

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
National Drinking Water Advisory Council
Public Meeting**

December 1, 2021

10:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m. Eastern Time¹
and

December 2, 2021

10:00 a.m. – 5:30 p.m. Eastern Time

Location: Online Only

Meeting Summary

Meeting Objectives

- Review recommendations made by the National Drinking Water Advisory Council (NDWAC or Council) Consumer Confidence Report Rule Revision (CCR³) working group and develop advice and recommendations from the NDWAC to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on targeted issues related to revisions to the Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) rule.
- Receive information about the Microbial and Disinfection Byproducts (MDBP) rule revisions charge from EPA to the NDWAC and formation of a NDWAC MDBP working group.
- Receive information about new and updated health advisories.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Elizabeth Corr, Designated Federal Officer for the NDWAC, opened the meeting. Lisa Daniels, the NDWAC's Chair, made welcoming remarks and asked the NDWAC's members and the Council's liaisons from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) to introduce themselves.² She then briefly reviewed the agenda.

Jennifer McLain, Director of the Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (OGWDW) in EPA's Office of Water, welcomed everyone to the meeting. She thanked Elizabeth Corr, Lisa Daniels, and Jana Littlewood for their coordination and efforts and noted that many regulations besides the CCR rule would be discussed in future meetings. She described EPA's efforts to implement the newly passed bipartisan infrastructure bill as a high priority for the agency, with substantial funding available to improve water infrastructure; and discussed EPA's priorities, especially focusing on environmental justice and disadvantaged communities, to develop solutions for funding and financing programs. She also noted EPA's stakeholder engagement efforts under the Justice40 initiative.

Radhika Fox, Assistant Administrator of EPA's Office of Water, thanked the CCR³ working group and NDWAC members for their service and hard work in providing suggestions for ways to improve the proposed rule

¹ First and second day adjournments were earlier than scheduled (approximately 4:45 p.m. and 4:30 p.m. eastern time).

² Attachment A lists the NDWAC's members and CDC liaisons, all of whom introduced themselves.

revision. She highlighted that the unprecedented challenges facing drinking water systems across the United States provide exciting opportunities for the new drinking water infrastructure funds. She noted that EPA is looking forward to seeing the recommendations that the NDWAC develops on important regulatory issues related to the CCR rule and other drinking water regulations in the future.

Dr. McLain returned to her discussion of other high priority areas, including per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) and lead. She highlighted EPA's work related to PFAS and drinking water unregulated contaminant monitoring, National Primary Drinking Water Regulation development, and water quality analytical methods improvement. She also described EPA's stakeholder engagement efforts on lead in drinking water and noted that EPA is working on revisions to MDBP rules.

New and Updated Health Advisories

Betsy Behl, Director of the Health and Ecological Criteria Division of the Office of Science and Technology in EPA's Office of Water, delivered a presentation on EPA's new drinking water health advisories. She outlined EPA's health-based drinking water levels, explained what a health advisory is, and described what is in a health advisory document. She then discussed what health advisory documents require, including a summary of a toxicity assessment, and explained the importance of toxicity assessments. She also noted that EPA has a strategic roadmap for PFAS and will publish health advisories for additional PFAS soon. She then discussed EPA's draft documents for peer review to support the development of perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS) regulations, which include updated toxicity assessments. She outlined the timeline for those peer review public meetings and discussed how the NDWAC factors into the process, recalling 2018 input from the NDWAC on the health advisories program. Ms. Behl's presentation is in Attachment B.

Microbial and Disinfection Byproduct Rule Revisions

Ryan Albert, Chief of OGWDW's Standards and Risk Reduction Branch, discussed EPA's charge to the NDWAC related to potential revisions to MDBP rules, the process for formation of an MDBP Rule Revisions Working Group to assist the work of the Council, and the anticipated schedule for the working group. He provided background information on EPA's third Six-Year Review of National Primary Drinking Water Regulations, which resulted in the identification of candidates for review that fall under the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproduct Rules, the Surface Water Treatment Rule, the Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule, and the Long-Term 1 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule, and provided information on topics under consideration. He also outlined the public engagement process and EPA's timeline for next steps. Mr. Albert's presentation is in Attachment C.

