

Upper Cape Fear River Basin Association

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

NAME	AGENCY	CONTACT INFO
Maya Cough-Schulze	TJCOG	mcough-schulze@tjcog.org
Grace Messinger	PTRC	gmessinger@ptrc.org
Charlie Cocker	City of Durham	charles.cocker@durhamnc.gov
Jonathan Baker	City of Durham- Stormwater	jonathan.baker@durhamnc.gov
Sarah Braman	Town of Cary	sarah.braman@townofcary.org
Kent Jackson	Town of Pittsboro	kjackson@pittsboronc.gov
Elijah Williams	City of Greensboro	elijah.williams@greensboro-nc.gov
Alicia Goots	City of Greensboro	alicia.goots@greensboro-nc.gov
Ben Bani	City of Burlington	bbani@burlingtonnc.gov
Michael Rhoney	City of Asheboro	mrhoney@ci.asheboro.nc.us
Dennis Hodge	City of Mebane	dhodge@cityofmebane.com
Michael Rhoney	City of Asheboro	mrhoney@ci.asheboro.nc.us
Steve Tedder	Tedderfarm Consulting	tedderfarmconsulting@gmail.com
Tonya Mann	City of Graham	tmann@cityofgraham.com
Mark Vander Borgh	NC DWR Coalition Coordinator	mark.vanderborgh@ncdenr.gov
Gary Perlmutter	NC DWR Municipal NPDES Permitting	gary.perlmutter@ncdenr.gov
Nick Coco	NC DWR	nick.coco@ncdenr.gov
Martie Groome	City of Greensboro	martie.groome@greensboro-nc.gov
Reggie Hicks	City of Durham	reginald.hicks@durhamnc.gov
Amanda Hill	City of Mebane	achill@cityofmebane.com
Tony Bowes	City of Mebane	tbowes@cityofmebane.com
Sharon Wagoner	City of Burlington	swagoner@burlingtonnc.gov
Amy Moore	Durham County	ajmoore@dconc.gov
Robby Stone	City of High Point	robby.stone@highpointnc.gov
Michael Rhoney	Town of Asheboro	mrhoney@ci.asheboro.nc.us
Wil Lawson	OWASA	wlawson@owasa.org
Shelby Smith	City of Graham	ssmith@cityofgraham.com
Adam Scholl	PTRC	ashull@ptrc.org
Jake Smith	Chatham Park	jake@prestondev.com

The meeting opened at 10am. Elijah Williams welcomed the group to the UCFRBA's first in-person meeting in 3 years being held in person at the TZ Osborne Waste Water Reclamation Plant, Greensboro. We finished our 56mgd upgrade last year and can offer a few interested folks a tour after the meeting.

Revisions on the agenda included:

- Plan to take a break at 11am
- Alicia Goots will do QA/QC report, Dawn was not able to attend the meeting

Organizational Report

1. QA/QC Report (Alicia Goots, Greensboro):

- Turbidity and DO standard violations (hottest month of the year)
- Site 28, Richland Creek upstream of High Point Eastside WWTP. Dark blue/green water, dead fish, DO 0.18.
 - Mark: There was a sewer main break above the plant – regional office called it in to Mark; issue was swiftly addressed by City of High Point staff
- A few data notations/corrections; see Powerpoint.
- 99.7% no issues

Grace shared a thank you to Martie Groome for 42 years of service and expertise to the City of Greensboro. She officially retired in August but returned in October on a contract basis. She was integral in forming the QA/QC Committee for the UCFRBA among many other accomplishments!

2. DWR Cape Fear Basin Plan update (Nora Deamer, NCDEQ):

Following on Maya Miller's presentation about the Cape Fear River Basin Plan stakeholder engagement process at the July UCFRBA meeting, Nora Deamer presented on the Draft Cape Fear River Basin Plan.

See Nora's presentation for full details. Some takeaways from the Draft presentation below:

- River basin plans cover water quantity and quality recommendations, not rules.
- Watershed chapters on the Haw and the Deep HUC 8 subbasins will cover the UCFRBA region.
- Public survey about Cape Fear River Basin concerns and priorities identified development pressures as one of the top public water quality concerns. Percent population growth is highest in the upper half of the Cape Fear (Upper/Middle Cape Fear). Animal feeding operations are densest in the lower half of the basin.
- Nora thanks the UCFRBA for their data collection – she has used all of it for the last 20 years in this plan!
- Reach out: Nora.deamer@ncdenr.gov

Discussion:

