

Waterworks Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Libbie Mill Library
2100 Libbie Lake East St.
Henrico, Virginia 23230

In Person and Electronic Meeting via WebEx
Thursday, September 24, 2026, 9:30 a.m.

Members Present: David Van Gelder (Chair), Water Operator; Geneva Hudgins, VA AWWA; Mitch Rieley, VA SERCAP; W. Weedon Cloe, III, DEQ; Shane Wyatt, DCLS; Mark Estes, VRWA; Christopher Pomeroy, Virginia Municipal Drinking Water Association; Jesse L. Royall, Jr., Community Waterworks Owners; Michelle Caruthers, VWEA; Ivy Ozmon, HRPDC; Tom Fauber, VA ABPA; Mark Titcomb, VWWA.

Online attendees: Ignatius Mutoti, VSPE; Skip Harper, Virginia Plumbing and Mechanical Inspectors Association.

Members Absent: Isabelle Stitt-Fredericks, VA Health Catalyst; Caleb Taylor, VML; Andrea Wortzel, Mission H2O

Stakeholders and Public:

Online attendees: Christopher Gill, Kassie Smith, Anurag Mantha, Ashley Pierce (DCLS), Brian Redder, Charles Paullin (freelance journalist), Ryan Maslyn, Taylor Valencia.

Virginia Department of Health (VDH) Staff: Dwayne Roadcap, Bailey Davis, Grant Kronenberg, Aaron Moses, Jane Nunn, Katie Sallee, and Linda Botts.

Online attendees: Robert Edelman, Jarrett Talley, Steve Kvech, Anthony Hess, James Reynolds, Jeremy Hull, and Athena Van Lear.

Welcome and Establish Quorum

The Waterworks Advisory Committee (WAC) met with an in-person quorum on Thursday September 24, 2026, 9:30 a.m. WAC Chair David Van Gelder presided over the meeting. Mr. Mutoti joined remotely from Wythe County due to a personal reason, as he was on a work assignment. Mr. Harper joined remotely from his home in Louisa County due to a family member's medical condition that required him to provide care for the family member, thereby preventing his physical attendance. Both Mr. Mutoti and Mr. Harper joined in accordance with the WAC's policy on remote participation.

Mr. Van Gelder called the meeting to order at approximately 9:35 a.m.

Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes of March 2026 Meeting

Mr. Kronenberg briefly reviewed the meeting minutes from the WAC's June 2026 meeting. A motion was made and seconded to approve the meeting minutes as drafted, and the WAC unanimously approved the March 2026 meeting minutes.

ODW Staffing and Budget

Mr. Roadcap gave an update on employee staffing at ODW. He noted that ODW has 144 full-time employees, with 122 of those positions filled, and 22 vacant. The vacancy rate is 15%, which is close to the agency average. Turnover at ODW is 7%, therefore the vacancy rate reflects movement internally.

He noted that ODW is currently in the process of hiring an emergency coordinator, following the second recruitment.

ODW has found that hiring engineers has been requiring more than one recruitment process. He also stated that ODW is working on a retention plan for engineers. Class and comp completed an analysis on engineering salaries, and ODW is working on updating salary recommendations for engineering positions with input from human resources.

Mr. Roadcap also updated the WAC on federal funding to ODW. Following previous updates on the drop in federal funding, Mr. Roadcap stated that he is looking for new funding sources, and without the previous funding, 29 positions will no longer be funded. He directed the WAC to the Department of Planning and Budget's website to see more information on this issue.

He noted that there is an upcoming funding gap for 48 positions total. He also highlighted the need for another 40 FTEs to cover needs of ODW staffing to meet federal and state requirements. He stated that ODW has requested nine million for 40 positions in addition to moving 29 positions to general funds from federal funds. He stated this would also cover some additional funding costs due to inflation including lease increases for field offices. He mentioned one lease will be renewed at 50% per month. This is reflected across the board within rents for the department of health.

Mr. Roadcap covered uses for infrastructure funding from the General Assembly. The General Assembly provided 75 million in additional drinking water infrastructure funding through the state with the stipulation that 50 million be earmarked for certain localities. He stated that the funding agreement for those localities will be completed soon. The other 25 million from prior budget session are being revised but are obligated through funding agreements.

