



**The November 14, 2013 meeting will be a Conference Call Only.**

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

**An Outlook Invitation will be sent out separately from Molly Ranes at [mranes@casaweb.org](mailto: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

**Mark Your Calendars for the Next Tri-TAC Meeting:**

- **December 12, 2013 9:30 – 12:30 – Tri-TAC Meeting in Sacramento**



## TRI-TAC MEETING

CONFERENCE CALL ONLY

**THURSDAY, November 14, 2013**

**9:30 A.M. – 12:00 P.M.**

### GENERAL MEETING

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

**An Outlook Invitation will be sent out separately from Molly Ranes at [mranes@casaweb.org](mailto: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. 6)
2. Water Committee Agenda (P. 7)
3. Committee Issue Summaries (P. 11 & 15)

TRI-TAC ATTENDANCE ROSTER  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2013  
ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS AND INTERESTED PARTIES WERE PRESENT:

Layne Baroldi – Synagro  
Christina Becerra-Jones – City of LA  
Deirdre Bingman - OCSD  
Dindo Carrillo – OCSD  
Paul Cobian – City of LA  
Matt Copeland – LACSD  
Doug Edwards – Eastern Municipal  
Edward Filadelfia – Riverside Regional Water Quality Control Plant  
Brennan Flahive – SOCWA  
Rebecca Franklin – City of San Bernadino  
Phil Friess – LACSD  
Diane Gilbert Jones – City of LA  
Bob Gilette – Carollo  
Sharon Green – LACSD  
Rashi Gupta – SCAP/Carollo  
Bobby Gustafson – San Bernadino Water  
Lisa Haney – OCSD  
Eric Have, Encinca Wastewater Authority  
John Hay – Black & Veatch  
Al Javier – Eastern Municipal  
Jackie Kepke – EBMUD  
Greg Kester, CASA  
Lindy Lewis – Irvine Ranch Water District  
Adam Link -CASA  
Jason Lofton, SRCSD  
Phil Markle - LACSD  
Tom Meregillano, OCSD  
Terrie Mitchell, SRCSD  
Mitchell Mysliwec, LWA  
John Pastore – SCAP  
Lisa Rothbart – OCSD  
Brian Voss - Synagro  
Simon Watson – Brown & Caldwell

**TRI-TAC LOCATIONS & 2013 SCHEDULE**  
(EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 12, 2013)

TRI-TAC MEETING DATE <sup>1</sup>	LOCATION/HOTEL	COMMENTS
JANUARY 10, 2013	Conference Call	CASA – January 16 - 18 Indian Wells, CA
FEBRUARY 14, 2013	Boy Scout Council 1001 Davis Street San Leandro, CA 94577	CASA D.C. Conference February 25 – 27
MARCH 14, 2013	Carollo Engineers 2880 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 300 Sacramento, CA 95833	
APRIL 11, 2013	<b>Conference Call</b>	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.
JUNE 13, 2013	Carollo Engineers 2880 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 300 Sacramento, CA 95833	
JULY 11, 2013	<b>Conference Call</b>	
AUGUST 8, 2013	No Meeting	CASA – August 21-24 San Diego, CA
SEPTEMBER 12, 2013	Boy Scout Council 1001 Davis Street San Leandro, CA 94577	
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 Oct. 5 – 9 Chicago, IL
NOVEMBER 14, 2013	<b>Conference Call</b>	
DECEMBER 12, 2013	Sacramento Carollo Engineers	Annual Tri-TAC Holiday Luncheon  Tri-TAC Retreat December 12-13 at EBMUD Lake Pardee Facilities

<sup>1</sup> 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

<sup>2</sup> 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 is meeting on an Ad-Hoc Basis.

**TRI-TAC SPONSOR REPRESENTATION 2013**  
(October 2013)

<b>League of California Cities (LOCC)</b>	<b>CASA</b>	<b>CWEA</b>	
Jason Rhine	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 Phil Scott Alec Mackie Monica Oakley

**Tri-TAC Liaison Representation**

BACWA: Dave Williams  
CASA: Roberta Larson, Greg Kester  
SCAP: John Pastore

CVCWA: Debbie Webster  
CWEA: Phil Scott, Alec Mackie  
LOCC: Jason Rhine

**COMMITTEES**

<b>AIR</b>	<b>LAND</b>	<b>WATER</b>	
Chair: Air Committee On Ad-hoc Basis only	Co-Chairs: Vince De Lange Tom Meregillano	Co-Chairs: Shannon Bishop & Jason Lofton Finance Subcommittee Chair: Dave Bruns	
<b>Interested Participants</b>	<b>Interested Participants</b>	<b>Interested Participants</b>	
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 Doug Edwards Melissa Fischer Bonnie Jones Diane Gilbert Jones Robert Gillette Rashi Gupta 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 Phil Friess 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 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 Phil Scott Jennifer Shepardson Christopher Stacklin Martin St. George Curt Swanson Bonnie Teaford Melissa Thorne David Tucker Lysa Voight Debbie Webster