- Elijah: Those data were from before we finished our WWTP upgrade, so they should look better now.
 - Nora: Let's work together to put some text in the Basin Plan about this. This is an open invitation to anyone – reach out and share your updates.
- Steve Tedder: What's your timeframe for data review?
 - Nora: Data goes through 2020
- Charlie: River basin has a lot of issues – plant discharges is one; what are others?
 - Nora: We have point and nonpoint source issues from the top to the bottom of the watershed. Jordan Lake; TMDLs and nutrient strategies in the Haw watershed. Nutrient strategies above Randleman. Modeling effort underway and additional monitoring (UCFRBA contributed in 2019-2020) which will help DWR understand nutrient issues in the Middle Cape Fear. And of course, issues with PFOS, PFOA, 1, 4 Dioxane. In the lower Cape Fear, there is low DO downstream of Lock & Dam 1.
- Mark Vander Borgh: How much of the data was skewed by the Rocky River/Loves Creek data?
 - Nora: That was just getting started during the data window so won't show up as much
- Jon Baker: Are you investigating septic systems?
 - Nora: There isn't a whole lot of data, so no.

- Martie: What's the deadline to submit additional information?
 - o Nora: By the end of 2022. The plan will go through internal review in January 2023.
- Nora: Once approved, the plan will go into a Story Map and be posted online.
- Grace: When plants do upgrades, will that info be able to be included real-time?
 - o Nora: Yes unless changes are so significant that they need to go before EMC.
- Steve Tedder: Do you know the schedule for the Jordan Lake rules?
 - o Nora: I can find out; it's delayed due to staff shortages
 - o A follow-up schedule was shared with UCFRBA staff after the meeting:

Jordan Nutrient Management Strategy Readoption Timeline

2020 – 2022	Collaboratory products review Lake model supplemental contracting Strategy concepts planning
Spring - Fall 2023	Lake model completion, external review, finalization
Spring-Summer 2023 to Spring-Summer 2024	Facilitated stakeholder engagement Part 1 => rule concepts
2024	Rules text development Stakeholder engagement Part 2 -> rules refinement WQC approval to proceed
2025	Fiscal analysis, OSBM approval EMC approval to proceed, 60-day comment, hearings, hearing officer deliberations
2026	EMC adoption, RRC approval

3. Membership update – Durham County and Siler City (Maya Cough-Schulze, TJCOG):

- a) Durham County's permit asks to join the UCFRBA. A summary of the process for bringing on a new member was reviewed. Durham County would join this current fiscal year and pay the base membership; starting in FY24 proportional dues would be incorporated into invoice; Tonya Mann moves to accept Durham County as a member. Michael Rhoney seconds it.

Via roll call vote, all BOD members present voted in favor of Durham County joining (BOD members were present for the following utilities: Asheboro, Burlington, Chatham Park, City of Durham, Graham, Greensboro, High Point, Mebane, OWASA)

Next step: Mark Vander Borgh will send Durham County's signatory an amendment to the MOA to sign.

- b) Siler City's permit removes the monitoring waiver associated with membership in the coalition.
- Mark Vander Borgh: Siler City's permit requires much more frequent monitoring than would be possible for the Coalition to do. It does not remove them from the coalition, it just removes their monitoring waiver.
 - o Martie: Is this something DWR is going to do with more WWTPs in the future?
 - Mark: This is specific to Siler City. They have been out of compliance, and this is causing huge issues for the creeks. That is the reason for this change.

- Martie: We have seen that in the QAQC of data.
 - Steve Tedder: Siler City was the first WWTP to have a TON limit. Will that be applied to other WWTPs?
 - Gary Perlmutter: That's site-specific to Siler City because their receiving waters have been shown to be sensitive to TN, so it shouldn't apply to other WWTPs.
- Maya: Siler City staff were unable to be present today due to a water main break but reached out to Maya to say that they would like to remain in the coalition since what happens in the basin affects them, and vice versa. Whether they will remain as an affiliate or associate member is up to them.

4. Draft FY24 Dues and Budget Scenarios (Grace Messinger, PTRC):

Prior to this meeting, Grace & Maya reviewed with the Finance Committee (Elijah Williams, Charlie Cocker, and Michael Rhoney) options to consider for dues and budgeting.

Grace presented scenario based on changes as discussed. Durham County will as a new Association member and Siler City may become an affiliate member (like Cary; paying only base rate; this is to be determined based on Siler City's decision. Siler City expressed interest prior to this meeting in remaining in the UCFRBA.)

If Siler City's proportional dues as calculated from permitted capacity were removed, Durham County's dues in FY24 would likely offset that difference. This will be reviewed in the new calendar year and discussed at the January Joint BOD/TAC meeting.

