

**DRAFT MINUTES  
WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL  
August 9, 2016  
Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality  
Multipurpose Room  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma**

**Official WQMAC  
Approved at October 4, 2016 Meeting**

**Notice of Public Meeting** – The Water Quality Management Advisory Council (WQMAC) convened for a Regular Meeting at 2:00 p.m. at the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), 707 North Robinson, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The meeting was held in accordance with the Open Meeting Act, with notice of the meeting given to the Secretary of State on October 20, 2015. The agenda was posted at DEQ twenty-four hours prior to the meeting. Mr. Duane Winegardner, Chair, called the meeting to order. Ms. Quiana Fields called roll and confirmed that a quorum was present.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Robert Carr  
Brian Duzan  
Mark Matheson  
Jon Nelson  
Jim Rodriguez  
Steve Sowers  
Debbie Wells  
Terry Wyatt  
Duane Winegardner

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Mike Paque  
Jeff Short

**DEQ STAFF PRESENT**

Shellie Chard-McClary  
Mark Hildebrand  
Scott Cordell  
Jennifer Boyle  
Michelle Wynn  
Patty Thompson  
Mike Moe  
Quiana Fields

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Lynette Wrany, Court Reporter

**Approval of Minutes from the January 12, 2016 Meeting** – Mr. Winegardner called for a motion to approve the Minutes of the January 12, 2016 Regular Meeting, with the May 3 for approval of the Minutes line be strikethrough. Mr. Rodriguez moved to approve and Ms. Wyatt made the second.

*See transcript pages 5 – 6*

Robert Carr	Yes	Steve Sowers	Yes
Brian Duzan	Yes	Debbie Wells	Yes
Mark Matheson	Yes	Terry Wyatt	Yes
Jon Nelson	Yes	Duane Winegardner	Yes
Jim Rodriguez	Yes		

**DISCUSSION OF RULEMAKING FOR OCTOBER 4, 2016 WQMAC MEETING:**

**OAC 252:606 – OKLAHOMA POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (OPDES) STANDARDS** – Mr. Mark Hildebrand, Environmental Programs Manager of the WQD, stated that the DEQ staff is proposing to update the date of incorporation by reference for federal regulations. This includes the Electronic Reporting Rule; effluent limitation guidelines

and standards for the steam electric power generating point source category; and discharges from the oil and gas extraction point source category to publicly owned treatment works.

*See transcript pages 6 – 11*

**OAC 252:690 – WATER QUALITY STANDARDS IMPLEMENTATION** – Mr. Hildebrand stated that the DEQ staff is proposing to update the date of incorporation by reference for federal regulations. This includes the Electronic Reporting Rule; effluent limitation guidelines and standards for the steam electric power generating point source category; and discharges from the oil and gas extraction point source category to publicly owned treatment works.

*See transcript pages 11 – 13*

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT** – Ms. Chard-McClary provided an update on other division activities, such as the budget and legislature. Ms. Chard- McClary called upon Mr. Michael Moe, Engineering Manager of the WQD, to give a presentation on the NPDES Program Update. Also, Ms. Patty Thompson gave a presentation on the PWS Program Update.

*See transcript pages 13 – 61*

**NEW BUSINESS** – None

**ANNOUNCEMENTS** – The next scheduled meeting is on Tuesday, October 4, 2016, 2:00 p. m. at DEQ.

**ADJOURNMENT** - The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

**Transcripts and Attendance Sheet are attached as an official part of these Minutes.**

WQMAC Meeting 8/9/2016

<p>1 DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY 2 REGULAR MEETING 3 WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 AUGUST 9, 2016 - 2:00 P.M. 12 13 14 15 Multi-Purpose Room, 1st Floor 16 DEQ Building 17 707 N. Robinson 18 Oklahoma City, OK 19 20 21 22 23 Reported by Lynette H. Wrany, C.S.R. #1167 24 25</p>	<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p>	<p>1 CALL TO ORDER - 2:00 P.M. 2 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: Okay. I'd like to 3 call this meeting to order. 4 This is the August 9th, 2016 meeting of the 5 Water Quality Management Advisory Council. And just 6 right off the bat, I ripped my rotator cuff. I'm 7 going to be okay. By the October meeting, you guys. I 8 will be playing volleyball. But, in any case – 9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is that a challenge? 10 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: So, in accordance with 11 our call to order, we have the protocol statement that 12 says, "This regular meeting of the Water Quality 13 Management Advisory Council was called in accordance 14 with the Open Meeting Act. 15 "Notice for this August 9th, 2016 meeting was 16 filed with the Secretary of State on October 20th, 17 2015. The Agenda was duly posted at DEQ at least 18 twenty-four hours prior to the meeting. 19 "Only matters appearing on the posted Agenda 20 may be considered at this regular meeting. In the 21 event that this meeting is continued or reconvened, 22 public notice of the date, time, and place of the 23 continued meeting will be given by announcement at 24 this meeting. Only matters appearing on the Agenda of 25 a meeting which is continued may be discussed at the</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>1 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: 2 Mr. Robert Carr 3 Mr. Brian Duzan 4 Mr. Mark Matheson 5 Mr. Jon Nelson 6 Mr. Jim Rodriguez 7 Mr. Steve Sowers 8 Ms. Debbie Wells 9 Ms. Terry Wyatt 10 Mr. Duane Winegardner-Chair 11 12 COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT: 13 Mr. Mike Paque 14 Mr. Jeffrey Short-Vice-Chair 15 16 OTHERS APPEARING 17 Mr. Mark Hildebrand, Environmental Program 18 Manager, Water Quality Division 19 Ms. Shellie Chard-McClary, Director, Water 20 Quality Division 21 Mr. Michael Moe, Engineering Manager, Waste 22 Water Group, Water Quality Division 23 Ms. Patty Thompson, Engineering Manager, 24 Public Water Supply Group 25 Ms. Quiana Fields, Board and Council Secretary</p>	<p>2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p>	<p>1 continued or reconvened meeting." 2 Thank you. May we have the roll call? 3 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Carr? 4 MR. CARR: Here. 5 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Duzan? 6 MR. DUZAN: Here. 7 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Matheson? 8 MR. MATHESON: Here. 9 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Nelson? 10 MR. NELSON: Here. 11 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque is absent. 12 Mr. Rodriguez? 13 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Here. 14 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Short is absent. 15 Mr. Sowers? 16 MR. SOWERS: Here. 17 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Wells? 18 MS. WELLS: Here. 19 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Wyatt? 20 MS. WYATT: Here. 21 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Winegardner? 22 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: Here. 23 MS. FIELDS: We have a quorum. 24 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: Okay. Now, I assume 25 we've all had the opportunity to review the minutes</p>	<p>4</p>

WQMAC Meeting 8/9/2016

5	<p>1 from the January 12th, 2016 meeting. Is there any                  2 discussion or comments or revisions to those minutes?                  3 MR. HILDEBRAND: Duane, the thing that -- the                  4 only thing I see on here, Duane, is it says approved                  5 at the May 3rd, 2016 meeting. And I'd just suggest we                  6 approve with that line stricken.                  7 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: Okay.                  8 MR. HILDEBRAND: Because I think that was                  9 meant to be "to be approved" at that meeting, which we                  10 didn't have. So --                  11 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: Oh, okay. Thank you.                  12 Are there any other changes to be noted? If                  13 not, I will entertain a motion.                  14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: So move.                  15 MS. WYATT: Second.                  16 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: Thank you.                  17 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Carr?                  18 MR. CARR: Yes.                  19 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Duzan?                  20 MR. DUZAN: Yes.                  21 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Matheson?                  22 MR. MATHESON: Yes.                  23 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Nelson?                  24 MR. NELSON: Yes.                  25 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Rodriguez?</p>	7
6	<p>1 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.                  2 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Sowers?                  3 MR. SOWERS: Yes.                  4 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Wells?                  5 MS. WELLS: Yes.                  6 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Wyatt?                  7 MS. WYATT: Yes.                  8 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Winegardner?                  9 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: Yes.                  10 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.                  11 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: Thank you very much.                  12 Now the next thing, Mark is going to talk to                  13 us with some discussion of rulemaking for the October                  14 4th upcoming meeting.                  15 MR. HILDEBRAND: Good afternoon. Is that                  16 pretty loud?                  17 I'm Mark Hildebrand and I'm the Environmental                  18 Program Manager in the Water Quality Division. And I                  19 just wanted to, as common that we do, we try and let                  20 you know ahead of time before we vote on some                  21 rulemaking that's upcoming and we're trying to get                  22 some done before our November Board that we'll vote on                  23 next October. And it's primarily update of                  24 incorporation of our federal regs.                  25 But for Chapter 606, the Oklahoma Pollutant</p>	8
5	<p>1 Discharge Elimination System Standards, in October we                  2 are proposing to update the date of incorporation by                  3 reference for federal regulations from July of 2015 to                  4 July of 2016. And this will include the Electronic                  5 Reporting Rule that we've talked about for years. And                  6 part of that will be, by this December, we will have                  7 to be able to accept electronic reports, as well as                  8 furnish EPA some electronic reporting information, and                  9 also give them an implementation plan.                  10 And we've got a group. David Pruitt and his                  11 group have been working on this. And we've had some                  12 -- some trial runs. We've had -- I think OG&amp;E's been                  13 working on it with us, and a couple of other                  14 industries. And we plan on having some outreach                  15 throughout the state where we'll get people signed up                  16 for the electronic process, go through it with them,                  17 and then also hosting people here in our office,                  18 either weekly or bi-weekly, to just get everybody up                  19 to snuff.                  20 And then the next portion of this rule will                  21 not take place until December of 2020, which will be                  22 including electronic Notice of Intent submittal,                  23 Biosolids Report submittal, MS4, Separate Storm Sewer                  24 submittals and all of that. So, we've got a big                  25 hurdle here in December. And I think we're -- at</p>	7
6	<p>1 least get a good start at it here.                  2 And then another reference that's updated                  3 here is the Effluent Limit Guidelines, Standards for                  4 Steam Power Generating Industry. Which this                  5 establishes national limits on the amount of toxic                  6 metals and other harmful pollutants that coal-fired                  7 power plants are allowed to discharge.                  8 And I think this will affected six of our                  9 power plants here in the state, six or so. I may be                  10 forgetting one. But the earliest this will take place                  11 is 2018 to 2022, depending on when their permit comes                  12 due. And we've been in -- we've let the folks know                  13 about it. I know we had -- Mike's talked to them at                  14 EFO and everything and they're pretty -- I mean, these                  15 big power plants are pretty much up on what the rules                  16 are coming.                  17 But we're going to work with those six and do                  18 whatever we need to do to help ease their pain as                  19 they're going to have to do some more treatment. And                  20 I know at least one of our power plants is phasing out                  21 their coal-powered part of it. So, we'll work with                  22 them on that and work with EPA as well to try and --                  23 if they need some variances, we'll try and get that                  24 done.                  25 And then the other update that's going to be</p>	8

