-577-9000	
AUGUST 8, 2013	DARK	CASA – August 21-24 San Diego, CA
SEPTEMBER 12, 2013	Boy Scout Council 1001 Davis Street San Leandro, CA 94577 510-577-9000	
OCTOBER 10, 2013	Orange County Sanitation District 108 44 Ellis Avenue Fountain Valley, CA 92708 (Shuttle bus offered from John Wayne Airport at about 8:40am)	WEFTEC 2013 Oct. 5 – 9 Chicago, IL
NOVEMBER 14, 2013	Carollo Engineers 2880 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 300 Sacramento, CA 95833 916-565-4888	
December meeting To Be Announced		
<p>¹ If you would like to add an agenda item or schedule a presentation for an upcoming meeting, please contact one of the committee co-chairs at least 14 days before the designated meeting date</p> <p>² If you would like an “after Tri-TAC” meeting noted in the agenda package, please contact Terrie Mitchell at least ten days before the designated meeting date.</p> <p>★ Air Committee will meet.</p>		

Notes for 2013 **revise as needed.**

1. Confirmations are underway.

TRI-TAC SPONSOR REPRESENTATION 2013

League of California Cities (LOCC)	CASA	CWEA	
Kyra Ross	Sharon Green Ben Horenstein Roberta Larson Terrie Mitchell, Tri-TAC Chair	James Clark Jim Colston Bob Gillette Tom Grovhoug Jon Hay	Chandra Johannesson Jackie Kepke, Tri-TAC Vice Chair Hugh Logan Alec Mackie Monica Oakley

Tri-TAC Liaison Representation

BACWA: Dave Williams	CVCWA: Debbie Webster
CASA: Roberta Larson, Greg Kester	CWEA: Hugh Logan, Alec Mackie
SCAP: John Pastore	LOCC: Kyra Ross

COMMITTEES

AIR	LAND	WATER
Chair: Air Committee On Ad-hoc Basis only	Co-Chairs: Vince De Lange Tom Meregillano	Co-Chairs: Sharon Greene (Interim) & Shannon Bishop Jason Lofton Finance Subcommittee Chair: Dave Bruns

Interested Participants

Interested Participants

Interested Participants

Gregory Adams Terry Ahn Frank Caponi Stephanie Cheng James H. Clark Sarah Desalauriers Zeynep Erdal Kris Flaig Sharon Green Patrick Griffith Bobbi Gustafson Ron Hipkiss Kirk Howard Greg Kester Vlad Kogan John Pastore Amanda Roa Lisa Rothbart Jim Sandoval Randy Schmidt Jennifer Shepardson Kevin Steet Debbie Webster	Matt Bao Layne Baroldi Stephanie Cheng James Clark Bonnie Jones Diane Gilbert Jones Robert Gillette Eric Have Jon Hay Ron Hipkiss Al Javier Bonnie Jones Zachary Kay Greg Kester Matt Krup Derrick Lee Ajay Malik Mike Moore Octavio Navarrette Michelle Pla Tim Potter John Pugliarese Lisa Rothbart Kelly Sarber Mike Sullivan Caroline Quinn Sandy Warren Debbie Webster	Matt Bequette Rebecca Bjork Phil Bobel Barbara Buikema Amy Chastain Stephanie Cheng James Clark Paul Cobian Jim Colston Mike Connor Vicky Conway Linda Dorn Andy Eggleston Lorien Fono Rebecca Franklin Levi Fuller Dan Gallagher Preeti Ghuman Nicole Granquist Donald Gray (Gabb) Sharon Green Tom Grovhoug Bobbi Gustafson Tom Hall LeAnne Hamilton Lisa Haney Beverley Hann Ben Horenstein Al Javier Chandra Johannesson Jim Kelly	Jackie Kepke, Tri-TAC Vice Chair Roberta Larson Melody LaBella Hugh Logan Phil Markle Patricia McGovern Tom Meregillano Terrie Mitchell, Tri-TAC Chair Kelly Moran Andy Morrison Mitchell Mysliwicz Karen North Monica Oakley Laura Pagano John Pastore Michelle Pla Tim Potter Paul Prange Daniel Rynn Amanda Roa Lisa Rothbart Jennifer Shepardson Christopher Stacklin Martin St. George Curt Swanson Bonnie Teaford Melissa Thorme David Tucker Lysa Voight Debbie Webster
---	--	--	---

Tri-TAC BIOSOLIDS LAND COMMITTEE

AGENDA
April 11, 2013
Conference Call

Item No.	Topics	Lead Person	Est. Time (minutes)	Attachments
1.	Regulatory/Legislative/Legal Updates			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ordinances Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Imperial - San Luis Obispo - Solano (+Measure E) ▪ Kern (Measure E) ▪ Gilbert Case Resolution ▪ City of Menifee 	G. Kester/L. Baroldi D. Gilbert G. Kester/L. Baroldi L. Baroldi/T. Meregillano	20	
2.	State and Regional Updates			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CalRecycle FOG/Food Waste Digestion ▪ CalRecycle 75% Diversion Plan ▪ CDFR Regulations on Rendering 	G. Kester G. Kester/V. De Lange G. Kester	15	
3.	EPA and Nationwide Updates			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EPA Disinvestment in Biosolids ▪ Biosolids Solid Waste Definition/EPA MACT Standards ▪ Arsenic Cancer Slope Factor ▪ New Proposed FDA Rules 	G. Kester G. Kester G. Kester G. Kester	15	
4.	Regional Facilities Updates			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bay Area Agencies ▪ So. Cal. & C.V. ▪ IERCF ▪ Westlake Farms ▪ TIRE 	B. Gillette, B. Jones T. Meregillano/E. Have M. Bao M. Bao D. Gilbert	15	
5.	Industry Association Updates			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WEF ▪ CASA ▪ CWEA ▪ SCAP ▪ BACWA ▪ CVCWA 	G. Kester/V. De Lange G. Kester J. Hay M. Bao M. Krupp B. Gillette	10	
6.	Emerging Contaminants			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pyrethroid Working Group ▪ Trace Organics Activities 	G. Kester G. Kester	10	
7.	Biosolids Research			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WEF Biogas Study ▪ Other 	G. Kester G. Kester	5	
8.	Conferences/Webinars			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ BioGas Forum in Diamond Bar ▪ WEF Residuals and Biosolids Conference ▪ CWEA Annual Conference 	All	5	
9.	Information Sharing	All	10	

Tri-TAC Water Committee Agenda – April 11, 2013

ITEM #	Topic	LEAD	Time (min)	Relevant material
Discussion Items:				
1.	SSS WDR MRP	Monica Oakley	20	Attachment: Draft SSS WDR MRP: P. 9
2.	Statewide Nutrient Strategy	Tom Grovhoug Mitchell Mysliwec	15	
3.	Biological Objectives – Causal Assessment Guidance	Phil Markle	20	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/plans_policies/docs/biological_objective/ca_usl_asmt_wkpln.pdf
4.	North Coast Region Board Update on Water Quality Objectives	Shannon Bishop	20	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/north_coast/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/130221_wqo/130221_wqo_amendment.pdf
Updates				
1.	State Water Board Update on Mercury Projects	Debbie Webster	10	
2.	State Water Board Resource Alignment	Adam Link	10	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/rap/docs/resc_alignmt_prop.pdf
3.	Iowa League of Cities v. EPA	Sharon Green	10	http://www2.bloomberglaw.com/desktop/public/document/iowa_League_of_Cities_v_EPA_Docket_No_1103412_8th_Cir_Nov_04_2011/1
Items that are out there:				
Wastewater User Charge Survey	State Water Board	Attachment: Wastewater Charge Survey: P. 22		

WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD
ORDER NO. 2013-XXXX-EXEC

AMENDING MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
FOR
STATEWIDE GENERAL WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR
SANITARY SEWER SYSTEMS

The State of California, Water Resources Control Board (hereafter State Water Board) finds:

1. The State Water Board is authorized to prescribe statewide general Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) for categories of discharges that involve the same or similar operations and the same or similar types of waste pursuant to Water Code section 13263(i).
2. Water Code section 13193 *et seq.* requires the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Water Boards) and the State Water Board (collectively, the Water Boards) to gather comprehensive and specific Sanitary Sewer Overflow (SSO) information and make this information available to the public, including but not limited to, SSO cause, estimated volume, location, date, time, duration, whether or not the SSO reached or may have reached waters of the State, response and corrective action taken, and an enrollee's contact information for each SSO event. An enrollee is defined as the public entity having legal authority over the operation and maintenance of, or capital improvements to, a sanitary sewer system greater than one mile in length.
3. Water Code section 13271, *et seq.* requires notification to the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA, formerly the California Office of Emergency Services) for certain unauthorized discharges, including SSOs.
4. On May 2, 2006, the State Water Board adopted Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ, "Statewide Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems"¹ (hereafter SSS WDRs) to comply with Water Code section 13193 and to establish the framework for the statewide SSO Reduction Program.
5. Subsection G.2 of the SSS WDRs and the Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) adopted by the State Water Board on May 2, 2006 both provide that the Executive Director may modify the terms of the MRP at any time.
6. On February 20, 2008, the State Water Board Executive Officer revised the original MRP adopted by the State Water Board on May 2, 2006 to rectify early notification deficiencies to ensure that first responders are notified in a timely manner of SSOs discharged into waters of the state.
7. When notified of an SSO that reaches a drainage channel or surface water of the state, Cal EMA, pursuant to Water Code section 13271(a)(3), forwards the SSO notification information² to local

¹ Available for download at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2006/wqo/wqo2006_0003.pdf

² Cal EMA Hazardous Materials Spill Reports available online at:

[http://w3.calema.ca.gov/operational/mal haz.nsf/\\$defaultview](http://w3.calema.ca.gov/operational/mal haz.nsf/$defaultview) and <http://w3.calema.ca.gov/operational/mal haz.nsf>

government agencies and first responders including local public health officials and the applicable Regional Water Board. Receipt of notifications for a single SSO event from both the SSO reporter and Cal EMA is duplicative. To address this, the SSO notification requirements added by the February 20, 2008 MRP revision are being removed in this MRP revision.

