The Wisconsin Section
Central States
Water Environment Association

Wisconsin Section CSWEA
Quarterly Officer/Committee/Representative Reports
Winter Board Meeting
February 28, 2007

Trustee's Report – Rusty Schroedel, Trustee

The most recent meeting of the Central States Executive Committee was held on January 25 and 26, 2007, at the Concourse Hotel in Madison, Wisconsin. The following summarizes highlights of the Executive Committee Meeting.

1. Financial Reports: Association and Sections are in good financial condition. Both income and disbursements for FY2006 exceeded expectations. A loss was due to the WEFTEC '06 Reception in spite of the increase in sponsorship. The bar expense was excessively high. WisIllMinn advertising revenue was under budget due to not pursuing renewals in anticipation of the shift to a new publisher that will negotiate advertising contracts. The Audit will be conducted after all of the interest statements are received from the bank.
2. WEF Report: A committee of 55 Delegates was formed to develop a plan whereby WEF will review and find common ground to determine how the House of Delegates should function and what their role should be. WEF's president appointed a "Speaker of the House" and is looking to have that person be on the WEF Board of Directors and attend all WEFMAX meetings. WEF's Board discussed combining organizations with AWWA, but AWWA declined.
3. Group Membership: The WEF Membership Work Group actions are delayed due to the scope of implementing the proposed Group Memberships. Most noteworthy however, is the ability to market membership to non-traditional groups such as Academic or Environmental group members. A Group Membership model will be provided as an option for increasing membership in answer to the concern that MAs have about group membership leading to a decrease in their number of members
4. The 2006 Operations Challenge teams, the Shovelers and the Pumpers exceeded their expectations in placing 23rd and 32nd, respectively and the Shoveler's placed 1st in the Lab event. Team Captains were Rick Ashling and Jim Miller. Thanks to all of the sponsors and Paul Nehm of Madison Met for hosting the training sessions. Howard Jacobson of Duluth, MN will become the new PWO Representative and Rick and Jim will continue to coach the teams.
5. Education Seminar: All arrangements are on track. The Education Seminar registration fee was raised to $175.
6. WISILLMINN: *The Wisillminn/ Central States Water* will be published four times yearly with April being the first issue with "Water is Life and Infrastructure Makes it Happen"

as the feature article. Advertising is coming in to the publisher at a good pace and their deadline for ads and content is February 23.

7. Nominations: The nominees are Rusty Schroedel for 2nd Vice President, Scott Trotter for Treasurer, Dan Lynch for WEF Director '09, and Howard Jacobson for PWO Representative '09.
8. Students and Young Professionals
    a. Student Paper Competition: In anticipation of more than one submission per State, Sections will determine which paper from their state will be presented at the Annual Meeting.
    b. Student Design Competition: The committee is trying to get two judges from each Section. It should be kept in mind that the criteria WEF uses to evaluate/judge the designs should be used at all levels. Volunteers are needed to judge the event. WEF's evaluation sheets will be obtained and used to create ones for Sections and the Association.
    c. Student Chapters: WEF is planning the YP Summit on April 19, 2007 in conjunction with WEFMAX in Chicago. Central States will sponsor and provide some financial support for this event.
9. Midwest Water Industry Expo: At this time, 104 booths, with 90 exhibitors have registered. February 15, 2008 is open at the Kalahari Resort and is a tentative date for the next Expo.
10. Annual Meetings
    a. 2007 Wisconsin: The theme is "Water is Our Life" and meteorologist, Dr. Steven Ackerman will deliver the keynote address. In case of inclement weather, transportation will be provided between the hotel and conference center.
        i. The Technical Program Committee reports 83 abstracts were received from which 41 were selected to provide a good mix of both operations and engineering. The committee is looking at incentives to encourage attendance at the sessions.
        ii. Technical Program Committee Chair Bill Marten has tendered his resignation and recommends that Steve Reusser be selected to take his place on the committee.
    b. 2008 Minnesota: The Local Arrangements Committee (LAC) is proposing that there be one day of Exhibits and no competition from Technical Sessions, just committee meetings on that day, so there would be better attendance at vendor booths. Dr. James Barnhard is planned as the Keynote speaker.
    c. 2009 Illinois: Dean Wiebenga and Debbie Ness will co- chair the LAC and will meet next month to discuss venues.
11. Substantial revisions to the WI Section Policies & Procedures Manual were proposed by Randy Wirtz. The document format and language was excellent and was recommended to be adopted. It was also suggested that other Sections review it and possibly incorporate similar changes to their SOPs.
12. 2006 CSWEA/IWEA WEF Reception: There were approximately 250 attendees including several WEF dignitaries. Over $14,000 was collected in donations, food expense was controlled and over 1200 cocktails served. Over $17,000 was spent. Changes need to be made for the next event. It was recommended to control costs of the reception by controlling the time of the event and communicate to IWEA that in order to participate they need to agree to share costs.

13. The Strategic Plan Review included several recommended changes which were approved. The CSWEA Marketing Plan needs to analyze "who we are, what is our culture, what service are we providing and to whom and who is our competition"? This "define the problem" portion of our Marketing Plan and other efforts will be led by Scott Trotter.
14. Eric Lecuyer was re-appointed as Executive Director. A 5% increase in his monthly equipment and management fee was approved.
15. The proposed FY 07 Annual Budget was discussed and approved. It was noted that funding for all current programs was included as well as sponsorship of the YP summit.
16. Dan Lynch will update and submit Central States nomination package to WEF for the MA of the Year Award.
17. Next meeting is scheduled for May 22, 2007, at The Madison Concourse Hotel, Madison, WI.

WWOA Liaison's Report – Randy Thater, Liaison

The WWOA board met December 7 & 8, 2007 in La Crosse, WI. Executive Secretary McKee presented the financial report and a list of vouchers for approval. A full slate of committee reports was presented. Of particular interest to CS-WI:

Current active membership stands at 1921, with a list of 157 non-renewals from the prior year.

The status of the Clarifier was discussed in detail. Current committee chair and editor Busch is looking to hand over his duties in 2007. Various options were discussed. The committee was interested in the CSWEA situation with Craig Kelman. At this point WWOA is hoping to keep the Clarifier more in-house.

Awards chair Thalke and regional coordinator Thater discussed the issues with the Regional Operator of the Year awards. An improved version of the nomination form that clarifies the process is being developed. Thalke floated the idea of a 'Region of the Year' award. The board asked for more work on the idea.

Operator Training chair Carlson advised that Greg Kester of WiDNR has volunteered to present a round of training sessions at the regional level related to Biosolids operations. Details have not been worked out yet.

Government Affairs chair Thater and Spring Biosolids chair Egge gave updates on planning for these events. The budget issues with GAS were discussed.

Liaison Thater reported on the CS-WI section November meeting. Thater informed the board of the Collection System idea to go to 2 locations for the seminar in 2008. Status of the CoC and policy updates vis-à-vis the Liaison were discussed. Thater floated the idea to ask for a swap of Collection System for Safety committee responsibilities. The idea is that the Liaison already has some Collection System responsibilities with WWOA, since WWOA has no CS committee. Thater also presented the idea that WWOA consider submission of WWOA ROY award winners to CS-WI for consideration as CS-WI operator of the year. The problem of lack of dual

membership was discussed. The general consensus was that it is a good idea, but best left as an informal arrangement. Following the meeting, Thalke apprised Thater that a previous WWOA award policy contained a clause that sanctioned this process, but it was apparently dropped at the last update in 2004.