WQMAC Meeting 8/9/2016

<p>9</p> <p>1 covered on this is the pretreatment standards that 2 prevent the discharge of pollutants in waste water 3 from onshore unconventional oil and gas extraction 4 facilities to publicly-owned treatment works. We've 5 not ever had anybody do that in Oklahoma, but it's on 6 there and that will tell them no. So, this will help 7 -- this is -- the intent is to help protect the 8 integrity of the, you know, the sewer plants, the 9 publicly-owned treatment works. 10 And if anybody's got any questions on any of 11 those federal rules -- 12 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: What is unconventional 13 onshore production? Unless people are -- is that 14 where they take some of their water and put it in the 15 waste -- in the public treatment system? 16 MR. HILDEBRAND: My best guess is that it's 17 the water that comes back out of the hole. You may 18 know this better than anybody, Steve. 19 MR. SOWERS: It's probably the produced 20 water. 21 MR. HILDEBRAND: Frac -- 22 MR. SOWERS: Yeah, uh-huh. 23 MR. HILDEBRAND: Produced water that comes 24 back out of the hole going to the sewer plant. 25 MR SOWERS: Yeah.</p>	<p>11</p> <p>1 Okay. Well, Mark, you got off easy on that 2 one. 3 MR. HILDEBRAND: All right. 4 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: How about Item B, the 5 Water Quality Standards Implementation? 6 MR. HILDEBRAND: The Water Quality Standards 7 Implementation. We plan to update -- that 8 October meeting, we plan to update the date of 9 incorporation by reference from July of 2015 to July 10 of 2016. And this includes those same incorporations 11 that we just went over. 12 And then also, another thing that we plan on 13 doing is just separating the two sections in our 14 rulemaking on the date of incorporation by reference. 15 And this will streamline future rulemaking, since the 16 date of incorporation is often updated and the rules 17 incorporated aren't. So, that will eliminate having 18 to do that. In Chapter 606, we have it where we just 19 change a sentence. And this, we've got to open five 20 pages, which isn't a huge deal. But while we're at 21 it, we may as well make it easier is our thought. 22 MR. DUZAN: I guess I have one question about 23 the electronic reporting. What's the time frame for 24 that to actually -- where the industries or whoever 25 will actually be required to start reporting that?</p>
<p>10</p> <p>1 MR. MOE: When EPA says unconventional 2 production, they're basically referring to fracing, 3 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: Okay. 4 MR. MOE: Fracing waste water will not be 5 allowed to be discharged to publicly-owned treatment 6 works. 7 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: Thank you. 8 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: Can you identify 9 yourself? 10 MR. HILDEBRAND: And Mike was -- 11 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: The court reporter can't 12 get you. 13 MR. HILDEBRAND: Oh, that was Mike Moe. 14 MR. MOE: Yes. I'm Mike Moe. I'm the 15 Engineering Manager for the Waste Water Group in the 16 Water Quality Division here at DEQ. And when EPA 17 refers to unconventional production, they are, 18 essentially, referring to fracing. So, fracing waste 19 waters would not be allowed to be discharged to 20 publicly-owned treatment works. 21 MR. HILDEBRAND: That's probably a good idea. 22 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: That's right. Right. 23 Any discussion by the Council? Any other 24 questions? 25 Any discussion by the public? Any comments?</p>	<p>12</p> <p>1 MR. HILDEBRAND: Well, the rule says December 2 21st, 2016. Now, these -- let's just say you all pass 3 these in November and the Board -- in October and the 4 Board passes them in November. The rule won't 5 actually take effect in the state rules until 6 September of '17. 7 But, in the meantime, I don't know really for 8 sure that we expect our folks are going to be ready by 9 December 21st or if the EPA is even expecting that, 10 But we're going to be working with them this fall and 11 getting up to speed and making sure our system that 12 we've had a contractor working on for a few years, and 13 a node that will take enough data come -- what we've 14 had trouble with is we can only get so much data 15 across our network node. And I'm the last guy to talk 16 about computers. But we think we're getting that -- 17 getting that straightened out. And then we're going 18 to do our outreach with all of the -- all of our 19 permit holders and also host training up here. 20 And EPA's -- and once this happens, it will 21 cut down on our data entry and it will cut down on a 22 lot of paper. But, getting to that point, it's been a 23 pretty rough stretch, but we're hoping to get there. 24 MR. DUZAN: Okay. 25 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: Any other questions by</p>

WQMAC Meeting 8/9/2016

<p style="text-align: right;">13</p> <p>1 the Council?</p> <p>2 Any comments or questions by the public?</p> <p>3 Okay. Thank you, Mark.</p> <p>4 MR. HILDEBRAND: You bet.</p> <p>5 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: The next one that</p> <p>6 we've got is, all right, the Director's Report. This</p> <p>7 is quick.</p> <p>8 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: We wanted to take the</p> <p>9 opportunity, since we knew you all would be coming,</p> <p>10 and we wanted to talk about the rulemaking that was</p> <p>11 coming up in October. But we knew there had been a</p> <p>12 lot of things in the news water quality-related. You</p> <p>13 know, for a long time I answered the question "How are</p> <p>14 you?" with, "Oh, my gosh, did you hear there was lead</p> <p>15 in drinking water in Michigan?", because those were</p> <p>16 the questions we were getting by the dozens every day.</p> <p>17 At the same time, we were dealing with all of</p> <p>18 the budget issues at our state capitol and then the</p> <p>19 federal budget discussions.</p> <p>20 Because of those things, we thought today</p> <p>21 would be a good time to take the opportunity to talk a</p> <p>22 little bit about our state budget, some changes in</p> <p>23 legislation, and then to have our engineering group</p> <p>24 managers talk about some key points in the Drinking</p> <p>25 Water Program and Waste Water Program, keeping in mind</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">15</p> <p>1 agency is we've kind of done some reorganizing and</p> <p>2 rearranging of staff and staff duties, particularly in</p> <p>3 the Water Quality Division. We have shifted some</p> <p>4 vacant positions from one program to the other in</p> <p>5 order to address, particularly, our public water</p> <p>6 supply needs. At the same time that we've had these</p> <p>7 cuts, we had an audit of the Public Water Supply</p> <p>8 Program. We still don't have the final document. In</p> <p>9 the draft that the contractor shared with us showed</p> <p>10 that we are under staffed by 35 Drinking Water</p> <p>11 positions. That's a number we're never going to see.</p> <p>12 That's not going to happen. And what we've done is</p> <p>13 moved some -- some three Waste Water positions into</p> <p>14 our Drinking Water Program.</p> <p>15 Some of the things that we are trying to</p> <p>16 address, I know some of you may have heard about the</p> <p>17 situation in Hugo, Oklahoma where we had significant</p> <p>18 failures at the drinking water plant ranging</p> <p>19 everything from the plant was not built to the design</p> <p>20 plans and specs, certain pieces of equipment were</p> <p>21 significantly smaller than they were supposed to be.</p> <p>22 We had one operator who had been the cashier at</p> <p>23 Wal-Mart before taking over running the water plant.</p> <p>24 We had just an enormous amount of issues. And that</p> <p>25 was a situation where, by the time all the dust</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">14</p> <p>1 those are evolving every day.</p> <p>2 I think one of the things Mike is going to</p> <p>3 talk to you about is advanced notice of proposed</p> <p>4 rulemaking that we learned about yesterday. So,</p> <p>5 things are changing very quickly in a lot of our</p> <p>6 programs.</p> <p>7 I did want to just let you know with our</p> <p>8 budget, we have seen a 34 percent decline in our</p> <p>9 general revenue in the last four years alone. As</p> <p>10 somebody who's been around since the agency was</p> <p>11 formed, I think our general revenue is about a million</p> <p>12 and a half, two million less than it was in 1993 when</p> <p>13 we became an agency, which is a little scary to think</p> <p>14 about sometimes.</p> <p>15 We've had \$26 million taken from our</p> <p>16 revolving fund and 3 million from the Used Tire</p> <p>17 Recycling Fund that have been taken and placed in the</p> <p>18 general fund for the state and appropriated elsewhere.</p> <p>19 So, with those kinds of cuts, what have we</p> <p>20 done and what are we continuing to do is the most</p> <p>21 common question, because you don't see a lot of those</p> <p>22 cuts. It's not -- you know, DHS we hear about all the</p> <p>23 time and how many case workers are going to be</p> <p>24 eliminated and some things along those lines.</p> <p>25 Some of the things that we've done in the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">16</p> <p>1 settled, the contract operator paid \$955,000 in</p> <p>2 penalties.</p> <p>3 The goal was to take that money and give it</p> <p>4 to Hugo to allow them to make improvements to their</p> <p>5 water plant. However, that was part of the money that</p> <p>6 we lost to the legislature and we were not able to</p> <p>7 make that money available for the water plant</p> <p>8 upgrades.</p> <p>9 We've also seen a lot of cuts in our Land</p> <p>10 Protection Program where we were working with the</p> <p>11 County Commissioners on trash collection. We had a</p> <p>12 contract all but signed with Wagoner County and OU on</p> <p>13 some road testing and we were unable to continue with</p> <p>14 that.</p> <p>15 We've had a decline in the number of tire</p> <p>16 clean up, those type projects that we typically do.</p> <p>17 And we had to delay or potentially cancel a research</p> <p>18 project that we had with OSU on waste water treatment</p> <p>19 systems and innovative technology.</p> <p>20 We have eliminated some of our septic system</p> <p>21 installation grants that we made available to the</p> <p>22 low-income individuals that have failing septic tanks</p> <p>23 so we could reduce the amount surfacing sewage,</p> <p>24 particularly around some of our water bodies. Those</p> <p>25 are the kind of programs that, unfortunately, have</p>