Drought Conditions

Mr. Roadcap reviewed current drought conditions in the Commonwealth. He stated that the Drought Monitoring Task Force (DMTF) including the U.S. Geological Survey, other state agencies, and federal partners, meets weekly to assess conditions across the state. The DMTF is seeing many pronounced issues with groundwater supply, though the state is now entering recharge season. Recent rain has been helpful but annually falls below average. He stated that we are seeing improvement but not quickly.

The DMTF is looking at four different factors to gauge throughout the Commonwealth, and each category is being reviewed weekly and is updated on DEQs website every Thursday or Friday. They are paying particular attention to regions considered in severe drought, and about a dozen water systems are being very closely monitored including a weekly measurement of flows. In most cases, the drought is not as bad as the 2002 drought, but some are getting close. ODW sends out a weekly survey to determine changes, and the Commissioner's team sends a weekly report to the Secretary of Health and Human Resources. Mr. Weedon Cloe stated that DEQ sends a report to the Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources as well.

He presented a dashboard that reflects data from the weekly survey. The vast majority of community water systems are in voluntary conservation or have some conservation measure in place. Changes in surface water have been seen more quickly, but ground water has not been as impacted yet. He stated that as we move more into fall and winter, we will see changes in ground water. The El Nino is expected to persist through late winter/early spring of next year, which typically provides increased precipitation and warmer weather for east coast, and prevents hurricanes in the Atlantic. He noted that this year set a record for non-formation of hurricanes in Atlantic this year after seeing zero hurricanes formed by September 11.

Mr. Cloe commended the Office of Drinking Water for collaboration during this time.

Mr. Roadcap also noted that ODW has been connecting smaller towns without emergency response plans to water supply planning help from DEQ, as well as connecting them with assistance from ODW's new emergency planner to help small localities adjust operations as the drought continues.

Two-Hour Reporting

Mr. Roadcap stated that ODW has had 237 two-hour reports since August 1st, averaging 10-20 per week. 156 of those met the required criteria. Most of the reports have been about water main breaks, and some dealing with SCADA and power loss without backup power. Through implementation of this new program, ODW has not issued any Notices of Alleged Violation, and is continuing focus on education instead. He confirmed that ODW has no plans to send violations for failure to make a two-hour report unless there are waterworks with other issues going on that require enforcement action.

Ms. Caruthers asked if there are any reasons why waterworks did not report.

Mr. Roadcap stated that the call center stamps the time and date stamp when they call in. The call center has phone a tree that starts with Mr. Roadcap, then Mr. Davis, then to Mr. Talley. The new emergency planner will be incorporated into phone tree. In instances where the report is not made within two hours, it has been that the operator has called the field office and left a message when the staff member was not on call. Right now, the focus is on intention to make the report. ODW is working on an MOA with VDEM Situational Awareness Unit that has a 24-hour call service. VDEM has ability to send out mass communication.

Mr. Van Gelder asked if there is a vetting process at the call center to determine how far the report needs to go. Can they filter out calls that do not meet criteria of two-hour report?

Mr. Roadcap said the call center is a straight answering service. Their job is to get name of person, phone number, issue, and public water system identification. He hopes that VDEM's Situational Awareness Unit will assess the situation rather than just forwarding.

Mr. Van Gelder asked how much good are these calls doing.

Mr. Roadcap said that sometimes people call when they haven't found the water main break yet, and in those situations Mr. Roadcap states that he tells people to check in in a few hours and assess where you are and if you are able to maintain service. A very small percentage of calls that were really necessary in that two-hour time frame. He noted that ODW didn't get any money to implement this law. He believes the Situational Awareness Unit will be able to triage but is not

sure of their comfort level because they aren't experts in drinking water. He does not know if they want to focus on assessment and triage without any money going toward it.

Mr. Pomeroy requested a report on cost-benefit of this program. He stated that the WAC understands why this particular program came to be but seems to be hearing that it's a low benefit. He suggested the two-to-three-year anniversary might be the right time to do this report. He offered help looking at the report.

Mr. Roadcap noted that the water system is the one who must do the response. ODW does the coordination between the waterworks and emergency services, so a lot of them are being handled without ODW anyway. He stated that when making these reports, people are erring on the side of caution instead of assessing real needs.

Lead and Copper Rule Improvements

Robert Edelman provided an update on the Lead and Copper Rule Revisions (LCRR) and the Lead and Copper Rule Improvements (LCRI). He reviewed deadline of November 1st for baseline inventory, service line replacement plan, and school notifications.