Exhibits committee reports 116 booths should be available in La Crosse. Operators Competition plans to continue with 3 person teams for 2007. Local Arrangements is concerned with the Golf Outing and the late conference date. Alternate options were discussed, including a golf/bowling biathlon. Also discussed having a trap shoot or field shoot competition as an alternate event. No final decision was made. Two tours were discussed. One would be of the Dresback Lock and Dam lock aeration system coupled with the La Crosse Stormwater pumping station. The second tour would be the West Salem WWTP. The La Crosse WWTP was willing but advises there has been little change since 2002.

The WWOA has officially notified the Kalahari of cancellation of the 2008 booking. Bookings there for 2010 and 2012 remain in place. The WWOA has booked the Stevens Point Holiday Inn for 2008 instead, and the Regency Suites/KI Center in Green Bay for 2009. Plans are to return to Wisconsin Dells in 2010, and we have also signed a statement of intent with La Crosse for 2011. The intention is to establish a 4 city/4 year rotation.

A walk through of the La Crosse Center completed the board's meeting. The next meeting of the board is scheduled for March 20, 2007 in Stevens Point.

The call for papers for the 2007 conference appeared in the December Clarifier and mailings were sent concurrently. The Technical Committee chaired by John Bond met February 13 at Stevens Point. A full slate of technical presentations has been selected. Besides the typical topic areas, sessions on Community Action, Preliminary Treatment and Retirement planning are scheduled. The pre-conference workshop has a laboratory theme.

Collection System – Jim Beier, Chair

Collection System Committee Meeting
January 7, 2007 at 9:00 AM
Applied Technologies/Brookfield, WI

Members Present: Jim Beier (Chair) Todd Stelmacher (Vice Chair/Secretary), Mark Kolczaski, Andrew Craven Jim Fratrick Nancy Schultz, Bob Lecey, Carl Scharfe, Paul Lange, Frank Tiefert, Mike Spence, Mike Krosnosky, Ron Dickrell, Tom Nejedlo (Earth Tech), Keith Alexander, Tom Krueger

Meeting called to order at 9:04 by Chairman Beier.

1. Introduction of new members: Nancy Schultz from CH2M Hill and Ron Dickrell from the City of Marshfield. Ron has volunteered to sponsor our 2008 "Northwoods" seminar.

2. Chairman Beier reviewed the topics discussed in the October , 2006 meeting at the WWOA Conference.
3. Chairman Beier reviewed the topics discussed in the November 8, 2006 CSWEA Annual Business Meeting. Todd Stelmacher announced that the Safety Committee has been resurrected and a new chair, Jerry Hirt of Alpha Terra Science, has volunteered. The Collection System Committee was given notice for organization and participation. The nominee for the collection system award was discussed. Chairman Beier suggested writing a letter to the Board asking to broaden the pool of potential nominees to both WWOA and CSWEA members.
4. Discussion switched to the annual Collection System Seminar which will be held on June 7, 2007 in Watertown.. This year's seminar will be the 20th Annual Seminar held in Watertown. There was continued discussion of a special gift item to be given to attendees to commemorate the 20th year. Ideas discussed include hats, manhole shaped coasters, coffee mugs, and mouse pads; among others. Keith Alexander and Mark Kolczaski will look into the give away items and return to the committee with ideas at the next meeting held at the Government Affairs Seminar. The committee members in attendance will vote on the gift items.
5. Topics for the Seminar were presented. One topic was "wet weather – design storm" and another was "trenchless technology". There was another suggestion for "collection system rehab". After much discussion it was decided that "Collection System Rehab" will be the theme for the seminar.
6. Tom Krueger suggested a topic for a survey to ask, "what have municipalities done?" "How has it worked?" "What methods have been employed?" "Do you measure effectiveness?" and "How do you measure effectiveness?"
7. There was some discussion on what is rehab. It was decided that rehab is not maintenance activity and not work associated with serving a new area. Andy Craven and Carl Scharfe volunteered to prepare the survey.
8. Carl Scharfe suggested a case study of a recent project for the City of Nekoosa which involved pipe bursting of a 4-mile force main.
9. Public relations associated with collection system rehab projects was suggested as a topic. Beth Foy of MMSD was suggested as a speaker. Nancy Schultz will call Beth to determine her availability. There was a suggestion to focus the discussion on smaller communities rather than large MMSD projects due to poor feedback in the past.
10. Record keeping was suggested as a topic. Nancy mentioned there is a Wallingford Software package available among others. The topic will focus on not just the available software, but also the various steps in record keeping, the importance of record keeping to increase bond ratings, and to set priorities for rehabilitation projects (CMOM) and GASBY. Steve Woodman was suggested as a speaker as well as GIS interface with Reukert & Mielke. Andy Craven, Ron Dickrell, and Nancy Schultz will work on this topic.
11. Todd Stelmacher advised that the Safety Committee has suggested a safety topic, OSHA's Top 10 Most Cited Violations for 2006/How They Pertain to Workers in Water/Wastewater Entities. There was discussion to ask the Safety Committee to focus on collections systems wherever possible.
12. Pump station rehab was suggested as a topic. There was discussion that this could be the theme of a whole seminar rather than just one topic. There was some

discussion of touching on a number of issues and making this the theme for the 2008 seminar. Bob Lecey and Todd Stelmacher volunteered to work on this topic.

13. The preliminary agenda for the 2007 Seminar will be as follows:
    8:00-8:15 Welcome
    8:15-8:30 Results of Survey
    8:30-9:10 Case Study – Nekoosa
    9:10-9:50 Public Relations
    9:50-10:05 Break
    10:05-10:45 Record Keeping
    10:45-11:25 Safety
    11:25-12:00 Pump Station Rehab
14. There was discussion to keep the brochure the same but fees will be increased due to increasing costs for the seminar. Fees for registrants will be $35 and $40 for advance and on-site registration. Fees for vendors will be $60 and $35 for exhibits and additional people. There was a suggestion to have fresh fruit available in addition to doughnuts.
15. Chairman Beier's term officially ends as of May 25, 2007, but will run through the June 7 seminar. Todd Stelmacher will be the new chair. Chairman Beier asked for volunteers for Vice Chair. No volunteers.
16. The vendor letter will be mailed on February 5th. The brochure will be complete March 12th-19th. The brochure will be given to the printer on April 2nd and the brochures will be mailed on April 23rd.
17. Speakers should be identified by March 1 (next meeting). Speakers should send their presentation to Chairman Beier at least 1 week early to combine onto a single laptop. Speakers should also be asked to arrive early (7:30 to 7:45) for coordination.
18. Under review of Legislation and Regulatons: SSO Committee has published draft rules on the for MEG. Information available on the website. Tom Krueger will get info from the committee. Jim Fratrick will email the draft rule to the committee.
19. The next meeting will be at the Government Affairs Seminar on March 1.

Respectfully Submitted,
Todd R. Stelmacher, P.E.
Vice Chair/Secretary

Government Affairs Committee – Bill Desing, Chair

ATCP 50 and NRCS 590
David Taylor; Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District
<Information from Previous Report>

The Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection is in the process of revising ATCP 50, which implements Wisconsin's soil and water resource management program. ATCP 50 includes nutrient management requirements and is closely linked to the Natural Resources Conservation Service conservation standard for nutrient management (NRCS 590). Revisions to ATCP 50 are currently being evaluated by DATCP. Revisions to NRCS 590 were finalized in September, 2005.

Proposed revisions to ATCP 50 and actual revisions to NRCS 590 place an increased emphasis on phosphorus management. While there is exemption language for material regulated under NR 113, 204 and 214, those responsible for land applying material under these regulations need to recognize that farm customers will be under increased pressure to manage phosphorus loadings. It is recommended that those responsible for managing biosolids, septage, etc. become familiar with the ATCP 50 and NRCS 590 requirements and follow practices, where reasonable and appropriate, to effectively manage phosphorus. These practices may include selecting fields with low soil test P levels, growing high P consuming crops, rotating use of fields on a 3-4 year cycle, etc. NRCS 590 uses a phosphorus index (PI) to evaluate the potential of individual fields to deliver P to receiving streams. The PI is incorporated in SNAP-Plus, which is Wisconsin's nutrient management software (http://www.snapplus.net/).