WQMAC Meeting 8/9/2016

17	<p>1 gone by the wayside.</p> <p>2 You know, we think that environmental</p> <p>3 protection is a public health issue and really is a</p> <p>4 core function. So, we're trying to see what we can do</p> <p>5 to kind of make the best of the funding that we do</p> <p>6 have.</p> <p>7 You all work with not only the Water Quality</p> <p>8 Division, but Environmental Complaints and Local</p> <p>9 Services and the State Environmental Laboratory.</p> <p>10 We've been looking at some ways that we can utilize</p> <p>11 staff differently. In some cases, we had some</p> <p>12 functions that were being done by one division that</p> <p>13 will now kind of be a shared function. But we've also</p> <p>14 recognized that, you know, we are going to dedicate as</p> <p>15 much resources to drinking water as we can. That is a</p> <p>16 direct public health issue.</p> <p>17 So, we know on the waste water side we may</p> <p>18 have a little bit longer permit issuance times. Our</p> <p>19 technical assistance may not be as timely as we would</p> <p>20 like, but we're going to try to continue to do as much</p> <p>21 of that as we can.</p> <p>22 The Environmental Complaints and Local</p> <p>23 Services Division is closing two or three more offices</p> <p>24 and they're shifting staff around trying to cover</p> <p>25 those offices.</p>	19
18	<p>1 The lab will not be able to do as much</p> <p>2 equipment replacement as they would like. We have</p> <p>3 about half the amount of money allocated with some of</p> <p>4 the cryptosporidium monitoring that we have had in the</p> <p>5 past. So, we're -- everybody is kind of taking cuts</p> <p>6 here and there, but we're trying to still, you know,</p> <p>7 kind of piece it together to make sure we do at</p> <p>8 least -- do the public health protection. So, that's</p> <p>9 kind of our focus on the budget.</p> <p>10 Did anybody have any questions before I move</p> <p>11 to anything else?</p> <p>12 MS. WYATT: Did that deplete part of -- the</p> <p>13 26 million and 3 million from the legislature, did</p> <p>14 that deplete those?</p> <p>15 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: It didn't take them to</p> <p>16 zero, but it took it down to a point where it was</p> <p>17 difficult to predict whether we would -- they continue</p> <p>18 to do that. It was going to be an issue in making the</p> <p>19 first payroll of the year, because we still, when</p> <p>20 they're in session and we have balances, that does not</p> <p>21 take into account money that's encumbered or already</p> <p>22 basically spoken for in terms of salaries or ongoing</p> <p>23 projects. So, it got a little tight at the end of the</p> <p>24 year.</p> <p>25 MS. WYATT: Do they still have the authority</p>	20
17	<p>1 to keep taking that money?</p> <p>2 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: The legislature has the</p> <p>3 authority to -- to take whatever money the agencies</p> <p>4 have. The agencies have restrictions. We can only</p> <p>5 spend NPDES waste water fees on a NPDES program or</p> <p>6 Public Water Supply fees can only go to Public Water</p> <p>7 Supply program. The federal grant dollars, only the</p> <p>8 state and EPA or the treasury can do anything with</p> <p>9 those.</p> <p>10 MS. WYATT: Is it going to affect our -- our</p> <p>11 federal money coming in?</p> <p>12 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: Right now, we do still</p> <p>13 have the match that we need and we have not lost</p> <p>14 federal dollars.</p> <p>15 MS. WYATT: Okay.</p> <p>16 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: I know some of the state</p> <p>17 agencies have, but we have not.</p> <p>18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I've got a couple of</p> <p>19 questions about the Hugo situation.</p> <p>20 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: Yes.</p> <p>21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: When fines are levied, what</p> <p>22 is the requirement for the deposit of those fines?</p> <p>23 What requirement does DEQ need to satisfy when that</p> <p>24 fine is paid?</p> <p>25 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: If it is a fine for</p>	19

WQMAC Meeting 8/9/2016

21	<p>1 MR. RODRIGUEZ: My suggestion was going to be</p> <p>2 that, if fines have been levied in a community, that</p> <p>3 you get with a banking institution in that community</p> <p>4 and work with the city to deposit that in a trust</p> <p>5 account for that project.</p> <p>6 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: We actually – we tried</p> <p>7 to do that through the establishing of basically an</p> <p>8 escrow account and we were not authorized to do that</p> <p>9 by the legislature.</p> <p>10 MR. NELSON: An offshore account.</p> <p>11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you.</p> <p>12 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: Any accounts that get</p> <p>13 established like that, we have to have specific</p> <p>14 legislative authority to do that and they have not</p> <p>15 been inclined to do that.</p> <p>16 MR. NELSON: Shellie, the, what was it, 30</p> <p>17 million out of the SRF, how much did they harvest out</p> <p>18 of the SRF?</p> <p>19 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: Well, the SRF, since</p> <p>20 that's the federal funding, that has not been taken.</p> <p>21 MR. NELSON: So, that's not taken, it is just</p> <p>22 revolving?</p> <p>23 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: The agency revolving</p> <p>24 fund, which is our state-appropriated dollars and our</p> <p>25 fee dollars.</p>	23
22	<p>1 MR. NELSON: Okay.</p> <p>2 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: And but the state</p> <p>3 revolving fund loan programs, they – those cannot be</p> <p>4 touched for anything other than the</p> <p>5 federally-authorized purposes. But what has happened</p> <p>6 with those on the drinking water side, 31 percent of</p> <p>7 that money can go towards program administration. And</p> <p>8 we've tried to keep that as low as possible, but, as</p> <p>9 the general revenue goes away and the federal</p> <p>10 requirements have increased, we find ourselves in the</p> <p>11 upper 20s, as far as percentage of that money, going</p> <p>12 to program implementation.</p> <p>13 MS. WYATT: What shape is the town of Hugo</p> <p>14 in? Are they going to be able to come up to</p> <p>15 standards?</p> <p>16 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: Well, they are working.</p> <p>17 doing what they can with the funding that they have.</p> <p>18 They have hired a different contract operations firm.</p> <p>19 They are doing significantly better treatment than</p> <p>20 they were doing before. But it's going to take them a</p> <p>21 much longer time. Rather than having to come up with</p> <p>22 only 60 percent, 70 percent of a project, they're now</p> <p>23 having to come up with 100 percent of the funding.</p> <p>24 MS. WYATT: Are they still going to have to</p> <p>25 pay all the fine?</p>	24
21	<p>1 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: The fine has already been</p> <p>2 paid. That was paid by the contract operations</p> <p>3 company. That's a multi-national corporation, so they</p> <p>4 did pay the fine. It was not levied against the city,</p> <p>5 it was their contractor.</p> <p>6 MR. SOWERS: Is that contractor still doing</p> <p>7 business in Oklahoma?</p> <p>8 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: They are.</p> <p>9 MR. SOWERS: They are?</p> <p>10 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: Yes. It makes me</p> <p>11 nervous.</p> <p>12 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: Does the DEQ have the</p> <p>13 authority then to make sure that that contractor has</p> <p>14 no further work in Oklahoma?</p> <p>15 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: No, we do not have that</p> <p>16 authority.</p> <p>17 MR. SOWERS: Is there any additional bonding</p> <p>18 or anything that could be required of that contractor?</p> <p>19 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: No.</p> <p>20 MR. SOWERS: No?</p> <p>21 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: No, they are just like</p> <p>22 everybody else. The one hook, I guess, that we have</p> <p>23 is, under EPA's penalty policy that authorized states</p> <p>24 have to adopt, if they were to have non-compliance at</p> <p>25 another facility they operated, the fines would be</p>	23
22	<p>1 escalated quite a bit. There are multipliers. But,</p> <p>2 in this case, the actual calculated fine actually</p> <p>3 exceeded the statutory maximum. So, we went with the</p> <p>4 statutory maximum and then settled just under a</p> <p>5 million dollars.</p> <p>6 But I will tell you, you know, we are looking</p> <p>7 at discharge monitoring reports and monthly operating</p> <p>8 reports we get from that company in plants that they</p> <p>9 operate in order to, you know, just double check that</p> <p>10 we do have some comfort there. But they have the same</p> <p>11 requirements as any other entity.</p> <p>12 Okay. So, ready to move to legislation?</p> <p>13 Okay.</p> <p>14 So, more exciting, cheerful news. Actually,</p> <p>15 we did have one piece of legislation that we were</p> <p>16 really excited to have passed this year. And this</p> <p>17 basically allows DEQ to directly contract with</p> <p>18 non-profit organizations that provide technical</p> <p>19 assistance for water and waste water systems.</p> <p>20 We've historically contracted with Rural</p> <p>21 Water Association for some operator training. And for</p> <p>22 the first time last year, we were told we needed to go</p> <p>23 through a bidding process and it took a long time to</p> <p>24 get through all of those hurdles. So, now the agency</p> <p>25 is authorized to contract with other non-profit</p>	24