# Tri-TAC BIOSOLIDS LAND COMMITTEE

AGENDA  
November 14, 2013  
Conference Call

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

Tri-TAC Water Committee Agenda – November 14, 2013

ITEM #	Topic	LEAD	Time (min)	Relevant material
<b>Discussion Items:</b>				
1.	ACWA Guide for Downstream Notification	Adam Link	10	Attachment 1 – Draft ACWA Guide for Best Practices
2.	Statewide Nutrient Management Strategy	Adam Link	10	
3.	Electronic Reporting	Shannon Bishop	10	<a href="http://www2.epa.gov/compliance/proposed-npdes-electronic-reporting-rule">http://www2.epa.gov/compliance/proposed-npdes-electronic-reporting-rule</a>
4.	Enforcement Policy	Melissa Thorne	10	
<b>Updates</b>				
1.	Toxicity Policy	Phil Markle	5	
2.	California Estuaries Portal Update	Jason Lofton	10	<a href="http://www.mywaterquality.ca.gov/eco_health/estuaries/index.shtml">http://www.mywaterquality.ca.gov/eco_health/estuaries/index.shtml</a>
3.	Freshwater Ammonia Criteria	Phil Markle	5	<a href="http://water.epa.gov/scitech/swguidance/standards/criteria/aqlife/ammonia/">http://water.epa.gov/scitech/swguidance/standards/criteria/aqlife/ammonia/</a>
4.	Biological Objectives	Phil Markle	15	
5.	Water Quality Standards Clarification	Adam Link	5	
<b>Items that are out there:</b>				
State Water Boards Ground Water Workplan		<a href="http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/groundwater/workpla.shtml">http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/groundwater/workpla.shtml</a>		
CA Coastal Commission Sea Level Rise		<a href="http://www.coastal.ca.gov/climate/slr/guidance/CCC_Draft_SLR_Guidance_PR_10142013.pdf">http://www.coastal.ca.gov/climate/slr/guidance/CCC_Draft_SLR_Guidance_PR_10142013.pdf</a>		

## Outline for Best Practices Guide

**Topic:** Notification for Downstream Users

**Background:**

Drinking water treatment facilities are not always given timely notice of spills or other instances of non-compliance with NPDES permits by upstream industrial or municipal discharges. This lack of information can make the process of providing safe drinking water more difficult and expensive for these facilities, which are often operating with limited resources. NPDES permits are required to contain some notification conditions, but these stipulate only that EPA should be notified of spills. There may be a way to include permit conditions with limitations or notification procedures that more effectively protect and inform drinking water sources.

**Existing regulations/guidance/memo:**

- 40 CFR 122.41 (l)(2) *Anticipated noncompliance*
  - The permittee shall give advance notice to the Director of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity which may result in noncompliance with permit requirements.
- 40 CFR 122.41 (l)(6) *Twenty-four hour reporting*
  - (i) The permittee shall report any noncompliance which may endanger health or the environment. Any information shall be provided orally within 24 hours from the time the permittee becomes aware of the circumstances. A written submission shall also be provided within 5 days of the time the permittee becomes aware of the circumstances. The written submission shall contain a description of the noncompliance and its cause; the period of noncompliance, including exact dates and times, and if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate, and prevent reoccurrence of the noncompliance.
- 40 CFR 122.41 (l)(7) *Other noncompliance*
  - The permittee shall report all instances of noncompliance not reported under paragraphs (l) (4), (5), and (6) of this section, at the time monitoring reports are submitted. The reports shall contain the information listed in paragraph (l)(6) of this section.
- 40 CFR 122.41 (m)(3) *Notice- (i) Anticipated bypass*
  - If the permittee knows in advance of the need for a bypass, it shall submit prior notice, if possible at least ten days before the date of the bypass.
- 40 CFR 122.41 (m)(3) *Notice- (ii) Unanticipated bypass*
  - The permittee shall submit notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in paragraph (l)(6) of this section (24-hour notice).



- State-specific Rules may also apply:
  - For example, Ohio Administrative Code (OAC) 3745-33-08(F) – Notification to public water supply operators: Permits for facilities designated by the director as major discharges, in the following locations, shall require the permittee to notify the public water supply operator as soon as practicable after a discharge begins that results from a spill, separate sewer overflow, bypass, upset, or combined sewer overflow that reaches waters of the state: (a) Discharges within three thousand feet of a public water supply intake located in a lake; or (b) Discharges within ten stream miles upstream of a public water supply intake located in a reservoir or any other surface water of the state.

