



Our wAAter | Public Advisory Group Meeting #10

Date: October 28, 2024 Time: 4:30 – 6:30 p.m. MS Teams: <u>Join the meeting now</u>; Meeting ID: 258 378 318 27,Passcode: xMx8vs MS Teams Call-In Info: <u>(833) 255-2803,,541603557#</u> Location: 2664 Riva Road, Annapolis, MD 21401 [Independence Room – Heritage Complex Building]

Attendees

Anne Arundel County, Department of Public

Works (DPW) George Heiner Jimmy Howard Karen Henry Erin Dey Beth O'Connell Noelle Anuszkiewicz

Public Advisory Group (PAG) Members

Elle Bassett Tammy Domanski Sally Hornor Erik Kreifeldt Lloyd Lewis Doug Nichols Craig Myers Jerry Pesterfield Elizabeth Rosborg

Anne Arundel County, Department of Health

Al Herb Don Curtian Brian Chew Bill Dehn

Anne Arundel County, Office of Planning and Zoning Cindy Carrier

<u>HDR</u>

Ed Shea Ziwei He Meghan Robinson Jessica Host

<u>Agenda</u>

Торіс	Time	Speaker
Introductions & Agenda	5 minutes	George Heiner
Cybersecurity Update	10 minutes	George Heiner
Odenton – Fort Meade Update	25 minutes	Don Curtian
MAR Follow-up	25 minutes	Jimmy Howard
Break	5 minutes	
MAR Public Outreach	40 minutes	George Heiner
Closing Remarks	10 minutes	George Heiner





Introductions and Agenda (slide 1 – slide 3)

Meghan Robinson welcomed the group and asked participants to introduce themselves. George Heiner introduced the group and gave an overview of the meeting agenda.

Cybersecurity Update (slide 4 – slide 7)

George Heiner presented the cybersecurity slides [4-7] and shared that the County participates as a member of Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) Water Information Sharing and Analysis Center. He shared that County had a lot of ongoing activity and planning efforts and noted one strength for DPW is that the Informational Technology (IT) and Operational Technology (OT) systems are separate for Anne Arundel County. The County highlighted the recent accomplishments and the five-year plan to continue strengthening the system and staff education.

Noelle Anuszkiewicz added that there is a detailed report with tasks laid out for the cybersecurity plan and the County is partnering with OT. The County is trying to maintain separation so if one system is hacked the other remains online. This is going to be a year-by-year process as technology progresses. She noted there are opportunities within the budget to add personnel.

Questions and Open Discussion

- Q: Do your separate systems use the internet to talk to themselves?A: It is an intranet that does have access to the internet.
- **Q**: Are you still in the evaluation phase? Have you put together an action plan to reflect the five-year plan? I would like some specific details of this plan to show progress.
 - **A:** DPW will look into this further. The County is looking for areas that need to be improved and a consultant team has been hired.
- Q: Who reviews the five-year plan to see if it is complete?
 - A: The consultant. DPW has not discussed hiring another party to review the plan.
- **Q:** The contractor was hired over six months ago. We need some level of progress and completion.
 - A: We do not want to put these details on the slide for security purposes. The County will work to provide more details for this group.

Q: If we were to go down tomorrow is there a detail action plan in place for the County?

• A: The County has drills to practice for this situation and an action plan in place.

Q: Have any utilities been affected yet?

• A: There have not been any incidents to date.

Odenton – Fort Meade Update (slide 8 – slide 9)

Bill Dehn gave an update on the current status of the contamination plume within the Odenton community near Fort Meade. This plume goes southeast through the Odenton area which is mostly on public water. The source of the contamination was removed when dumping ceased in the 1970's. A groundwater treatment system has since been put in place. This effort began in the 1990's and will continue for the next 15 years or more.





Karen Henry explained the department is monitoring wells around the County water production wells and have not detected any of the contaminants at the Crofton wells. If the department was to detect anything affecting a domestic well, it would offer to work with the homeowner on a new well at a deeper depth.

For more information, the Department recommends going to the Odenton Library. Resident advisory group meetings on the topic are ongoing and meet virtually.

Questions and Open Discussion

Q: Are none of the wells contaminants of concern? Has that been altered over time?