Additional information on ATCP 50 and NRCS 590 can be found at http://www.datcp.state.wi.us/arm/regulation/soil_water.jsp.

Potential EPA Part 503 Round 3 Parameters
David Taylor; Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District

EPA is conducting a targeted national sewage sludge survey. As of December, sampling was nearly complete, with samples being collected at 72 facilities across the U.S. Plans were in place to collect samples from at least two additional facilities. Samples will be analyzed for the parameters shown below. The data will then be reviewed and a decision will be made regarding the need for future rulemaking.

Table 1
Target Analytes for the 2006 National Sewage Sludge Survey, by Analyte Class and Method

Analyte Class		Analyte
Metals	Aluminum	Manganese
	Antimony	Mercury
	Arsenic	Molybdenum
	Barium	Nickel
	Beryllium	Phosphorus
	Boron	Selenium
	Cadmium	Silver
	Calcium	Sodium
	Chromium	Thallium
	Cobalt	Tin
	Copper	Titanium
	Iron	Vanadium
	Lead	Yttrium
	Magnesium	Zinc
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)	Benzo(a)pyrene	2-Methylnaphthalene
	Fluoranthene	Pyrene
Semivolatiles	bis (2-Ethylhexyl) phthalate	4-Chloroaniline
Inorganic Anions	Fluoride	Water-extractable Phosphorus
	Nitrate/Nitrite	

APPENDIX A
OPTIONAL TARGET ANALYTES

Antibiotics and Drugs			
CAS Number	Common Name	CAS Number	Common Name
6604-07-5	Carbodox	738-70-5	Trimethoprim
57-62-5	Chlortetracycline	1401-69-0	Tylosin
85721-33-1	Ciprofloxacin	21411-53-0	Virginiamycin
564-25-0	Doxycycline	103-90-2	Acetaminophen
93106-60-6	Enrofloxacin	18559-94-9	Albuterol (salbutamol)
114-07-8	Erythromycin-hydrate	58-08-2	Caffeine
154-21-2	Lincomycin	51481-61-9	Cimetidine
70458-96-7	Norfloxacin	486-56-6	Cotinine
79-57-2	Oxytetracycline	20830-75-5	Digoxin
80214-83-1	Roxithromycin	1672-46-4	Digoxigenin
98105-99-8	Sarafloxacin	42399-41-7	Diltiazem
80-32-0	Sulfachloropyridazine	54910-89-3	Fluoxetine
122-11-2	Sulfadimethoxine	25812-30-0	Gemfibrozil
127-79-7	Sulfamerazine	15687-27-1	Ibuprofin
57-68-1	Sulfamethazine	657-24-9	Metformin
144-82-1	Sulfamethizole	66357-35-5	Ranitidine
723-46-6	Sulfamethoxazole	35189-28-7	Norgestimate
72-14-0	Sulfathiazole	738-70-5	Trimethoprim
60-54-8	Tetracycline	81-81-2	Warfarin
Steroids and Hormones			
CAS Number	Common Name	CAS Number	Common Name
80-97-7	Cholestanol	53-16-7	Estrone
57-88-5	Cholesterol	57-63-6	Ethynyl estradiol
360-68-9	Coprostanol	72-33-3	Mestranol
313-04-2	Desmosterol	68-22-4	Norethindrone
651-55-8	17-α-Dihydroequilin	6533-00-2	Norgestrel
516-92-7	Epicoprostanol	83-46-5	β-Sitosterol
474-86-2	Equilin	83-48-7	Stigmasterol
57-87-4	Ergosterol	58-22-0	Testosterone
57-91-0	17-α-Estradiol	26538-44-3	α-Zearalanol
50-28-2	17-β-Estradiol	611-59-6	1,7-Dimethylxanthine
50-50-0	β-Estradiol 3-benzoate		
Polybrominated Diphenyl Ether Congeners (congeners of primary interest in bold)			
Congener Number	Congener Name	Congener Number	Congener Name
BDE-7	2,4-DiBDE	BDE-83	2,2',3,3',5-PeBDE
BDE-8	2,4'-DiBDE	BDE-85	2,2',3,4,4'-PeDBE
BDE-12	3,4-DiBDE	**BDE-99**	**2,2',4,4',5-PeBDE**
BDE-13	3,4'-DiBDE	**BDE-100**	**2,2',4,4',6-PeBDE**

Polybrominated Diphenyl Ether Congeners (congeners of primary interest in bold)			
Congener Number	Congener Name	Congener Number	Congener Name
BDE-15	4,4'-DiBDE	BDE-105	2,3,3',4,4'-PeBDE
BDE-17	2,2',4-TrBDE	BDE-116	2,3,4,5,6-PeBDE
BDE-25	2,3',4-TrBDE	BDE-119	2,3',4,4',6-PeBDE
BDE-28	**2,4,4'-TrBDE**	BDE-120	2,3',4,5,5'-PeBDE
BDE-30	2,4,6-TrBDE	BDE-126	3,3',4,4',5-PeBDE
BDE-32	2,4',6-TrBDE	BDE-128	2,2',3,3',4,4-HxBDE
BDE-33	2',3,4-TrBDE	BDE-138	2,2',3,4,4',5'-HxBDE
BDE-35	3,3',4-TrBDE	BDE-140	2,2',3,4,4',6'-HxBDE
BDE-37	3,4,4'-TrBDE	**BDE-153**	**2,2',4,4',5,5'-HxBDE**
BDE-47	**2,2',4,4'-TeBDE**	**BDE-154**	**2,2',4,4',5',6-HxBDE**
BDE-49	2,2',4,5'-TeBDE	BDE-155	2,2',4,4',6,6'-HxBDE
BDE-51	2,2',4,6'-TeBDE	BDE-166	2,3,4,4',5,6-HxBDE
BDE-66	2,3',4,4'-TeBDE	BDE-181	2,2',3,4,4',5,6-HpBDE
BDE-71	2,3',4',6-TeBDE	**BDE-183**	**2,2',3,4',4,5',6-HpBDE**
BDE-75	2,4,4',6-TeBDE	BDE-190	2,3,3',4,4',5,6-HpBDE
BDE-77	3,3',4,5'-TeBDE	BDE-209	DeBDE
BDE-79	3,3',4,5'-TeBDE		

National Biosolids Partnership EMS Program
David Taylor; Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District

Over ninety wastewater agencies are now participating National Biosolids Partnership (NBP) Environmental Management System (EMS) program, including Appleton, Green Bay MSD, Madison MSD, and Milwaukee MSD. At last count, 16 agencies have successfully gone through the third party audit process and been certified. The NBP has developed a tiered recognition approach. Ten agencies have achieved platinum status in the tiered recognition program. To achieve platinum status, agencies must be certified and have successfully completed their first interim 3rd party audit.

The NBP has developed a template for small agencies to use in developing an EMS program. The template can be obtained by contacting Lori Stone (lori_stone@verizon.net).

Biosolids End Use Survey
David Taylor; Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District
<Information from Previous Report>

A new national survey of treatment practices, biosolids quality and the use/disposal of biosolids will be conducted, with funding being provided by the USEPA. The survey will have multiple cooperators, including the New England Biosolids and Residuals Association, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR), the Northwest Biosolids Management Association (NBMA), BioCycle, the National Association of Clean Water Agencies (NACWA) and others. This will be the most comprehensive survey ever conducted. This project will provide up-to-date key, basic information on what is happening with biosolids around the country, will identify trends in biosolids management and will help identify future needs as they relate to biosolids management.
Data will be collected in a phased approach. The first phase involved collecting biosolids information from state biosolids coordinators. This step has been completed and the data is being analyzed. The second phase will target select POTWs to fill in any identified data gaps.