### **State Examples/Case Studies:**

- The Ohio NPDES permit example provided to the workgroup requires the discharger to notify the downstream public water systems (PWSs) as soon as practicable, after a spill. The specific arrangement for the notification is left to the discharger to work out with the downstream entities. ORSANCO is likely to have very specific guidance, backed up by a long track record.
- In Region 3, there is a 24-hour notification system already in place. This means that NPDES permittees must report any non-compliance to EPA within 24 hours.
- The Massachusetts *Sanitary Sewer Overflow (SSO)/Bypass Notification Form* (<http://www.mass.gov/dep/water/approvals/ssoform.pdf>) states that “all responsible officials whose duties include management of resources which may be affected by the SSO discharge” must be contacted within 24 hours of an overflow. A list of relevant agencies includes Drinking Water Resource Managers.
- Philadelphia has an early warning system concerning spills and emergency conditions. They received EPA funding to assist them in developing the warning system. They’ve also developed a protocol called “River Cast” ([www.phillyrivercast.org](http://www.phillyrivercast.org)). It’s based on synthesizing information about Fecal Coliform levels, historical data, flows, and weather conditions in order to make real time assessments of the condition of the river.
- The Metropolitan Sewer District of Greater Cincinnati (MSD), Sanitation District No. 1 of Northern Kentucky (SD1) and the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission (ORSANCO) has developed a website to provide Ohio River water quality information and river conditions in the Greater Cincinnati area ([www.recr8ohioriver.org](http://www.recr8ohioriver.org)). This provides an excellent example of overcoming interstate notification barriers.
- City of Elkins, WV NPDES Permit: § F(2)(h)(9) (*Combined Sewer System Overflows; Public Notification*) The permittee shall notify the water treatment facility when CSOs upstream of the City’s water intakes become active in order to avoid impact to the City’s water intakes. The permittee shall document these notifications in a log.

**Barriers:**

- Specifying a particular time frame for notification or a specific notification procedure may be inappropriate for our practitioners' guide, given the diversity of situations permit writer face.
- Interstate notification can be even more challenging, when industrial plants or wastewater treatment plants in one state affect drinking water facilities in the states downstream.

**Workgroup Recommendations:**

- It may be helpful for state clean water and drinking water regulatory authorities to coordinate on an annual basis to develop/update a list of NPDES permits which are up for renewal and have an outfall located within a particular distance to a public water system's intake structure (e.g., 10 river miles, 3,000 feet from a PWS intake structure on a lake, etc.).
- Upon renewal, NPDES permits with outfalls of concern to public water systems (identified in the previous bullet) could include language requiring the permittee to provide notification to potentially affected public water supply operators.
- The details of a notification plan are likely best left to the dischargers and the public water supply operators. This allows impacted parties the opportunity to reach a mutual agreement that considers their unique circumstances. That being said, a permit writer may want to include a qualitative description of the *objectives* of such notification (e.g., that it be timely; that it be given to those likely to be impacted, taking into consideration dilution and time of travel; that it be developed in consultation with the downstream user, etc. ).
- Public water supply operations that are located within the pre-determined distance from an NPDES permitted outfall should be listed in the NPDES permittee to avoid confusion as to which entities require notification.

# Tri-TAC Land Committee Key Issue Summary

(as of November 14, 2013)

