



Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, March 9th, 2022

Attendees:

Blair Corning – South Platte Renew

Julie Tinetti – Centennial

Katie Koplitz – Metro

Andra Ahrens – Pueblo

Wes Martin – Plum Creek

Gave Racz – Vranesh and Raisch

Nathan Moore – CDPHE

Bonnie Pierce – Fort Collins

Barb Biggs – Roxborough Metro Dist.

Tara Wilson - Westminster

Bryan Burks – Mt. Crested Butte

Cynthia Lane – Platte Canyon

Mark Thomas - NFRWQPA

Hunter Greeno -C. Springs

Mary Paterniti - Longmont

Jason Kruckeberg - Silverthorne

Manuel Freyre - Northglenn

Sam Calkins - Centennial

Diana Trejo Calzada– LRE Water for BHCCSD

Meg Parish - CDPHE

Roy Heald – Security

Jeremy Woolf - Greeley

Jessica DiToro – LRE Water for BHCCSD

Jim Kendrick – Tri Lakes

Jim Dorsch – Metro

Dawn Cowell - Broomfield

Brandon Bernard - Security

Tanner Kraft – Westminster

Shelley Stanley – Northglenn

Mike Fabbre – Mount Crested Butte

Meghan Wilson – Boulder

David Bries – Montrose

J Urget – ?

Brandon Bernard – Security

Joe Creaghe - Loveland

Katie Duncan – Brownstein Hyatt Farber & Schreck

H Webb - ?

Amy Conklin – CWWUC Coordinator

Amy got the virtual meeting started and Blair welcomed everyone. Amy asked that everyone help her with the impossible task of keeping track of everyone at the meeting. There were two (2) people I couldn't identify. Here is a link to the meeting recording:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/gdohe5g7p3hugfq/Meeting%20Recording.m4a?dl=0>

Dawn Cowell – RMWEA – Dawn reported that April 29th there is a design competition at South Platte Renew that will be combined as a board meeting. It's a great opportunity to support students and see their unique ideas. Their Intermediate and Advanced School will be held in Longmont from April 11th to April 15th with lower pricing available until April 10th. June 15th is the due date for RMWEA education grants. There are grants for high school seniors and higher education students. Both are for students working towards a degree in the water environment profession. The Operators school will be held in Leadville from July 17th to July 22nd. The RMWEA conference will be held in Keystone September 18th to September 21st. The deadline for abstracts is March 28th. Blair suggested the CWWUC should consider submitting an abstract about the council. More information can be found at www.rmwea.org.

Nathan Moore (CDPHE) – Nathan reported that their funding request has been approved so they'll be able to spend previously approved money in different categories. They'll be hiring more full time employees (FTEs) who will work on inspections and some permit drafting. There are some rulemakings coming up for Regulation 21, clarifying the appeals process for alternative analyses. There may be a Work Group through the Water Quality Forum to develop the changes to the regulation for the appeals process. The WQCD staff has proposed some rule changes as well. Those changes will be proposed on Monday, March 14th. In April they'll be looking at Regulation 72, the Cherry Creek Reservoir Control Regulation. Regulation 84, concerning reuse water, will be heard in May. They'll be looking at tweaks to make the regulation work more smoothly.

Meg reported that there will be another round of PFAs monitoring modifications being proposed. They will be public noticed in April. They will be reaching out to permit holders whose permit requirements will be impacted. Requiring two (2) years of PFAs monitoring for dischargers to water supplies will be the focus of the modifications. She's happy to answer any questions on the industrial stormwater permit that will be public noticed tomorrow. She will be sending an email to share the chemical evaluation website. <https://cdphe.colorado.gov/clean-water-program/clean-water-permits/for-permittees/chemical-evaluations-and-discharge-permits> They are trying to be clearer about the wet testing. She is looking for feedback on the website.

Meg was asked about wastewater treatment plants being required to monitor as part of the industrial stormwater permitting process. Meg responded that the requirement would be mostly for PFAs storage and is unlikely to have any problems in complying with the general industrial permit.

Wes added that the stakeholder process is starting tomorrow. He is concerned about poly aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH, found in coal tar products) requirements. The products are used on roads and on roofs, generally. March 23rd there will be a meeting to address individual questions. [https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZErcO-tpzkqGt1IXytI9aaTnytBw1n6s-WI](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/9121721721)

Meg also reported that they are in the stakeholder process for anti-degradation guidance for alternative analyses. She encouraged everyone to review the proposed guidance and share any comments. All the Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) serve society's good so have an advantage in proposing alternative analyses.