National Academy of Science Dioxin Reassessment
David Taylor; Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District
<Information from Previous Report>

The National Academies recently issued its evaluation of the Environmental Protection Agency's reassessment of health risks posed by dioxins. This evaluation was requested by EPA, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Health and Human Services. The agencies asked the National Academies to convene a panel to review the draft dioxin reassessment which EPA issued in 2003. Key findings from the National Academies review are given below. Additional information can be found at http://www8.nationalacademies.org/onpinews/newsitem.aspx?RecordID=11688.
It is unclear at this time what impact, if any, the review will have on how EPA approaches dioxin from a regulatory standpoint.

KEY FINDINGS

The committee identified three areas that require substantial improvement in describing the scientific basis for EPA's dioxin risk assessment to support a sufficient risk characterization:

- Justification of approaches to dose-response modeling for cancer and noncancer end points.
- Transparency and clarity in selection of key data sets for analysis.
- Transparency, thoroughness, and clarity in quantitative uncertainty analysis.

The following points represent Summary recommendations to address the key concerns:

- EPA should compare cancer risks by using nonlinear models consistent with a receptor-mediated mechanism of action and by using epidemiological data and the new NTP animal bioassay data. The comparison should include upper and lower bounds, as well as central estimates of risk. EPA should clearly communicate this information as part of its risk characterization.
- EPA should identify the most important data sets to be used for quantitative risk assessment for each of the four key end points (cancer, immunotoxicity, reproductive effects, and developmental effects). EPA should specify inclusion criteria for the studies (animal and human) used for derivation of the benchmark dose (BMD) for different noncancer effects and potentially for the development of RfD values and discuss the strengths and limitations of those key studies; describe and define (quantitatively to the extent possible) the variability and uncertainty for key assumptions used for each key end-point-specific risk assessment (choices of data set, POD, model, and dose metric); incorporate probabilistic models to the extent possible to represent the range of plausible values; and assess goodness-of-fit of dose-response models for data sets and provide both upper and lower bounds on central estimates for all statistical estimates. When quantitation is not possible, EPA should clearly state it and explain what would be required to achieve quantitation.
- When selecting a BMD as a POD, EPA should provide justification for selecting a response level (e.g., at the 10%, 5% or 1% level). In either case, the effects of this choice on the final risk assessment values should be illustrated by comparing point estimates and lower bounds derived from selected PODs.
- EPA should continue to use body burden as the preferred dose metric but should also consider physiologically based pharmacokinetic modeling as a means to adjust for differences in body fat composition and for other differences between rodents and humans.

The committee encourages EPA to calculate RfDs as part of its effort to develop appropriate margins of exposure for different end points and risk scenarios, including the proportions of the general population and of any identified groups that might be at increased risk, for example, by exceeding an RfD.

2005 Wisconsin Act 347-Regarding Provisions Relating to the Management and Disposal of Septage and Municipal Sewage Sludge (2005 Assembly Bill 449)
David Taylor; Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District
<Information from Previous Report>

This bill was prepared for the joint legislative council's special committee on septage disposal. The complete text can be found at http://www.legis.state.wi.us/2005/data/acts/05Act347.pdf. POTWs and septage haulers are encouraged to read the complete text. Some of the highlights include:

1. Regulating septage disposal fees
2. Requiring that septage needs be evaluated during the facilities planning process if a plant increases it treatment capacity by 20 percent or more
3. Creating a zero percent interest rate for the portion of a clean water fund loan for septage receiving and storing facilities and capacity for septage treatment.
4. A city, village, town, or county may not prohibit septage disposal on land if the disposal conforms with the statutes and DNR rules or with a septage land disposal ordinance adopted by a county, city, village, or town

5. The department (DNR) shall oversee, set technical standards for, and regulate the application of sewage sludge to land. No city, village, town, or county may prohibit, through zoning or any other means, the application of sewage sludge to land if that application complies with applicable state statutes and rules promulgated under applicable statutes, although a city, village, town, or county may regulate the application of sewage sludge to land if the regulation is identical to regulations of the department.

Sanitary Sewer Overflows and CMOM
David Taylor; MMSD
<Information from Previous Report>

DNR has re-started efforts to prepare new administrative rules to address Sanitary Sewer Overflows and CMOM. DNR is working with an advisory committee comprised of representative stakeholders to assist in this effort. Primary issues for that the advisory committee has been asked to weigh in on by DNR are identified below. Dave Taylor (davet@madsewer.org) represents the Wisconsin Section on the advisory committee. Wisconsin Section members are encouraged to provide feedback to Dave on these issues as soon as possible.

1. Overall integration of proposed CMOM approach with current Wisconsin programs. Identify optimal regulatory approach to maximize achievement of goals while minimizing impacts and costs to the permittees, the public, and the WDNR.

2. The EPA proposal includes the "prohibition and excuse" regulatory approach for SSOs and other performance requirements, but does not recommend states issuing approvals of various CMOM elements. This overall approach appears to be predicated on using case-by-case prosecutorial discretion and leaves considerable subjectivity with regard to compliance decision making. What general approach should DNR take to evaluate compliance with SSO and CMOM requirements? What method or level of regulatory specificity is appropriate to ensure both regulators and regulated entities share consistent interpretations of program goals (thus presumably minimizing necessary enforcement actions)? (III.-N.)

3. What collection system performance indicators could be used? (I.-J.-1 and III.-G.-5) Should tracking of certain performance indicators be required? Indicators might also be used in the DNR Compliance Maintenance program (CMAR form) or as basis for other performance-based requirements (possibly in lieu of prescriptive requirements).

4. How to assess whether a permittee has taken "feasible steps" to avoid or mitigate overflows and their associated environment and public health risks. How might the DNR prescribe and/or assess the following:

   a. "System Evaluation and Capacity Assurance Plan" - EPA is proposing case by case assessment of system wet weather performance based on 2 criteria: severe natural conditions and no feasible alternatives (IV.-E). But what is "feasible" in terms of providing conveyance capacity? Wisconsin currently has a de facto minimum standard of containing a

5-year storm. Should a minimum standard be employed in conjunction with case specific evaluations? Is the traditional approach of I/I and SSES studies still appropriate to identify and correct collection system capacity deficiencies (I.-I.-1). Is there a need for specific procedures to evaluate whether treatment plant capacity reserves are adequate to accommodate flows from proposed new sewer connections (III.-G.-4.-e).

b. Collection system inspection and maintenance programs. (III.-G.-4.-d)

c. Emergency response plans. (III.-I.-2)

d. Reporting, notification and record-keeping procedures. How to assess risks associated with a particular event, and establish different notification procedures based on the risk. (III.-I.-2.-c and VI.)

e. Program audits (III.-I.-3)

5. What CMOM elements can be eliminated or simplified for smaller systems or lower-risk systems? (III.-K.)

6. Should DNR maintain or modify its sewer extension ban program (s. NR 110.05 WAC) currently based on "Category 1" bypass events?

7. Sewer and pump station design and construction standards. Including reliability and redundancy criteria and design flow determinations for both treatment and conveyance facilities. Are inspection requirements for new sewer construction adequate?

8. Should DNR propose procedures or requirements that promote greater use of PEFTFs?

9. What is necessary to allow or promote integration with watershed approaches? (III.-M.)

10. How should satellite systems be regulated and with what extent of flexibility? What authorities are appropriate for regional systems with regard to their tributary satellite systems or to privately owned sewer laterals.