Item No.	Description	Issues for POTWs	Meeting Notes/Updates	Lead(s)	Next Steps	Due Date
<b>Goal: Support Long-term Viability of Land Application Options</b>						
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Local County Ordinances</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Imperial</li> <li>▪ San Luis Obispo: Ordinance placing restrictions on Class B biosolids land application.</li> <li>▪ Solano Ordinance: Ordinance requires agencies to divert a portion of biosolids to Class A or B2E facility by 2012; annual progress reporting.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ 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</li> <li>▪ 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 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit, in Nov 2010. A Preliminary Injunction (PI) was granted by Tulare County Judge Hicks in Jun 2011.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Potential loss of existing and future land application practices.</li> <li>▪ Increased biosolids management costs (e.g., longer hauling distances, more expensive alternative practices).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ Solano: The Board of Supervisors would like a court decision as to whether Solano's Measure-E is moot under AB 845.</li> <li>▪ The court agreed with CASA and the Respondents and found that "enactment of Assembly Bill No. 845 has rendered the issues raised on appeal moot. Because the portion of the judgment directing enforcement of Measure E is contrary to existing law, the appropriate course of action is to reverse that portion of the judgment with instructions to dismiss the petition." Although the court did not reach the merits of the case, and the opinion remains unpublished, this is a very positive result and underscores the impropriety of out-of-county bans of solid waste and biosolids alike.</li> <li>▪ Potrero Landfill continues with plans for expansion.</li> <li>▪ State Supreme Court agreed to review one of Kern County's claims concerning a statute of limitation issue. The City has submitted an opposition brief due on September 23. A trial date has not been scheduled at this time.</li> </ul>	G. Kester D. Gilbert L. Baroldi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Imperial: No updates.</li> <li>▪ San Luis Obispo: No updates, continue to track.</li> <li>• Continue to track</li> <li>▪ Continue to track</li> </ul>	
<b>Goal: Sustain and Develop Biosolids Management Options with Focus on Sustainability</b>						
<b>2</b>	<p><b>FOG/Food Waste Digestion Program Regulation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CalRecycle vs. State/Regional Board oversight</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ensure that existing and future programs are regulated under NPDES permit framework by Water Boards rather than under SW regulations by CalRecycle.</li> <li>▪ Review and comment on draft/proposed regulations that may impact existing and planned programs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Tom Howard, SWRCB Executive Officer, sent a letter to POTWs &gt;1MGD, addressing multi-jurisdictional issues on co-digestion of organic material. The letter outlines steps to notify RWQCB of planned or existing co-digestion projects.</li> <li>▪ CalRecycle formal rule making process on co-digestion exemption regulation is anticipated to start Jan 2014. CalRecycle will conduct a financial impact analysis.</li> <li>▪ CASA is working with CWEA in developing an SOP training module.</li> </ul>	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G. Kester to work with CWEA on SOP training module.</li> </ul>	

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

Item No.	Description	Issues for POTWs	Meeting Notes/Updates	Lead(s)	Next Steps	Due Date
3	<b>CalRecycle 75% Recycling, Composting or Source Reduction of Solid Waste by 2020</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May prohibit agencies from claiming recycling credits for utilizing biosolids as an alternative daily cover (ADC) for landfills.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CASA and Tri-TAC continues to seek clarity on the status of the CalRecycle's plan to achieve 75% recycling goal of AB 341. In particular, the interest has been on the possibility that CalRecycle may eliminate biosolids as an alternative daily cover (ADC) at municipal solid waste landfills along with its associated recycling credits.</li> <li>ADC may still be on the table for discussion. As for green waste, it is more than likely that CalRecycle may pull out from the landfill to help achieve the diversion goal, but will impact diversion credit.</li> </ul>	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to track.</li> </ul>	
4	<b>Rendering Facility Regulations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>California Department of Food &amp; Agriculture (CDFA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that existing and planned FOG acceptance programs are not subject to rendering facility permitting requirements by CDFA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CASA and Tri-TAC working with CDFA on Slaughter House Waste exemption.</li> </ul>	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>G. Kester to follow up with CDFA regarding slaughter house exemption.</li> </ul>	
5	<b>Biosolids Solid Waste Definition</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CISWI rules could have applied to POTWs utilizing methane in an internal combustion (IC) engine.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure clarification letter is widely distributed.</li> </ul>	
7	<b>FDA – Proposed Food Safety Rule</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed rule may spur potential controversy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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. <b>Comments extended to December 16, 2013.</b></li> </ul>	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support proposed rule.</li> <li>G. Kester reviewing proposed regulations.</li> </ul>	
8	<b>WEF – NBP Update</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May impact EMS Certification Program.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ned Beecher was hired to support the EMS certification program.</li> </ul>	G.Kester/ V. De Lange	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to track and monitor.</li> </ul>	
9	<b>Legislation Congressman Serrano – Labeling Bill</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May impact biosolids land application.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Last Action: Referred to the House of Agriculture Committee on 1/4/13.</li> </ul>	L. Baroldi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to track and monitor.</li> </ul>	
10	<b>EPA Maximum Available Control Technology (MACT) Standards</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to comply with new regulations is currently uncertain. NACWA and NRDC filed a request for reconsideration and advance notice of possible litigation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oral arguments were held May 3 in NACWA's litigation challenge to EPA's sewage sludge incineration (SSI) rule, with the Association aggressively challenging EPA's legal basis for its new SSI regulations. NACWA is hopeful for a ruling from the court within the next 3-4 months</li> </ul>	G. Kester/L. Baroldi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to track and monitor litigation if filed.</li> </ul>	
11	<b>Arsenic Cancer Slope Factor</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Feb 2010, EPA proposed a 17-fold increase in the cancer slope factor for inorganic arsenic based on questionable interpretations of available data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If adopted, the new cancer slope factor would likely impact recycled water, effluent and biosolids limits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Academy of Science is reviewing the process in which EPA used to develop the arsenic slope factors (IRIS) and the research that supported the slope factor.</li> </ul>	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to track, monitor, and comment as efforts proceed.</li> </ul>	
12	<b>EPA's Proposed Electronic NPDES Reporting Requirement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed regulations will require permittees and regulators electronically report information and data related to the NPDES permit program in lieu of written reports.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If adopted and among other requirements, NPDES regulated biosolids generators and handlers will be required to electronically submit data elements specific to biosolids annual program reports.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public comments period has been extended to December 12, 2013 due to Federal Gov. shutdown.</li> <li>General comments: 1) agree with the general goal to go paperless, 2) concerns with duplication of data entry (State/Fed), 3) concerns that the State's CIWQS system is not CROMERR certified, 4) ambiguity of SSO reporting, and 5) question on whether it is possible to request for biogas production information in platform.</li> </ul>	G. Kester/T. Meregillano	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>G.Kester to look into Dept. Energy and EPA the best way to capture reliable biogas data..</li> </ul>	