Voluntary Incentive Program (VIP) nutrient emails have not been sent to everyone. Meg and Nathan will follow up and are encouraging everyone to go to the spreadsheet and fill it out. The information is due by March 31st. A link to the spreadsheet is here: [https://cdphe.colorado.gov/nutrients-incentive-program#:~:text=The%20voluntary%20incentive%20program%20encourages,\(Policy%2017%2D1](https://cdphe.colorado.gov/nutrients-incentive-program#:~:text=The%20voluntary%20incentive%20program%20encourages,(Policy%2017%2D1)

Checks for Approval, March 2022		
2313 - Amy Conklin	\$2,843.75	Feb 2022 Coordinating
2310 - Vranesh & Raisch	\$1,197.00	Dec and Jan charges

Board Action Items

Approval of invoices for payment. Andra made a motion to approve payment of the invoices. Wes seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of February 9th 2022 minutes - Julie noted that there is one correction on the minutes; changing Paul Winkle to Dana Winkleman. With that correction she moved to approve the minutes. Wes seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Audit requirement in by laws – The by-laws require that an audit is done every three (3) years but we're having trouble defining exactly what we need and finding a person or firm who can perform the work reasonably. Mark Thomas recommended the firm North Front Range Water Quality Planning Association (NFRWQPA) uses, John Cutler and Associates and shared the contact information. Roy Heald offered his services if Andra could use them since he has a degree in accounting. Barb Biggs reached out to colleagues at Metro State University to see if there might be some students who would be interested in helping us. Shelley Stanley shared information about the firm the Rocky Flats Stewardship Council uses. **Amy** will get more information and share it with the group.

Amy explained that all the auditors are so busy that they recommend doing the audit on our current fiscal year because it would be too late to make any changes to our procedures to make a difference by the time they could schedule their review. Julie explained that there was a concern about financial protocols which resulted in a decision to add a requirement into the bylaws for an audit. She suggested the council consider changing 'shall' to 'may' in the by laws to give us more flexibility. Andra added that she would prefer to have an audit of some kind since she shouldered most of the fiduciary responsibilities.

Invoice reminders – Invoice reminders are being sent for membership dues. Please let us know if there are any issues with membership dues payment. Andra reported that there are some issues with matching invoices and payments. If a member receives an invoice for dues they have paid, please let us know.

Discussion Items

Gabe Racz – Updates and discussion – Chemical Evaluations and new website. He's received feedback on the chemical evaluation forms and website that there is still some confusion and there needs to be a meeting to help resolve some of the questions. The wet testing is particularly confusing. The last meeting wasn't long enough to resolve the issues. Here is a link to the chemical evaluations website Meg referenced (again): <https://cdphe.colorado.gov/clean-water-program/clean-water-permits/for-permittees/chemical-evaluations-and-discharge-permits> **Amy** will send the link to the membership and ask for them to review and share questions. We should make a list of questions and ask for resolution.

The antidegradation alternatives analyses process effort is continuing. Gabe is working on some comments that will be high level and he will share them. The most controversial issues for domestic POTWs, is how they are going to set the new limit, being appealed. The policy says that the limit must be the same as the highest level in the effluent. It is confusing to him because that approach doesn't allow any for any degradation even though the alternative analysis should allow some. There are growth and industrial concerns. If there is a lot of growth or a particular industry that wants to send wastewater to the POTW, the antidegradation limits could control how much growth there could be

and what types of industry a community could allow. The deadline for comments is next Tuesday.

Mark asked about the arsenic limits on the 10-year water quality roadmap that are unattainable at this point. Do dischargers in the South Platte basin need to be concerned with the alternative analyses and anti-degradation issues. The current limit for arsenic is 0.02 mg/L which is below detection limit. It shouldn't be an issue because the standard is unattainable due to the reality of higher detection limits. The science is supporting increasing the limit because higher values will still protect the environment. Gabe thinks that the response for unattainable arsenic limits in discharges will be to get variances where appropriate. Arsenic standards will be revisited in 2024.

Andra asked if there were responses to the memo on Non Impact Limits (NILs). CDPHE hasn't responded yet. There were important disagreements around NILs. It would be important to look at specific facility issues now. **Amy** will share the draft alternative analysis with the group.

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1gwf98GtVy0ujhK1rO4UAWb3Cg_qlwr2bA7a4itn9U5Y/edit Be sure to let Gabe know if there are any issues with his comments in a timely manner because comments are due Tuesday March 15th.