A NDWAC member asked if EPA is anticipating that the working group would cover all of the rules and considerations or just a select few. Mr. Albert explained that the rules are complex and EPA does not expect the working group to review all aspects; rather, there will be priority topics. Another member asked if EPA would bring in guest speakers to the working group meetings. Mr. Albert responded that they could bring in guest speakers, as the working group may have questions that could require a more advanced level of technical knowledge.

EPA's Consumer Confidence Report Rule Revision Charge to the National Drinking Water Advisory Council

Anita Thompkins, Director of OGWDW's Drinking Water Protection Division, thanked the CCR³ working group's members Yolanda Barney, John Brady, Alexandra Campbell-Ferrari, Shellie Chard, Michael Hansen, Olga Naidenko, Benjamin Pauli, Jennifer Peters, Jeffrey Szabo, Sri Vedachalam, and Taka Wiley, as well as the working group's Chair Jana Littlewood, for their work. She explained EPA's charge to the NDWAC and what EPA is hoping to learn from the recommendations from the NDWAC on targeted issues related to the CCR rule revisions.

Consumer Confidence Report Rule Revision Session 1: Presentation of Working Group Recommendations

Jana Littlewood, Chair of the CCR³ working group and a member of the NDWAC, presented the working group's final recommendations to the NDWAC for the Council's review and discussion. She reviewed each of the four charges and referred members to the working group's report to the Council for detailed reasoning. The Council's discussion is summarized below in the order that the charges were discussed. Ms. Littlewood's presentation is in Attachment D.

Charge Two: Advancing Environmental Justice and Supporting Underserved Communities

NDWAC members discussed the working group's non-consensus recommendation, related to EPA's second charge to the Council, pertaining to whether the CCR rule should encourage water systems to include more information in their CCRs about the overall health of their water system, including financial information. Members made the following points during the discussion.

- Financial information and rate setting do not need to be in the CCR.
- Smaller water systems might find this recommendation to be too burdensome. The rule should provide flexibility for small systems that do not have the resources to include this additional information.
- CCRs should inform residents of poverty-stricken communities when water system repairs will lead to rate increases; although, they should not include water system liabilities or similar financial information.
- CCRs may be an appropriate place for financial information given that customers do not typically have time to review this information in other venues.
- Board meetings and direct communication with water system staff may be more suitable arenas for discussing this information.

NDWAC members also discussed the consensus recommendations about improving access for non-billpaying customers. Members made the following points during the discussion.

- EPA does not have authority to enforce landlords to pass on CCRs. There may be other methods for water systems to find addresses for non-billpaying customers and to communicate the role that landlords should play in disseminating information.
- Resources may be available to water systems for finding addresses for non-billpaying customers who still should see information related to CCRs.

Charge Three: Improving Readability, Understandability, Clarity, and Accuracy of Information and Risk Communication of CCRs

NDWAC members discussed the working group's recommendations related to EPA's third charge to the Council.

Members made the following points during the discussion.

- The additions recommended by the working group could result in a long and complex report, specifically the addition of a summary page. Incorporating all the information recommended by the working group could result in CCRs that look like primacy agency reports and would not ultimately result in a report that is easier for consumers to understand. The additional content could also create a burden, especially for medium and small systems, and the CCR may not be the appropriate place for that information.
- Including information about treatment processes could present security concerns. This recommendation should be a suggestion, if the water system felt comfortable sharing that information, but not a requirement. EPA could review the required language in the CCR to provide guidance on what information about treatment processes could be included.

Charge One: Addressing Accessibility Challenges, Including Translating CCRs and Meeting Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Requirements

NDWAC members discussed the working group's recommendations related to EPA's first charge to the Council. Members made the following points during the discussion.