Mr. Edelman stated that before the deadline of November 1, 2027, waterworks should be identifying unknown service lines, gathering service line material information, and identifying connectors as lead, unknown, non-lead, and locations with no connectors.

He defined connections again under the LCRI as a short segment of piping not exceeding three feet that can be bent and is typically used for connections from the water main in the street to the service line. It is not considered part of the service line, so it does not make the service line lead or galvanized requiring replacement (GRR).

Ms. Caruthers asked if the water system is not aware of connectors, do you leave field blank?

Mr. Edelman said that if the water system reviews their records and there is no information on the connector, they can leave that field blank.

He discussed that the responsibility of making efforts at removing barriers to customer-side lead service line (LSL) replacement lies with waterworks to figure out for their community and should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. He pointed to an article in AWWA on removing barriers to LSL line replacements as a good resource.

Mr. Edelman pointed out waterworks need to submit updated sampling plans using new sample tiers in advance of Tap Sampling by the start of the next lead and copper monitoring period. He also noted new requirements for consumer-requested sampling for customers with LSL, GRR, and unknown service lines. He discussed a change in the deadline to provide the customer notice of lead or copper tap sampling results to no later than three business days of learning of the results.

Ms. Caruthers asked where do day care centers get a comprehensive list? Can the Virginia Department of Education (DOE) provide that list?

Mr. Edelman said some lists are held by DOE, but VDH has plans to help put together that list. ODW will put together training early in 2027 to detail procedures.

Ms. Caruthers asked is there a check list asking if day cares have been tested?

Mr. Roadcap said ODW is fielding these questions. Jose Garcia is coordinating with DOE and can provide an update at the next meeting.

Through WebEx chat, Mr. Hess noted that there is a public transparency database of schools and childcare centers that have completed their testing through the VDH/EPA grant for this purpose. Additionally, ODW is working to include samples ODW have received for childcare centers that are currently not part of this grant program. He provided the link to the public transparency dashboard: <https://vdh-leadtestingprogram.120wateraudit.com/>.

ODW will offer training beginning in January, when EPA will provide more information.

Mr. Pomeroy stated that in August EPA finalized its service line inventory tips and created a 5-page fact sheet. How helpful is that guidance?

Mr. Edelman said it is great to follow that guidance. We are encouraging water systems that have no history of lead in service lines to reclassify and rethink the galvanized requiring replacement assessments.

Mr. Pomeroy asked how can private side replacements be tackled? Is there any possibility of relieving property owner of cost and avoiding shifting to rate payers of same utility? There are some grant programs from ODW. What remaining funds are there in that program? What is overall burden in Virginia and that matches up with remaining funds from that program?

Mr. Edelman and Mr. Hess commented that federal funding from the Bipartisan Infrastructure bill is administered by ODW's FCAP program. Awards for the last round of funding will be administered soon and marks the last of the funds in that program. Once all funds are distributed, it is possible that the EPA could need to provide additional allocations from states that did not take any funding. Virginia received \$26M of reallocation this year.

Mr. Edelman noted that eligibility requirements are that at least one lead service line must be identified. Currently there is not enough funding for larger cities like Richmond and Norfolk. He noted that galvanized replacement will also have a huge need for funding.

There are 25 waterworks with lead service lines, and the most recent summary showed 3,625 lead service lines total. This is compared to 117 waterworks with galvanized service lines with 10,100 lines total. For the most part, applications have been from waterworks with five or more LSLs. Sixteen water systems have less than five LSLs.

Consumer Confidence Report Rule Revisions

Mr. Edelman presented virtually regarding new changes to the Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) Rule. He noted that waterworks would not be able to reuse format from last year due to significant changes. Waterworks that serve over 10,000 must now submit two CCRs per year, the second is due on December 31st of 2027.

He noted that other changes include: CCR due to VDH 10 days after distributed to customers, CCRs must be left online for three years, CWS's serving more than 50,000 must post online, CCRs now require a summary at beginning of report with key information, and lastly that CWS serving more than 10,000 people are required to develop language access plans.

Mr. Royall cautioned the importance of tools for CCR for smaller water systems, stating that it is the responsibility of VDH to help. He noted that without that help, smaller water systems may do it wrong and need additional help after.