8. In the February 28, 2008 Memorandum of Agreement between the State Water Board and the California Water and Environment Association (CWEA), the State Water Resources Control Board committed to re-designing the CIWQS³ Online SSO Database to allow “event” based SSO reporting versus the original “location” based design. Revisions to this MRP and accompanying changes to the CIWQS Online SSO Database will implement this change by allowing for multiple SSO appearance points to be associated with each SSO event caused by a single asset failure.
9. In prior versions of this MRP, SSOs have been categorized as Category 1 or Category 2. This MRP implements changes to SSO categories by adding a Category 3 SSO type. This change will improve data collection and management to further assist Water Board staff with evaluation of high threat SSOs while also assisting enrollees in identifying SSOs that require Cal EMA notification.
10. Based on over six years of implementation of the SSS WDRs, the State Water Board concludes that the February 20, 2008 MRP must be updated to better advance the SSO Reduction Program⁴ objectives, assess compliance, and enforce the requirements of the SSS WDRs.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

Pursuant to the authority delegated by Water Code section 13267(f), Resolution No. 2002-0104, and Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ, the MRP for the SSS WDRs (Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ) is hereby amended as shown in Attachment A and shall be effective on XXXX XX, 2013.

Dated:

Thomas Howard
Executive Director

³ California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) publicly available at
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/publicreports.shtml>

⁴ Statewide Sanitary Sewer Overflow Reduction Program information is available at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ssso/

ATTACHMENT A

WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD **ORDER NO. 2013-XXXX-EXEC** AMENDING MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR STATEWIDE GENERAL WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR SANITARY SEWER SYSTEMS

This Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) establishes monitoring, record keeping, reporting and public notification requirements for Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ, “Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems” (SSS WDRs). This MRP shall be effective from XXXX XX, 2013 until it is rescinded. The Executive Director may make revisions to this MRP at any time. These revisions may include a reduction or increase in the monitoring and reporting requirements. All site specific records and data developed pursuant to the SSS WDRs and this MRP shall be complete, accurate, and justified by evidence maintained by the enrollee. Failure to comply with this MRP may subject an enrollee to civil liabilities of up to \$5,000 a day per violation pursuant to Water Code section 13350; up to \$1000 a day per violation pursuant to Water Code section 13268; or referral to the Attorney General for judicial civil enforcement. The State Water Resources Control Board reserves the right to take any further enforcement action authorized by law.

A. SUMMARY OF MRP REQUIREMENTS

Table 1 – Spill Categories and Definitions

CATEGORIES	DEFINITIONS [see Section A on page 5 of SSS WDRs for SSO definition]
CATEGORY 1	Discharges of untreated or partially treated wastewater of any volume resulting from an enrollee’s sanitary sewer system failure or flow condition that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reach surface water and/or reach a drainage channel tributary to a surface water; or • Reach a municipal separate storm sewer system and are not fully captured and returned to the sanitary sewer system or not otherwise captured and disposed of properly. Any volume of wastewater not recovered from the municipal separate storm sewer system is considered to have reached surface water unless the storm drain system discharges to a dedicated storm water or ground water infiltration basin (e.g., infiltration pit, percolation pond).
CATEGORY 2	Discharges of untreated or partially treated wastewater of 1,000 gallons or greater resulting from an enrollee’s sanitary sewer system failure or flow condition that do not reach surface water, a drainage channel, or a municipal separate storm sewer system unless the entire SSO discharged to the storm drain system is fully recovered and disposed of properly.
CATEGORY 3	All other discharges of untreated or partially treated wastewater resulting from an enrollee’s sanitary sewer system failure or flow condition.
PRIVATE LATERAL SEWAGE DISCHARGE (PLSD)	Discharges of untreated or partially treated wastewater resulting from blockages or other problems within a privately owned sewer lateral connected to the enrollee’s sanitary sewer system or from other private sewer assets. PLSDs that the enrollee becomes aware of may be <u>voluntarily</u> reported to the CIWQS Online SSO Database.

Table 2 – Notification, Reporting, Monitoring, and Record Keeping Requirements

ELEMENT	REQUIREMENT	METHOD
NOTIFICATION (see section B)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 2 hours of becoming aware of any Category 1 SSO greater than or equal to 1,000 gallons, notify the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA) and obtain a notification control number. 	Call Cal EMA at: (800) 852-7550
REPORTING (see section C)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category 1 SSO: Submit Draft report within 3 business days of becoming aware of the SSO and certify within 15 calendar days of SSO end date. • Category 2 SSO: Submit Draft report within 3 business days of becoming aware of the SSO and certify within 15 calendar days of SSO end date. • Category 3 SSO: Submit Certified report within 30 calendar days of the end of month in which SSO occurred. • SSO Technical Report: Certify within 45 calendar days after the end date of any Category 1 SSO in which 50,000 gallons or greater is spilled to surface waters. • “No Spill” Monthly Certification: Certify that no SSOs occurred within 30 calendar days of the end of the month in which no SSOs occurred. • Collection System Questionnaire: Update and Certify every 12 months. 	Enter data into the California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Online SSO Database (http://ciwqs.waterboards.ca.gov/), certified by enrollee’s Legally Responsible Official(s).
WATER QUALITY MONITORING (see section D)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct water quality sampling within 48 hours after initial SSO notification for Category 1 SSOs in which 50,000 gallons or greater is spilled to surface waters. 	Water quality results are required to be uploaded into CIWQS for Category 1 SSOs in which 50,000 gallons or greater is spilled to surface waters.
RECORD KEEPING (see section E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSO event records. • Sanitary Sewer Management Plan (SSMP) implementation and changes/updates to SSMP. • Records to document Water Quality Monitoring for SSOs of 50,000 gallons or greater spilled to surface waters. • Collection system telemetry records if relied upon to document and/or estimate SSO Volume. 	Self-maintained records shall be available during inspections or upon request.

B. NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Although State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) and Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) staff do not have duties as first responders, this MRP is an appropriate mechanism to ensure that the agencies that have first responder duties are notified in a timely manner in order to protect public health and beneficial uses.

1. For any Category 1 SSO greater than or equal to 1000 gallons that results or may result in a discharge to a surface water, either directly or by way of a drainage channel or municipal separate storm sewer system, the enrollee shall, as soon as possible, but not later than two (2) hours after (A) the enrollee has knowledge of the discharge by discovery or receipt of information from a public informant or other source(s), (B) notification is possible, and (C) notification can be provided without substantially impeding cleanup or other emergency measures, notify the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA) and obtain a notification control number.
2. To satisfy notification requirements for each applicable SSO, the enrollee shall provide, at a minimum, the following information to Cal EMA before receiving a control number:
 - i. Name of person notifying Cal EMA and direct return phone number.
 - ii. Estimated SSO volume discharged (gallons).
 - iii. If ongoing, estimated SSO discharge rate (gallons per minute).
 - iv. SSO Incident Description:
 - a. Brief narrative.
 - b. On-scene point of contact for additional information (name and cell phone number).
 - c. Date and time enrollee became aware of the SSO.
 - d. Name of sanitary sewer system agency causing the SSO.
 - e. SSO cause (if known).
 - v. Indication of whether the SSO has been contained.
 - vi. Indication of whether surface water is impacted.
 - vii. Name of surface water impacted by the SSO, if applicable.
 - viii. Indication of whether a drinking water supply is or may be impacted by the SSO.
 - ix. Any other known SSO impacts.
 - x. SSO incident location (address, city, state, and zip code).
3. Following the initial notification to Cal EMA and until such time that an enrollee certifies the SSO report in the California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Online SSO Database, the enrollee shall provide updates to Cal EMA regarding substantial changes to the estimated volume of untreated or partially treated sewage discharged, and any substantial change(s) to known impact(s).
4. Private Lateral Sewer Discharges (PLSDs): The enrollee is strongly encouraged to notify Cal EMA of discharges greater than or equal to 1,000 gallons of untreated or partially treated wastewater that result or may result in a discharge to surface water resulting from failures or

flow conditions within a privately owned sewer lateral or from other private sewer asset(s) if the enrollee becomes aware of the PLSD.