## Tri-TAC Land Committee Key Issue Summary

(cont'd)

Item No.	Description	Issues for POTWs	Meeting Notes/Updates	Lead(s)	Next Steps	Due Date
<b>Goal: Share Information</b>						
13	<b>Regional Facilities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Bay Area Agencies</u>: A coalition of 18+ agencies is developing a regional biosolids management facility.</li> <li>▪ <u>Southern CA &amp; Central Valley</u>: Biosolids projects and facilities in Southern and Central Valley regions.</li> <li>▪ <u>Inland Empire Regional Composting Facility (IERCF)</u>: Indoor composting facility located in Rancho Cucamonga, owned by LACSD/IEUA.</li> <li>▪ <u>Westlake Farms</u>: Covered ASP composting facility located in Kings County, CA developed by LACSD.</li> <li>▪ <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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Maintain awareness of collaborative efforts to develop regional biosolids management facilities.</li> <li>▪ Understand challenges and lessons learned from new facilities in startup or operation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Bay Area Agencies</u>:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bay Area Biosolids to Energy: Received four proposals which are being reviewed.</li> <li>- Lawrence Livermore/Chemergy Inc – hydrogen demonstration project to start in the end of the month in Delta Diablo treatment plant.</li> <li>- City of San Jose looking at other technologies after working with Harvest Power on their gasification system.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ <u>Southern CA &amp; Central Valley</u>:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>OCSD</u>: Research group looking into Aquacritox. A technology that utilizes super-oxygenation process to destroy solids and to recover energy.</li> <li>- <u>Encina Wastewater Authority (EWA)</u>:                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Hosted joint Energy/Biosolids SCAP meeting</li> <li>o EWA continue to conduct a pyrolysis trial on PureGreen pellets with Energia (Gasification System) producing gas for energy recovery and concentrate that is feed back into digesters to enhance methane production</li> <li>o EWA working on an LLC with private firm to market PureGreen Product..</li> <li>o EWA partnering with Orange County Farm Bureau.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <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.</li> <li>- <u>Westlake Farms</u>: Facility is currently in construction with an anticipated startup date in 2013.</li> <li>- <u>Terminal Island</u>:                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Demonstration project continues to take an average of 85-90 wet tons per 5 days of biosolids. Draft EPA permit for public release was postponed due to Federal Gov. shutdown.</li> <li>o Oct 13<sup>th</sup> MOU between Bureau of Sanitation and Zoo Dept. to purchase crops from Green Acres Farm was signed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	B. Jones T. Meregillano M. Bao D. Gilbert B. Gillette	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue to provide regional biosolids management updates.</li> </ul>	
14	<b>Regional Associations Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SCAP: Strategic Planning meeting scheduled for November 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>▪ BACWA: Joint meetings held w/Tri-TAC meeting scheduled in Nov 14<sup>th</sup> (conference call).</li> <li>▪ CVCWA: Joint meetings held w/Tri-TAC meeting scheduled in Nov 14<sup>th</sup> (conference call).</li> <li>▪ CWEA: Conference (Santa Clara) April 2014</li> </ul>	M. Bao V. De Lange B. Gillette G. Kester J. Hay		
15	<b>Conferences/Webinars</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Stay abreast of upcoming conferences, local seminars, and webinars.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ California Bioresources Alliance Symposium, Sept 18-19, 2013                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biosolids use opportunities for mine reclamation and forest services.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	All		
<b>Goal: Address Emerging Issues of Concern</b>						

## Tri-TAC Land Committee Key Issue Summary

(cont'd)

