## Meeting Minutes Tuesday, September 15, 2020 Point Source Nutrient Reductions Review (PSNR Review)

## Work Group (WG) Electronic-only Meeting on GoToWebinar

<u>Members Present</u>: George Hayes, Ted Henifin, Adrienne Kotula, Chris Pomeroy, Peggy Sanner, and Bill Street.

Members Absent: Chris McDonald.

<u>Other Attendees</u>: Allan Brockenbrough, Gary Graham, Austen Stevens, Tish Robertson, Alison Thompson, Clifton Bell, Patrick Bradley, Jamie Brunkow, Tim Castillo, Patrick Fanning, KC Filippino, Steven Herzog, Anna Killius, Jim Pletl, Lisa Reynolds, Gary Williams, Jim Taylor, and Joe Wood.

The meeting convened at 9:06 a.m. and adjourned at 10:44 a.m.

- 1. Introductions and Meeting Logistics [Allan Brockenbrough, DEQ]. Mr. Brockenbrough checked in the WG members, made sure they had good audio connections, and introduced the on-line attendees that were present for the electronic meeting. The Agenda (Attachment 1) and the updated Alternatives spreadsheet (Attachment 2) had been provided to WG members for information before the meeting.
- 2. Alternatives Discussion [Allan Brockenbrough, DEQ]. Using Attachment 2, Mr. Brockenbrough presented the updated (since the last meeting) predicted Total Nitrogen (TN) and Total Phosphorous (TP) wasteloads in the different River Basins under the previously proposed options, including lowering the TN wasteload allocation standards in the York (5mg/l) and James River (4mg/l) basins, the Floating Wasteload Allocation proposal, and the VAMWA Hybrid proposals with and without the HRSD SWIFT upgrades and with and without HRSD Injection. Mr. Brockenbrough then invited discussion of those alternatives and the spreadsheet from the WG members. (Refer to the recording for details of questions and discussions.)
- 3. Estimating Costs [Allan Brockenbrough, DEQ]. Using Attachment 2, Mr. Brockenbrough identified 16 facilities that would be impacted by a >4 MGD Floating WLA proposal, 11 of which have upgrades in progress with good estimates of capital costs. Mr. Brockenbrough then opened the topic for discussion by the members. The capital costs for remaining 5 facilities depend on how the facilities choose to achieve compliance, with a revised estimate between \$20 million and \$120 million. (Refer to the recording for details of questions and discussions.)
- 4. **Next Steps** [Allan Brockenbrough, DEQ]. Mr. Brockenbrough announced that the next meeting of the WG will convene at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 29, 2020. For the next meeting, DEQ will do more development of the options and correct some numbers in Attachment 2, will modify the proposal to target reductions of the TN wasteload allocation standards in the York, James River, upper tidal James, and the lower tidal James, and will add a temporal component to the report to describe the timing of changes. Mr. Brockenbrough proposed that the WG would wrap up discussions on the alternatives and costs at the September 29<sup>th</sup> meeting of the WG and for DEQ to then

write the required report. Some members asked that DEQ consult with concerned legislators concerning whether to allow the WG to review the report prior to Executive review and submission of the report.

The <u>recording of the meeting</u> is available for review on-line.

Attachments:

- 1. Meeting 4 Agenda
- 2. VA WIP III Input Deck-Alternatives Analysis-09-14-20c

## Attachment 1

Agenda Point Source Nutrient Reduction Review Work Group Meeting No. 4 – September 15, 2020, 9:00 a.m.

- 1. Meeting Logistics
- 2. Introductions
- 3. Alternatives Discussion
- 4. Estimating Costs
- 5. Next Steps

Attachment 2

VA WIP III Input Deck-Alternatives Analysis-09-14-20c

This file is too large and too complex to fit in these minutes. Please contact the following person for a copy of the file:

> Gary Graham, DEQ Regulatory Analyst gary.graham@deq.virginia.gov (804) 698-4103