C. **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

1. **CIWQS Online SSO Database Account:** All enrollees shall obtain a CIWQS Online SSO Database account and receive a “Username” and “Password” by registering through CIWQS. These accounts allow controlled and secure entry into the CIWQS Online SSO Database.
2. **SSO Mandatory Reporting Information:** For reporting purposes, if one SSO event results in multiple appearance points, the enrollee shall complete one SSO report in the CIWQS Online SSO Database which includes the GPS coordinates for the location of the SSO appearance point closest to the failure point, blockage or location of the flow condition that caused the SSO, and provide descriptions of the locations of all other discharge points associated with the SSO event.
3. **SSO Categories**
 - i. **Category 1** – Discharges of untreated or partially treated wastewater of any volume resulting from an enrollee’s sanitary sewer system failure or flow condition that:
 - a. Reach surface water and/or reach a drainage channel tributary to a surface water; or
 - b. Reach a municipal separate storm sewer system and are not fully captured and returned to the sanitary sewer system or not otherwise captured and disposed of properly. Any volume of wastewater not recovered from the municipal separate storm sewer system is considered to have reached surface water unless the storm drain system discharges to a dedicated storm water or ground water infiltration basin (e.g., infiltration pit, percolation pond).
 - ii. **Category 2** – Discharges of untreated or partially treated wastewater greater than or equal to 1,000 gallons resulting from an enrollee’s sanitary sewer system failure or flow condition that does not reach surface water, a drainage channel, or the municipal separate storm sewer system unless the entire SSO volume discharged to the storm drain system is fully recovered and disposed of properly.
 - iii. **Category 3** – All other discharges of untreated or partially treated wastewater resulting from an enrollee’s sanitary sewer system failure or flow condition.
4. **Sanitary Sewer Overflow Reporting to CIWQS - Timeframes**
 - i. **Category 1 & Category 2 SSOs** – All SSOs that meet the above criteria for Category 1 or Category 2 SSOs shall be reported to the CIWQS Online SSO Database:
 - a. Draft reports for Category 1 & Category 2 SSOs shall be submitted to the CIWQS Online SSO Database within 3 business days of the enrollee becoming aware of the SSO by citizen complaint or discovery. Minimum information that shall be reported in a draft Category 1 SSO report shall include all information identified in section 8.i.a. below. Minimum information that shall be reported in a Category 2 SSO draft report shall include all information identified in section 8.i.c below.
 - b. A final Category 1 or Category 2 SSO report shall be certified through the CIWQS Online SSO Database within 15 calendar days of the end date of the SSO. Minimum

information that shall be certified in the final Category 1 SSO report shall include all information identified in section 8.i.b below. Minimum information that shall be certified in a final Category 2 SSO report shall include all information identified in section 8.i.d below.

- ii. **Category 3 SSOs** – All SSOs that meet the above criteria for Category 3 SSOs shall be reported to the CIWQS Online SSO Database and certified within 30 calendar days after the end of the calendar month in which the SSO occurs (e.g., all Category 3 SSOs occurring in the month of February shall be entered into the database and certified by March 30th). Minimum information that shall be certified in a final Category 3 SSO report shall include all information identified in section 8.i.e below.
- iii. **“No Spill” Monthly Certification** – If there are no SSOs during the calendar month, the enrollee shall certify, within 30 calendar days after the end of each calendar month, a “No Spill” certification statement in the CIWQS Online SSO Database certifying that there were no SSOs for the designated month. If there are no SSOs during a calendar month but the enrollee reported a PLSD, the enrollee shall still certify a “No Spill” certification statement for that month.
- iv. **Amended SSO Reports** – The enrollee may update or add additional information to a certified SSO report within 120 calendar days after the SSO end date by amending the report or by adding an attachment to the SSO report in the CIWQS Online SSO Database. SSO reports certified in the CIWQS Online SSO Database prior to the adoption date of this MRP may only be amended up to 120 days after the effective date of this MRP. After 120 days, the enrollee may contact the SSO Program Manager to request to amend an SSO report if the enrollee also submits justification for why the additional information was not available prior to the end of the 120 days.

5. **SSO Technical Report**

The enrollee shall submit and certify an SSO Technical Report in the CIWQS Online SSO Database within 45 calendar days of the SSO end date for any SSO in which 50,000 gallons or greater is spilled to surface waters. This report, which does not preclude the Water Boards from requiring more detailed analyses if requested, shall include at a minimum, the following:

- i. **Causes and Circumstances of the SSO:**
 - a. Complete and detailed explanation of how and when the SSO was discovered.
 - b. Photographic evidence as required by subsection E.2.i of the this MRP, including photographs that show field crew response operations, and reveal site conditions after field crew SSO response operations have been completed.
 - c. Diagram showing the SSO failure point, appearance point(s), and final destination(s).
 - d. Detailed description of the methodology employed and available data used to calculate the volume of the SSO and, if applicable, the SSO volume recovered.
 - e. Detailed description of the cause(s) of the SSO.
 - f. Copies of original field crew records used to document the SSO.
 - g. Historical maintenance records for the failure location.

ii. **Enrollee's Response to SSO:**

- a. Chronological narrative description of all actions taken by enrollee to terminate the spill.
- b. Explanation of how the SSMP Overflow Emergency Response plan was implemented to respond to and mitigate the SSO.
- c. Final corrective action(s) completed and/or planned to be completed, including a schedule for actions not yet completed.

iii. **Water Quality Monitoring:**

- a. Description of all water quality sampling activities conducted including analytical results and evaluation of the results.
- b. Detailed location map illustrating all water quality sampling points.

6. **Private Lateral Sewage Discharges (PLSDs)**

Discharges of untreated or partially treated wastewater resulting from blockages or other problems within a privately owned sewer lateral connected to the enrollee's sanitary sewer system or from other private sanitary sewer system assets may be voluntarily reported to the CIWQS Online SSO Database.

- i. The enrollee is also encouraged to provide notification to Cal EMA per section B above when a PLSD greater than or equal to 1,000 gallons has or may result in a discharge to surface water. For any PLSD greater than or equal to 1,000 gallons regardless of the spill destination, the enrollee is also encouraged to file a spill report as required by Health & Safety Code section 5410 et. seq. and Water Code section 13271, or notify the responsible party that notification and reporting should be completed as specified above and required by State law.
- ii. If a PLSD is recorded in the CIWQS Online SSO Database, the enrollee must identify the sewage discharge as occurring and caused by a private sanitary sewer system asset and should identify a responsible party (other than the enrollee), if known. Certification of PLSD reports by enrollees is not required.

7. **CIWQS Online SSO Database Unavailability**

In the event that the CIWQS Online SSO Database is not available, the enrollee must fax all required information to the appropriate Regional Water Board office in accordance with the time schedules identified herein. In such event, the enrollee must also enter all required information into the CIWQS Online SSO Database as soon as the database becomes available.

8. **Mandatory Information to be Included in CIWQS Online SSO Reporting**

All enrollees shall obtain a CIWQS Online SSO Database account and receive a "Username" and "Password" by registering through CIWQS which can be reached at CIWQS@waterboards.ca.gov or by calling (866) 792-4977, M-F, 8am to 5pm. These accounts will allow controlled and secure entry into the CIWQS Online SSO Database. Additionally, within thirty (30) days of receiving an account and prior to recording SSOs into the CIWQS Online SSO Database, all enrollees must complete a Collection System Questionnaire (Questionnaire). The Questionnaire shall be updated by all enrollees at least once every 12 months.

i. **SSO Reports**

At a minimum, the following mandatory information shall be reported prior to finalizing and certifying an SSO report for each category of SSO:

- a. **Draft Category 1 SSOs**: At a minimum, the following mandatory information shall be reported for a draft Category 1 SSO report:
1. SSO Contact Information: Name and telephone number of enrollee contact person who can answer specific questions about the SSO being reported.
 2. SSO Location Name.
 3. Location of the overflow event (SSO) by entering GPS coordinates. If a single overflow event results in multiple appearance points, provide GPS coordinates for the appearance point closest to the failure point and describe each additional appearance point in the SSO appearance point explanation field.
 4. Whether or not the SSO reached surface water, a drainage channel, or entered and was discharged from a drainage structure.
 5. Whether or not the SSO reached a municipal separate storm drain system.
 6. Whether or not the total SSO volume that reached a municipal separate storm drain system was fully recovered.
 7. Estimate of the SSO volume, inclusive of all discharge point(s).
 8. Estimate of the SSO volume that reached surface water, a drainage channel, or was not recovered from a storm drain.
 9. Estimate of the SSO volume recovered (if applicable).
 10. Number of SSO appearance point(s).
 11. Description and location of SSO appearance point(s). If a single sanitary sewer system failure results in multiple SSO appearance points, each appearance point must be described.
 12. SSO start date and time.
 13. Date and time the enrollee was notified of, or self-discovered, the SSO.
 14. Estimated operator arrival time.
 15. For spills greater than or equal to 1,000 gallons, the Date and time Cal EMA was called.
 16. For spills greater than or equal to 1,000 gallons, the Cal EMA control number.
- b. **Certified Category 1 SSOs**: At a minimum, the following mandatory information shall be reported for a certified Category 1 SSO report, in addition to all fields in section 8.i.a :
1. Description of SSO destination(s).
 2. SSO end date and time.
 3. SSO causes (mainline blockage, roots, etc.).
 4. SSO failure point (main, lateral, etc.).
 5. Whether or not the spill was associated with a storm event.
 6. Description of spill corrective action, including steps planned or taken to reduce, eliminate, and prevent reoccurrence of the overflow; and a schedule of major milestones for those steps.
 7. Description of spill response activities.