Item No.	Description	Issues for POTWs	Meeting Notes/Updates	Lead(s)	Next Steps	Due Date
16	<b>Pyrethroids</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pyrethroid Working Group (PWG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Potential impacts (positive/negative) to existing programs, public perceptions.</li> <li>▪ May provide opportunities for direct participation in research/studies to address local concerns/issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PWG to submit final pyrethroid report to DPR.</li> <li>▪ PWG working on scientific journal/article (summary) for distribution.</li> <li>▪ Tri-TAC Steering working on next steps – Pyrethroid Strategic Plan, covering communication and regulatory advocacy. .</li> </ul>	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PWG to present to Tri-TAC of findings on Sept 4<sup>th</sup>. PWG.</li> </ul>	
17	<b>Trace Organics Activities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Potential impacts (positive/negative) to existing programs, public perceptions.</li> <li>▪ May provide opportunities for direct participation in research/studies to address local concerns/issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul>	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul>	
18	<b>Climate Change Legislation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ensure development of strategic approach to climate change issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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).</li> </ul>	G. Kester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Meet with the CPUC to discuss the pricing structure approach to feed-in-tariffs.</li> </ul>	
<b>Goal: Maintain Awareness of Key Research Initiatives</b>						
19	<b>Biosolids Research</b> 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"> <li>▪ Potential impacts (positive/negative) to existing programs, public perceptions.</li> <li>▪ May provide opportunities for direct participation in research/studies to address local concerns/issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ WEF Biogas Study published.</li> </ul>	G. Kester		

# Tri-TAC Water Committee Key Issue Summary

(as of  
October 2013)

**DRAFT**

Item No.	Description	Issues for POTWs	Meeting Notes/Updates	Links	Lead(s)	Next Steps	Due Date
1	<b>Whole Effluent Toxicity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State is developing a new Toxicity Policy that will dictate how toxicity is reported and enforced. The draft "Policy" is now being reformatted for distribution as a "Plan" with an expected update to become available in the summer of 2013 with eventual adoption in late 2013 or later.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft State Toxicity Policy issued in 2011 would establish/ require:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>numeric limits for chronic toxicity</li> <li>use of Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) as statistical method to determine toxicity (concerns it will lead to more false positive results);</li> <li>use of marine organisms in &gt;1,000 mg/L salinity waters which affects current use of flow-through testing for acute-toxicity</li> <li>single and multiple test numeric violations that will also trigger accelerated monitoring</li> <li>RWQCB discretion on inclusion of acute toxicity in permits and whether to allow for dilution</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Tri-TAC voiced concern with uncertainty in the WET Policy and SB plans to address our concerns to a certain degree.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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. Ultimately, there was no consensus among Tri-TAC regarding a phasing approach.</li> <li>We need to address the potential issue of anti-backsliding and the differences between acute testing versus chronic testing.</li> </ul>	<a href="#">State Board Page</a>	Bobbi Larson, Phil Markle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are currently waiting for the next release of the draft "Plan" to see if and how our previously voiced concerns have been addressed.</li> <li>We will then conduct an evaluation of the required elements and determine the likelihood of a non-toxic effluent being in violation and the costs associated with such exceedances as well as the likelihood of non-toxic receiving waters being erroneously identified as impaired using the requirements of the Plan..</li> </ul>	
2	<b>Recycled Water Policy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State Water Board is modifying the monitoring requirements for CECs in the policy to implement the Expert Panel's recommendations.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State Board revised the water monitoring requirements for recycled water. Comments are due in July on the most recent draft.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>It seems that the policy on CECs is getting close to closure and a majority of our concerns are being addressed.</li> </ul>		Bobbi Larson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work on draft comment letter (possibly joint letter with other associations)</li> </ul>	
3	<b>Nutrient Policy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any POTW that discharges to inland surface water will be affected under the policy.</li> <li>Adoption of a statewide approach to nutrient control will affect NPDES permitting, 303(d) listings, and TMDL development.</li> <li>Possible outcomes associated with the policy include stringent numeric endpoints for total nitrogen and phosphorus.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>The QUAL-2 model will likely result in very low nutrient numbers that are very conservative and unlikely to be regularly attainable by POTWs. .</li> <li>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.</li> <li>We should advocate for identifying sources, analyzing</li> </ul>		Tom Grouvhog	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a suggested monitoring template that will support CASA's recommendations for the nutrient policy.</li> </ul>	

