

Chesapeake Bay Mid-Point Assessment

There was a meeting in Annapolis this past quarter with presentations on finalizing the Phase 6 Bay modeling tools and choosing a base year for setting new state and basin planning targets.

The most controversial agenda topic was the status of the Conowingo Dam. The 2010 Bay TMDL assumed the Dam would continue trapping sediments through 2025. The general consensus now is that the Dam is reaching capacity at a much quicker pace. This means that there could be an additional 1.7 million pounds per year of phosphorus to reduce in order to achieve the water quality standards.

The options being proposed ahead of a December 22 meeting are:

Option 1. Assign reductions to the Susquehanna Watershed only. Pennsylvania reductions of 12-25%; New York of 10-21%; and Maryland of 1%.

Option 2. Assign reductions to the Susquehanna plus Maryland and Virginia. Pennsylvania reductions of 7-14%; New

York of 6-11%; Maryland of 7-16%; and Virginia of 4-9%.

Option 3. Assign reductions to the entire Bay Watershed. Pennsylvania reductions of 14%; New York of 5-10%; Maryland of 6-14%; Virginia of 4-8%; Delaware of 9-20%; DC of 1-3%; and West Virginia of 5-11%.

These suggested approaches will ultimately provide each Bay jurisdiction, including Virginia, with draft planning targets to begin drafting their own Phase III Watershed Implementation Plans. Virginia will be posting its draft Phase III WIP for public comment on February 8, 2019, with its final Phase III WIP being posted on June 7, 2019.

Hopefully any phosphorus reductions associated with the Dam will be deferred until after 2025. Perhaps the Dam will actually be dredged of its sediments and be able to continue to effectively remove sediments well beyond the year 2025.

Executive Director:
Brian Key

Assistant Director:
Nathan Carroll

Maintenance Manager:
Tom Cberro

Wastewater Operations Manager:
Michael Ramsey

Water Operations Manager:
William Wood



DEQ's Final Draft of EQ Biosolids Permit

DEQ continues working on its first major distribution and marketing (D&M) Permit of Excellent Quality bulk and blended biosolids. The terms of this first Permit are important to very many POTWs for DEQ views it as a "pilot" for future Permits.

With this in mind, it becomes important that DEQ's approach will support and encourage additional owners considering investments in excellent quality technology to re-

cover and reuse resources.

District of Columbia Water, which will receive the pilot Permit, has provided DEQ with several rounds of feedback already.

There have been voiced concerns that the draft Permit imposed restrictions beyond those allowed by the State's biosolids regulations at 9VAC25-32-570 (Distribution and Marketing).

It remains unclear at this time how DC Water will respond to the final draft or when DEQ will issue the Permit.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

Chesapeake Bay Update

DEQ's EQ Biosolids Permit 1

EPA's Dental Amalgam Rule Update 2

RiverKeeper vs EPA 2

DEQ and Pipelines 2

Methods Update Rule from EPA 3



EPA Dental Amalgam Rule Update

EPA has issued FAQs for Dentists and Dental Offices concerning what they must do in regards to the new Dental Amalgam Rule.

This Rule defines “dental dischargers” subject to its standards as those offices that place and remove amalgam and discharge to a POTW.

This Rule requires, by July 14, 2020, that dental offices install amalgam separators; implement two best management practices regarding handling of the amalgam; make a one-time compliance report to Control Authori-

ties within 3 years and 90 days of the Rule’s effective date or within 90 days of a transfer of ownership; and to maintain amalgam records as specified by this Rule.

The installation/use of ADA-compliant separators is mandated by this Rule. There is no performance standard to meet.

This Rule, as passed, is significantly improved from the original, but POTWs still have to receive and maintain notices from dentists who reside within their collection systems. It remains unclear what responsibility the POTW will have if dentists

do not submit the required notices as well as for verifying the accuracy of such notices.