WQMAC Meeting 8/9/2016

<p style="text-align: right;">25</p> <p>1 organizations for some of that training.                  2 We've had a contract with Rose State, several                  3 other entities that it just, all of the sudden, became                  4 much more complicated and burdensome. So, this                  5 legislation, it took effect on July 1st, allows us to                  6 do that contracting, which we rely on as our staffing                  7 has decreased. And it allows us to call on those                  8 entities when we have emergencies or need technical                  9 assistance right away, and they have somebody an hour                  10 away and we're three hours away and it's Saturday                  11 afternoon on a holiday weekend, which is when those                  12 kind of things typically happen. So, that's something                  13 that was very positive.                  14 We also -- there was a change on coal ash on                  15 power plants. This is really a Land Protection                  16 Division issue, but it just made our state statutes                  17 match up with what the federal requirements were,                  18 rather than being more restrictive.                  19 On some of the agency coordination bills, we                  20 have Corp Comm and DEQ working together on                  21 applications for produced and marginal quality waters,                  22 looking at some of those flow back waters from oil and                  23 gas, also looking at some of the -- not saline                  24 aquifers, but hard to treat for drinking water                  25 purposes. So, we will be working with them on those</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">27</p> <p>1 clarification.                  2 We had a bill that made water a compelling                  3 state interest. It seems pretty reasonable. I think                  4 everyone can agree that water is a compelling state                  5 interest. This bill actually came about in some of                  6 the discussions with the Right-to-Farm bill that is                  7 the initiative that will be on the November ballot.                  8 And the way that that's worded is that, if there's a                  9 compelling state interest, then there could be some                  10 kind of state involvement in agricultural practices.                  11 So, at this point, it doesn't really do                  12 anything. And I'm not totally sure that it -- what                  13 impact it has if that ballot measure passes or not.                  14 But, that was one that got quite a bit of attention.                  15 For those of you in Northeastern Oklahoma,                  16 you're well aware of the changes with the Scenic                  17 Rivers Commission. That state agency was merged into                  18 GRDA, Grand River Dam Authority, under their                  19 environmental programs. So, basically, it just picked                  20 them up, moved Ed Fite over into environmental. The                  21 river rangers are in with the GRDA lake rangers, is                  22 basically what that has done.                  23 The Corporation Commission was given                  24 emergency regulatory authority in cases of                  25 emergencies. They didn't have that authority. And,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">26</p> <p>1 issues.                  2 We're also -- we have a bill for DEQ and the                  3 Water Board working on aquifer storage and recovery.                  4 This has gone on in a few states over the years. It's                  5 basically on -- some of the coastal states will inject                  6 treated water in order to stop saltwater intrusion.                  7 Texas has two or three areas around San Antonio where                  8 they treat to drinking water standards and then inject                  9 into a confined aquifer and then can pull that water                  10 out later for use. That way it doesn't evaporate, you                  11 don't lose as much of it.                  12 Arizona has been doing this for quite some                  13 time. Wichita, Kansas has a similar set up, except                  14 they're doing it with flood or high flows in certain                  15 rivers. They treat to drinking water standards and                  16 then inject. And then they can pull water later for                  17 drinking water purposes or other purposes.                  18 So, that's something that we will be working                  19 on for the next two or three years I'm sure. And you                  20 all will be seeing rulemaking at some point.                  21 We had a bill that clarified that the Storage                  22 Tank Act only applies to petroleum. We had a lot of                  23 discussions of, oh, my gosh, why does a drinking water                  24 storage tank have to meet requirements that are                  25 clearly set up for oil and gas. So, that was just a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">28</p> <p>1 you know, it was one of those things that everyone                  2 just assumed and they took necessary actions, but now                  3 they specifically have the authority.                  4 Something that does change a little bit, some                  5 of the language that you all will see when we do                  6 rulemaking, there was a bill that required a statement                  7 of the gist of the rule. So, now rulemaking rule                  8 impact statements will state "The gist of this rule                  9 is" and then there will be language. The idea was to                  10 have kind of a straight-forward, easy-to-understand                  11 language explaining the rule before it went into                  12 whatever the technical details were.                  13 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm not much of a speller.                  14 Is that G-I-S-T or is that J-I-S-T?                  15 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: You are correct.                  16 G-I-S-T. It is a statement of the gist, which, you                  17 know, I didn't really realize that was an actual word.                  18 I'd heard it, but that is a statutory requirement.                  19 So, we -- our rule impact statements that we have                  20 prepared for the October rulemaking has that statement                  21 of the language in it.                  22 A few years ago we went from a rule approval                  23 process where, if the legislature took no action, the                  24 rule was approved and went to the Governor. If the                  25 legislature -- they could disapprove a rule, but they</p>

WQMAC Meeting 8/9/2016

<p style="text-align: right;">29</p> <p>1 had to take an action to do that. They changed that  2 requirement so that the legislature had to  3 affirmatively approve all rules in order for them to  4 go into effect.  5 For the second straight year, they did not  6 take up the rules. And so, the Governor issued a  7 declaration regarding the agency rules, approving all  8 of them for the DEQ.  9 There were several bills that were related to  10 DEQ that did not make it through the legislative  11 process and to the Governor. One of them was to  12 revert to the former rules process, which is kind of  13 what's been happening anyway. But they did not vote  14 on that. It didn't get voted down, it just didn't get  15 voted on.  16 There was also a bill that would have allowed  17 the legislature to make changes to rules once they  18 were submitted to them, that they could make any  19 changes to whatever had been submitted. So, that did  20 not pass.  21 There was a bill that would authorize the  22 Office of Management and Enterprise Services to  23 reconcile agency funds. No one was ever quite sure  24 exactly what "reconcile the agency revolving funds"  25 meant or how that would work. It made it a long way</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">31</p> <p>1 transparent in fees.  2 And then there's a study on options for  3 recycling produced water as an alternative to the  4 Underground Injection Control Program. The goal is to  5 bring in some of the nation's innovative recyclers to  6 see what cost-effective methods are available. So,  7 that will be interesting.  8 Also kind of interesting as we move into the  9 next legislative session is kind of a change in the  10 legislature. You know, we had the term limits imposed  11 a few years ago. So, this coming year, we'll have  12 eleven Senators that have been term limited and one  13 additional is not running for reelection. So, that's  14 a pretty significant number of Senators that will be  15 changing.  16 There are 19 House of Representative members  17 that are term limited and another 10 that have not  18 chosen to run for reelection. So, if every incumbent  19 wins, we will still have 41 new legislators next  20 session. So, it's going to be very interesting.  21 We also will have a new Speaker of the House,  22 a new Senate Pro Tem, a new Appropriations Committee  23 Chair in the Senate and likely a new Appropriations  24 Chair in the House. So, that's a lot of change and a  25 lot of education on what all of the agencies do and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">30</p> <p>1 through the process, but it did end up dying before it  2 was voted on.  3 There was a bill that would require a super  4 majority in order for the legislature to transfer  5 funds from one agency back to the general fund, but  6 that did not pass.  7 There was a bill that would make any  8 federally-imposed rule subject to upfront legislative  9 review. We weren't sure how that was going to work or  10 play out either, but that did not pass.  11 And there was a prohibition on the Clean  12 Power Plan State Implementation Plan and Air Quality  13 without specific approval by the Governor and the  14 Attorney General. I'm not sure the details on where  15 that came from and what the goal was, but it did not  16 pass.  17 There are several interim studies that could  18 impact us. One is the agency realignment and paper  19 reduction streamlining effort. That's — right now  20 all we know about them is kind of their descriptor,  21 but they will be occurring later this summer and early  22 fall.  23 Agency fee-for-service threshold fees charged  24 by various agencies and the cost of providing the  25 services would be examined. The idea being more</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">32</p> <p>1 how they function. So, those are some things that  2 we'll be addressing as we move into the next session.  3 Does anybody have any questions on those  4 before I quickly cover one more item? You're all  5 looking at me like "please stop."  6 MS. WYATT: I'm just feeling really sorry for  7 you.  8 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: Well, I appreciate that.  9 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: I appreciate your  10 balanced presentation.  11 MS. WYATT: Yeah.  12 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: Well, it — you know,  13 hopefully, when it comes out it's a little more  14 politically correct than sometimes what's in my head.  15 Okay. I have one more item. Chris  16 Armstrong, the Director of the State Environmental  17 Lab, was unable to be here today and wanted me to just  18 let you know something that we may be talking about in  19 October or January, or we may not, depending on what  20 happens with EPA.  21 There is a method update rule, yet again. We  22 just did the Sufficiently Sensitive Scientific Method  23 update rules last year. There's another Laboratory  24 Methods update rule for the analysis of effluent. It  25 was proposed by EPA in February of 2015. According to</p>