8. Spill response completion date.
 9. Whether or not there is an ongoing investigation, the reasons for the investigation and the expected date of completion.
 10. Whether or not a beach closure occurred or may have occurred as a result of the SSO.
 11. Whether or not health warnings were posted as a result of the SSO.
 12. Name of beach(es) closed and/or impacted. If no beach was impacted, NA must be selected.
 13. Name of surface water(s) impacted.
 14. If water quality samples were collected, identify parameters the water quality samples were analyzed for. If no samples were taken, NA shall be selected.
 15. If water quality samples were taken, identify which regulatory agencies received sample results (if applicable). If no samples were taken, NA shall be selected.
 16. Description of methodology(ies) and type of data relied upon for estimations of the SSO volume discharged and recovered.
 17. SSO Certification: Upon SSO Certification, the CIWQS Online SSO Database will issue a final SSO identification (ID) number.
- c. **Draft Category 2 SSOs**: At a minimum, the following mandatory information shall be reported for a draft Category 2 SSO report:
1. Items 1-14 in section 8.i.a above for Draft Category 1 SSO.
- d. **Certified Category 2 SSOs**: At a minimum, the following mandatory information shall be reported for a certified Category 2 SSO report:
1. Items 1-14 in section 8.i.a above for Draft Category 1 SSO and Items 1-9, and 17 in section 8.i.b above for Certified Category 1 SSO.
- e. **Certified Category 3 SSOs**: At a minimum, the following mandatory information shall be reported for a certified Category 3 SSO report:
1. Items 1-14 in section 8.i.a above for Draft Category 1 SSO and Items 1-6, and 17 in section 8.i.b above for Certified Category 1 SSO.
- ii. **Reporting SSOs to Other Regulatory Agencies**
- These reporting requirements do not preclude an enrollee from reporting SSOs to other regulatory agencies pursuant to State law. In addition, these reporting requirements do not replace other Regional Water Board notification and reporting requirements for SSOs.
- iii. **Collection System Questionnaire**
- The required Collection System Questionnaire (Questionnaire) [see subsection G of the SSS WDRs] provides the Water Boards with site-specific information related to the enrollee's sanitary sewer system. The enrollee shall complete and certify the Questionnaire at least every 12 months to facilitate program implementation, compliance assessment, and enforcement response.
- iv. **SSMP Availability**
- The enrollee shall provide the publicly available internet website address to the CIWQS Online SSO Database where a downloadable copy of the enrollee's approved SSMP, critical supporting documents referenced in the SSMP, and proof of local governing board

approval of the SSMP is posted. If all of the SSMP documentation listed in this subsection is not publicly available on the internet, the enrollee shall comply with the following procedure:

- a. Submit an **electronic** copy of the enrollee's approved SSMP, critical supporting documents referenced in the SSMP, and proof of local governing board approval of the SSMP to the State Water Board, within 30 days of that approval and within 30 days of any subsequent SSMP re-certifications, to the following mailing address:

State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Water Quality
Attn: SSO Program Manager
1001 I Street, 15th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814

D. WATER QUALITY MONITORING REQUIREMENTS:

To comply with subsection D.7(v) of the SSS WDRs, the enrollee shall develop and implement an SSO Water Quality Monitoring Program to assess impacts from SSOs to surface waters in which 50,000 gallons or greater may have been spilled to surface waters. The SSO Water Quality Monitoring Program, shall, at a minimum:

1. Require water quality analyses for nutrients and bacterial indicators to be performed by an accredited or certified laboratory.
2. Require monitoring instruments and devices to implement the SSO Water Quality Monitoring Program to be properly maintained and calibrated, including any records to document maintenance and calibration, as necessary to ensure their continued accuracy.
3. Within 48 hours of initial notification from a complainant, informant, or through self-discover (whichever is earliest) require water quality sampling for, at a minimum, the following constituents:
 - i. Nutrients, including total nitrogen, total phosphorus, and ammonia; and
 - ii. Bacterial indicators, including total and fecal coliform, enterococcus, and e-coli.
4. Allow for additional water quality monitoring should the Water Boards require it for SSO(s) of any size.

E. RECORD KEEPING REQUIREMENTS:

The following records shall be maintained by the enrollee for a minimum of five (5) years and shall be made available for review by the Water Boards during an onsite inspection or through an information request:

1. General Records: The enrollee shall maintain records to document compliance with all provisions of the SSS WDRs and this MRP for each sanitary sewer system owned including any required records generated by an enrollee's sanitary sewer system contractor(s).
2. SSO Records: The enrollee shall maintain records for each SSO event, including but not limited to:

- i. Photographic evidence showing the extent of Category 1 and Category 2 SSO events that support spill volume estimates and whether the spill reached or did not reach surface waters, a drainage channel tributary to a surface water or a municipal separate storm sewer system. In addition, photographic evidence for Category 1 and Category 2 SSOs shall be attached to the SSO report in the CIWQS Online SSO Database prior to certification of the SSO report by the Legally Responsible Official. Photographic evidence shall not be required for any SSO event if circumstances beyond the reasonable control of the enrollee or site conditions (e.g., safety, night conditions) prohibit photographs from being obtained in the field. For situations where photographic evidence could not be obtained, the enrollee must provide a certified statement in the SSO Online Database regarding why photographic evidence could not be obtained. Photographic evidence is strongly recommended but not required for Category 3 SSO events. If photographic evidence is not maintained for Category 3 SSO events, the enrollee shall maintain documentation to substantiate the extent of each Category 3 SSO event, that support spill volume estimates, and support the conclusion that the SSO event did not reach surface waters or that it was fully recovered from a drainage channel tributary to a surface water or from a municipal separate storm sewer system.
 - ii. Complaint records documenting how the enrollee responded to all notifications of possible or actual SSOs, both during and after business hours, including complaints that do not result in SSOs. Each complaint record shall, at a minimum, include the following information:
 - a. Date, time, and method of notification.
 - b. Date and time the complainant or informant first noticed the SSO.
 - c. Narrative description of the complaint, including whether or not the complainant or informant reporting the potential SSO thinks the SSO has reached surface waters, drainage channels or storm drains.
 - d. Name, address, and contact telephone number of the complainant or informant reporting the potential SSO (if not reported anonymously).
 - e. Follow-up return contact information for complainant or informant for each complaint received (if not reported anonymously).
 - f. Final resolution of the complaint.
 - iii. Records documenting steps and/or remedial actions undertaken by enrollee, using all available information, to comply with section D.7 of the SSS WDRs.
 - iv. Records documenting how all estimate(s) of volume(s) discharged and, if applicable, volume(s) recovered were calculated.
3. Records documenting all changes made to the SSMP since its last certification indicating when a subsection(s) of the SSMP was changed and/or updated and who authorized the change or update. These records shall be attached to the SSMP.
 4. Electronic monitoring records relied upon for documenting SSO events and/or estimating the SSO volume discharged, including, but not limited to records from:
 - i. Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) systems;
 - ii. Alarm system(s); and

- iii. Flow monitoring device(s) or other instrument(s) used to estimate wastewater levels, flow rates and/or volumes.

F. CERTIFICATION

1. All information required to be reported into the CIWQS Online SSO Database shall be certified by a person designated as described in subsection J of the SSS WDRs. This designated person is also known as a legally responsible official (LRO). An enrollee may have more than one LRO.
2. Any designated person (LRO) shall be registered with the State Water Board to certify reports in accordance with the CIWQS protocols for reporting.
3. Data Submitter (DS): Any enrollee employee or contractor may enter draft data into the CIWQS Online SSO Database on behalf of the enrollee if authorized by the LRO and registered with the State Water Board. However, only LROs may certify reports in CIWQS.
4. The enrollee shall maintain continuous coverage by an LRO. Any change of a registered LRO or DS (e.g., retired staff), including deactivation or a change to the LRO's or DS's contact information, shall be submitted by the enrollee to the State Water Board within 30 days of the change by calling (866) 792-4977 or emailing help@ciwqs.waterboards.ca.gov.
5. A registered designated person (i.e., an LRO) shall certify all required reports under penalty of perjury laws of the state as stated in the CIWQS Online SSO Database at the time of certification.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned Clerk to the Board does hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of an order amended by the Executive Director of the State Water Board.

Jeanine Townsend
Clerk to the Board



State Water Resources Control Board

To All Wastewater Agencies and Interested Parties,

FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2012-13 WASTEWATER USER CHARGE SURVEY; REQUEST FOR INFORMATION FROM AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLECTION, TRANSPORT, TREATMENT OR DISPOSAL OF WASTEWATER

The State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) is conducting a new survey of sewer rates and connection (capacity) fees. In order to make the process as easy as possible, we have developed an online survey and provided a hard copy of the survey questionnaire to assist in gathering the information necessary to complete the online survey. The online survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please complete the survey at your earliest convenience. The online survey is available via the following link:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/FY12-13DFASURVEY>

If you cannot complete the online survey you may complete a hard copy of the survey questionnaire and return it by mail to the address below or, you may email the completed form to DFA-Survey@waterboards.ca.gov. Please complete the survey no later than April 15, 2013. We hope to publish the survey results by July 1, 2013, so your timely response to the survey will assist us in meeting this timeline.

**Mailing Address: State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Financial Assistance
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100**

After the survey report has been completed, a link to the report will be provided to you via the email provided on the survey questionnaire. If you wish to receive a hard copy, please indicate by stating in the comments field that you need your copy mailed to your agency address.