- A: Remediation investigation is reviewed by the EPA, Maryland Department of Environment (MDE), and the staff at Fort Meade. They analyze the data and identify which contaminants are tied to what sources and what the risks are to humans and the environment.
- **Q:**. How current is this information?
 - A: This started in the mid-90s and is continuing today. They have done a lot of work to remove the contamination source and adding in a treatment system to eliminate the plume.
- **Q:** Is it coming from the Millersville landfill?
 - A: No these are distinct plumes between Millersville and this plume.
- Q: Is the contamination in a higher-level aquifer?
 - A: It is the lower Patuxent aquifer.

Q: Is the military cleaning the soil above ground?

• A: There were buried vessels that were removed from the affected soils as well as the contaminated soils until there was a lower concentration of contaminants found in the soils.

Q: Does it come to the surface? (Slide 14 last bullet)

• A: There are certain areas in the northwestern County that are in the recharge area for the aquifer, typically in sandy soils.

Q: So, it is still there?

• A: Yes, but the levels are going down and no new contaminants have been added.

Q: How long will this continue?

• A: For the next 15 years.

Q: Is the Department of Health doing anything about PFAS?

• A: Yes, all public water systems are getting tested. They are only going to require it for residential wells with known or existing issues.

Q: Does the health department test for PFAS?

• A: MDE tests for public water samples. The Department of Health does not do any testing. Testing can be done by private residents, but the testing methods are very sensitive at such low concentrations.

Q: Is there any record of people living southeast of the source with increased cancer rates?





• A: We do not have any data on that, but it is unlikely.

Q: As that plume moves will new wells in its path potentially have this issue? Is there anything proactive to test?

• A: There are a handful of wells near the public water lines. Very few wells located in the southeast. If there is an existing well in the plume the Army will provide a treatment system to remove the containments and reconnect to public water. There is a system in place to address problems as they arise.

Q: How many people are aware of this problem? It seems pretty well hidden.

• A: There are about 59 wells in the plume and all information is available at the website and the Odenton Library.

Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) Follow-up (slide 10 – slide 23)

Jimmy Howard presented the progress of MAR to date and the list of supporters of the program. Lloyd Lewis shared that the Chesapeake Environmental Protection Association (CEPA) will also support this effort.

George followed up on questions from the last PAG meeting, including information a pilot system for nitrogen transformation, and what the Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD) has been working on.

Questions and Open Discussion

Q: What does MAR stand for?

• A: Managed aquifer recharge.

Q: You are pumping nitrogen levels deep in the ground - why care?

• A: It is a question that has come up. There are limits on nitrates in drinking water that are well above the levels in the advanced water treatment system and even our wastewater treatment facility.

Q: Have they been successful at HRSD?

• A: Yes, the HRSD project is going to full scale in the future and an initial location is under construction. The treatment process has safety checks at each stage and if all fails, the contaminated water can be withdrawn with a pump.

Q: Will there be an oversight board for this project?

• A: DPW does not have plans for a board but are not opposed to implementing one.

Q: Is public comment only going to be online or an open town hall in-person?

• A: If there is a bill introduced the public can go online to support or oppose the bill. If you want a hearing, you have to request it to submit a comment in person.

Q: If you are going to all the trouble to get to drinking water standards why not return it to the drinking water system and avoid going back into the aquifer? IPR versus DPR?

• A: The main reason is that an indirect system that uses an environmental buffer is safer than a direct system. It provides response time in case something does happen and there is some natural treatment within the aquifer.





MAR Public Outreach (slide 24 – slide 37)

George shared that the outreach for MAR will need to be broadened regardless of the legislation decision. He shared the public outreach completed to date and asked the group for their thoughts on what should be considered for future efforts.

Feedback from the PAG on types of outreach to include or consider:

- Timing of outreach should be a tiered/phased approach over time
- Include newspapers as an outreach tactic
- Consider reaching out to Dan Nataf with Anne Arundel Community College to discuss and possibly collaborate with on outreach effort and any survey discussions
- Arrange a briefing at a Greater Severna Park Council meeting for feedback and discussion
- Arrange a briefing/meeting with the Mayo Peninsula Communities
- Survey compare data received at the start of the Our wAAter program to now and also include MAR elements
- Offsite outreach local museums, public buildings, virtual tours, mobile exhibits
- Videos

The group indicated generally that outreach to neighborhood associations could be an effective approach through informational meetings.

Closing Remarks (slide 38 – slide 40)

George Heiner thanked the group for their participation.