

AGENDA

UPPER CAPE FEAR RIVER BASIN ASSOCIATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mebane Arts & Community Center
633 Corregidor Street
Mebane, NC 27302

October 29, 2019
9:30 AM

Attendees

NAME	AGENCY	CONTACT INFO
Mark Vander Borgh	NC DWR	Mark.Vanderborgh@ncdenr.gov
Forest Shepherd	NC DWR	forest.shepherd@ncdenr.gov
Julie Grzyb	NC DWR	Julie.grzyb@ncdenr.gov
David Huffman	NC DWR	David.huffman@ncdenr.gov
David Merritt	Meritech	david.merritt@meritechlabs.com
Shelby Smith	City of Graham	ssmith@cityofgraham.com
Tonya Mann	City of Graham	tmann@cityofgraham.com
Monica Dodson	OWASA	mdodson@owasa.org
Alicia Goots	City of Greensboro	Alicia.Goots@greensboro-nc.gov
Martie Groome	City of Greensboro	Martie.Groome@greensboro-nc.gov
Charlie Cocker	City of Durham	Charles.Cocker@durhamnc.gov
Michael Rhoney	City of Asheboro	mrhoney@ci.asheboro.nc.us
Dennis Hodge	City of Mebane	dhodge@cityofmebane.com
Bob Patterson	City of Burlington	bpatterson@burlingtonnc.gov
Glenn McGirt	City of Burlington	gmcgirt@burlingtonnc.gov
Elizabeth Goodson	Town of Pittsboro	egoodson@pittsboro.gov
Maria Vanderloop	Town of Cary	Maria.vanderloop@townofcary.org
Dawn Molnar	City of High Point	Dawn.molnar@highpointnc.gov
Chuck Smith	City of Reidsville	csmith@reidsville.nc.us
Ben Bani	City of Reidsville	bbani@reidsville.nc.us
Bernadine Wardlaw	City of Asheboro	bwardlaw@ci.asheboro.nc.us
Jen Schmitz	TJCOG	jschmitz@tjcog.org
Judy Smith	City of Asheboro	judysmith@ci.asheboro.nc.us
Cameron Colvin	PTRC	ccolvin@ptrc.org
Maya Cough-Schulze	TJCOG	mcough-schulze@tjcog.org
Steve Tedder	Tedderfarm Consulting	tedderfarmconsulting@gmail.com

Short term action items:

- TJCOG/PTRC will organize a Joint TAC/Board meeting before mid-December focused exclusively on the metals data request

- Coalition to send TJCOG/PTRC any other follow-up questions related to metals data request for discussion at the next meeting
- Meritech will update their quote prior to this Joint meeting
- Anyone with thoughts on station locations (for metals request or routine sampling) should convey them to TJCOG/PTRC
- Mark will share data that led to 35 metals delistings mentioned in July 11 memo
- If Coalition would like to meet directly with DWR to discuss, either in advance of or after the next Joint meeting, TJCOG/PTRC can coordinate

Longer term action items:

- TJCOG/PTRC will present MOA incorporating any comments to Board in January.
-

The meeting opened at 9:30am after coffee and donuts

- Maya introduced the meeting
- The agenda was changed to read “TAC meeting” not “Joint meeting”

Organizational Report

- MOA Updates (Cameron Colvin)
 - Send any comments to Cameron, Jen or Maya.
 - TJCOG/PTRC will present cleaned-up MOA incorporating any comments to Board in January.
- Sampling station review
 - Cameron and Maya will visit each site, take up to date photos, and evaluate for safety concerns.
- Station changes:
 - Durham requested to re-add station B3300000/21, NE Creek at SR 1102 Sedwick Rd
 - Added b/c lower in watershed, needed to do loading calculations for fecal coliform TMDL
 - If anyone has any stations you want to add, tell us and we’ll bring to board in Jan
- QA/QC Update
 - Dawn summarized the violations
 - Site 19, New Hope Creek: very low DO (2x in July)
 - Site 37 Deep River: Turbidity violation (Aug)
 - Site 42: Turbidity violation (Aug)
 - Site 56: DO violation (Aug)
 - Site 43: DO violation (Sept)
 - Data correction: Site 41, conductivity
- **Station 3040000 move**
 - Relocated because bridge had high railings that staff had to climb up on to get sample. Also, concern with traffic safety on road. Relocated site up footpath by SCM

a few hundred meters away on game land. Precautions: wear orange vest, get lock code between December-Jan. Station co-located with DWR, USGS now.

- Forest Shepherd (DWR) set up the station move and will reach out with code.
- Due to move, station was renamed **B3039000**
 - Cameron: Will new name for station create conflicts for data submittals?
 - Mark: Take care data is coming in under new code.
- Reach out to Mark if any other stations are unsafe—they're happy to move them as needed.
 - Charlie: This bridge flooded, was once closed for a week.
 - Mark: if bridge flooded, write "station inaccessible" and sample next time it's safe/accessible
- David Huffman pointed out that newer bridges have high railings unsuitable for sampling, so this may be an ongoing problem as more bridges are replaced or retrofitted.

Complex Permitting Updates

- Julie Grzyb explained that her group and other groups who do NPDES permitting are being restructured—permits for pretreatment will look at downstream impacts in future

PFAS Updates

- 1,4 dioxane and PFAS sampling: want to make a map of where sampling has been done. Have gotten requests from reporters for data.
- Shared brand new PFOS+PFOA data. Sums of these two analytes *only* rarely exceed EPA drinking water advisory level of **70 ng/L**. NCDWR will be working to determine whether a state standard is feasible; other states have implemented standards far lower than 70 ng/L.