WQMAC Meeting 8/9/2016

<p style="text-align: right;">33</p> <p>1 Chris, they keep hearing soon it's going to be 2 published in its final form and that will start the 3 clock for the states to review and adopt. 4 Basically, the proposal is to revise and 5 include new analytical methods, revise existing 6 methods by voluntary consistent standard bodies, such 7 as ASTM, and changes to clarify procedures for EPA 8 approval nationwide and limited-use alternative test 9 procedures. And then amendments to the procedure for 10 the determination of the method detection limit. 11 The method detection limit is the area that 12 the lab expects there to be the most controversy and 13 the most impact. It's the smaller labs, particularly, 14 where we have under the NPDES program, individual 15 wastewater treatment plants can have their own lab and 16 do certain basic tests. This could change some of 17 that or make it more complicated for those smaller 18 labs. So, right now it's maybe coming soon-ish. So, 19 the lab is not quite sure when we'll see it, but they 20 think in the next year we will definitely be seeing 21 rulemaking on the subject. 22 And I will just tell you now, if you have 23 questions on that, I'm happy to write them down and 24 have Chris get back with you. 25 MR. HILDEBRAND: Fire away, Brian.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">35</p> <p>1 permit updates rule. And then we just recently 2 learned of a new rulemaking that EPA is considering 3 that it's just starting the process for, an advanced 4 notice of proposed rulemaking for Baseline Water 5 Quality Standards for Indian reservations. 6 And then, I also wanted to give you all an 7 update on the status of the Water Reuse rules we're 8 working on here at DEQ for indirect potable reuse. 9 So, the MS4 remand rule, the proposed rule 10 was published January 6th of this year. The gist of 11 this rule is that it would revise the procedures that 12 we use -- that are used for issuing general permits to 13 the -- for small and medium MS4s. EPA is proceeding 14 with this rulemaking in response to a court remand, 15 which decided that the regulations for small MS4 16 general permits, as they currently existed, did not 17 provide adequate public notice and opportunity for the 18 public to -- or anybody to request a hearing on 19 issuance of those permits and also determined that the 20 EPA had failed to require permitting authority review 21 of best management practices established under those 22 general permits to ensure that they would reduce 23 pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. 24 Now, we're anticipating -- or EPA said that 25 they plan to have the final rule out some time in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">34</p> <p>1 MR. DUZAN: I'll take it easy on you. 2 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: I appreciate that. 3 That's all I have. And I will turn things 4 over to Mike Moe to talk about some NPDES program 5 update issues. 6 MR. MOE: Thank you, Shellie. 7 As Shellie mentioned, I'm Mike Moe. I'm the 8 manager -- Engineering Manager for the Waste Water 9 Group here in the Water Quality Division. I do have a 10 PowerPoint slide show on the screen over here to my 11 side, if folks want to rearrange where they can maybe 12 see that a little easier. 13 MR. HILDEBRAND: There are seats over here. 14 MR. MOE: Well, anyway, I'm going to be 15 giving a summary of some current ongoing rulemakings 16 at EPA and one here at DEQ. These will not come to 17 the Council for incorporation or adoption this year, 18 but they are likely to come to the Council next year 19 and we wanted to go ahead and give you all an update 20 at this time just because they could potentially have 21 big impacts on our programs here. 22 So, at EPA we have three rulemakings that are 23 currently going on that we have been following. The 24 first one is the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer 25 System, or MS4, remand rule. Then there's the NPDES</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">36</p> <p>1 October or November of this year. We have been 2 participating with ACWA and the other states, put 3 together comments on the proposed rule. As a result, 4 EPA is currently working on developing the final rule. 5 And we have participated in a face-to-face meeting 6 with EPA, some of the other states also participated 7 in that, to go over some of the proposed language for 8 the final rule. 9 But, under the proposed rule, EPA would 10 propose to adopt one of three approaches to general 11 permit issuance for MS4s. The first approach would be 12 what they called the traditional approach, which is 13 kind of a standard approach that is used for most 14 general permits where all of the substantive and 15 enforceable permit requirements would be included in 16 the master general permit. And then, when facilities 17 apply for coverage, the Notice of Intent or NOI that 18 they submit would contain just basic identifying 19 information about the permittee. 20 And public notice under this approach, public 21 notice would occur only for the master general permit. 22 There would be no public notice for the notice of 23 intent, because they would not be involving any 24 changes to the permit conditions established in the 25 master general permit. This was EPA's preferred</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">37</p> <p>1 approach.</p> <p>2 The second approach that they proposed is</p> <p>3 what they call the procedural approach. And this is</p> <p>4 similar to the approach we currently follow here in</p> <p>5 Oklahoma. Under this approach the master general</p> <p>6 permit would establish the framework and basic</p> <p>7 requirements that facilities would have to meet and</p> <p>8 that municipalities MS4s would have to meet. And then</p> <p>9 the MS4s, when they applied for coverage under the</p> <p>10 general permit, they would submit a more detailed NOI</p> <p>11 that describes their proposed best management</p> <p>12 practices and measurable goals that would become an</p> <p>13 enforceable part of the permit, you know, basically to</p> <p>14 show that they're achieving pollution reduction to the</p> <p>15 maximum extent practicable.</p> <p>16 These proposed BMPs and measurable goals that</p> <p>17 would be included in the NOI, they would be subject to</p> <p>18 state review and approval. And for states that have</p> <p>19 delegated programs, then it would also be subject to</p> <p>20 EPA review and approval.</p> <p>21 And then once the state, you know, the state</p> <p>22 or the EPA reviews the NOIs, the proposed BMPs and</p> <p>23 measurable goals, they could require changes to those.</p> <p>24 But once that's all finalized, then there would be a</p> <p>25 second public notice basically under this approach.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">39</p> <p>1 participated in a face-to-face meeting up at EPA</p> <p>2 headquarters a couple of months ago to go to review</p> <p>3 some of the proposed language that EPA had developed</p> <p>4 and to comment on that and to try and help them out</p> <p>5 with coming up with the rules language.</p> <p>6 One of the big questions that remains to be</p> <p>7 resolved is under this procedural approach, if the</p> <p>8 municipality makes some changes to the Best Management</p> <p>9 Practices that they use or makes other changes to</p> <p>10 their Storm Water Management Program, there is still</p> <p>11 kind of an open question of what level of change would</p> <p>12 trigger a requirement to do a formal permit</p> <p>13 modification.</p> <p>14 But EPA, you know, still is working that out.</p> <p>15 They've been, you know, playing it fairly close to</p> <p>16 their vest. Other than this one face-to-face meeting,</p> <p>17 they haven't really shared any details on, you know,</p> <p>18 what the final rule might look like. But, like I say,</p> <p>19 they are anticipating having a final rule out in</p> <p>20 October or November time frame for this year.</p> <p>21 Then we have the NPDES program updates rule</p> <p>22 which EPA proposed in May of this year. And it lays</p> <p>23 out a lot of revisions throughout the NPDES program,</p> <p>24 throughout the NPDES rules and multiple parts of 40</p> <p>25 CFR that deal with the NPDES program, basic program</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">38</p> <p>1 There is a public notice when the Master General</p> <p>2 Permit is issued. And then there would be a second</p> <p>3 public notice when the NOI is finalized with all of</p> <p>4 those additional municipality-specific enforceable</p> <p>5 permit requirements.</p> <p>6 And then the third approach that they have</p> <p>7 proposed is what they called the state approach where</p> <p>8 the state could choose to follow either option 1 or</p> <p>9 option 2 or some mixture or hybrid of both.</p> <p>10 In the proposal, the rules language was fully</p> <p>11 fleshed out only for the traditional approach. For</p> <p>12 these other approaches, you know, just laid out kind</p> <p>13 of the framework, proposed framework, but did not</p> <p>14 propose actual rules language. That gave the states a</p> <p>15 lot of concern, because they didn't feel like they</p> <p>16 could fully evaluate the alternatives when we didn't</p> <p>17 have rules language for everything.</p> <p>18 So, and the final rule, looks like EPA will</p> <p>19 be going with an approach where the states would have</p> <p>20 the option to adopt either, well, you know, the</p> <p>21 traditional approach or follow the procedural</p> <p>22 approach. And they have been working on fleshing out</p> <p>23 the rules language for that second alternative, the</p> <p>24 procedural approach.</p> <p>25 So, as I indicated, we and a few other states</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">40</p> <p>1 requirements, state-specific program requirements,</p> <p>2 procedures for decisionmaking, et cetera.</p> <p>3 Again, EPA is anticipating -- their goal is</p> <p>4 to have their final rule out in October or November of</p> <p>5 this year. The proposed revisions to the rules -- the</p> <p>6 rules revisions that they've proposed are much too</p> <p>7 lengthy, much too detailed to go through in great</p> <p>8 detail here. But just as kind of an overview, the</p> <p>9 proposed rule does propose some updates to permit</p> <p>10 application requirements.</p> <p>11 Probably the biggest ones there would be that</p> <p>12 for new facilities that are just starting up and so</p> <p>13 they don't necessarily have, you know, have not</p> <p>14 started discharging yet and don't have actual</p> <p>15 discharge data, the time frame for them to provide</p> <p>16 that data is reduced from the current 24 months after</p> <p>17 commencing discharge down to 18 months after</p> <p>18 commencing discharge.</p> <p>19 And for existing facilities when they submit</p> <p>20 renewal applications, the time period for effluent</p> <p>21 data that they summarize and provide in the permit</p> <p>22 application is getting longer, going from two or three</p> <p>23 years' worth of data, that's to be summarized to 4.5</p> <p>24 years or, essentially, summarizing all the discharge</p> <p>25 data for the previous permit cycle.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">41</p> <p>1 The proposal – the proposed rule also lays                  2 out a lot of additional details and specifications for                  3 factors that have to be considered and documented in                  4 development of water quality-based limits from the                  5 first step of doing reasonable potential analysis to                  6 determine if limits are needed and then through the                  7 development process of those water quality-based                  8 limits.                  9 Here we feel like we are already doing most                  10 of the things that they have proposed in the rule.                  11 But, you know, we may have to provide additional –                  12 some additional justification in developing our water                  13 quality-based limits for permits.                  14 There is also the potential that, well, in                  15 the proposed rule it says that we have to consider all                  16 relevant qualitative and quantitative information in                  17 developing water quality-based limits. And that could                  18 mean that we – that we might end up imposing more                  19 water quality-based limits than we have in the past                  20 where we don't have actual, you know, don't yet have                  21 actual quantitative effluent data. You know, so, you                  22 know, we might end up having to – as a result having                  23 to impose more water quality-based limits based on a                  24 – if a similar facility has a water quality-base                  25 limit, you know, we might have to consider that as</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">43</p> <p>1 permits. And what that would do would be, it would                  2 trigger their ability to object to the permits. And                  3 if they were to declare a permit, an                  4 administratively-continued permit, to be a proposed                  5 permit and we didn't get a new draft permit out in                  6 time, then they could object to that proposed permit                  7 and potentially take over permit issuance themselves.                  8 And so, you know, none of the states are in                  9 favor of that. We, you know, feel like it's a big                  10 additional administrative burden. You know we feel                  11 like there are already systems in place, initiatives                  12 in place, to deal with those situations. We, in                  13 Oklahoma, currently, we only have about a dozen                  14 permits out of, you know, 6 or 700 permits that have                  15 been expired for more than two years. So, you know,                  16 we don't really see this as being a big problem here.                  17 And we just don't see it as being very effective,                  18 because, you know, if EPA – you know, they have                  19 trouble getting all the permits that they're currently                  20 responsible for issued, states' permits reviewed. How                  21 are they going to take on this additional burden and                  22 get these permit renewals out any faster?                  23 You know, so, that's one of the key points                  24 that the states and ACWA have commented on. We'll see                  25 how EPA responds to that.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">42</p> <p>1 qualitative data that would justify a water                  2 quality-base limits in a new facility.                  3 The proposal also would incorporate                  4 additional anti-backsliding provisions, language from                  5 the Clean Water Act. Basically, you know, that's                  6 pretty much already being followed. It just hasn't                  7 previously been incorporated in the CFR. So, we don't                  8 see any significant change there.                  9 Probably the most controversial, most                  10 contested, or the proposed change that the states                  11 certainly are least happy about, is the EPA has                  12 proposed some new provisions for                  13 administratively-continued permits. And that is                  14 where, you know, a five-year permit – you know, the                  15 permits we issue are good for five years and then we                  16 have to do a permit renewal, issue a renewal permit.                  17 Well, as long as the facility gets their renewal                  18 application in on time, if we aren't able to get the                  19 new renewal permit issued before the existing permit                  20 expires, then that old permit is administratively                  21 continued, stays in effect, until such time as we do                  22 get a new permit issued.                  23 Under this proposal, EPA would have the                  24 authority to designate certain of those                  25 administratively-continued permits as proposed</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">44</p> <p>1 Another proposed change would revise public                  2 notice procedures. On its face it seemed like this                  3 would be a good change, because it allows for                  4 additional flexibility in dealing with the public                  5 notice requirements, would allow states to provide                  6 public notice through their website in lieu of                  7 newspaper publication. Currently, you know, we do                  8 both newspaper publication and publication on our                  9 website when we have a permit that's being issued or                  10 going out to public notice.                  11 But the problem with this proposed change is                  12 that, if a state does opt to go with public notice on                  13 their website in lieu of newspaper publication, that                  14 would trigger an additional requirement for the state                  15 to basically post all of their permits on the website                  16 for the full life the permits, the fact sheet and the                  17 supporting documentation for the full life of that                  18 permit. And so, that would be a big, big burden of                  19 additional information that we would have to put up                  20 and maintain on our website.                  21 And then the rule also lays out a lot of                  22 additional details and specifics on what information                  23 has to be included in the fact sheets that go along                  24 with the individual and general permits that we                  25 develop. The fact sheets explain how the permit</p>

