

NC Source Water Collaborative

November 18, 2014 Meeting Summary

Attendees

Rebecca Sadosky, NCDENR DWR	Keith Larick, NCDA & CS	Julie Ventaloro, NCDENR / DEMLR	Sarah Collins, NCLM	Anne Coan, Farm Bureau
Jay Frick, NCDENR DWR	Gale Johnson, NCDENR DWR	Caitlin Burke, CTNC	Cy Stober, PTRC	Ed Buchman, City of Raleigh
Marilyn Carrington, NCDENR DWR	Joey Hester, NCDENR DSWC	Bob Midgette, NCDENR DWR	Mike Schlegel ,TJCOG	Grady McCaulie, NC Conservation Network
Sean McGuire, NCDENR DWR	Christy Perrin, WRRRI	Debbie Maner, NCRWA	Brooke Massa, NCWRC	

Introduction

The meeting was called to order by Jay Frick. Introductions were made around the room.

Overview

Jay Frick provided an overview of the stakeholder team's role for the HB 894 legislation. The stakeholder team should be separate from the collaborative team. The stakeholder role consists of the following:

- Refine the approach
- Identify issues
- Review and critique draft rule language

The HB 894 legislation is an act to improve source water protection planning; with emphasis on emergency preparedness. Changes / corrections were made to the legislation to include "treating and furnishing water from surface supplies" and to adapt three new rules.

A proposal of implementation for the legislation will:

- Set standards for plan updates,
- Set standards for implementation, and
- Enhance spill response strategies; most important component for the legislation.

Implementation

Jay outlined a "3-Tiered Proposal" to move forward with the implementation process.

The implementation process will consist of the following:

1. Water systems develop traditional SWP plans with emphasis on emergency preparedness and implementation (develop contingency plan or emergency response plan).
2. Strengthen regulatory oversight of selected PCSs (potential contaminant sources)
3. Create web-based GIS tool to support emergency preparedness

Feedback

Attendees provided feedback, addressed current procedures and supported ideas to use current methodologies and enhancements.

Component # 1 – Traditional SWP

Jay expressed the need to take a proactive approach to the protection of drinking water.

The main focus is to develop contingency plan / emergency response plan.

Component # 2 – Strengthen regulatory oversight of selected PCSs

Currently, legislation does not include “emergency preparedness” wording. Attendees asked if “we were biting off more than we can chew”.

Debbie M stated “Emergency Response” is a broader way to protect our drinking water.

Julie V indicated that there may be some timing issues relative to revisions of the water supply/watershed rules; could be some overlaps.

Anne C commented “we should be cognizant of the existing local and state regulations”.

Sean M suggested inviting waste management for assistance and support. Additionally, include Emergency Management to understand their current processes as it relates to notification during emergency situation.

Jay indicated there are ways to look at if there is an emergency situation such as

1. Real time data monitoring
2. Having additional off stream storage
3. Secondary backup source

Anne suggested putting together all rules that would apply to entities within specific area as a resource. What agency inspect and/or who is the agency contact. What division of local government implements. Anne asked if we were trying to pursue too broad a regulatory program based on the current legislation. We should work on what we are good at. There are jurisdiction issues – asking another local government to regulate the water supply.

Sean – there are risks. This is doing a real risk assessment.

Cy asked “What is a significant PCS?” Some form of self-reporting by the local water supply with a different basis for ranking – reporting on significant PCSs by each PWS. There are not enough resources to perform inspection.

Sarah C – For potential spills, make sure there is existing legislation (Hazardous Waste Section, Public Health). She doesn't think her members would want more regulatory.

Method to determine significant (priority, risk of a PCS).

Grady proposed iterative process for implementation (staged, in steps)

Mike – levers/criteria things to consider size, spillable – factors of susceptibility . Having an inventory of regulated contaminants. Inventory these existing regulated PCSs.

Bob – we would provide a set of criteria to help PWS to determine on local level, what PCSs are significant. Every water system has a table to identify PCS. They have identification numbers and be seen on a map. Which are the most impactful to our drinking water source – significant potential contaminant sources? Leave decision to local – rules must define the framework.

How could we get at what are the biggest risk avenues to PWSs? We don't have a track record because have not ever had a large spill that rendered water untreatable for drinking water.

Shellfish may have model that identifies how large of a waste water spill would cause the fishing area to be closed.

Suggestion to stick with what we know – don't go into legislation.

Debbie – keep process as simple as possible – don't add too much to existing.

Cy – Empower utility director with avenues to find more information and talk to state about concerns (ie, someone not following forestry rules).

Raleigh – look at treatment technologies at PWS to help categorize SWPP requirements.

Grady – we need to have clear understanding of regulatory requirements.

Greg – Is this too complicated? The goal is to have an effective protection plan.

Julie – How many PCSs do you need to worry about? Utilities could reach out to the contaminant sources.

Component # 3 – DWR Spill Response Online Mapping Tool

Jay explained the DWR Spill Response Online Map can be used as an alert mechanism.

Bob proposed requirement of SWPP to have system notify all PCS owners within targeted area that they are within a certain distance from a drinking water intake.

Cy indicated the County EMS programs might be able to give us some feedback related to their notification process. Include County EMS Program as stakeholder

Grady - Can you take the system as a model? Put in different spills and see what scenarios come up short (gaps). Drop contamination on your map.

Follow-Up Actions

Sarah: Review existing regulatory programs and ask if existing programs protect the water supply.

Jay: Contact Anne to identify additional stakeholders. Review draft agenda for stakeholder meeting and refine the approach based on the today's meeting. Make sure to capture and prioritize issues and concerns.

Rebecca: Make sure Anne's email is correct.

Rebecca / Jay: Send out some items to get feedback for the remaining agenda items.

Rebecca: Get with Julie to create a cheat sheet / summary of water supply / watershed rules.