If you have any questions concerning this letter, the enclosed forms, or wastewater user charge systems, please contact Mr. Joshua Fegurgur at (916)341-5699 or by email at jfegurgur@waterboards.ca.gov. Thank you in advance for completing the questionnaire and participating in this year's survey.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth L. Haven
Deputy Director
Division of Financial Assistance

STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

Fiscal Year (FY) 2012-13 Survey for Municipal Wastewater Collection, Transport, and/or Treatment Agencies

SWRCB USE ONLY	
Survey ID No:	

I. AGENCY INFORMATION

Agency: _____

Zip Code: _____ County: _____

Contact Name: _____ Title: _____

Phone: _____ Email: _____

Address: _____

For future Surveys who should receive this survey:

Contact Name: _____ Title: _____

Phone: _____ Email: _____

Address: _____

II. SERVICE AREA

1. Approximate population receiving wastewater service from your agency: _____

2. If known, what is the estimated Median Household Income (MHI) of your agency's service area:

\$_____ (per year)

(Reference source below; if census data is not available for the service area, explain the basis for estimating MHI)

III. FINANCES

1. Check all that apply:

	Billing Frequency			Rate Structure	
	Monthly	Bimonthly	Annual	Flat Rate	Variable Based on Water Use
Single-family residence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Multiple family (per unit)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mobile homes (per unit)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Industrial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Commercial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Institutional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Please fill in the following table:

	Number of sewer accounts	FY 2012-13 Wastewater User Fee (\$): If variable please specify the average	Connection (or capacity) fees: If variable please specify the average
Single-family residence			
Multiple family (per unit)			
Mobile homes (per unit)			
Industrial			
Commercial			
Institutional			

3. Sources of revenue (check all that apply; and, if available, please provide the approximate percentage of total revenue provided by each of the following sources):

- Sewer service charge _____% Sewer connection fees _____% Industrial waste fees _____%
 Ad valorem (property) taxes _____% Other _____% (describe) _____

4. Is loading considered when setting rates (if yes, please check all loading types that apply)? Yes No

- Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) Suspended Solids (SS)
 Other, please specify: _____

5. Wastewater debt service (bonds, loans, Certificate of Participation, etc.) is included in (check all that apply):

- The wastewater user fee
 Other wastewater-related charges to the customer (i.e., property taxes)
 Neither of the above, the agency has no debt

6. Are connection fees used for anything other than capital expansion (or replacement)? Yes No

7. a. Agency's FY 2012-13 wastewater operation and maintenance budget is: \$ _____

b. Agency's FY 2012-13 wastewater debt service budget is: \$ _____

c. Agency's FY 2012-13 wastewater capital expenditure budget is: \$ _____

IV. AGENCY ROLE/RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Wastewater facilities your agency is responsible for (check all that apply):

- Collection Interceptor Treatment Disposal

2. Do you have a pre-treatment program? Yes No

3. a. Current average dry weather flow (ADWF) is: _____ mgd (million gallons per day)

b. Design (or contractual) capacity is: _____ mgd

4. If your agency is responsible for onsite septic system maintenance please check here .

If onsite septic system maintenance is your agency's only responsibility, please skip to Section VI.

5. If your agency is not responsible for treatment, please list the agency that is then skip to Section VI:

V. WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES

1. Please list the name(s) and location(s) of the treatment facilities your agency is responsible for:

2. The treatment facilities consist of or include the following components or processes (check all that apply):

- Community Septic System
 Septic Tank Effluent Pump (STEP) System
 Ponds and/or Lagoon System
 Extended Aeration

Primary Treatment:

- Comminutor/Grinder Screening Scum and/or Grit Removal Sedimentation Tank
 Other, please explain: _____

Secondary Treatment:

- Suspended Growth/Activated Sludge (i.e., Sequencing Batch Reactor, Membrane Bioreactor, etc.)
- Attached Growth (i.e., Trickling Filter, Biotower, Rotating Biological Contactor, etc.)
- Other, please explain: _____

Disinfection:

- Chlorine Ozone Ultraviolet Light Other, please explain: _____

Tertiary Treatment:

- Filtration, please specify filtration type: _____

Sludge Handling:

- Anaerobic Digestion Dewatering Thickening Compost Disposal/Landfill

Other Processes:

- Other, please explain: _____

3. Does treatment facility process include Nutrient Removal? Yes No

4. If your agency is not responsible for wastewater discharge, please list the agency that is then skip to Section VI:

5. Discharge is regulated under (please check all that apply, and write the order number(s) in the blank below):

- Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) Order No. _____
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit NPDES No. _____
- Both WDRs and NPDES Permit (i.e. discharge to land w/seasonal discharge to surface water)
Order No. _____ NPDES No. _____

VI. FUTURE NEEDS

1. Does your agency have an electronic capital improvement plan available on the internet? Yes No

If yes, please provide the website address: _____

VII. COMMENTS

1. Please provide comments in the space provided below:

Tri-TAC Land Committee Key Issue Summary

(as of April 2, 2013)

Item No.	Description	Issues for POTWs	Meeting Notes/Updates	Lead(s)	Next Steps	Due Date		
Goal: Support Long-term Viability of Land Application Options								
1	Local County Ordinances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential loss of existing and future land application practices. ▪ Increased biosolids management costs (e.g., longer hauling distances, more expensive alternative practices). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Imperial: Advocacy efforts to challenge ordinance ban on biosolids is placed on hold until a final decision on Kern County Measure-E case is made. ▪ San Luis Obispo: On 3/12/13, the Board of Supervisors (BOS) unanimously approved the extension of the existing interim biosolids ordinance until March 2017 as requested by County staff and supported by wastewater agencies and CASA. By extending the interim ordinance until 2017, the County is provided time to review the science and the issues, and consult with others, while drafting a new ordinance. The BOS committed to providing funding as they go through their budget process to allow the Department of Health the ability to perform due diligence as they work on a new ordinance. During public testimony, a statement was made that Kellogg ceased using biosolids for producing compost. ▪ Solano: The Board of Supervisors would like a court decision as to whether Solano's Measure-E is moot under AB 845. ▪ AB 845 (Ma), Solid Waste Place of Origin: Signed by Governor. ▪ Kern (Measure E): On 3/12/13, the California Court of Appeal for the Fifth Appellate District granted the requests of CASA, its co-Plaintiffs and several amici to publish its opinion affirming the preliminary injunction against the Kern County ordinance banning the land application of biosolids (Measure E). As a result, other courts and parties may now cite to and rely upon the opinion in other cases going forward. Kern has recently indicated that it intends to file a petition for review of the opinion by the California Supreme Court, which would be due on 4/22/13. 	G. Kester D. Gilbert L. Baroldi				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Imperial 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ San Luis Obispo: Ordinance placing restrictions on Class B biosolids land application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Imperial: No updates. ▪ San Luis Obispo: Attend Board of Supervisor meeting.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Solano Ordinance: Ordinance requires agencies to divert a portion of biosolids to Class A or B2E facility by 2012; annual progress reporting. ▪ Solano Measure E (1984): This measure restricts waste imported from other counties and is currently in litigation. If upheld and enforced, 90% of imported waste (up to 820,000 tpy) would be banned. 							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ AB 845, Ma, Solid Waste Place of Origin – This bill prohibits an ordinance enacted by a city or county from otherwise restricting or limiting the importation of solid waste into a privately-owned solid waste facility in that city or county based on place of origin. ▪ Kern (Measure E): A voter-approved ordinance that would prevent land application of biosolids in unincorporated parts of the county. A legal challenge was brought in state court in Jan 2011 after dismissal of a federal appeal by the 9th Circuit, in Nov 2010. A Preliminary Injunction (PI) was granted by Tulare County Judge Hicks in Jun 2011. 							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kern (Measure E): Continue to track appeal of PI.
2	Local Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential loss of existing and future land application practices. ▪ Increased biosolids management costs (e.g., longer hauling distances, more expensive alternative practices). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ City of Menifee: After listening to testimony from county and environmental experts, Menifee City Council members expressed satisfaction that the community does not face health dangers from any presence of biosolids. David Crohn, an associate professor of environmental science at UCR, emphasized that proper land application biosolids for farm fertilizing would not pose a health risk. 	L. Baroldi/ T. Meregillano				
Goal: Sustain and Develop Biosolids Management Options with Focus on Sustainability								
3	FOG/Food Waste Digestion Program Regulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that existing and future programs are regulated under NPDES permit framework by Water Boards rather than 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CASA and Tri-TAC member agencies continue to work with CalRecycle and SWRCB to develop language to exempt POTWs from processing/storage permits. CalRecycle is reviewing the proposed 	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to work with CalRecycle SWRCB staff to incorporate POTW exclusionary language. 			

