



VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER AGENCIES, INC.

P.O. Box 51

Richmond, Virginia 23218-0051

Tel (804) 716-9021 • Fax (804) 716-9022

MEMBER AGENCIES

Alexandria Renew Enterprises
County of Arlington
Augusta County Service Authority
Blacksburg-VPI Sanitation Authority
County of Chesterfield
Town of Christiansburg
Coeburn-Norton-Wise Reg. Wastewater Auth.
Town of Culpepper
City of Danville
County of Fairfax
County of Goochland
Hampton Roads Sanitation District
County of Hanover
Harrisonburg-Rockingham Reg. Sewer Auth.
County of Henrico
City of Hopewell
Town of Leesburg
Loudoun Water
City of Lynchburg
City of Martinsville
Pepper's Ferry Regional Wastewater Auth.
Prince William County Service Authority
City of Richmond
Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority
South Central Wastewater Authority
County of Spotsylvania
County of Stafford
Upper Ocoquan Service Authority
City of Waynesboro
Western Virginia Water Authority
City of Winchester

ASSOCIATE MEMBER AGENCIES

Amherst County Service Authority
Town of Amherst
Bedford Regional Water Authority
Town of Bowling Green
City of Buena Vista
County of Campbell
County of Caroline
County of Charles City
Town of Colonial Beach
County of Culpeper
Dinwiddie County Water Authority
Fauquier County Water & Sanitation Auth.
Frederick County Sanitation Authority
City of Fredericksburg
Town of Front Royal
Halifax County
Henry County Public Service Authority
Town of Kilmarnock
Louisa County Water Authority
Maury Service Authority
Montgomery County Public Service Auth.
County of New Kent
Town of Onancock
County of Powhatan
Town of Purcellville
Rapidan Service Authority
Stoney Creek Sanitary District
Town of Strasburg
Sussex Service Authority
Town of Tappahannock
Town of Warsaw
Wise County Public Service Authority
Town of Woodstock

AFFILIATE MEMBER AGENCY

D.C. Water

CONSULTANT MEMBERS

Arcadis
Black & Veatch
CDM Smith
CH2M Hill
Dewberry
Greeley and Hansen
Hazen and Sawyer
O'Brien & Gere

ASSOCIATE CONSULTANT MEMBERS

AECOM
Atkins
Brown and Caldwell
CHA Consulting
Clyde Wilber LLC
Draper Aden Associates
Energy Systems Group
GHD
HDR Engineering
Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson
LimnoTech
Parsons
Reid Engineering
Whitman, Requardt & Associates
Wiley/Wilson
William P. Johnson II, PE, PC
WW Associates

LEGAL COUNSEL

Christopher D. Pomeroy, Esq.
President, AquaLaw PLC

April 30, 2015

By Electronic Mail (agreement@chesapeakebay.net)

Nicholas DiPasquale, Director
Chesapeake Bay Program
Environmental Protection Agency
410 Severn Ave., Suite 109
Annapolis, MD 21403

Re: Draft Chesapeake Bay Management Strategies

Dear Mr. DiPasquale:

Enclosed please find the comments of the Virginia Association of Municipal Wastewater Agencies, Inc. (VAMWA) on select draft Management Strategies, written pursuant to the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement.

VAMWA is a statewide association that includes owners and operators of municipal wastewater treatment plants throughout Virginia, many of which clean and discharge highly treated wastewater within the Chesapeake Bay watershed. VAMWA members are proud of their Bay-leading treatment upgrade program in partnership with the Commonwealth of Virginia and its Department of Environmental Quality through the Water Quality Improvement Fund and the innovative Chesapeake Bay Nutrient Credit Exchange Program.

In addition to considering VAMWA's comments, we request that you consider the individual comments of VAMWA Members, including the Hampton Roads Sanitation District.

Sincerely,

/s/ Lisa M. Ochsenhirt
VAMWA Deputy General Counsel
AquaLaw

cc: VAMWA Members
Christopher Pomeroy, AquaLaw



**VAMWA COMMENTS ON 2014 CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED AGREEMENT
DRAFT MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES
APRIL 30, 2015**

I. INTRODUCTION

VAMWA – the voice of Virginia’s Clean Water Utilities – brings together approximately 100 proactive local governments and leading wastewater engineering firms to work for clean water in Virginia, based on sound science and good public policy. VAMWA has been supporting clean water, vibrant communities, and a strong state economy for nearly 25 years by seeking to align clean water goals, smart management practices, and affordable technology and infrastructure.

VAMWA has worked extensively with EPA, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and well-known trade associations and citizen groups to advance water quality in Virginia and the Chesapeake Bay. In promoting abundant clean water in this manner, VAMWA helps maintain Virginia’s U.S.–leading business climate ranking. VAMWA is proud of its and its Members’ well-known leading efforts on nutrient reduction, beneficial policy development, and overall positive water quality contributions.