Mr. Roadcap noted that while VDH will provide as much help as possible, the program is understaffed and under resourced. Mr. Nunn offered that the EPA does have CCR iWriter on website that water systems can use to write their CCRs starting 2027. She noted that it pulls data from SDWIS and creates a complete CCR for water systems as long as the water information is existing. Mr. Estes also noted that Virginia Tech has a training webinar on how to write a CCR.

Ms. Caruthers asked is there a training opportunity with ODW in how to utilize the iWriter?

Mr. Roadcap said the next meeting can include how this tool works. ODW will take feedback into consideration.

Ms. Caruthers asked can ODW redistribute effort from water systems that don't need help to those who do? Some have financial limitations and abilities to create this report.

Mr. Rieley noted that SERCAP provides help to communities with CCRs as well, however they have issues extracting the data from the drinking water viewer. He noted that SERCAP sees the same communities every year in need of help, and that more training is needed in rural and small communities on how to use Drinking Water Viewer. He also noted that South Carolina has a state system that will generate a CCR in 30 minutes to an hour. Mr. Moses stated that he would do some research into this tool.

PFAS Update

Mr. Davis provided a PFAS update and gave an overview of the timeline of changes to the PFAS rule, starting with the initial challenge from the AWWA and AMWA in October of 2024 which has been covered in previous meetings.

On September 11, 2025, EPA filed a motion to partially vacate the PFAS rule. This follows EPA's plan to vacate the maximum contaminant level (MCL) and the maximum contaminant level goal (MCLG) for PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA (Gen-X) and the Hazard Index, so EPA would only regulate PFOS and PFOA.

Mr. Davis said arguments occurred last Friday and were all posted online. He noted difficulty in argument for procedure, standing, and harm. Arguments are ongoing; however, the rule is in place until then.

He noted that the other proposed rule is for extension for compliance deadline to 2031. He stated ODW would apply to EPA for extension and approval would come from EPA based on good faith efforts to monitor/treat for PFAS.

Mr. Davis discussed waterworks regulations and primacy. He stated that ODW is running into the initial monitoring period with no ability to have primacy over the rule. Internally ODW does not have primacy and has seen issues with lead and copper rule revision enforcement because of that. He stated EPA region 3 is not staffed to accomplish in a timely fashion and requires a lot of coordination. As ODW has been progressing with this rule, the decision so far has been to wait on legal challenge but now is coming up against a time constraint. The ODW PFAS committee

proposes to adopt PFAS rule as currently written. If the rule were to be vacated in coming months, ODW would have opportunity to make changes to that course of action.

He recommended putting forward the regulatory amendment to get it approved and apply for primacy with EPA. Interim primacy status will allow ODW to monitor and enforce the rule moving forward. He noted that the rule is still on the books either way, this path just changes the need for coordination between ODW and EPA.

He stated that the initial primacy application was due in April, and the two-year primacy extension was approved to 2028. The ODW PFAS committee feels internally as a committee that compliance monitoring activities will be difficult through EPA Region 3. This course of action will show Virginia systems that we are moving forward on the rule as written, rather than a wait and see approach. He said this will clarify requirements for systems that have been waiting. He also noted that the public has also been asking for action from Virginia on this matter.

Mr. Davis noted that disadvantages include the potential for multiple regulations updates and that it may cause a period of state rules being more stringent than federal rules. He also noted that there would be uncertainty surrounding proposed rules and that we would be communicating changes on state timeline instead of federal.

The proposal will go through Commissioner's office before moving forward, but the PFAS committee is still seeking input from the regulatory community before submission. Mr. Davis requested the committee submit feedback to him individually or now during the meeting.

Mr. Pomeroy asked, regarding the two-year extension, if EPA were to finalize rule and adopt it, how would Virginia water system obtain the extension?

Mr. Davis responded that waterworks could apply to VDH for extension. The primacy agreement would include adopting extension rules. EPA has not adopted any extension language yet and only has a proposed rule so far. Part of the rule says waterworks would apply directly to EPA. ODW would utilize tools internally and accept the burden of extension request in primacy package.

Mr. Pomeroy said without primacy, is a waterworks stuck dealing with two regulators?

Mr. Davis said that EPA is trying to communicate that extension is generally approved given explanation for reason, not based on public comment. They are also trying to say it's going to be self-implementing. If waterworks apply, they can consider it to be approved.

