

Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, September 29, 2020  
Point Source Nutrient Reductions Review (PSNR Review)

Work Group (WG)  
Electronic-only Meeting on GoToWebinar

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

Members Absent: Chris McDonald.

Other Attendees: Allan Brockenbrough, Gary Graham, Austen Stevens, Tish Robertson, James Martin, Alison Thompson, Clifton Bell, Patrick Bradley, Jamie Brunkow, Pat Calvert, Tim Castillo, Patrick Fanning, KC Filippino, Normand, Goulet, Steven Herzog, Anna Killius, Curt Linderman, Scott Morris, Andrew Parker, Jim Pletl, Erin Reilly, Lisa Reynolds, Gary Williams, and Joe Wood.

The meeting convened at 2:04 p.m. and adjourned at 3:56 p.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 revised (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.
3. **Estimating Costs** [Allan Brockenbrough, DEQ]. Using Attachment 2, Mr. Brockenbrough identified 16 facilities that would be impacted by the  $\geq 3$  MGD (facilities below the fall line) and  $\geq 5$  MGD (facilities above the fall line) Floating WLA proposal, 11 of which have upgrades in progress with good estimates of capital costs. The remaining 5 facilities would have to meet their allocations with some combination of trading, optimization or upgrades. The capital costs for the remaining 5 facilities depend on how the facilities choose to achieve compliance, with a revised estimate between \$10 million and \$110 million for capital upgrades (depending on the chosen method of meeting the allocations). Mr. Brockenbrough then opened the topic for discussion by the members.
4. **Next Steps** [Allan Brockenbrough, DEQ]. Mr. Brockenbrough announced that there is no set date for follow-on meeting of the Work Group. If it is determined that one is needed, it may be on Friday, October 16<sup>th</sup>. There is no resolution as yet on the subject of bringing the draft report back to the work group for discussion prior to Executive review and submission of the report. Some members asked for a discussion of “regulatory certainty” in the report.

There is no recording of the meeting available.

Attachments:

1. Meeting 5 Agenda
2. VA WIP III Input Deck-Alternatives Analysis-09-17-20c

## Attachment 1

### Agenda

Point Source Nutrient Reduction Review Work Group  
Meeting No. 5 – September 29, 2020, 2:00 p.m.

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

Attachment 2

VA WIP III Input Deck-Alternatives Analysis-09-17-20c

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](mailto:gary.graham@deq.virginia.gov)  
(804) 698-4103