Tri-TAC Land Committee Key Issue Summary

(cont'd)

Item No.	Description	Issues for POTWs	Meeting Notes/Updates	Lead(s)	Next Steps	Due Date
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CalRecycle vs. State/Regional Board oversight 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> under SW regulations by CalRecycle. ▪ Review and comment on draft/proposed regulations that may impact existing and planned programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> draft exemption language and will be scheduling several informal workshops with interested parties to discuss issues. ▪ CalRecycle held a workshop to discuss exemption language on 3/19/13. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CalRecycle is expected to issue exclusionary language for public comment. 	
4	<p>CalRecycle 75% Recycling, Composting or Source Reduction of Solid Waste by 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>AB 323 (Chesbro)</u>: Solid Waste Recycling – Diversion of Green Material: No later than 1/1/20, the use of green material, as ADC or alternative intermediate cover, does not constitute diversion through recycling and shall be considered disposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May prohibit agencies from claiming recycling credits for utilizing biosolids as an alternative daily cover (ADC) for landfills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CASA/Tri-TAC members to work with CalRecycle on ADC issue. ▪ CASA to track and monitor. 	G. Kester G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ G. Kester to provide an update on Carroll Mortensen's presentation at the CASA conference. 	
5	<p>Rendering Facility Regulations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ California Department of Food & Agriculture (CDFA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that existing and planned FOG acceptance programs are not subject to rendering facility permitting requirements by CDFA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CDFA has been extremely responsive to POTW comments and has provided an exemption for POTWs accepting FOG. CDFA provided flexibility for POTWs with regard to how to specifically quantify FOG when received. Initially, CDFA required that FOG be weighed by using a certified scale or flowmeter; however, it accepted the industry practice of using the volume of the tanker as the amount received. ▪ This regulation has not yet been adopted but is anticipated soon. ▪ CDFA is preparing for a second phase of regulatory development pertaining to POTWs that accept slaughter house waste. Early indication is that they will be using the same exemption language used for FOG and food waste. 	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support CDFA regulations ▪ G. Kester to follow up with CDFA regarding slaughter house exemption. 	
6	<p>Biosolids Solid Waste Definition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CISWI rules could have applied to POTWs utilizing methane in an internal combustion (IC) engine. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EPA released a clarification letter that it did not intend to define methane transported in a pipe for combustion in an IC engine as a solid waste. 	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure clarification letter is widely distributed. 	
7	<p>FDA – Proposed Food Safety Rule</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed rule may spur potential controversy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On 1/16/13, FDA published (in the Federal Register) proposed rules for the handling, storage, and safety of produce in the U.S. The use of biosolids is mentioned in the proposed rule; use is permissible as long as it is in compliance with EPA regulations (CFR503). B. Bastian and B. Brobst (EPA staff) have offered their services in providing responses to comments received. Comments are due 5/16/13. 	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support proposed rule. ▪ G. Kester reviewing proposed regulations. 	
8	<p>EPA Disinvestment in Biosolids</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May reduce EPA's oversight on Biosolids Management Programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EPA has reconsidered its original intent to disinvest in biosolids program oversight. EPA is proposing to hire two full-time personnel in Region 7 who will be handling all biosolids compliance issues and may oversee annual report review. ▪ G. Kester discussed disinvestment issues with EPA in D.C. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support EPA staffing in Region 7. 	
9	<p>WEF – NBP Update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May impact EMS Certification Program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The NBP has been moved under the WEF Water Science & Engineering Center. WEF hired a new Biosolids Program Manager in February. Despite the reorganization, WEF intends to support the EMS certification program. ▪ Ned Beecher was hired to support the EMS certification program. 	G.Kester/ V. De Lange	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to track and monitor. 	
10	<p>Legislation Congressman Serrano – Labeling Bill</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May impact biosolids land application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduced on 1/4/13, H.R. 213 Serrano - A bill to amend the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the egg, meat, and poultry inspection laws to ensure that consumers receive notification regarding food products produced from crops, livestock, or poultry raised on land on which sewage sludge was applied. 	L. Baroldi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to track and monitor. 	

Tri-TAC Land Committee Key Issue Summary

(cont'd)

Item No.	Description	Issues for POTWs	Meeting Notes/Updates	Lead(s)	Next Steps	Due Date
11	EPA Maximum Available Control Technology (MACT) Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to comply with new regulations is currently uncertain. NACWA and NRDC filed a request for reconsideration and advance notice of possible litigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no real change in the rule, but there is some easing of the standard as it relates to biosolids energy projects that do not want to classify biosolids as a solid waste under the legitimacy criteria (>5000 btu, considered a valuable commodity, and meet a certain contaminant level). Agencies can appeal to EPA that they have satisfied the criteria. A WEF Webinar to discuss MACT standards will be held on 4/8/13. 	G. Kester/L. Baroldi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to track and monitor litigation if filed. 	
12	Arsenic Cancer Slope Factor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Feb 2010, EPA proposed a 17-fold increase in the cancer slope factor for inorganic arsenic based on questionable interpretations of available data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If adopted, the new cancer slope factor would likely impact recycled water, effluent and biosolids limits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Academy of Sciences is reviewing the process in which EPA used to develop the arsenic slope factors (IRIS) and the research that supported the slope factor. 	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to track, monitor, and comment as efforts proceed. 	
13	South Coast AQMD Rule 1110.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon adoption in 2008, the rule included a requirement that a technology assessment (TA) be completed by 7/1/10 to demonstrate that commercially-available technologies exist to cost effectively allow compliance with NOx, VOC, and CO limits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emission limits would jeopardize ability of IC engines to utilize methane, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2/7/13 Meeting – SCAQMD – Biogas Impacts on Rule 1110.2 There is a need to work with power companies and negotiate a fair process to accept biogas. 	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiate conversation with power companies on a fair process to accept biogas. 	
Goal: Share Information						
14	Regional Facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Bay Area Agencies</u>: A coalition of 18+ agencies is developing a regional biosolids management facility. <u>Southern CA & Central Valley</u>: Biosolids projects and facilities in Southern and Central Valley regions. <u>Inland Empire Regional Composting Facility (IERCF)</u>: Indoor composting facility located in Rancho Cucamonga, owned by LACSD/IEUA. <u>Westlake Farms</u>: Covered ASP composting facility located in Kings County, CA developed by LACSD. <u>Terminal Island</u>: The City of Los Angeles and its partners operate the Terminal Island Renewable Energy (TIRE) biosolids injection project, which is designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and create renewable energy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain awareness of collaborative efforts to develop regional biosolids management facilities. Understand challenges and lessons learned from new facilities in startup or operation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Bay Area Agencies</u>: Bay Area Biosolids to Energy: RFP currently being developed and is scheduled to be released this summer. A pilot project with Lawrence Livermore is being planned. <u>Southern CA & Central Valley</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>OCS</u>: A temporary halt on hauling biosolids to the Prima Deshecha Landfill. Working with vendor on hauling disposal logistics. <u>Encina Wastewater Authority (EWA)</u>: EWA will hit its Biosolids Management Plan's 5-year diversification goal (2,300 tons sold to Tier II markets) this month (one year early). EWA conducted a pyrolysis trial on PureGreen pellets. The results were very positive. EWA Biosolids Executive team is continuing negotiations with Pharmgrade for a long term partnership/commitment. K-mart retail deal is still dealing with logistics but progress is being made. Mellano Flowers & Co has taken 150,000 lbs of PureGreen this year and is a major supplier for the Rose Parade in Pasadena. EWA initial research trials at the Center for Agricultural & Horticultural Research showed that PureGreen worked extremely well for Roses. <u>IERCF</u>: Facility continues to operate within its permitted capacity. Modifications to material conveyance are currently in design. Construction is anticipated for summer 2012 and completion in 2013. <u>Westlake Farms</u>: Facility is currently in construction with an anticipated startup date in 2013. <u>Terminal Island</u>: The City of Los Angeles approved a Subsequent Negative Declaration for the TIRE biosolids injection project, which addresses project changes. The current project is operating under an existing Underground Injection (UIC) permit, pending approval of a new UIC permit application that was submitted to EPA in Aug 2011. 	B. Jones T. Merigillano M. Bao D. Gilbert B. Gillette	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to provide regional biosolids management updates. 	

Tri-TAC Land Committee Key Issue Summary

(cont'd)

Item No.	Description	Issues for POTWs	Meeting Notes/Updates	Lead(s)	Next Steps	Due Date
15	Regional Associations Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Foster partnerships between regional associations by sharing info regarding new issues of concern, lessons learned, project updates, training and educational programs, and public outreach efforts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SCAP: Green Acres meeting - City of L.A. release a Notice of Preparation for a DEIR regarding their Green Acres project required by a long standing Court Order. ▪ BACWA: Joint meetings held w/Tri-TAC meetings in San Leandro. ▪ CVCWA: Joint meetings held w/Tri-TAC meetings in Sacramento. ▪ CWEA: 2013 Annual Conference (Palm Springs) April 2013 	M. Bao V. De Lange B. Gillette G. Kester J. Hay		
16	Conferences/Webinars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stay abreast of upcoming conferences, local seminars, and webinars. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WEF MACT Standards Webinar ▪ CWEA April 16-19, 2013 – Palm Springs 	All		
Goal: Address Emerging Issues of Concern						
17	Pyrethroids <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pyrethroid Working Group (PWG) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential impacts (positive/negative) to existing programs, public perceptions. ▪ May provide opportunities for direct participation in research/studies to address local concerns/issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Survey is progressing along having completed all three phases of sampling. Results will be shared shortly. 	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to work with PWG, DPR, U.S. EPA, and others to make the survey possible. Will need to solicit voluntary survey participation from 20 to 30 POTWs. 	
18	Trace Organics Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recognized need to fill data gaps to provide U.S. EPA data to conduct credible risk assessment on trace organics that may be present at low concentrations in biosolids. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential impacts (positive/negative) to existing programs, public perceptions. ▪ May provide opportunities for direct participation in research/studies to address local concerns/issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Phase 2 report is complete and set for release by early summer. Phase 2 examined unpublished data (largely from manufacturers) to help fill data gaps for 62 constituents identified by U.S. EPA as high priority. Data was found for 29 of them. 	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phase 3 will be scoped with an RFP developed by this fall. Will need to solicit funding from across the country, because this phase will involve actual research. 	
19	Climate Change Legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure development of strategic approach to climate change issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CWCCG is focused on resolving the pricing structure approach to renewable feed-in-tariffs with the CPUC. An alternative proposal has been submitted (waiting for response from CPUC). 	G. Kester Z. Erdal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meet with the CPUC to discuss the pricing structure approach to feed-in-tariffs. 	
Goal: Maintain Awareness of Key Research Initiatives						
20	Biosolids Research WEF Biogas Study: Create a robust, consensus data set regarding the current and potential production of biogas from anaerobic digestion at WWTPs in the U.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential impacts (positive/negative) to existing programs, public perceptions. ▪ May provide opportunities for direct participation in research/studies to address local concerns/issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WEF Biogas Study: Project team has distributed a data survey and is currently incorporating this information into a database. 	G. Kester		