**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"> <li>control methods and effectiveness, and focus on endpoints instead of just adopting a number.</li> </ul>				
4	<b>CECs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pharmaceuticals and other trace constituents of emerging concern (CECs) are ubiquitous in wastewater at low concentrations and have unknown effects on aquatic organism</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>The panel will recommend monitoring wastewater for CECs, and possibly bioanalytical assays to test for toxic effects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>WERF may be a source of funding if stakeholders decide to manage the study.</li> <li>Jon Bishop will likely recommend that the Board accept our recommendation that POTWs initiate studies on their own accord.</li> <li>CECs may be an important topic for Board Member Felicia Marcus.</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Draft Report</a>	Chris Stacklin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wait for final report and await Determine our preference for how this study should be conducted and funded.</li> </ul>	
5	<b>Statewide Mercury Programs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Mercury Programs will incorporate methylmercury objectives and control plans for mercury impaired waterbodies</li> <li>Mercury Control Program for Reservoirs will address all mercury impaired reservoirs included on the 2010 303(d) list</li> <li>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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any wastewater that discharges to a mercury-impaired waterbody will eventually be included under the policy</li> <li>The State Board is considering ways to harmonize efforts with existing TMDLs</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tri-TAC provided comments urging them to harmonize with existing TMDLs and link implementation to impairment</li> <li>Existing TMDLs will likely be grandfathered in</li> </ul>	<a href="#">State Board Mercury Page</a>	Tom Grovhoug, Shannon Bishop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to provide input at public meetings and submit comments</li> </ul>	
6	<b>Methylmercury Objectives</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State Board is developing a methylmercury fish tissue objective and implementation plan</li> <li>The scientific underpinnings for the criteria development are still under consideration, but there will likely be two objectives in terms of fish tissue, one to protect human health and one to protect the California Least Tern</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State Board staff are working on the implantation plan for the objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State Board is restarting this effort continuing from the alternatives developed in 2006. The project is part of the Statewide Mercury Programs</li> <li>State is considering a new beneficial use based on high consumption rates of fish (mainly for tribes)</li> </ul>	<a href="#">State Board Mercury Page</a>	Tom Grovhoug, Shannon Bishop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Begin to work on internal strategy and then begin working with State Water Board and to iron out issues</li> </ul>	



**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
7	<b>Biological Objectives</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State Board is developing a Biological Objective Policy that will incorporate bioassessment results into Basin Plans, impairment listing decisions and eventual enforcement actions to protect aquatic life beneficial uses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If biological impairment is found to be caused by a pollutant, it could impact how NPDES permits are written and permit limits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current evaluation will focus on invertebrates in perennial and Wadeable streams but other criteria (non-perennial, algae, etc) are anticipated in the future.</li> <li>State Board staff have indicated at the latest stakeholder meeting that they intend to develop biological for all water bodies, even those with significant modification and in areas where reference condition is underrepresented..</li> <li>State Board presented its policy ideas for Biological Objectives. Option 1 was numeric standards for BO. Option 2 was a "target" for BO. Option 3 was almost the no project alternative.</li> <li>State Board is forming a policy stakeholder group, Ann Heil is representing POTWs. Policy is projected to be adopted in mid-2014.</li> <li>It is possible that the entire state will now be subject to the BO. Previously, we expected central valley and other heavily modified areas to be exempt.</li> </ul>	<a href="#">State Board Biological Objectives Page</a>	Phil Markle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a current Tri-TAC technical workgroup that has been involved in providing technical comments on various documents as they have been released. Tri-TAC is now in the process of forming a Policy workgroup to address policy issues of BO. Ann Heil should be included in the Tri-TAC working group since she is representing the POTW perspective on the working group.</li> </ul>	
8	<b>SSS WDR</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Monitoring and Reporting Program for the SSS WDR is being revised by the State Board</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised MRP was implemented in September 2013.</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Draft SSS WDR</a>	Bobbi Larson, Monica Oakley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to monitor the SSS WDR program for possible future changes and review data presented in the annual compliance reports.</li> </ul>	
9	<b>Delta Issues</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standing topic to discuss issues in the Delta that can have statewide impact.</li> <li>State Board is updating Bay Delta Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> <li>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</li> <li>Various studies to resolve uncertainties related to the impacts of ammonia are underway</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>		Terrie Mitchell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to track issues as they emerge and act on those with state-wide significance</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	
11	<b>EPA Ammonia Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPA released the final version of the new freshwater ammonia criteria in August 2013.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 2013 freshwater ammonia criteria is lower than the 2009 draft criteria and depending on how the criteria is applied, it could be difficult for POTWs to meet to limits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>		Tom Grouvhog/ Phil Markle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Track and provide comments when necessary</li> </ul>	
12	<b>EPA Water Quality Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPA is proposing changes to the water</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key elements likely to be included in the regulation:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The regulation is being reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget and will be released in</li> </ul>		Shannon Bishop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Track and provide comments when necessary</li> </ul>	