WQMAC Meeting 8/9/2016

<p style="text-align: right;">45</p> <p>1 conditions were developed, what rules apply, and  2 basically all of our decisionmaking.  3 Again, we feel like our fact sheets pretty  4 much follow, you know, all of the additional  5 requirements that EPA is proposing. But we may still  6 have to, you know, make some tweaks, maybe, you know,  7 provide some additional justification for certain  8 aspects of our permitting.  9 Then the latest thing that we just learned of  10 very recently is EPA has announced that they are  11 planning to do an advanced notice of proposed  12 rulemaking for baseline Water Quality Standards for  13 Indian reservations. We just had a webinar with EPA,  14 the other states and ACWA yesterday. You know, the  15 title of this rule is a little bit misleading, because  16 it says Indian reservations. But it would apply not  17 only to Indian reservations, which we don't have in  18 Oklahoma, but would also apply to Tribal trust lands,  19 which we do have in Oklahoma. And it would propose  20 nationwide baseline Water Quality Standards for Tribal  21 lands where the Tribes have not yet developed their  22 own Water Quality Standards and where EPA has not  23 approved Water Quality Standards.  24 As I indicated, this is a very recent  25 development and we don't have a whole lot of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">47</p> <p>1 You know, last year we worked with the OWRB  2 to -- and our Water Quality Standards work group or  3 subcommittee to develop a new designation for -- in  4 the Water Quality Standards for Sensitive Public and  5 Private Water Supplies Reuse, or SWSR. Currently, we  6 have Sensitive Public and Private Water Supply  7 designation, which essentially, except for storm  8 water, basically prohibits any new discharges or  9 increase in existing discharges to the lakes that have  10 been designated as SWS.  11 This new designation would allow for  12 municipalities to petition to have lakes reclassified  13 under this SWS-r designation, which would basically  14 allow -- maintain the same prohibitions on discharge,  15 except for allowing for discharge of treated municipal  16 waste water for reuse.  17 So, that has been approved by the legislature  18 for the Water Quality Standards, OWRB's Water Quality  19 Standards, which are currently awaiting EPA approval.  20 And then, once the EPA has approved the latest Water  21 Quality Standards updates, that would go into effect  22 and be available for municipalities to petition OWRB  23 to make that change.  24 Our Water Quality Standard subcommittee  25 continues to meet on a monthly basis to work on</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">46</p> <p>1 information. We will be watching this rulemaking very  2 closely, because it could have, potentially, a huge  3 impact here in Oklahoma and in other states that have  4 Tribal lands.  5 As I mentioned, there was a webinar yesterday  6 that just provided some very basic information on what  7 EPA is thinking about with this rulemaking and some  8 timelines. They are planning on doing another  9 outreach session at a breakfast at the ACWA annual  10 meeting in Seattle next week on the 17th. Shellie  11 will be participating in that meeting. Then they plan  12 on doing another joint ACWA and ECOS webinar on  13 September 1st. Their hope is to have this kind of  14 public -- the publication of the advanced notice of  15 proposed rulemaking -- that's a real mouthful -- by  16 the end of this calendar year. And that would,  17 basically, solicit comments on, you know, the key  18 issues being considered for rulemaking and whether EPA  19 should proceed with that rulemaking.  20 So, you know, this could potentially play out  21 over the next year or two. So, we will be following  22 that very closely.  23 And then, finally, I wanted to just briefly  24 give an update on some of the work we've been doing  25 here at DEQ for rulemaking for Indirect Potable Reuse.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">48</p> <p>1 rulemaking. That subcommittee consists of  2 representatives from DEQ, OWRB, consultants who have  3 expertise in water reuse and some municipalities. In  4 developing rules for indirect potable reuse, the  5 subcommittee has reached consensus on some aspects,  6 such as requirements for log removal, disinfection,  7 for viruses. And we continue to have ongoing  8 discussions.  9 Right now, the main focus is on discussions  10 on whether we should go with a technology-based  11 approach or essentially we would say that for indirect  12 potable reuse you have to use these specific  13 technologies and those would be protective of the  14 water, both the receiving water and the public water  15 intake, or whether to go with a pollutant  16 concentration-based approach where we would say  17 essentially, you know, that you have to meet these  18 concentration limits on different pollutants. And  19 then municipalities would be able to -- potentially be  20 able to select different technologies as long as they  21 ended up meeting those final limits.  22 So, we're not anticipating coming forward  23 with a rulemaking on this this year. We are aiming to  24 have rules ready for next year and we do anticipate  25 having a more detailed update on this rulemaking at</p>

