



**SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM SOURCES
WORK GROUP MEETING
Meeting Notes
July 20, 2009**

- **Individuals Present**

Herman Sanders (HCPID), Andrew Isbell (Walker County), Kim Laird (TCEQ), Gail Lindholm by phone (TCEQ-SBLGA)

- **H-GAC Staff Present**

Erin Livingston, Rachel Powers

- **Call to Order/Welcome/Introductions**

Rachel welcomed attendees, initiated self-introductions, and reviewed the agenda.

- **Discussion**

Rachel began by reviewing the implementation activity priorities previously identified and reminded all present of one topic from the previous meeting, the idea that more stakeholders need to be involved in the discussions regarding implementation activities. Rachel expressed the feeling that some of the proposed implementation activities needed further fleshing out prior to involving the other stakeholders.

CMOM

Q: What is *CMOM*? Capacity, Management, Operation and Maintenance

Q: Do we want *CMOM* to be mandatory or voluntary? That is a question we are still trying to answer.

It's not just MUDs that will have a hard time if *CMOM* is mandatory. Small municipalities will as well because they don't have enough staff. Maybe if a community enters *CMOM* voluntarily they should get extra points with TWDB in order to get grants. There needs to be many incentives if we want to increase participation. A negative of making *CMOM* mandatory would be the loss of bragging rights for those that would voluntarily participate.

We could do something scaled like is done with the requirements for Phase I and II. Just as Phase II has fewer requirements than Phase I, it could be designed that small municipalities would have fewer requirements than larger ones.

A question we are trying to address is how to regulate subscriber systems.

Cities have a hard time enforcing anything with subscriber systems, especially if they have a contract already that says they will take whatever sewage the subscriber sends. It may work better if the contract limits the amount of sewage.

Phased approach

Rachel introduced the idea of a phased approach for CMOM participation.

First 5 years: Require owners of collection systems to obtain a permit, identify the coverage area for the collection system, and identify subscriber systems. Subscriber systems would then also be required to have permits. New systems would develop a CMOM plan from the start.

Next 5 years: Require a CMOM be put in place. Each municipality would be able to choose from a suite of options for the make-up of their CMOM.

Discussion

We could get estimates on costs for the various activities of CMOM from the Dallas region. They have a lot of participation.

Increasing the benefits would be helpful. One benefit that already exists is that municipalities can't get grant money to fix a violation, but those that enter into a CMOM plan voluntarily are eligible.

Q: Should we have a program over the minimum requirements? That would be good. Extra benefits for those doing more than the minimum required.

Maybe we need to review the sticks as well as the carrots. They are not always a deterrent.

Small cities won't have the capabilities of submitting collection system coverage in GIS. Maybe H-GAC could get funding and help.

It would be good if the CMOM program choices also included an "Other" option. The municipality would submit their proposed "Other" activity to TCEQ who would then approve it or not.

We need to convince municipalities that it is cheaper to maintain a system all along than to wait until major repairs are needed.

It was brought up that private collection systems cannot participate in the SSO initiative program, but CMOM allows both public and private collection systems to participate.

The idea had been brought up at the last meeting of requiring SSOs be reported to the county in addition to TCEQ. The feeling was that maybe it would work better if there was a database that a community reported to, which others could access. TCEQ already has this type of database, STEERS, and it would be good for municipalities to report SSOs in it. Maybe there could be a way that those wanting to be notified of SSOs could set it up in STEERS to get reports via email of SSOs meeting certain characteristics.

If it was mandatory for a municipality to report the SSOs to STEERS TCEQ would likely not have an issue, because it would not increase the workload.

How do we proceed? What is the appropriate format?

It might be nice to have a seminar, with speakers and a roundtable discussion, and then a meeting later on giving everyone the opportunity to think it over. Or maybe have a few information meetings and then have a big meeting for everyone to discuss later once they have thought it over. We could do a webcast. Maybe we need an informational sheet.

CMOM conference in August in Austin. People from all over the country will be there.

Operator school coming up (water and wastewater) in August.

- **Wrap-up**

Next meeting date: TBD

Next steps: H-GAC to write-up the plan, meet in September (?) with the additional groups.

Find the definition of a subscriber system.

Kim will find out how many subscriber systems we have in the region.

Rachel to send checklist of CMOM to Andrew.

Contact Texas Public Utilities Commission to find CCN info.

DRAFT