Pretreatment Program Enforcement Response Plans dictate what must be done in the event of “failure to report”, or a report is not complete. The Program also requires the POTW to collect sufficient data to evaluate whether the Dental User is in compliance with the Dental Rule. What must be done when Dental best management practices are not being utilized? Is this a violation of the Rule? This remains a very hazy area with the Rule.

“WHAT MUST BE
DONE WHEN
DENTAL BEST
MANAGEMENT
PRACTICES ARE
NOT BEING
UTILIZED? IS THIS A
VIOLATION OF THE
RULE? “

Earlier this year the Potomac Riverkeepers filed suit against EPA’s approval of Virginia’s decision not to list the Shenandoah River as being “impaired” under the Clean Water Act.

Virginia DEQ is completing the second season of field work on the South and North Branches of the Shenandoah, intending

RiverKeeper vs EPA

to address the freshwater algae issue as it applies to recreational use of those forks of the river. DEQ has previously classified the Shenandoah as Category 3S, which suggests water quality problems but not impairment.

Riverkeepers wants to evaluate recreational use of the river

based upon aesthetics and odor. DEQ evaluates recreational use based upon bacteria water quality standards alone. The levels of nitrogen and phosphorus have trended at a plateau or downward . There are already 17 local total maximum daily load (TMDL) restrictions in place for nutrients and sediment that help improve the water quality of the river.

DEQ and Pipelines

The department announced that it would expand its review of the two proposed inter-state natural gas pipelines. It is to require certification of the pipelines under CWA Section 401. The additional certification is to assure the general public that the state intended to “do more” on these two projects.

These additional certifications will add to the existing processes under the Army Corps of Engineers permit to guarantee protection of land disturbed by construction, wetlands, and

water bodies.

The expanded scope of review is to also ensure that state water quality standards as well as erosion and sediment controls will be adhered to during construction.

Of concern to wastewater and water treatment departments statewide is the potential spill-over effects on the permitting and construction of sewer and water line projects.

Given that the DEQ Guid-

ance in question is specifically limited to interstate gas pipelines, currently the spill-over effects have been negligible. But environmental groups have become increasingly more aggressive over the past five years in requesting the courts to intervene in any issues that affect water quality or standards that they deem EPA or the states have reneged on. So how long before these groups begin pushing the courts on environmental impacts of water and sewer line projects?

BEDFORD REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY

“PROVIDING QUALITY SERVICE TO EVERYONE”

Eric Rajaniemi
Pretreatment Coordinator
Phone: 540-586-7679, ext. 105
Cell: 540-871- 0925



Industrial Pretreatment
Wastewater Treatment



EPA's latest Method Update Rule



EPA's Methods Update Rule

On August 7, the EPA Administrator signed the latest Update Rule for publication. This is to update its 40 CFR Part 136 specification of analytical methods approved for NPDES purposes. It covers required preservation procedures, holding times, alternate test procedure requirements, and any other related analytical issues.

This time around the MUR corrects a minor wording problem in the ATP procedures. This MUR emphasizes the required EPA approvals and absence of

any mechanism for less formal EPA approvals or through which a state NPDES agency may itself approve or require the use of non-Part 136 methods.

This is important due to the fact that EPA Regional Offices and state agencies often attempt to shortcut the ATP process and require the use of experimental or inaccurate methods that are not in the interests of the Permittee.

This MUR also incorporates changes to the Part 136 Appendix B procedures for laboratory determinations of Method Detection Limits (MDL). An MDL is a method-specific, and frequently lab-specific or instrument-specific, specification of the minimum concentration of an analyte (the substance analyzed) that can be measured and reported with a 99 percent confidence that the substance concentration is great-

er than zero. The MDL represents the floor below which the result should be reported as either zero or “less than” the stated MDL.

Your in-house or contract laboratory should review and incorporate as appropriate the MUR changes that affect its Standard Operating Procedures and Quality Manual.