49	<p>1 our next – at the next Council meeting.</p> <p>2 So with that, does anybody have any</p> <p>3 questions on any of the material I've covered?</p> <p>4 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: One. One comment.</p> <p>5 The --</p> <p>6 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: Duane – Mike, can you</p> <p>7 give him the mic? The court reporter can't hear you.</p> <p>8 In dealing with Indian trust lands and Tribal</p> <p>9 lands, the way things are – the way things are – the</p> <p>10 properties are distributed here in Oklahoma, that's</p> <p>11 going to be a real chore, because you've got trust</p> <p>12 lands intermixed with private lands. Very, very</p> <p>13 confusing.</p> <p>14 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: This is Shellie</p> <p>15 Chard-McClary. Yes. The movement between what are</p> <p>16 the State of Oklahoma standards and what standards</p> <p>17 could potentially apply on Tribal land, it does get</p> <p>18 interesting. We looked at this about 10 years ago,</p> <p>19 plus or minus, when EPA was considering something</p> <p>20 similar and we had several Tribes looking at doing</p> <p>21 their own Water Quality Standards.</p> <p>22 There was one municipality that we just</p> <p>23 randomly picked. The discharge would go through a</p> <p>24 total of nine Water Quality Standards changes in the</p> <p>25 area that we have to consider when we develop permit</p>	51
50	<p>1 limit. So, we would be looking at nine different</p> <p>2 Water Quality Standards and then trying to determine</p> <p>3 what an appropriate permit limit was. So, it has the</p> <p>4 potential to be very convoluted and difficult.</p> <p>5 About the only thing that EPA did state or</p> <p>6 agree was that individual allotment lands would not be</p> <p>7 considered in the Tribal Water Quality Standards, that</p> <p>8 they would continue to be under the State of Oklahoma</p> <p>9 or whatever the state authority is.</p> <p>10 So, we wouldn't have to deal with every</p> <p>11 allotment, but we would be dealing with discharges</p> <p>12 that would be impacted. If it's just a federal</p> <p>13 standard, then we'd be looking at two, the Oklahoma</p> <p>14 and whatever the federal. But once there is the</p> <p>15 federal standard, then we would anticipate seeing</p> <p>16 potentially the Tribes using that as a jumping off</p> <p>17 point for their own Water Quality Standards.</p> <p>18 The one significant concern, along with the</p> <p>19 complicated, convoluted regulatory scheme, EPA is at</p> <p>20 this point considering proposing a new designated</p> <p>21 beneficial use that we have not seen before and its</p> <p>22 Tribal and cultural significance. They can't really</p> <p>23 tell us exactly what that means at this point. But</p> <p>24 the Water Board in some discussions late yesterday</p> <p>25 after the conference call said, Well, there is some</p>	52
	<p>1 concerns about fish consumption, whether it's a whole</p> <p>2 fish or only parts of the fish. And we don't know for</p> <p>3 sure what that's going to be. But that was kind of</p> <p>4 the Water Board's first reaction, was how many parts</p> <p>5 of a fish make a whole fish and some things along</p> <p>6 those lines.</p> <p>7 So, it's early, but we're going to hear a lot</p> <p>8 about it, I think.</p> <p>9 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: I think we need to go</p> <p>10 back over there. We have got another one.</p> <p>11 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: Yeah. And Patty is going</p> <p>12 to talk about Public Water Supply. Hopefully, it</p> <p>13 won't be quite as technical.</p> <p>14 MS. THOMPSON: Intense.</p> <p>15 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: Intense. That's a good</p> <p>16 word.</p> <p>17 MS. THOMPSON: Yeah. This is going to be</p> <p>18 fun. There's pictures. It's colorful.</p> <p>19 Okay. Well, let's go ahead and get started</p> <p>20 so that we can get through here. I'm Patty Thompson.</p> <p>21 I'm the Engineering Manager for the Public Water</p> <p>22 Supply Group. That's everything to do with drinking</p> <p>23 water.</p> <p>24 We're located on the 8th floor on the south</p> <p>25 side. We just recently got all the sections together.</p>	

<p style="text-align: right;">53</p> <p>1 Sections, they hosted 22 workshops across the state in  2 early 2016. They had 2,000 attendees. And the rule,  3 very quickly, requires new site plans to do a Level 1  4 assessment if they exceed a certain amount of total  5 coliform, and then a Level 2 assessment if the E. coli  6 MCL is in violation. The Level 2 assessment, we  7 probably – is – well, is currently being done by the  8 PWS engineers.</p> <p>9 The Lead and Copper Rule. Flint, Michigan, I  10 know we've all heard of this. Just to ensure that you  11 know that we are doing everything we can, we're taking  12 it extremely seriously, very seriously. We  13 re-evaluated our procedures on doing the Lead Rule,  14 the Lead and Copper Rule. And we have determined that  15 the Lead and Copper Rule allows up to five years to  16 comply if the 90 percentile lead action level exceeds.  17 So, it -- they can take almost -- well, they can take  18 five years to get it fixed.</p> <p>19 So, we're taking a more proactive approach.  20 We have -- we went out and did some technical  21 assistance to shorten this time frame. We now have 23  22 systems that have exceeded the lead action level. And  23 we assigned DEQ engineers to each system to provide  24 the technical assistance and to meet requirements,  25 evaluate the system, conduct a corrosion control study</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">55</p> <p>1 handle that backlog, we are drafting 150 to 175  2 consent orders. That is a huge number. And so, we've  3 streamlined it, we have a template. The legal staff  4 helped us. We're really working on this.</p> <p>5 We have currently drafted 74 of these and  6 they're in the process of either being reviewed,  7 mailed, returned or signed. But at least there are 74  8 drafted. And our goal date is September 1st, I don't  9 know if we can make it, but we certainly are trying.</p> <p>10 So this is a big deal, very big deal.</p> <p>11 Okay. I want to talk about emergencies. The  12 Public Water Supply Group, the Public Water Supply  13 Engineering Section particularly, you know, when you  14 come to work in the morning, you never know what's  15 going to happen. There are emergencies. I mean, you  16 can think you're going to have your day all planned  17 and then an emergency pops up and you're out in the  18 field, you're taking care of some flooding, ice, high  19 turbidities, a water leak that -- you know, a line  20 break, iron and manganese complaints.</p> <p>21 Iron and manganese may be a secondary  22 contaminant, but we spend more time on iron and  23 manganese, we get more complaints about that. At  24 least the engineers spend a lot time out there giving  25 technical assistance.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">54</p> <p>1 and also recommend that they get an engineer, if we  2 see that they need one, they have to do some  3 infrastructure.</p> <p>4 Our initial meetings for the original 19  5 systems were completed in May of 2016, so we're still  6 working with these systems and getting updates and  7 getting things fixed. And it looks like some of those  8 may be able to come off of that list maybe in the next  9 couple of months.</p> <p>10 The Water Quality Division and the State  11 Environmental Lab is providing free testing for  12 citizens that call in concerned about lead in their  13 drinking water. This is -- you know, we're limited on  14 funds. We can't do it for everyone. But we don't  15 advertise it. But if someone calls in and they're  16 concerned, this gives them a peace of mind that their  17 water is safe. And if it's not, then we let them know  18 and we do what we can to start getting everything  19 corrected.</p> <p>20 The Stage 2 Disinfectant By-Product Rule,  21 this was signed in January of 2006. We received  22 primacy in January of 2014. The EPA was the enforcer  23 during that period of time before we took primacy.  24 And so, along with the primacy, we inherited a huge  25 backlog of enforcement from EPA Region 6. So, to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">56</p> <p>1 Boil advisories, water outages, chlorine  2 releases at water plants. That's happened a couple of  3 times in the recent past.</p> <p>4 We recently had a back siphon of herbicide  5 involving a Public Water Supply. And that took, I  6 don't know, four days. We had to go out and flush  7 the man's entire house. He put his hose in a tank  8 that he had his herbicide in there and he went back in  9 to get his coffee or something and, lo and behold,  10 there was a line break between his house and the  11 Public Water Supply and came out and all that was  12 gone. It just sucked up in the hose. And so, but it  13 took quite awhile to deal with that.</p> <p>14 So, these are just a few of the things that  15 we do. And, of course, there's always the harmful  16 algal blooms that blossom every summer.</p> <p>17 We are also -- The Drinking Water State  18 Revolving Fund is responsible for doing the Need  19 Survey every four years. It's another big deal. It  20 takes a lot of effort. And so, the 2015 Needs Survey,  21 we had completed our part in early 2016 and the report  22 to Congress should be completed by spring of 2017.  23 Cadmus is the contractor who puts all that together  24 and does the report for EPA.</p> <p>25 The Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, its</p>