Mr. Pomeroy noted that VAMWA has been communicating with VDH about moving forward on primacy regulation. The association's preference and recommendation is that VDH wait to adopt final regulation when dust settles. He confirmed that they fully intend to comply with regulations, whichever is applicable, but are trying to meet both interests. He mentioned the possibility of seeking legislative authorization for VDH to enforce federal rule, so VDH can enforce without having to follow the changing federal rules. He stated they don't want VDH to worry about adopting and revising and adopting again. He stated that they would ask that VDH wait on primacy adoption. VAMWA offers to work with ODW on compliance and enforcement. He noted the possibility to also seek confirmation of enforcement authorities under federal regulation.

Ms. Caruthers asked if EPA does get rid of hazard index and Virginia has already adopted the rule, will Virginia be allowed to get rid of hazard index as well or will Virginia be more stringent than EPA?

Ms. Nunn stated the Board of Health is required to follow EPA guidelines, so ODW wouldn't be stuck with hazard index forever. The 2022 General Assembly asked Virginia to set MCLs for PFAS, and VDH suggested waiting until EPA did something.

Mr. Pomeroy asked what is the cost to take on primacy?

Ms. Nunn and Mr. Davis responded that amendments to regulations have already been drafted and are with EPA. If determination is made to move forward, we want to get things in place in April when regs are adopted. Staff time required up front is drafting amendments. After that it is a simple matter of ruling out forms and sending to government and regulatory affairs. Cost will come as in need of additional staff to implement the rule.

Mr. Estes asked, in that case, why take on primacy?

Mr. Roadcap, Ms. Nunn, and Mr. Kronenberg responded to note that if ODW does nothing, the percentage of water systems that are not doing initial compliance monitoring will not face any consequences for that. Primacy allows accountability for everyone. With LCR, took over two years to start enforcing, which is not good for the public. With primacy, ODW can move forward with compliance enforcement without waiting for EPA.

Ms. Caruthers asked what is the timeframe to take authority over part of PFAS regs? Does that require proposed legislation and goes into effect in July 1?

Mr. Davis responded yes, and the July 1st timeframe would mean there is no enforcement in April as necessary. It would require more work from ODW because everything would have to be reported to the EPA without primacy.

Mr. Pomeroy stated that the department's budget challenges have come up for two years now, and the deadline is coming up in FY 2028.

He proposed consideration of two motions:

1. Recommend the Commissioner and the administration maintain the annual General Fund appropriations in the amount of at least \$6.46 million currently designated as federal matching BIL [bipartisan infrastructure law] funds ending FY27 and utilizing those funds in FY28 and beyond to fund those at-risk 29 FTE existing positions that are at risk of federal SRF [Drinking Water State Revolving Fund] funding loss.

The WAC members unanimously approved the motion.

2. Recommend VDH temporarily defer adoption of PFAS regulations awaiting outcome of the pending federal rulemakings.

Mr. Pomeroy stated that the WAC would know by either February or March if legislation was successful or not and ODW would have additional authorities by July 1.

Mr. Davis brought up a concern on legislation during the 2027 session and noted that actors in the legislature may want to create something different than proposed, which could put ODW out of control and lead to a PFAS level that is unenforceable.

Mr. Pomeroy stated that VAMWA feels faced with multiple bad choices and has concerns about compliance with regulation on certain systems. He noted that it feels like decisions are being driven by small set of bad actors rather than necessity for the majority.

The WAC unanimously approved the second motion. Mr. Royall had stepped out of the room and did not vote on the motion.

Mr. Davis reviewed ODWs program for small water systems (serving less than 10,000 people) to collect samples and do initial monitoring at no cost. There are 1,186 eligible waterworks for this program and so far 829 are enrolled. Currently 896 samples have been analyzed. 81 of those systems sampled above MCL and 132 sampled above trigger level. Mr. Davis displayed a map of samples that have been analyzed so far and noted that we are seeing more exceedances immediately to the west of I-95.

Regulations

Jane Nunn gave an update on the Waterworks Regulations. She stated that the Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) amendments based on the periodic review not yet posted to Town Hall for public comment and is unsure when this will occur. The proposed rule is drafted and will take six to nine months to be finalized.

She also stated CCR3 amendments will be effective as of September 23, 2026. LCRR/LCRI Final Exempt regulatory package will be submitted to the Commissioner's Office following completion of EPA's informal review. PFAS Final Exempt regulatory package on hold pending outcome of discussions with internal and external stakeholders

Data and Permitting

Mr. Aaron Moses gave an update on data and permitting. He stated that ODW is averaging twelve days to issue construction permits. ODW has completed reorganization of the program to centralize it including hiring a sampling verification manager. Field office sampling verification staff are now under the central office and report to the same manager. Five out of six of those positions were vacant. Four of the positions have been filled and an offer has been made on the fifth. He has been focusing on training new staff and achieving consistency across field offices.