Temperature in permits is another issue. He is late submitting comments. CDPHE had requested comments by Monday March 7th. The two issues Gabe is concerned with are 316 waivers (alternative limits) and mixing zones. He would like to see a way to include calculations where the effluent may be above the temp limit, but when it mixes with the stream, the standard is met. In stream cooling is another issue. If the stream cools in the mixing zone or downstream segments, does a POTW get credit for that. It could be important when the standard is just barely met.

PFAs legislation update – **Julie Tinetti** – There was a meeting with the bill proponents who were receptive to removing the biosolids monitoring requirements. She's hopeful that the legislation would just require removal of PFAs from consumer products.

February 16th – Industrial Stormwater general Permit stakeholder work group meeting, COR900000 – **Wes Martin** added that he's not sure what category a POTW is in that permit. He advises to pay attention to the requirements. He was concerned about PAHs and being in compliance with the requirements. The permit will be coming out tomorrow and is probably worth reviewing.

Julie added that we should try to coordinate comments and send some from the CWWUC if there are enough members interested. There is still confusion about what category POTWs fall into. Katie responded that Metro Water Recovery is category T. That category doesn't include lift stations and other infrastructure. If there are underground storage tanks, the facility would be put in another category. If there is only storage and unloading that might be a lower level of requirement.

Special District legislation update – **Julie Tinetti** - She has been tracking Sente Bill 22-136, <https://leg.colorado.gov/bills/sb22-136> . There was a hearing in which Barb Biggs testified opposing the bill. In the proposed bill, any citizen from the community could nominate themselves and put themselves on the Board. All Board actions would be

subject to referendums. It was more targeted towards Metro districts where developers issue bonds to pay for infrastructure and then are overrepresented on the board until there are enough residents to form a majority. The bill was postponed indefinitely. But there may be another bill which will hopefully remove special districts. Barb is now on NACWA PFAs committee.

Colorado Monitoring Framework – **Andra Ahrens** – there was a board meeting last week. There will be an annual meeting for all the members, hopefully in person at Brown & Caldwell, serving lunch. There will be stories about individual experiences about PFAs, chemical evaluation forms, and Technical Advisory Committee updates. They will be voting on a new Board member as well. It will be a full meeting. No date has been set yet but it will probably be in May.

Cynthia Lane asked about that national water week in April. Several people are going to Washington DC representing drinking water interests. If anyone knows that they are going representing wastewater interests, please contact Ken Lykens, Cynthia Lane, or Devon Buckles and try to coordinate visits to representatives on the hill. They will be much more effective that way. Dan DeLaughter is going for South Platte Renew.

Future Guest speakers, topics and meeting format– **Blair Corning** Blair posted a link in the chat.

https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=BNaIBTOXLUyO_z6_zxu8acJLlx_difB9NI6V-RnESJLIUMVVSrkMwQVNCM0kzU0YyM09INUtTWVc2OS4u

The responses showed that people would prefer to continue meeting online. Although there was support for a few hybrid meetings so we could have some meetings in person. The in person meetings could be held in locations around the state.

Members would also like to hear information on the following topics:

- Regulatory changes and challenges of other utilities
- PFAs
- TENORM
- Chemical Form Process
- Anti-degradation
- Temperature
- How to prepare for the 10-year road map
- Others that Blair will share.

The people members would like to hear from include:

- Members who are having issues at their facilities
- Jane Clary
- Industry issues experts
- Water and Power Authority staff
- Experts familiar with water quality trading

Issues that facilities are facing include:

- Groundwater permit compliance
- Staffing and competitive salaries
- Temperature and chemical evaluations

- Arsenic, salinity and phosphorus
- Obtaining radium disposal information
- PFAs
- TENORM
- Temperature regulations
- Meeting chloride permit limits
- Chemical evaluations
- Water supply designations
- DPR
- Anti-degradation
- Cyber security
- Infrastructure rehabilitation
- Expansion and treatment upgrades to meet future regulations
-

Suggestions for making meetings more effective meetings include sending out minutes and meeting recordings.

Diana asked about getting the website updated. She asked about being able to access the meeting recordings through the website. Getting a website through the Colorado Statewide Internet Portal Authority (SIPA) website. **Amy** will look into recordings storage options and using SIPA.

Wes noted that anyone experiencing supply chain issues impacting the cost and availability of treatment chemicals can contact Homeland Security and EPA for assistance.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 13th, 2022 at 1:00 pm