Questions:

- Jen: It's positive that summed PFOS+PFOA are below 70; any other specific analytes significantly high that might also be a concern?
- Julie: haven't analyzed data to this level yet—stay tuned.
 - Some issues with influent data
 - DWR will follow up with some municipalities

1,4 Dioxane

- Generally low values; however, DWR has estimated loads coming from upstream effluent and found that potentially concerning levels may occur at downstream intakes. Need to do more sampling and modeling.
 - Note loads are a coarse estimation method based on average flow
- Asheboro installing treatment technology
- Complex Permitting group is working with upstream municipalities on reducing 1,4 dioxane in effluent
- Chronic value (narrative standard): 0.35 micrograms/L
- Data will go public in November

Questions:

- Charlie: What's next for future sampling?

- Julie: Confirm good data at effluent for all municipalities
- Upstream/downstream connections are complicated due to lake. Julie will do dilution, consider what limit will be, if concerning
- Talk with upstream WWTPs with high 1,4 dioxane levels
 - Industrial data coming end of Jan
 - Groundwater remediation sites—1,4 dioxane limits—will find out whether cleaned up

Metals Data Request

Maya gave a recap of the DWR request to conduct additional dissolved metals sampling to potentially delist some sites. Updates to Meritech’s quote are pending and will be shared with TAC. Coalitions discussed questions/concerns related to how sites were selected, potential impacts on future permitting if sites remain impaired, sampling only for impaired metals, and further clarification on the delisting process.

Mark Vander Borgh shared the following information:

- He is creating a FAQ list for all coalitions
- Yadkin coalition questioned 303d listing—easier to get on, harder to get off?
 - Mark: Had to create a new methodology for integrated report; not easier to get on or off
- Detection limits so low?
 - No evidence of false positives based on crunching the numbers. Out of 8723 results, 8524 were non-detects. Only 17 violations or 0.0002% exceedances out of all samples
- Why should coalitions sample if there might be exceedances?
 - That’s the point of sampling. We don’t believe the data we collect will lead to stricter requirements, but we need the data to show there aren’t exceedances.
 - Note, because in-stream monitoring, not effluent monitoring, no possibility of NOVs
- Why were these sites selected?
 - Because they were metals violations that we were trying to get delisted before. Priority stations had 10% exceedances with less than 90% confidence and metals impairments only (or few other parameters.)
- Any weight for benefits to dischargers?
 - No, these are stations we need for delisting purposes. But we believe they will benefit dischargers, because if delisted, will loosen requirements in next permits.
- Any potential impacts for future NPDES permitting if remain impaired?
 - Yes, if a water’s impaired, permit must address violations.
- What is the process if an individual city decides to adopt a site and get it delisted?
 - Process: Portal on site, talk to Cam McNutt about study plan, accept data if acceptable. Won’t accept data for just a couple of metals; need full suite
 - Won’t accept data that’s just for impaired metals
 - Martie: If we have to do the whole suite, we probably won’t.
- Where are sites on DEQ priority list?
 - DWR is still looking into this.

- If coalitions don't collect data, when will it be done?
 - DWR doesn't know.
- Can DEQ provide data and process that resulted in 35 delisting?
 - IR report methodology is publicly available, and Mark has specific data in zipped files that he'll share with group.

Mark: Please send any other questions--want to make sure clear communication is going on.

Question raised: what's the state's job and what's the coalition's?

Discussion around station locations:

Julie: Concern that EPA keeps coming to DWR about whether each municipality is sampling full suite of analyses.

Martie: Some sites aren't of benefit to anybody. Or, are impaired for more than just metals. Would rather spend money sampling upstream and downstream of Greensboro for all parameters of concern.

Julie: We're at a crossroads. EPA criteria may be headed towards needing specific data around plants, up- and downstream.

Martie: Our downstream location was removed a while back. WWTP shut down. From Greensboro perspective, getting one upstream site.

Mark: How can we make the coalition function for everybody? If we need to move some stations around, open to that.

Julie: If we reduced the number of stations, would that be easier?

Martie: It depends where the stations were.

Julie: Additional coordination needed between NPDES (permitting staff/efforts) and impaired waters (303d listing staff/efforts). Need to discuss/improve.

Next steps

Jen: We can discuss all of this and the big stuff about the purpose of the coalition at Board meeting. Also, TAC should advise board; please send thoughts.

Martie: We should have a TAC meeting before Jan with all members represented since not all are today. Also, want to know what other coalitions are doing since we're setting a precedent here.

Jen: We will plan a Joint meeting with TAC immediately preceding Board meeting. Would Middle Cape Fear be interested in getting upstream data and perhaps help finance?

Martie: Chad said on a recent call that there's no money, but he's interested in what's going on.

Jen: Need more folks in Coalition to be represented to enable voting at next meeting.

- TJCOG will do outreach to get non-present members to meetings; some who don't attend would be affected by metals sampling (Star.)

FYI from Mark: metals are not mentioned in MOA, so won't hold up MOA

Updates from around the Upper Basin

- South Durham plant under construction
- Asheboro still waiting on permit because of 1,4 dioxane
- OWASA: Sandra Bradshaw retiring at end of year. Working with Complex Permitting group to negotiate permit.

The meeting adjourned at 11am.