VAMWA submitted comments on the abridged and final drafts of the new Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement (the 2014 Agreement) on August 13, 2013 and March 17, 2014. Today’s comments address four of the Management Strategies drafted to “achieve the Goals and Outcomes” of the 2014 Agreement, including: Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention Outcome; Toxic Contaminants Research Outcome; 2017 WIP, 2025 WIP, WQS Attainment & Monitoring Outcome; and Healthy Watersheds Outcome. Thank you in advance for considering our views and recommended revisions to these four important documents.

II. COMMENTS

A. Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention Outcome

VAMWA has concerns regarding the following aspects of the draft Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention Outcome Management Strategy:

- Biosolids – Biosolids are mentioned several times in the draft. Biosolids land application is listed as a potential source of PCBs in stormwater (p. 6), and the draft suggests a need for research on PCBs in biosolids because of the “[l]imited information...available on whether land application of biosolids containing PCBs are a source of PCBs in unregulated and NPDES regulated stormwater.” (p. 8, 21).

VAMWA objects to the characterization of biosolids as a potential source of PCBs in stormwater. *If* there are trace levels of PCBs in biosolids, a third-party, not the wastewater

collection or treatment system, is the source. It is most efficient and cost-effective to reduce PCBs at the source (on contaminated sites, through PCB transformer programs, etc).

Furthermore, biosolids are highly treated materials that are land applied with multiple environmental safeguards (for example, buffers). This is a valuable recycling program that brings nutrient management and other site management requirements to farmland that otherwise would not be subject such requirements. The draft Management Strategy fails to provide any context regarding these benefits.

Recommended Revision: Delete text suggesting that biosolids land application is a source of PCBs. If the text remains, provide a more holistic view of state biosolids land application programs that notes the positive aspects of the program.

- Method 1668 – The draft relies heavily on a test method (Method 1668) that does not meet EPA’s own requirements under 40 CFR Part 136 and comparable State requirements. For example, one of the recommended Management Strategies is to: “Encourage use of method 1668 to analyze PCBs as it is the most sensitive method.” (p. 20). This is a flaw in the strategy. An approved test method should be used or developed if important to this strategy.

Recommended Revision: Clarify that Method 1668 is not an approved method and cannot be used in any regulatory context.

- Numeric PCB Requirements – One of the wastewater-related Management Strategies is for the EPA Region 3 NPDES Permits Branch to “draft and review permits with a focus on ensuring that PCB WLAs are clear and enforceable.” (p. 22). Currently, in appropriate situations, Bay jurisdictions use non-numeric WQBELs in the form of pollutant minimization plans (PMPs) for wastewater permittees. (p. 9). PMPs are appropriate and effective and are preferable to numeric PCB requirements.

Recommended Revision: Revise the paragraph on page 22 to delete references to PCB WLAs in wastewater permits.

- PCB Monitoring by NPDES Stormwater Dischargers – The draft notes as a gap the fact that “NPDES regulated stormwater dischargers do not currently have effluent concentration limits for PCBs in their permits.” (p. 7). Many VAMWA Members also have responsibility for regulated municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s). VAMWA objects to PCB concentrations in MS4 permits as legally inappropriate, very costly, and of little value, given the fact that municipal stormwater facilities are spread over an entire drainage area. In addition, characterizing the absence of limits as a “gap” is factually incorrect for the following reasons: (i) there is not a “gap” unless a discharge has a “reasonable potential” to exceed WQS; and (ii) EPA’s existing regulations regarding NPDES permitting address pollutant discharges.

Recommended Revision: Strike the sentence quoted above from page 7.

B. Toxic Contaminants Research Outcome

VAMWA generally supports scientific research. However, VAMWA has identified two problematic issues in the draft Toxic Contaminants Research Outcome Management Strategy.

- Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades – The draft suggests that research could fuel additional management strategies, including “applying upgrades or new technology to wastewater treatment...” (p. 13). With regard to PCBs, suggesting upgrades to wastewater treatment plants is inconsistent with the Policy and Prevention draft (as noted above, PMPs are being used to address PCB TMDLs in appropriate situations). Jurisdictions are not requiring wastewater treatment plant modifications to address PCBs. They are instead appropriately considering the source of the pollutant (which is not the plant).

Recommended Revision: Delete the sentence quoted above from page 13.

- Biosolids – Consistent with VAMWA’s comments regarding the draft Toxics Policy and Prevention Management Strategy, references to biosolids land application as a potential source of PCBs should be eliminated.

In addition, as a part of the discussion of endocrine-disrupting chemicals (EDCs), the draft reads: “Sources of EDCs include biosolids, animal manures, aging sewer infrastructure, septic systems, agricultural runoff, urban runoff, and other factors.” (p. 15). If the relevant issue is trying to “better define the sources” of EDCs (p. 15), it is puzzling that the next paragraph appears to conclusively identify various sources of EDCs. In addition, listing biosolids first is objectionable. Biosolids, when land applied, are intended to be taken up by the crops as a nutrient source. Biosolids should not be first in a list that includes actual runoff pathways.