11. What are reasonable implementation schedules for the specific program requirements? (III.-L.)

12. How can private property I/I management be improved? (II.-G.-3)

13. Establishing eligibility for state financial assistance for sewer rehab work? Should eligibility be tied to implementation of certain CMOM program elements? How to demonstrate

project need and cost-effectiveness? (I.-L.)

14. Should exfiltration from collection systems be addressed?

15. CSO requirements?

NUTRIENT CRITERIA
Jane Carlson/Strand
An update on the status of nutrient criteria was provided by Jim Baumann of the DNR at the December 12, 2006, Rock River Basin TMDL public meeting. Jim Baumann also attended the July 2006 Wisconsin Section Watershed Management committee meeting and provided an update on nutrient criteria development. Some highlights from these two meetings follow:

- The USGS has completed their study of the biotic effects of nutrients in Wisconsin wadeable streams, and the report is available on the DNR's Web site (there is a link at the bottom of the Rock River Basin TMDL page: http://dnr.wi.gov/org/water/wm/wqs/303d/RockRiverTMDL/).
- The USGS wadeable stream study reports several threshold concentrations of total phosphorus (TP) above which impacts are found. These concentrations are in the range of 0.04 to 0.08 mg/L TP. For example, fish diversity and quality appears to be adversely affected when the average concentration of TP is greater than 0.06 mg/L. This is when state-wide data are evaluated.
- The USGS also attempted to extrapolate a "pre-settlement" concentration of TP, and it was reported to be around 0.03 mg/L.
- The USGS also found a relationship between total nitrogen concentrations and adverse biotic effects in wadeable streams, although it is not as clear as phosphorus. However, this may mean that the DNR will develop numeric water quality criteria for nitrogen as well as phosphorus.
- The USGS study on non-wadeable streams is expected to be complete in 2007.
- **The DNR is currently considering TP criteria around 0.08 mg/L for wadeable streams and around 0.125 mg/L for non-wadeable streams.**
- The DNR expects to develop a written plan, and possibly draft code language, for nutrients in 2007 and then form an external advisory group to review and provide input. This work will eventually lead to new administrative code language and an implementation plan for nutrient water quality criteria. Public hearings on the proposed criteria will likely be held in 2008.
- The DNR will look at nutrient criteria for lakes later, and may follow Minnesota's example using different lake classifications (shallow, deep, etc.).
- The USEPA is currently developing a guidance document for nutrient standards for wetlands.
- The DNR is starting a phosphorus and sediment TMDL for the Rock River Basin in Wisconsin. This should be completed in early 2008 and may result in waste load allocations for phosphorus for treatment plants.

- The DNR reported that USEPA is undertaking a nitrogen TMDL for the entire Mississippi River Basin including the Gulf of Mexico. This process is just starting, and may result in waste load allocations for total nitrogen for treatment plants.

The Watershed Management committee reminded Mr. Baumann of the Section's interest in assisting the DNR with criteria development, cost-effectiveness evaluations, and implementation.

NR 214 - LAND TREATMENT OF INDUSTRIAL LIQUID WASTES, BY-PRODUCT SOLIDS AND SLUDGES
Jane Carlson/Strand <Information from Previous Report>

Duane Schuettpelz of DNR was contacted in 2004 and 2005 and indicated there hasn't been any recent action to initiate a rule-making effort. There are, however, continuing discussions with interested parties on the current implementation of the rule in specific permitting situations. In early 2006 the DNR released their proposed draft permit language for all NR 214 permitted dischargers statewide. The draft permit language includes the following:

- New Waste Stream Requirements – new waste streams may not be accepted until the DNR has reviewed a revised waste management plan and provided written approved.
- Monitoring - includes requirements for maintaining records including daily logs; colleting and analyzing representative samples, and establishing site loading rates prior to landspreading. Records must be maintained for five years. For discharge to storage, includes requirements for maintaining a daily log of the type of waste, volume, characterization, and date added to storage; includes requirements for the permittee to develop their own waste acceptance procedures.
- Reporting – includes requirements for monthly reporting on DNR forms 3400-49 and 3400-55.
- Operating Requirements/Management Plan – requires a DNR-approved management plan per NR 214, with the following additional requirements: description of waste acceptance plan; notification of DNR regarding land application sites that will be used; record keeping procedures; calculations that will be used to determine loading rates; tracking of site loading; mitigation procedures for handling wastes that deviate from the plan; and odor control. Requires DNR notification prior to land application. Submit updated plan within 60 days of permit reissuance.
- Reauthorization of Land Application Sites – following permit reissuance, requires DNR notification and approval of all sites that will be used during that permit term, prior to their use.

The proposed permit language will particularly affect waste haulers that accept and land-apply wastes from multiple sources. At a minimum, their monitoring and reporting requirements will increase significantly. Contact Jane Carlson, (608) 251-4843, for a copy of the draft permit language.

Summary of Key Legislative and Rulemaking Activity
Submitted by:
Paul G. Kent of Anderson & Kent sc
Legal Counsel for the Municipal Environmental Group
Wastewater Division
Updated February 2007

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

The session has just started and everyone is getting prepared for the budget which will be the major legislative business of the spring session.

REGULATORY ACTIVITY

LABORATORY REGISTRATION AND CERTIFICATION (NR 149)

The Natural Resources Board (NRB) authorized a major revision of the lab certification rule, NR 149 for hearings last spring. Nearly all of those attending the hearings spoke against various aspects of the rule. Subsequent to the hearing numerous comments were received. DNR is now evaluating the comments and considering changes to the rule before presentation to the NRB for adoption later this year.

MERCURY GREEN TIER PROPOSAL

The Department of Natural Resources has approached MEG about the possibility of establishing a "Green Tier" program for wastewater facilities between 1 and 5 mgd with respect to mercury pollutant minimization programs (PMPs). The program would seek early compliance with PMP provisions. In exchange, the community may be able to avoid the permit requirement if mercury levels fall below the standard. However, the DNR has indicated participating communities would be given additional flexibility for participant even if they are still above the standard. Please contact us or Randy Case at DNR if you want more information.

NEW NR 105 REVISIONS.

The DNR is proposing changes to various water quality standards in NR 105. There is no proposed rule language at this time, but the tentative timeline is aggressive and looks for authorization for public hearings later this spring. As has become more common in the last few years, there will be no advisory committee prior to the rule development process.

Aquatic life criteria updates are being proposed for copper, nickel, endrin and selenium. Human health criteria updates are being proposed for: antimony, arsenic, cadmium, chlorobenzene, chromium +3, chromium +6, cyanide, 1,2-dichlorobenzene, 1,3-dichloropropene, 3,3-dichlorobenzidine, ethylbenzene, hexachlorocyclopentadiene, and toluene.

Arsenic is of particular concern for several communities along Lake Michigan. The proposed NR 105 criteria for arsenic is more stringent than the NR 809 drinking water standard. The DNR was not able to explain this discrepancy except to say that more factors, such as fish consumption, are considered when calculating the NR 105 criteria. DNR is currently working on a document that will help explain differences between MCLs and surface water quality criteria and will contain a review of the data used by EPA to derive the oral slope factor for arsenic.

SSO Developments (See Dave Taylor Report)

Nutrient and TMDL Developments (See Jane Carlson Report)

Government Affairs Seminar Report
Wisconsin Section – Central States WEA
By: Tom Foltz

The Government Affairs Seminar will be held on Thursday, March 1, 2007, at the Marriott Madison West on John Q. Hammons Drive. Sponsors remain Wisconsin DNR, Wisconsin Section of the Central States WEA, Wisconsin Wastewater Operators Association, Municipal Environmental Group and Wisconsin League of Municipalities. Tom Foltz and the Wisconsin Section of Central States led program organization. As usual, registration will begin at 8:00 AM, lunch will be provided and the program will adjourn prior to 4:00 PM.