He noted that data management has several big projects coming up, first being a transition from SDWIS to DW-SFTIES. This is a major transition that will take 1-2 years to achieve. He is holding GEC quarterly meetings to improve communication between GEC and the field offices.

He also described an effort to replace auto dialers with email reminders. So far, they have seen a 50% reduction in data violations. They have recently implemented this new system for lead and copper, consumer confidence reports, and customer notifications. He stated they want to update system for all other chemical samples. A reminder email is also in place for MORs, including making some improvements so that the emails can go out with a custom link that populates PWSID to make reports easier for waterworks and help prevent errors.

Lastly, he noted that they are implementing a process to automatically generate reporting violations. They have almost finished the process for bacteriological violations and are working on chemical sampling violations.

Compliance, Enforcement, and Policy Update

Grant Kronenberg then gave an update on the Annual Compliance Report. He noted that the Annual Compliance Report must be submitted every year to EPA. The 2025 report was submitted in August, and included information on types of waterworks, potential sources of contamination, standards and requirements, and various compliance metrics. Takeaways include that three out of four waterworks have no violations, 26% of TNCs had a violation, and 21% of community waterworks had violations.

He transitioned to discussing current compliance metrics, noting that 12 systems are currently considered to be serious violators by the EPA due to their Enforcement Targeting Tool (ETT) score. He noted that the ETT score lags behind the real-time data, and at this point 10 of the 12 systems are back in full compliance or under an administrative order. There are currently six waterworks that would qualify as a “serious violator” under the real-time Enforcement Targeting Tool Assistant, and ODW is looking to move forward with formal enforcement consent with some of those systems.

Mr. Kronenberg then discussed operator violations. He stated that ODW does not often pursue formal enforcement for operator violations. ODW is planning on changing this to treat these violations the same as other types of violation, however. He noted that these violations are discussed with the ODW field offices in monthly calls. For the most part, waterworks with operator violations have a plan in place and are making efforts. If that’s the case, ODW will continue to try to bring them into compliance without formal enforcement. He stated that ODW understands that there are market-based issues with operators, and that the operator shortage is more acute in certain areas. If a system is making a diligent effort, like offering a reasonable salary, and is simply unable to find an operator, that will be taken into account. There are limited instances where if the owner is not trying and ignores outreach from ODW, then ODW will begin to move forward with formal enforcement. He discussed that Class 5-6 systems fall under being state-only violations of the operator requirement, rather than federal violations.

Mr. Van Gelder requested that Mr. Kronenberg report back if this is growing problem.

Ms. Caruthers asked if there are any exemptions from the regulations, such as the licensed operator waiver. Mr. Kronenberg stated that if waterworks qualify and fall within bounds of that licensed operator waiver then they do not receive a violation notice. The EPA requirement is that there be an operator for systems that provide treatment. You could have a Class 1 waterworks that may have operators but not enough to cover all shifts. There is a difference between attendance requirements and hiring requirements.

Ms. Caruthers noted that DEQ wastewater plants only require one Class 1 operator and each shift has an operator in charge, asking why ODW requires 24/7 Class 1 operators. She asked whether Virginia’s rule is more stringent than other states.

Ms. Nunn stated that we have seen issues with decreased operator attendance. Modification of requirements can be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Nunn gave some examples of past modifications. The main goal is to ensure public health is protected.

Draft

Mr. Kronenberg stated that there have been a couple of recent requests for modifications of the operator attendance requirement on the case-by-case basis mentioned by Ms. Nunn.

Ms. Nunn stated that if a waterworks has been in compliance for years, that makes it easier to modify the operator attendance requirement depending on what their needs are.

Mr. Roadcap stated that ODW will assess other states and report on that next meeting.

Mr. Estes noted that they have seen an increase in operator pass rates, from 37% to 50% percent.

Open Discussion

None.

Public Comment

None.

Other Business

Mr. Kronenberg stated that the next WAC meeting still needs to be scheduled and that Katie Sallee will reach out to members with a poll. He also noted that the meeting will be held virtually.

Mr. Van Gelder adjourned the meeting at approximately 12:08.