57

1 percentage that we get of the SRF funds allocated by  
 2 Congress is dependent upon that Needs Survey. So,  
 3 we're always hoping that it's -- our percentage gets  
 4 larger. We have great needs. So --  
 5       The Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, I  
 6 think you all are familiar with that. So far, since  
 7 it was -- from its inception in State Fiscal Year  
 8 1998, we provided 162 DWS direct loans for a total of  
 9 \$930 million. We're almost to the billion-dollar mark  
 10 and maybe we'll have a big celebration. But that's  
 11 exciting.  
 12       Also, you know, we're required to provide 20  
 13 percent of our capitalization grant for -- in subsidy.  
 14 And we have chosen -- the Water Board and the DEQ, we  
 15 manage this program together. We are the grant  
 16 recipient. We are the -- we do the technical portion.  
 17 We determine the eligibility of the projects and then  
 18 the Water Board acts as our banker.  
 19       So, we have awarded since 2010, we have  
 20 awarded 11 regionalization projects for a total of 9  
 21 million -- about \$9.7 million. And for 2017, this  
 22 year, we have four proposed regionalization projects  
 23 that are going to be about 5.2 million.  
 24       We have one called the South Delaware County  
 25 Water Authority -- I think there's another name in

58

1 there, but it's -- that's what it is. And it's quite  
 2 a -- it's going to be about \$15 million, I believe.  
 3 We're putting in maybe a couple of million of  
 4 principal forgiveness, free money, but they're also --  
 5 this is a agency and federal and state, Tribal. Rural  
 6 development is putting in the majority of the loan and  
 7 some grant funds. The Indian Health Service is  
 8 providing some funds and the Cherokee Nation has  
 9 actually put in funds. So -- you know, Cherokee  
 10 Nation is a very good partner when we're funding these  
 11 projects. So, that's going to be a very interesting  
 12 project.  
 13       We have a line that we're going to be  
 14 starting this fall from Edmond to Arcadia. And that  
 15 is a subsidization project. And then we've got -- I  
 16 can't think of the other ones that we have. But  
 17 anyway, but we've got them on the list. So, I didn't  
 18 put them on my slide here.  
 19       We're also -- the Capacity Development  
 20 Program is a program that is everything to do with  
 21 drinking water. Just any way to make it better and  
 22 more capacity, whether it be training for operators,  
 23 going and insuring that water systems have the  
 24 managerial and technical and operational capabilities.  
 25 But we also decided to do a water loss audit pilot.

59

1 And Brandon Bowman has developed this within the last  
 2 couple of years. And so, EPA gave us special  
 3 permission to do this, use this funds, the SRF Funds.  
 4       We got 40 community water systems, they  
 5 volunteered, and we did a water loss audit using the  
 6 AWWA Program, which is free, and we had some training  
 7 come. A lady came to give us some training on that  
 8 program and she trained the DWSRF and PWS engineers,  
 9 along with ECLS, so that they could go out in the  
 10 community and do these.  
 11       The 40 community water systems represents  
 12 about 3.7 percent of the systems in Oklahoma. And  
 13 this is the first phase and it's been completed. And  
 14 it shows that on average the 74 percent is the  
 15 authorized consumption and the 26 percent is water  
 16 losses.  
 17       And water losses are composed of, you know,  
 18 leaky lines, stealing, just not knowing where the  
 19 water's going, bad bookkeeping, meters that aren't  
 20 calibrated correctly or old. But there's numerous  
 21 reasons. So, it's just not water running on the  
 22 ground, but there's other reasons.  
 23       And so, he calculated that we have 1.14  
 24 billion gallons being lost for this 3.7 percent in  
 25 Oklahoma and \$7.6 million. And so, if you extrapolate

60

1 that, you know, it's going to be lots of money.  
 2       So, anyway, so we're starting our Phase 2 and  
 3 we're partnering with the Oklahoma Rural Water  
 4 Association to conduct a leak detection and meter  
 5 analysis of the 40 volunteer systems. The work will  
 6 focus on, you know, locating the leaks, determining  
 7 the accuracy of the facility and the customer's meters  
 8 and also doing some training on showing the personnel  
 9 at the water treatment plant or water system on how to  
 10 locate leaks and verify meter accuracy. And then ECLS  
 11 and the Water Quality Division will go back out later,  
 12 after all this is done, and do another audit and just  
 13 see what improvement we see.  
 14       So, but this is very exciting and we're  
 15 anxious to get started. The contract is going to be  
 16 approved this week. I just feel it in my heart. So,  
 17 I think we're ready to go.  
 18       And the PWS Engineering Section, we have --  
 19 we're mentoring and training six new engineers this  
 20 past year. And, because of the budget cuts, the ECLS  
 21 will only be conducting one inspection a year. And  
 22 so, the PWS engineers will begin conducting sanitary  
 23 surveys for water treatment plants in 2018, which is  
 24 about a year from now. We're in the planning stage.  
 25 We're putting together plans and training and whatnot

<p style="text-align: right;">61</p> <p>1 to get this started. So, this is also a big deal and                  2 I'm anxious to get this started, too.                  3 The PWS Compliance Section, they did                  4 something really interesting. They have always been                  5 rule based, so we had a person for each rule. And so,                  6 we decided to district so we'd get them districts.                  7 And each coordinator is going to be an expert on all                  8 the rules. So, all a water system has to do is just                  9 pick up the phone and say, hey, district coordinator,                  10 what about this rule and that rule and that rule,                  11 instead of having to talk to eight different                  12 coordinators.                  13 So, this is going to be great. It's going to                  14 improve customer service, we hope. And also they'll                  15 be developing their relationship with their water                  16 systems. I think that these coordinators will take                  17 ownership of their district, improve on enforcement                  18 and compliance and also provide the training and                  19 technical assistance that they need.                  20 And I did it, I think, in 10 minutes. Any                  21 questions? Okay. Thank you.                  22 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: Well, thank you for                  23 these informative presentations today. You give us a                  24 lot to think about, a lot of things that are going to                  25 be coming up in October and beyond. And pretty soon</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">63</p> <p>1 this meeting adjourned.                  2 ADJOURNMENT - 3.35 P.M.                  3                  4                  5                  6                  7                  8                  9                  10                  11                  12                  13                  14                  15                  16                  17                  18                  19                  20                  21                  22                  23                  24                  25</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">62</p> <p>1 we'll all have a notebook as thick as the one down                  2 here that we'll be studying from day-to-day so that we                  3 can be up on all of these things.                  4 New business. I have no new business that                  5 needs to be before this Board. And then -- so then                  6 the announcements that we have?                  7 MR. HILDEBRAND: I'll just let the public                  8 know, we've got a little pamphlet on the Electronic                  9 Reporting Rule for anybody that wants to pick them up                  10 right back by where the Agendas were. Thanks.                  11 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: Okay. And our next                  12 scheduled meeting is October the 4th at 2:00 o'clock                  13 in this same room. I think we're going to be busy                  14 before that time and I anticipate that Mark will be                  15 communicating with us and sending us plenty of reading                  16 materials.                  17 And I have nothing else. Are there any other                  18 announcements that need to be made?                  19 MS. CHARD-McCLARY: This is Shellee. I would                  20 just say that one of the things you will be receiving                  21 from Mark will be some proposed dates for next                  22 calendar year for Council meetings. And those will be                  23 discussed and set at the October meeting.                  24 CHAIRMAN WINEGARDNER: Very good. Thank you.                  25 If there's nothing else then, I will declare</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">64</p> <p>1           ** CERTIFICATE **                  2 STATE OF OKLAHOMA )                                            ) SS.                  3 COUNTY OF OKLAHOMA )                  4                  5 I, Lynette Wrany, a Certified Shorthand Reporter                  6 within and for the State of Oklahoma, do hereby                  7 certify that I reported all of the foregoing meeting,                  8 and that I later reduced it to typewritten form, as                  9 the same appears herein.                  10 I further certify that I am not a relative of                  11 nor attorney for, nor clerk or stenographer for any                  12 party to this meeting, and that I am not otherwise                  13 interested in the event of the same.                  14 I further certify that the above and foregoing                  15 typewritten pages contain a full, true and correct                  16 transcript of my stenographic notes so taken, during                  17 said meeting.                  18 WITNESS my hand and seal this the 11th day of                  19 August, 2016.                  20                  21                  22                  23                  24                  25</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Lynette Wrany</i></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">LYNETTE WRANY, C.S.R.                  Oklahoma Certified Shorthand Reporter                  Certificate No. 1167                  Expiration Date: December 31, 2016</p>



# WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL

## Attendance Record

August 9, 2016

Department of Environmental Quality  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

CHECK BOX TO COMMENT

NAME and/or AFFILIATION Address and/or Phone and/or E-Mail

Quana Wiegand	WQMAC	
Mark A. Feldman	DEQ	
Patty Thompson	DEQ	
Shelie Chard McClary	DEQ	
Michael Moe	DEQ	
Amy Wyatt	DEQ	
Jon Nelson	WQMAC	
Quiana Fields	DEQ	
Robert Carr	WQMAC	
Linda Carr	Guest	
Jeff Everett	OGE	everetj@eoge.com
Jennifer Boyle	DEQ	
Scott Correll	DEQ	
MIKE MATHIS	CONTINENTAL RES.	MIKE.MATHIS@CLR.C
Michelle Wynn	DEQ	