- Consider numbers in the PowerPoint estimates to use in your budget conversations.
- These dues and budget numbers are not final as FY24 Budget/expenses might change as the details of Siler City's membership gets finalized, and as Meritech's sampling costs tend to increase yearly (approximately 3%/year; new sampling costs start in October.)

Mark Vander Borgh: The MOA between UCFRBA and DWR states that any removal of stations requires a negotiation with DWR.

Snapshot of current fiscal year: The bulk of members have paid their dues invoice for FY23. 8 have not yet, Grace has reached out to those where dues were not received yet.

Open discussion time on emerging contaminants of concern

1. About Technologies for PFAS Disposal, Treatment and Destruction

[PFAS 2022 Preliminary Program.pdf \(awma.org\)](#): Nov 8-10, \$450 to attend one day or \$675 government rate for three days (sessions 8 and 12 most relevant)

2. Challenges, questions, time to learn from one another

- Charlie: If you count a million seconds, it takes 11.7 days. If you count a billion seconds, it takes over 5 years. If you see parts per million or billion in your permit, think about it as those few seconds in 11 days or 5 years. That's what we're measuring.
- Amanda Hill (Mebane): Do we know when EPA will have standards?
 - Martie: At the pretreatment conference, they said they may anticipate having standards in January.

- Amy Moore: Durham County's permit includes PFAS monitoring.
- Gary: Quarterly or 2x/year PFAS monitoring will be required in several permits but will be delayed until 6 months after EPA publishes an established method. These 6 months are for laboratories to become state certified. If some labs need more time, reach out and it may be possible to take longer.
- Mark: Is Meritech looking into PFAS monitoring?
 - o David Merritt: We aren't looking into PFAS monitoring right now. We're at capacity doing what we can do (in terms of lab space.) We do monitor for 1, 4 dioxane – for several UCFRBA members.
- Reggie: Is the state anticipating that there will be the lab capacity to sample for permits?
 - o Gary: If no labs are state certified at 6 months, this timeframe can be extended. Ask for more time with permit writer.
- Elijah: This may be something that we could address as a group – write back to DWR regarding the timeframe needed for labs to be certified.
- Martie: Enthalpy is monitoring by the DOD method – those of us who needed to do this monitoring already use them.
- Elijah: Regarding PFAS, the Attorney General of NC is suing companies (Dupont and subsidiaries) on behalf of Piedmont Triad Regional Airport (co-plaintiff with the state). He expects we will see a range of means and methods of dealing with these contaminants.
 - o Gary: Yes, we expect so given there are over 5000 PFAS chemicals.
 - Martie: Which PFAS chemicals will DWR regulate - the 40 EPA recognizes?
 - Gary: Yes, but this may change per EPA.
 - EPA uses the 1633 method.
- Grace: When will the PFAS monitoring provision start being put in peoples' permits?
 - o Gary: It has been as of this past summer, statewide (not just this basin.)
 - o Nick Coco: If you have a downstream water supply, we would like PFAS monitoring. Whether quarterly or 2x/year is based on distance to water supply. We would like to understand how far PFAS is moving in the watersheds.
- Amanda: Is it monitoring only, or are there actual limits?
 - o Nick: It is monitoring only right now. We don't understand the gravity of the situation without sampling.
- Martie: Like with 1,4 dioxane, EPA recommended PFAS limits for some chemical can't be measured with current technology. We had this scenario with mercury decades ago – we were unable to measure the levels in our permit so adjudicated it. If you accept a limit, you say you can meet it and then you can't adjudicate it later.
- Maya: There were EPA speakers on the agenda for the AWMA conference on PFAS – maybe they will provide some insight into timeline, limits.

Updates from around the Upper Basin

- Durham City: Working with Gary on draft permit

- Greensboro: Trying to adjudicate our permit – in process. Greensboro and Jeff Poupart gave a presentation on 1, 4 and their SOC – copies of the presentation available. Data and more info about SOC on City of Greensboro website.
- Everyone else passes

Next Steps, Closing Remarks, Future Meeting Schedule

- 1) Follow-up tasks from this meeting: UCFRBA please follow up with any changes of staff/member contacts with Maya and Grace
- 2) Next meeting: Joint BOD/TAC - **Tues January 24th** (Virtual) - ok
- 3) Confirm plan: 2x/year virtual, 2x/year in-person - yes
- 4) Vote on TAC speaker or discussion topic (via raise of hands):
 - a. Strategies for developing the next generation of the workforce in this field
 - i. Employee retention also important
 - b. Continuation of emerging contaminants discussion?
 - i. Note: If EPA develops a standard for PFAS by January 2023, we should switch topics
 - c. Update from NC One Water Association (NC-AWWA/WEA)

The meeting adjourned at 10:54am.