Recommended Revision: See recommendations above regarding PCBs. Revise the text on EDCs to make the scientific uncertainty clear and to prioritize runoff pathways over biosolids land application.

C. 2017 WIP, 2025 WIP and Water Quality Standards Attainment & Monitoring Outcomes

VAMWA has reviewed the draft 2017 WIP, 2025 WIP and Water Quality Standards Attainment & Monitoring Outcomes Management Strategy, and recommends that the following changes be made before the strategy is finalized:

- Cross-Sector “Consequences” – The draft states that the “WIPs identify contingency strategies” that can be used if implementation does not occur. This allows a jurisdiction to “pursue the development of enhanced authorities or new regulations to control loadings from that same source sector or another source sector.” (p. 8). VAMWA objects to making one sector such as the Wastewater Sector bear “consequences” if another source sector fails to meet their goals or simply needs more time to do so than is currently assumed. The Bay is a nonpoint source dominated system, making it impossible for point sources to make up for

shortcomings in air deposition or other nonpoint source reductions. Additionally, major investments have recently been made in these wastewater facilities to meet Bay and Local water quality needs that would be undermined by cross-sector consequences.

Recommended Revision: “For example, if an enhanced cost-share program does not yield adequate participation and compliance rates, a jurisdiction might pursue the development of enhanced authorities or new regulations to control loadings from that same source sector ~~or another source sector.~~”

- Determining “Local Targets” – The draft includes a discussion of “Local Engagement” under the “Participating Partners” heading. (p. 4-5). VAMWA supports local engagement efforts, but has a concern about any use of the phrase “local targets” that assumes or implies a legal obligation or responsibility on a locality (i.e., local government) is being determined by the CBP Partnership. The term could cause confusion between determining geographic planning targets affecting a variety of sources in any given local area (proper) versus determining targets that could be misconstrued as mandates on a locality itself outside of the TMDL process (improper, because of the limited authority localities have over existing development on private property).

Recommended Revisions: “Outreach to a variety of local entities may help the CBP partners assess and determine the ideal scale at which implementation will occur and where possible, quantify identify efforts in local targets areas for inclusion within the WIPs. The CBP partnership recognizes that individual jurisdictions may pursue somewhat different approaches to this local outreach.”

- “Demonstrated” WQS Attainment – Expected improvements in water quality based upon the installation or implementation of particular practices are based upon projections, not demonstrations with factual outcomes. (p. 5). There are inherent issues with making projections and various stakeholders have expressed concerns about the Bay model, making the use of the word “demonstrated” incorrect.

Recommended Revisions: “Based on the current science and the associated CBP modeling system, the CBP partnership has ~~demonstrated~~ projected that implementing practices for reducing nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment loads ~~will~~ should achieve applicable water quality standards in the Bay. Improved understanding of the following elements could further enhance decision-making for the Phase III WIPs: (1) the factors affecting the time it will take to see improvements (i.e., “lag times”) between implementation of practices and responses in water quality; (2) factors in addition to nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment pollutant load reduction that affect response of DO, clarity, SAV, and chlorophyll; (3) the relationships between water quality improvements and the recovery of habitat conditions for fish and shellfish populations; ~~and~~ (4) how increases in plant and animal biomass in response to improved water quality improves the assimilative capacity of the system for nutrients and sediment and, (5) an improved understanding of uncertainty associated with model projections.”

D. Healthy Watersheds Outcome Management Strategy

In 2014, VAMWA expressed a concern that the Healthy Watersheds Outcome – “100 percent of state-identified currently healthy waters and watersheds remain healthy”— seemed to incorporate into the agreement the regulatory concept of “antidegradation” found in state water quality standards, but without the policy tools and flexibilities states have to balance water quality with other societal needs.

The draft Healthy Watersheds Management Strategy (p. 7, 12) suggests the need for “protective measures,” including “upstream projects that address wastewater discharges,” for healthy watersheds that are facing risks to existing water quality. The draft offers no additional details regarding the types of projects envisioned, who would pay for those projects, when they would be considered, etc.

In VAMWA’s experience, existing requirements for obtaining authorization to discharge into a high quality water are quite rigorous and time-consuming. The draft gives this reality short shrift and seems to criticize current antidegradation policies: “Allowable degradation cannot result in a loss of waterbody use(s), but can be significant nonetheless.” (p. 6). Additional “protective measures” are needed to address this perceived shortcoming. In this way, the draft Management Strategy, like the 2014 Agreement, attempts to create a higher standard for discharges to these waters. VAMWA believes this is unnecessary.

Recommended Revision: Remove references to the need for additional “protective measures” for wastewater discharges.