Tri-TAC Water Committee Key Issue Summary

(as of
April 03, 2012)

Item No.	Description	Issues for POTWs	Meeting Notes/Updates	Links	Lead(s)	Next Steps	Due Date
1	<p>Whole Effluent Toxicity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State is developing a new Toxicity Policy that will dictate how toxicity is reported and enforced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft State Toxicity Policy issued in 2011 would establish/ require: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> numeric limits for chronic toxicity use of Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) as statistical method to determine toxicity (concerns it will lead to more false positive results); use of marine organisms in >1,000 mg/L salinity waters which affects current use of flow-through testing for acute-toxicity single test failure triggers violation and accelerated monitoring RWQCB discretion on inclusion of acute toxicity in permits and whether to allow for dilution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Board held a workshop late August. Stakeholders thought that the proposed policy would initiate too many changes at once. Instead, it might be easier to breakdown the changes into phases, thus reducing impacts on stakeholders. The phasing logistics still need to be discussed and other board members need to be introduced to the idea. The initial ideas on phasing would focus on gathering a data set with the new TST without having penalties associated with the results. Stakeholders could use this data to determine the real effect of the TST in the regulatory setting. We should define the successful criteria needed to move from phase 1 to phase 2. Running the “test” of phase 1 would be expensive for POTWs, and we may want to consider running phase 1 test on POTWs over a certain size. We need to address the potential issue of anti-backsliding and the differences between acute testing versus chronic testing. Tri-TAC voiced concern with uncertainty in the WET Policy and SB plans to address our concerns to a certain degree. Storm Water representatives weren’t interested in our proposed phasing approach. 	<p>State Board Page</p>	<p>Bobbi Larson, Phil Markle</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work group is looking at numeric water quality standard impacts on discharges to erroneously (based on false positive tests) listed 303(d) water bodies. We may have to write a proposal for phasing the policy and present it to the Board at the hearing. Jon recommended that our proposal be specific on the phasing—it may take a lot of work to create this document. We should create a document that highlights the comments received in the comment letters and how the phased approach would address those comments (this would explain why the phasing approach is the best way to move forward.) We need to reach out to POTWs to see if they are OK with our proposal. 	
2	<p>Recycled Water Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Water Board is modifying the monitoring requirements for CECs in the policy to implement the Expert Panel’s recommendations. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Board revised the water monitoring requirements for recycled water. Comments are due in July on the most recent draft. State Water Board is amending the recycled water policy to address monitoring for CECs. An expert panel informed the Board and it seems that they will focus on ground water recharge and not irrigation uses of the recycled water. It seems that the policy on CECs is getting close to closure and a majority of our concerns are being addressed. 		<p>Bobbi Larson</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work on draft comment letter (possibly joint letter with other associations) 	
3	<p>Nutrient Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This effort is part of a statewide initiative, supported by the U.S. EPA Region IX and the SWRCB, to establish numeric water quality standards, expressed as NNEs, for State Waters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any POTW that discharges to inland surface water will be affected under the policy. Adoption of a statewide approach to nutrient control will affect NPDES permitting, 303(d) listings, and TMDL development. Possible outcomes associated with the policy include stringent numeric endpoints for total nitrogen and phosphorus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small group of stakeholders met with the State Board to discuss possible approaches to the statewide nutrient policy. Stakeholders advocated for a policy that is based in science, doesn’t have predetermined low limits, and an open process. The QUAL-2 model will likely result in very low nutrient numbers that are very conservative and unlikely to be regularly attainable by POTWs. . Restarting process for the SF Bay, led by R2. Will look at relationship between nutrient concentrations and harmful algal blooms. Will also look at DO, which is becoming increasingly important. Nutrient conference is being proposed for SFBay 		<p>Tom Grouvhog</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a strategy Possibly investigate how the State of Utah (or other states) have addressed the nutrient standard changes. 	

Tri-TAC Water Committee Key Issue Summary
(cont'd)

DRAFT

Item No.	Description	Issues for POTWs	Meeting Notes/Updates	Links	Lead(s)	Next Steps	Due Date
			estuary.				
4	CECs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pharmaceuticals and other trace constituents of emerging concern (CECs) are ubiquitous in wastewater at low concentrations and have unknown effects on aquatic organism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State Board, along with Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP), has been working with the Ecosystems Advisory Panel to determine next regulatory steps. The panel will recommend monitoring wastewater for CECs, and possibly bioanalytical assays to test for toxic effects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Water Board is trying to decide how to implement the Ecosystem Advisory Panel report on CECs. The panel created an initial list of CECs for monitoring. However, a study needs to be done to evaluate the different types of receiving water and treatment types. There are options to pay for this study: SWAMP surcharges could increase in NPDES permit fees, state board could direct certain POTWs to pay for the study, the state board could not do the study, or stakeholders could volunteer to participate and fund the study. WERF may be a source of funding if stakeholders decide to manage the study. Jon Bishop will likely recommend that the Board accept our recommendation that POTWs initiate studies on their own accord. CECs may be an important topic for Board Member Felicia Marcus. 	Draft Report	Chris Stacklin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wait for final report and await Determine our preference for how this study should be conducted and funded. 	
5	Statewide Mercury Policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy will likely incorporate methylmercury objectives being developed along with control plans for mercury impaired waterbodies Mercury Control Program for Reservoirs will be developed first and will address all mercury impaired reservoirs included on the 2010 303(d) list Future elements of the policy could include control programs for future impaired reservoirs, rivers/creeks/streams/enclosed bays/coastal bays/estuaries/lagoons impaired by mercury, NPDES permitted sources, and nonpoint sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any wastewater that discharges to a mercury-impaired waterbody will eventually be included under the policy The State Board is considering ways to harmonize efforts with existing TMDLs If control program for NPDES permitted sources is developed implementation measures such as mercury-specific pollution prevention, installation of amalgam separators for dental offices, and improving wastewater treatment may be required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Board will be holding CEQA Scoping Meetings: Sacramento- March 5, Oakland- March 6, Redding- March 8, and Riverside- March 12 Tri-TAC provided comments urging them to harmonize with existing TMDLs and link implementation to impairment Existing TMDLs will likely be grandfathered in 	State Board Mercury Page	Tom Grovhoug	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to provide input at public meetings and submit comments 	
6	Methylmercury Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Board is developing methylmercury fish tissue objective The scientific underpinnings for the criteria development are still under consideration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If point source dischargers cannot comply with criteria, then an implementation strategy would be included in permits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Board is restarting this effort continuing from the alternatives developed in 2006. The project will move in parallel with the Statewide Mercury Policy The objectives will likely be a part of the final Statewide Mercury Policy 	State Board Mercury Page	Tom Grovhoug	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working with State Water Board and to iron out issues 	
7	Biological Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State Board is developing a framework to develop biological objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If biological impairment is found to be caused by a pollutant, it could impact how NPDES permits are written and permit limits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current evaluation will focus on invertebrates but they may add algae criteria in the future. Tri-TAC sent a letter in February to State Board with 	State Board Biological Objectives Page	Phil Markle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalized BO documents were not available at the time of the 	

Tri-TAC Water Committee Key Issue Summary
(cont'd)

DRAFT

Item No.	Description	Issues for POTWs	Meeting Notes/Updates	Links	Lead(s)	Next Steps	Due Date
	(biocriteria) that assign narrative or numeric benchmarks to protect aquatic life beneficial uses.		<p>comments on the Scientific Basis for development of Biological Objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Bishop talked to CVCWA about focusing comments on the “no project” alternative as the way to proceed with this policy. If we can comment that there are no “reference” streams in certain regions, we might show that this idea won’t work. • Based on conversations with the regulators, it seems that their intent is to protect high quality streams. If this is the objective, we should try to steer the BO towards that goal. • Central Valley ecoregion has almost no area that can be considered “reference” and south coast has very little, so they need way to deal with this. Highly modified channels are also a problem. • Science Advisory Panel believes they can apply a statistical method to develop biological objectives in these areas. • Everyone will have to prevent degradation of the stream that has no reference condition. 			<p>February comment letter, so Tri-TAC needs to monitor the BO process to see when formal documents are available for review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tri-TAC should form a workgroup – SRCSD will be involved, Dan Jackson from EBMUD. 	
8	<p>SSS WDR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Monitoring and Reporting Program for the SSS WDR is being revised by the State Board 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Water Board held a public workshop on January 24, 2012 to discuss the SSS WDR next steps. They have indicated that the next draft will contain the following revisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Removed some reporting requirements ○ Remove mandatory reporting of Private Lateral Spills, and require enrollees to keep internal records of them • State Board is proposing updates to the MRP in lieu of updating the entire WDR. • Require private collection systems that discharge to private treatment works to enroll, but do not require private collection systems tributary to other sanitary sewer systems to enroll 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A small group of stakeholders held meetings with the State Board to discuss the changes to the MRP. The group is making progress towards a finalized MRP. • The new MRP will likely have three categories of SSOs.State Board wants to have the updated MRP finalized by May 2013. 	Draft SSS WDR	Bobbi Larson, Monica Oakley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder group submitted their latest MRP proposal to the State Board on March 6, 2013. We are waiting to hear back from their staff. 	