The program committee is comprised of Randy Herwig, Bill Desing, Dave Arnott, Paul Kent, Abigail Potts, Jane Carlson, Dave Taylor, Gil Hantzsch, Bernie Robertson, Mark Corbett, Jeff Mayou, Randy Thater, Dan Thompson and Tom Foltz. Comments, questions, constructive criticism and good ideas can be channeled to the committee by direct contact with any of the program committee members.

The Keynote address regarding National Emerging Water Issues will be given by Mark Borchardt, PhD of the Marshfield Clinic Research Foundation. Other program topics and speakers are: TMDLs – Rock River and Beyond – Jane Carlson and Paul Kent; Mercury Pollutant Minimization Plans – Randy Case; Municipal Financing Trends, Construction Costs and User Charges – Gil Hantzsch and Christy Cramer; National Trends Defining Strategic Planning Imperatives – Eric Rothstein; Status of Water and Wastewater Project Funding – Bob Ramharter; Major Trends in Municipal Finance: Where We've Come From and Where We're Headed – Dan Thompson; SSOs: Regulator and Environmentalist Perspectives – Duane Schuettpelz and Laurel O'Sullivan; Biosolids and Septage Update – Greg Kester; NR 149 Status and Timeline – David Webb; and the catch-all DNR Update – Roger Larson. Publicity was handled through CALS Outreach Services, and through posting on the WWOA, DNR, and Central States web sites.

As of Friday, February 09, 2007, we had 168 pre-registrants. At this point we are getting approximately 40 registrations per week. The final day for preregistration is February 16. Generally, we need on the order of 230 registrants to have a financially successful program.

Leadership for the 2008 Conference will be the responsibility of the Department of Natural Resources. I am more than willing to handle local arrangements and schedule the conference planning meeting as I have in the past..

Stream Re-classification/Proposed Revisions to Chapters NR 102, 104, and 106 as Related to Stream Classification & Outstanding and Exceptional Resource Waters

February 16, 2007

By

Chad T. Olsen

McMahon Associates, Inc.

As mentioned in previous updates, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) was in the process of revising Wisconsin Administrative Codes NR 102, 104 and 106 as they pertain to stream classifications. NR104 was originally promulgated in 1976 and has only been modified slightly several times since. However, there has not been a comprehensive updated of the classifications of many Wisconsin surface waters since the early 1980's. Phase I rule changes on the classifications went out for Public Comment in March 2002 and generated a lot of controversy. The controversy caused the DNR to pull back and review and document all classifications.

During the process, the DNR received a petition from the River Alliance and the Midwest Environmental Advocates in 2004 requesting that approximately 100 additional stream segments in northern Wisconsin be included in the Outstanding and Exceptional Resource Water list of NR 102. An Outstanding resource water is defined as a lake or stream which has excellent water quality, high recreational and aesthetic value, and high quality fishing and is free from point source and nonpoint source pollution. An Exceptional resource water is defined as a stream that exhibits the same high quality resource values as outstanding waters, but which may be impacted by point source pollution or have the potential for future discharge from a small sewer community.

Outstanding and Exceptional Resource Waters (ORW/ERW) are afforded additional protections above and beyond that of NR104. The final list of Outstanding or Exceptional Resource Waters was published in October 2006. A list of the ORW/ERW in NR102 can be viewed at the DNR website: http://dnr.wi.gov/org/water/wm/wqs/orwerw/. Justifications for the proposed 100 additional segments to be designated as Outstanding or Exceptional Resource Waters can also be found on that web page.

Actual rule changes to Wisconsin Administrative Codes NR 102, 104 and 106 as they pertain to stream classifications have been placed on hold for the time being. The Department has been focusing on the Outstanding and Exceptional Resource Waters list. Once complete, the Department plans on preparing a Guidance for staff on how to classify streams. Formal changes to Phase I rule changes Wisconsin Administrative Codes NR 102, 104 and 106 as they pertain to stream classifications will occur at a later date.

TMDLs
Bill Desing/CH2M HILL & Mike Mischuk/CH2M HILL
<Not update for this report>
The following is from Jane Carlson/Strand:

Jim Bauman/WDNR provided the following update in July 2006:

- The 2006 303(d) list was out for public comment and has now apparently been submitted to USEPA. See http://dnr.wi.gov/org/water/wm/wqs/303d/303d.html .
- The USEPA recently solicited proposals from their approved TMDL contractors for a phosphorus and sediment TMDL for the Rock River.
- The USEPA is starting to put pressure on DNR to develop more TMDLs or risk losing $6 million per year in funding.

On May 3, 2005 the DNR gave Public Notice for two sediment TMDLs, one for Becky Creek and one for the Sugar-Pecatonica basin. It appears the TMDLs are intended to address non-point sources only, which is consistent with what Jim Baumann of DNR has stated in the past (DNR wants to wait for things like numeric nutrient criteria before addressing point source-related impairments). However, point sources are mentioned in a few places. In the Sugar-Pecatonica TMDL there is a point source waste load allocation of zero for sediment. The TMDL mentions a few POTWs like Dodgeville but states they do not discharge "sediment." For more information see:
http://dnr.wi.gov/org/water/wm/wqs/303d/Draft_TMDLs.html

The following is background information from previous reports:

The Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) is a calculation of the maximum amount of a pollutant that a water body can receive and still meet water quality standards, and an allocation of that amount to the pollutant's sources. Section 303 of the Clean Water Act requires States to identify waters not meeting State water quality standards (303(d) list), sets priorities for development of a TMDL for each pollutant for each water body listed as being impaired. The USEPA is responsible for the management of the program and issues guidance to the States for development and implementation of TMDLs.

The following is a brief overview of the regulatory history of TMDLs:

- 1985 – TMDL regulations first issued. Provisions included nonpoint source and load allocations
- 1992 – TMDL regulations revised. Provisions called for State lists every two years
- 1999 – Revisions to TMDL and NPDES regulations proposed
- 2000 – Final Rule issued on July 13, 2000
- Congressional rider on military construction/supplemental appropriations prohibits EPA from implementing this rule
- TMDL program continues under 1992 regulations and agreements reached through litigation

The objective of the 2000 Rule was to establish an effective and flexible framework to move the country toward the goal of clean water and to establish a process for making decisions in cost-effective methods to restore polluted waterways. The following is an overview of the goals of the 2000 rule:

- Provide for a more comprehensive list of impaired waters
- Lists of impaired waters would be submitted every four years
- Impaired waters would remain on list until water quality standards are attained
- Public would be notified and have opportunity to comment on methodology, lists, and TMDLs
- Strengthen efforts to put in place cleanup actions that result in attaining water quality standards, and
- Sets goal of attaining water quality standards within 10 years, if possible

In Wisconsin, currently the 2000 final rule cannot be implemented due to funding constraints which means that the 1992 TMDL regulations and interpretive guidance will govern the State's program.

Wisconsin has been tasked with developing action plans (TMDLs) to remove impaired waters from their Section 303 (d) list which is required under the Clean Water Act. There are currently 264 impaired water bodies on Wisconsins Section 303 (d) list. This list was published in 1998 and has yet to be revised. The following is a synopsis of impairments:

- Sedimentation – 787 miles
- Nutrients – 231 miles
- Pathogens – 49 miles
- Toxics/Metals/Inorganics – 35 miles
- Toxics Organics – 585 miles
- Mercury – 661 miles

To date, progress in Wisconsin has been slow because the WDNR is currently facing significant budget reductions due to the State's budget deficit. However, the WDNR is attempting to use existing data that was obtained in the past for purposes other than TMDL development to develop TMDLs. In addition, WDNR has submitted a proposal to EPA for funding to begin the development of about 6 TMDLs per year. This proposal would only provide money to begin the development and any funding obtained could only be used for non-point watersheds. Given the limits and restrictions on funding it is not expected for TMDLs to be developed for two to three years. There will likely be available state and federal cost share funds for installing best management practices related to TMDLs.