**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
	quality criteria regulations regarding administrator determinations, attainable uses, triennial reviews, compliance schedules, antidegradation, and variances.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Antidegradation- States must adopt binding anti degradation requirements and minimum implementation methods</li> <li>• Attainable uses- when use is not attainable, State must specify next highest attainable use</li> <li>• Triennial review- current criteria should be examined</li> <li>• Variance- requirements will be specified</li> </ul>	Spring 2012 for comment.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with NACWA on comments</li> </ul>	
<b>13</b>	<b>EPA Integrated Permitting</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Is there a way to harmonize with Porter Cologne in California?</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Had a call to set up work group to come up with list of issues that should be considered</li> </ul>		Ben Horenstein/ Jackie Kepke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue tracking this effort along with NACWA</li> <li>• Review draft framework document when released</li> </ul>	
<b>14</b>	<b>Electronic Reporting</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agencies are now required to electronically report compliance data to their regional boards via CIWQS</li> <li>• State Board is working on eSMR 2.5 that will allow for electronic submittal of EPA required self-monitoring data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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)</li> <li>• Errors are difficult to correct</li> <li>• Finalization of eSMR 2.5 will require a different data file type to be submitted electronically</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPA released its proposed rule for electronic reporting of NPDES based reports. Comments are due December 12<sup>th</sup>.</li> </ul>		Shannon Bishop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit comment letter to EPA regarding the proposed electronic reporting rule.</li> <li>• Work with the State Board to ensure that California's electronic reporting databases are CROMMER certified.</li> </ul>	
<b>15</b>	<b>EPA Dental Amalgam</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agencies are concerned that dentists' offices will be regulated as part of POTWs' pretreatment program</li> <li>• EPA will likely create a new category so that dentists will not be categorized as SIUs</li> <li>• They may also grandfather in existing regional dental amalgam programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• EPA will likely create a new category so that dentists will not be categorized as SIUs</li> <li>• They may also grandfather in existing regional dental amalgam programs</li> </ul>		Tim Potter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comment on draft guidelines when they are released</li> </ul>	
<b>16</b>	<b>Pesticides</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cross-media issue</li> <li>• Some pesticides are toxic to sensitive organisms at extremely low concentrations.</li> <li>• Nanoparticles and some biocides have potential to interfere with biological treatment processes</li> <li>• Some pesticides like triclosan, fipronil, and nanosilver are considered CECs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with the pesticide work group is complete.</li> </ul>		Pesticide Work Group: Greg Kester, Linda Dorn, Preeti Ghuman, Phil Markle, Dave Snyder, Melody LaBella, Karin North,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	

**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	<b>DTSC Safer Consumer Products Regulation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Department of Toxic Substances control is developing new regulations that will allow chemicals to be controlled without recourse to the legislature.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This could be an important tool for POTWs to prevent the discharge of toxic substances to their influent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> <li>Green Chemistry workshop was held in early September and comments are due by October 11<sup>th</sup>.</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Draft DTSC Regulations</a>	Karin North, Melody LaBella, Kelly Moran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment on Green Chemistry regulations due on October 11<sup>th</sup>. BACWA will write letter and Tri-TAC may sign on the letter if warranted.</li> </ul>	
18	<b>State Water Board Resource Alignment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This project was initiated by the State Water Board. The Board directed staff to assess and align State Water Board priorities, resources, and performance targets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This effort is an opportunity for POTWs to State Water Board's priorities, recommend ways to improve efficiencies in regulatory requirements, and hopefully improve cost-effectiveness of regulatory compliance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An NGO meeting was held the week of June 10<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>The CASA lead group presented ideas to the State Board that were well received, but State Board wants recommendations on how to implement the ideas.</li> <li>Group had a discussion about performance based limits in NPDES permits and how they are inconsistently applied throughout the state. If the State Board could come up with favorable guidance on this issue, it could save POTWs money while still meeting the State Board's mission.</li> </ul>		Adam Link	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working group will brainstorm implementation ideas for the State Board.</li> </ul>	
19	<b>Statewide Cadmium and Hardness Policy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State Water Board staff is evaluating the cadmium criteria. As part of this policy, hardness selection criteria may be defined.</li> <li>CEQA scoping began in fall 2008 but was stalled. State Water Board staff are continuing work on the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new policy will likely result in more stringent cadmium criteria.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A conference call with State Water Board staff to discuss the policy was cancelled due to scheduling issues. The call will be rescheduled.</li> </ul>		Mitchell Mysliwiec	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work with State Water Board staff to get update on the project to determine next steps.</li> </ul>	