Tri-TAC Water Committee Key Issue Summary
(cont'd)

DRAFT

Item No.	Description	Issues for POTWs	Meeting Notes/Updates	Links	Lead(s)	Next Steps	Due Date
9	<p>Delta Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standing topic to discuss issues in the Delta that can have statewide impact. • Delta plan is moving forward, 6th draft should be out in next week. Key issues is that water quality authority should reside with State and Regional Board • Notice that longfin smelt is ESA smelt. Threat is low flow in SF Bay estuary and ammonia. • State Board is updating Bay Delta Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ammonia discharged from POTWs has been suggested to be disrupting the food-web, and ultimately contributing to the decline of pelagic fish populations in the Bay-Delta estuary • This rationale was used by the Central Valley RWQCB to support requiring Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District to upgrade to nitrification, at an estimated cost of \$800 million • Various studies to resolve uncertainties related to the impacts of ammonia are underway • SRSD has very tight pathogen limits that can't be met by disinfection that may be precedent setting for other POTWs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Agencies submitted comments on draft permits for CCCSD and Vallejo, citing ammonia research and requesting nitrification • In permit adopted Feb 2012, Regional Board required CCCSD to perform nutrient studies • The Delta Stewardship Council released the final draft of the Delta Plan in September 2012. • State Water Board is holding a hearing on the potential changes to San Joaquin River flows and Southern Delta WQ on March 20 and 21. 		Terrie Mitchell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to track issues as they emerge and act on those with state-wide significance 	
10	<p>Ocean Plan Amendment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A California Ocean Plan amendment is proposed to address designation of, and implementation provisions for, State Water Quality Protection Areas, including both ASBS and non-ASBS (called "General Protection") SWQPAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Resolution specified that no new limiting conditions or prohibitions are to be imposed on wastewater outfalls as a result of a SWQCB-General Protection or as a result of non-ASBS SWQPAs themselves. • The Resolution stated that no conditions are to be included in permits that require the removal or relocation of municipal wastewater outfalls, in recognition of the public service and investment that these facilities provide. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment letter submitted and Tri-TAC testified at State Water Board hearing • The State Board seems to recognize the importance of the existing sewer infrastructure and the potential impacts of Ocean Plan changes. • State Board may adopt the amendment at the second October board meeting. • California Ocean Plan amendment specifies that no new regulatory requirements will be imposed on existing POTW outfalls • The State Board indicated that they won't write NPDES permit requirements based only on the MPAs. Does this mean that they can find other reasons to write limits in the permit to address MPA issues? 		Sharon Green	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Await for response to comments from State Water Board 	
11	<p>EPA Ammonia Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA is in process of updating the current WQC for ammonia to incorporate new data and sensitive freshwater mussel ammonia toxicity data. This latest update is intended to eventually replace their current WQC for freshwater (marine criteria are unaffected by this update) and will result in much lower WQC than the previous update. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a 2009 update, EPA proposed a single national criterion for ammonia assuming freshwater mussels are present • The mussels present assumption results in extremely low objectives and is not appropriate for the majority of CA waters where freshwater mussels are not present 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA's request for Scientific Views "closed" in April 2010, final adoption of the criteria has not been proposed at this time. 		Tom Grouvhog/ Phil Markle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Track and provide comments when necessary 	
12	<p>EPA Water Quality Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA is proposing changes to the water quality criteria regulations regarding administrator determinations, attainable uses, triennial reviews, compliance schedules, antidegradation, and variances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key elements likely to be included in the regulation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Antidegradation- States must adopt binding anti degradation requirements and minimum implementation methods • Attainable uses- when use is not attainable, State must specify next highest attainable use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The regulation is being reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget and will be released in Spring 2012 for comment. 		Shannon Bishop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Track and provide comments when necessary • Work with NACWA on comments 	

Tri-TAC Water Committee Key Issue Summary
(cont'd)

DRAFT

Item No.	Description	Issues for POTWs	Meeting Notes/Updates	Links	Lead(s)	Next Steps	Due Date
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Triennial review- current criteria should be examined • Variance- requirements will be specified 					
13	EPA Integrated Permitting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA effort to integrate municipal stormwater and wastewater plans in relation to the CWA. The integrated planning process will potentially identify efficiencies in implementing overlapping and competing requirements that arise from separate wastewater and stormwater projects, including capital investments and operation and maintenance requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The integrated permitting approach could be beneficial for POTWs because it is intended to help municipalities meet their CWA obligations by optimizing their infrastructure improvement investments through the appropriate sequencing of work. • Is there a way to harmonize with Porter Cologne in California? • EPA integrated permitting document came out as a draft. This is driven by urban mayors. There wasn't a lot of substance, although one issue raised was removing 5-yr permit cycle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA held several listening session in January and February 2012 and is developing a draft framework document to describe the integrated planning concept, likely to be released in Spring 2012 • Had a call to set up work group to come up with list of issues that should be considered 		Ben Horenstein/ Jackie Kepke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue tracking this effort along with NACWA • Review draft framework document when released 	
14	Electronic Reporting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agencies are now required to electronically report compliance data to their regional boards via CIWQS • State Board is working on eSMR 2.5 that will allow for electronic submittal of EPA required self-monitoring data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Errors are often propagated when the data are made public, and they are also often presented out of context (e.g. presenting exceedences as violations) • Errors are difficult to correct • Finalization of eSMR 2.5 will require a different data file type to be submitted electronically 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Board is beta-testing eSMR 2.5 • Full implementation likely required by Summer 2012 • Once released, State Board will provide training for the new program 		Shannon Bishop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with State Water Board to beta test system • Participate in State Board CIWQS User Group 	
15	EPA Dental Amalgam <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October 26, 2011 - EPA released its 2010 Effluent Guidelines Program Plan announcing its intent to adopt guidelines on the use of dental amalgam by dentists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agencies are concerned that dentists' offices will be regulated as part of POTWs' pretreatment program • EPA will likely create a new category so that dentists will not be categorized as SIUs • They may also grandfather in existing regional dental amalgam programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA had planned to propose a rule in 2011 and finalize in 2012, but they appear to be behind schedule. Expect to hear something in the fall. • EPA will likely create a new category so that dentists will not be categorized as SIUs • They may also grandfather in existing regional dental amalgam programs 		Tim Potter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment on draft guidelines when they are released 	
16	Pesticides <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-media issue • Most pesticides, including pyrethroids, are currently unregulated in wastewater other than by narrative toxicity standards. Some pesticides are toxic to sensitive organisms at extremely low concentrations. • Nanoparticles and some biocides have potential to interfere with biological treatment processes • Some pesticides like triclosan, fipronil, and nanosilver are considered CECs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the future, POTWs could be regulated for pyrethroids, which they can't control and are toxic to sensitive organisms at very low levels. Engagement at this stage could steer regulators to adopt strategies favoring source control • Other pesticides may contribute to levels of regulated pollutants (e.g., copper, silver), cause or contribute to effluent toxicity, interfere with biosolids management options, challenge water recycling programs, or cause process interference. • POTWs are participating in a long-term joint program with stormwater and the water boards to work cooperatively with pesticide regulators to use their pesticide regulatory authorities prevent pesticide-related POTW compliance and operational problems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pesticide Work Group is continuing to work with pyrethroid manufacturers and DPR toward conducting a statewide survey of pyrethroids in POTW influent, effluent, and biosolids. 		Pesticide Work Group: Greg Kester, Linda Dorn, Preeti Ghuman, Phil Markle, Dave Snyder, Melody LaBella, Karin North, Kelly Moran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment on upcoming EPA review work plans for two pyrethroids (Resmethrin, Prallethrin). 	

Tri-TAC Water Committee Key Issue Summary
(cont'd)

DRAFT

Item No.	Description	Issues for POTWs	Meeting Notes/Updates	Links	Lead(s)	Next Steps	Due Date
17	<p>DTSC Safer Consumer Products Regulation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Department of Toxic Substances control is developing new regulations that will allow chemicals to be controlled without recourse to the legislature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This could be an important tool for POTWs to prevent the discharge of toxic substances to their influent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BAPPG commented on DTSC's draft Green Chemistry regulations in December 30, 2011, and Tri-TAC and CASA issued letter of support for these comments Green Chemistry workshop was held in early September and comments are due by October 11th. 	Draft DTSC Regulations	Karin North, Melody LaBella, Kelly Moran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment on Green Chemistry regulations due on October 11th. BACWA will write letter and Tri-TAC may sign on the letter if warranted. 	