CMOM & Wet Weather Collection System Issues Update
Andrew Craven/Strand Associates, Inc. <Not updated for this report>

CMOM and wet weather issues in general were popular topics at the recent WEFTEC 2005 convention in Washington D.C. Workshops and technical sessions focused on managing and operating collection systems during wet weather events. All of these discussions seem to assume that some type of a CMOM program is forthcoming – at some level at some time – and that communities may as well start working on this. Recent developments include;

- USEPA has included CMOM requirements in recent consent decrees issued to communities. Most of this activity has taken place in EPA Regions 4 & 5 (Ohio, Kentucky).
- The State of Wisconsin DNR continues to encourage communities to implement CMOM type programs into their existing O&M activities. This has been via the e-CMAR program as well as enforcement activities related to wet weather bypass events. Very little in the way of specific guidance has been provided.
- A recent proposal submitted by the National Association of Clean Water Agencies (NACWA, formerly AMSA) and the National Resources Defense Council (NRDC) to USEPA attempted to reach some consensus on the issue of blending at wastewater treatment plants. A coy of the proposal can be found on the NACWA website, or by contacting Andrew Craven at Strand Associate. The proposal was well received by USEPA personnel. However, state and local regulators indicated that it would place an additional burden on their already backlogged permit review personnel. This issue, and the proposal, continues to be debated at the national level.

In the Second Quarter report, it was reported that USEPA Region 5 had recently sent out CMOM Self Evaluation Forms to select communities. These communities were in the Cleveland area (Northeast Ohio). USEPA is using this as a pilot program to assess the CMOM implementation process.

Actual rule changes to Wisconsin Administrative Codes NR 102, 104 and 106 as they pertain to stream classifications have been placed on hold for the time being. The Department has been focusing on the Outstanding and Exceptional Resource Waters list. Once complete, the Department plans on preparing a Guidance for staff on how to classify streams. The guidance should be available this fall. Formal changes to Phase I rule changes Wisconsin Administrative Codes NR 102, 104 and 106 as they pertain to stream classifications will occur at a later date.

Wastewater Security
By Rusty Schroedel/Earthech
Updated February 2007

Below is the Press Release from the WEF Regarding the Physical Security Standard Guidelines

Nation's First Physical Security Standard Guidelines for Water/Wastewater Utilities

Water Environment Federation®
Preserving & Enhancing the Global Water Environment

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Media Contact: Lori Harrison, 703-684-2480
lharrison@wef.org
December 14, 2006

PROTECTING THE NATION'S WATER SUPPLY FROM ATTACK
Nation's First Physical Security Standard Guidelines for Water/Wastewater Utilities Released

Alexandria, Va. - The nation's first standard guidelines for protecting the public from potential malevolent acts and other threats by enhancing the physical security of water and wastewater infrastructure systems were released today for trial use by water and wastewater utilities.

The voluntary standard guidelines—jointly developed by the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) and the American Water Works Association (AWWA) with technical input from the Water Environment Federation (WEF)—are the result of Phase III of the Water Infrastructure Security Enhancements (WISE) program. They were created under ASCE's American National Standards Institute-accredited standards development program.

Titled "Guidelines for the Physical Security of Water Utilities" and "Guidelines for the Physical Security of Wastewater/Stormwater Utilities," the draft guidelines are open for public comment and trial use until June 30, 2007.

The guidelines provide drinking water, wastewater and stormwater utilities with practical information to help implement improved security measures in new and existing facilities of all sizes. The documents also address risks from construction and design perspectives and describe physical security approaches for detecting or delaying malevolent parties. The water guideline covers raw water facilities, wells and pumping stations, water treatment plants, water storage facilities, distribution systems and support facilities. The wastewater/stormwater guideline focuses on collections systems, pump stations, wastewater treatment plants and support facilities.

Copies of the draft standards for trial use will be available on each organization's Web site: **www.asce.org** , **www.awwa.org** and **www.wef.org**.

Grants Announced for Infrastructure Protection and State and Local Counterterrorism

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has released its fiscal year 2007 grant guidance and application kits for nearly $1.7 billion in the Homeland Security Grant Program for state and local counterterrorism efforts and for $445 million in funding for state, local and private industry infrastructure protection initiatives. Specific information about the grant programs and how to apply for the funds is available on DHS's website at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/odp/welcome.html. Specifically, the 2007 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) will award nearly $1.7 billion to enhance the ability of states, territories, and urban areas to prepare for, prevent, and respond to terrorist attacks and other major disasters. HSGP funds can be used for preparedness planning, equipment acquisition, training, exercises, management, and administration in order to obtain resources that are critical to building and sustaining capabilities that are aligned with the Interim National Preparedness Goal and respective State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategies. The 2007 Infrastructure Protection Program (IPP) will award roughly $445 million in funding for state, local and private industry infrastructure protection initiatives. The five programs which comprise the Infrastructure Protection Program (IPP), have provided to date more than $1.5 billion in grants to strengthen security at critical facilities ranging from chemical plants to mass transit systems and seaports.

EPA Expands Data, Adds Wastewater Treatment Category to Water Security Tool

EPA's Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water announced the expansion of the Water Contaminant Information Tool (WCIT), a secure, online database profiling chemical, biological, and radiological contaminants of concern for drinking water and wastewater utilities. EPA added a comprehensive data set on 45 new contaminants of concern— bringing the total number of contaminants in the database to 93. Moreover, for all 93 contaminants, EPA has expanded the scope of WCIT by including four new data categories, including one for wastewater treatment. The other categories are drinking water treatment, environmental impacts, and infrastructure decontamination. As the Agency noted in its release, improving the

data on WCIT "enables water utilities, public health officials and federal, state and local agencies to better plan for and respond to intentional or accidental contamination events." Wastewater utilities can access the site but, given the sensitivity of the WCIT data, access to the tool is tightly controlled via password-protection. To apply for access to WCIT, visit EPA's website at http://www.epa.gov/wcit.

Industrial Waste – Brian Molenaar, Chair

No report received.

Membership – Rob Szekeress, Chair

Since the last report, the Membership committee has grown to its desired level of four members:

Rob Szekeress – Peterson and Matz, Inc.
Randy Wirtz – Strand Associates
Gil Hantzsch – MSA Professional Services
Jason Schroeder – Force Flow

In accordance with the annual plan attached, our kick off meeting is currently being scheduled for March with a date to be set by the Winter board meeting on February 28th. At this meeting the committee will reassess the minimum basic committee duties of the Membership Committee as outlined in the CSWEA – Wisconsin Section Policy and Procedures Manual.

Additionally, Rob Szekeress is working with the local arrangements committee for the upcoming 2007 CSWEA annual conference to establish a new member orientation session and arrange for a membership information booth. This topic will also be discussed at the upcoming March committee meeting.

Operations Committee – Troy Larson, Chair

Awards

The lab analyst nominee and WI Section Operations award recipient information was sent to Tim Tack. The Hatfield Award nominee information was sent to Tom Krueger. Both Tim and Tom were satisfied with the submittals provided and no further efforts were requested.

Goals – Progress Report

- Goal 1 – In accordance with the schedule for goal 1, the WI Section Operations Committee was to have investigated potential example forms for use in reviewing award nominees. Eric Lecuyer reports similar concurrent efforts that are scheduled to have samples by May. In light of this effort the committee will not pursue this effort until the examples are available. Regarding operations, the Wisconsin Wastewater

Operator Associations form will be considered pending review of the examples referenced above.

- Goal 2 – Eric Lecuyer has indicated that use of the e-mail system to solicit nominations from the WI Section membership would be a viable option and he offered his help. The committee will request feed back from the WI State board before drafting a potential posting prior to the summer board meeting in accordance to the 2007 plan.

Management Seminar – Bill Marten

The 2006 Management Seminar was held on August 10, 2006 in Madison. The seminar was attended by 31 paid registrants and 8 speakers. Based on evaluations, the seminar and speakers were rated very highly, one of the highest cumulative ratings ever. The seminar resulted in a net profit of $484.73 which was split evenly between Wisconsin Water and the Wisconsin Section of CSWEA.

The seminar planning committee is in the process of assessing survey results to determine whether any changes should be made to future seminars to try and increase attendance. A decision on whether there will be a 2007 Management Seminar is pending based on this assessment.

Public Education/Public Awareness – Rick Knoelke, Chair

Challenge #2

The Public Education and Awareness Committee (PEAC) will be taking responsibility for coordinating the Wisconsin Section's activities for the Stockholm Junior Water Prize Competition.

Goal

Successfully transition the Stockholm Junior Water Prize Competition activities from the Students and Young Professionals Committee to PEAC.

Actions

At least one (hopefully two) members of the PEAC will work with Dan Busch through the process this year to familiarize themselves with procedures and timelines of the Stockholm Junior Water Prize Competition.

Due Dates

- March 30, 2007 determine the PEAC member(s) to work with Dan Busch
- October 1, 2007 complete transition of activities to the PEAC

Responsible Person

The PEAC member(s) who volunteer to do this.

Measurement

When Dan Busch says we are "Good to Go!"

Safety – Jerry Hirt, Chair

The committee is looking for new members.

The committee has submitted a presentation topic for the 2007 Collection System Seminar. The topic is OSHA's top 10 most cited violations. All issues pertain to water and wastewater.

The committee is considering a safety newsletter to go out to membership prior to the Collection System Seminar.

Watershed Management – Hans Holmberg, Chair

No report received.

Students & Young Professionals – Dan Busch, Chair

Student Chapters

Nothing new to report here. I have been too busy with local arrangements committee work for the CSWEA Annual meeting to even get members mobilized in Milwaukee to begin work with a student chapter at Marquette.

The Student Chapter Charter for UW-Madison was handed to me at the CSWEA Executive Committee meeting in Madison on January 25. I handed it off to Dan Lynch who is supposed to work with Tom Foltz to get it officially presented to the student chapter leaders.

Student Paper / Student Design Competition

This year Student Paper and Student Design competitions will again be held the afternoon before the CSWEA Education Seminar. Information has been posted on the CSWEA web site under the S&YP page. An email went out to all the University contacts in the three State regions at the end of January. Since that time I have added more names to the list. Another emailing will go out before the end of February. All Wisconsin Student chapters and Wisconsin Universities have been informed and invited to participate in both Student Paper and Student Design Competition. The competitions were also referenced in a letter from the Education Seminar Committee inviting all students to attend the Seminar. I have attached the letter of invitation to this report.

Stockholm Junior Water Prize

We are in the process of transitioning this responsibility to the Public Education and Awareness committee this year (2007). I am currently listed as the contact for Wisconsin on the WEF Stockholm web site. I have been including Rich Knoelke as Chair of PEA committee on any email correspondence with WEF.

WEFMAX and YP Summit

Rachel Lee has been involved with the WEF S&YP sub-committee who set-up the YP Summit. This event will be held in Chicago on Thursday April 19, the day prior to WEFMAX. Rachel is planning to attend. The WI Section is offering reimbursement of up to $500 for registration; travel and lodging for three Young Professionals form the WI Section to attend. I would like Rachel's attendance approved as a representative from both the WI Section and CSWEA. Please spread the word that there is money available for two others to attend. I think this is an excellent opportunity for YP's to get involved in a WEF event designed specifically for them. The brochure with registration information and agenda for the day should be posted on the CSWEA web site by the time of our meeting.

The Central States
Water Environment Association

January 23, 2007

Greetings;
I am communicating with you today for the purpose of introducing the Student Design and Student Paper Competition sponsored by the Central States Water Environment Association

(CSWEA). This year the competition for both events will be held on the afternoon of April 2, the day before the CSWEA Education Seminar at Monona Terrace Convention Center in Madison WI. This is a great opportunity to participate in the Competitions and attend the Education Seminar the following day.

The Student Design Competition and the Student Paper Competition are described in more detail on the attached fact sheets and at the WEF web site link noted in the fact sheets. For the purpose of introduction, it is an opportunity for students at the university level to demonstrate their engineering skills and practices by researching and preparing a design for an actual water quality based project or preparing and presenting a research based paper. It is an excellent networking opportunity between students and professionals in the water quality field. The competition at the CSWEA level is designed to feed into the national competition at the annual WEFTEC conference, which this year is scheduled for October 13 –17 in San Diego, CA. In 2006, a Student Design team from Northwestern University was sponsored by CSWEA at the WEFTEC in Dallas Texas.

Both the Student Design Competition and the Student Paper Competition are designed to be functions of the WEF Student Chapters program. We understand that you may not have a WEF Student Chapter at your university the present time. WEF requires students to have a WEF student membership to participate at WEFTEC; however CSWEA does not require it to participate in either of these two events at the local level. CSWEA will provide student membership enrollment in WEF for teams / individuals who are selected to represent CSWEA in October.

The State Sections of CSWEA have budgeted funds to assist individuals or teams from their State to present at the CSWEA competition event in April. We realize this is a short notice for participation and will be as flexible as possible in working with you and your students to afford the opportunity to participate on April 2nd. Design projects and Papers from 1st semester are eligible along with Design projects or Papers that are being developed as part of a 2nd semester class. Please read over the attached fact sheets on both opportunities and provide this information to any of your full time students in the water quality field that you feel may benefit from such an experience.

I look forward to hearing from you with any questions you may have or if you need additional information on how to participate in either of these two events. I can be contacted by phone at (920) 438-1101 or email at dbusch@gbmsd.org.

Best Regards;

Dan Busch
CSWEA Chair - Student & Young Professionals Committee

Spring Biosolids Symposium – Bill Marten, Representative

The 2007 Spring Biosolids Symposium will be held on March 21, 2007 at the Holiday Inn in Stevens Point. Another excellent program is in store with national speakers from US EPA, the National Biosolids Partnership, and the Northwest Biosolids Association. Regulars Greg Kester, DNR, and Dick Wolkowski/UWEX are back again, along with the popular panel discussion. The topic for the panel discussion is Class A Experiences - operators will discuss their successes and problems managing class A biosolids programs. There will also be presentations on the

increasing interest in septage treatment facilities, and national land-spreading issues that may affect Wisconsin. The program follows:

2007 Spring Biosolids Symposium

EPA Update – Bob Bastian.

DNR Update, Greg Kester

National Biosolids Partnership, EMS for Small Facilities - Lori Stone

Nitrogen Recommendations in Soil Test Reports - Dick Wolkowski

Phosphorus Availability in Soil – Angela Ebeling.

Northwest Biosolids Association – Maile Lono.

Morning Panel Q and A,

Class A Biosolids Experiences – Bob Hyde – Delahart SD, Sam Warp – RBF, Dave Taylor – Madison MET, Jim Kirk – Grand Chute/Menasha, Ron Groth – Lakeland SD.

Septage Treatment Facilities - Jerry Tyler

California Land Spreading Issues - Dianne Gilbert-Jones

Water/Wastewater Education Association – Tom Mulcahy, Chair

No report received.