- A two-step review process (first using online tools for translation and then having a verified translator review it for accuracy) to ensure translation accuracy would be costly and burdensome for water systems.
- While it is difficult to verify language translations, the need remains to get accurate information to as many people as possible.
- The rule can suggest ways for water systems to get accurate translations if they have the means, recognizing that the translation verification process would be difficult.
- Visually impaired consumers are underrepresented in rule language. It is difficult for systems to know the number of visually impaired customers in a given service area and determine when additional support (such as providing audio versions of the CCR) is needed. EPA could provide a toolkit that shows both how to make a CCR and how to use specific tools in a way that could accommodate specific accessibility requests.

Charge Four: CCR Delivery Manner and Methods, Including Electronic Delivery

NDWAC members discussed the working group's non-consensus recommendation, related to EPA's fourth charge to the Council, regarding the purpose of the CCR's biannual delivery requirement. Members made the following points during the discussion.

- It would be burdensome for small systems to provide two reports per year. If CCRs must be delivered biannually, the same report should be delivered twice.
- Requiring new data sets every six months could potentially misrepresent data for some drinking water regulations that calculate annual averages or require data from a longer period of time because sampling cycles could be interrupted. Compliance with many drinking water regulations cannot be determined unless a full year of data is reviewed, so sending two reports per year with different data could confuse customers.
- Updating CCRs on a biannual basis could also lead to needlessly alarming information being provided to customers, such as when samples are higher during certain times of the year but averaged out for compliance.

NDWAC members also discussed options for providing creative ways to share the CCR through direct links or

social media. Members made the following points during the discussion.

- Some small water systems use social media platforms such as Facebook as the primary method of sharing information with their customers and this should be an option for primary means of delivery.
- Social media do not constitute direct methods of delivery, although recommendations should still encourage water systems to use social media to disseminate the CCR.
- There are alternate ways of disseminating the CCR effectively, such as through schools or childcare facilities.

Public Comment to the National Drinking Water Advisory Council

Ms. Corr noted that EPA received no requests and that the meeting would move on to Council deliberations.

Consumer Confidence Report Rule Revision Session 2: Council's Deliberations and Recommendations

Ms. Daniels explained that the NDWAC would review the recommendations for each charge, discussing the consensus recommendations first and then circling back to the non-consensus recommendations after the NDWAC had agreed on the language for each of the consensus recommendations for the charge.

After an initial review of the first non-consensus item, the NDWAC had an in-depth discussion about the process and nuances regarding non-consensus recommendations. Several NDWAC members noted confusion about the term "non-consensus recommendation." They believed that EPA could misinterpret the non-consensus items because "non-consensus recommendation" could suggest more agreement in the group than there actually was and calling these items "recommendations" may misrepresent the overall sentiment of the group. Council members also discussed whether non-consensus recommendations should be included at all for consideration if a majority of the NDWAC opposed the recommendation. The meeting adjourned for the day without resolution of these issues.

The discussion continued at the opening of the second meeting day, with Dr. McLain clarifying that EPA is looking for consensus recommendations, but that for issues that cannot gain a consensus there should be pros and cons listed for EPA's review. She affirmed that the NDWAC had final discretion on whether to adopt, modify, or reject a particular suggestion. The NDWAC considered the best way to frame the issues for EPA to understand that the Council does not recommend suggestions for which the Council did not reach consensus. After a full discussion, Jeffrey Tiberi motioned to use the term "non-consensus additional guidance" for the non-consensus items and Scott Borman seconded the motion. The NDWAC approved the motion and settled on calling all non-consensus issues "non-consensus additional guidance."

The NDWAC then went on to deliberations.³ The Council first addressed all consensus items related to all of the charges and then addressed non-consensus additional guidance.

Deliberations on Consensus Recommendations

Deliberations on Consensus Recommendations for Charge Two: *Advancing Environmental Justice and Supporting Underserved Communities*

³ NDWAC member Macaroy Underwood was not present on December 2 and did not participate in the deliberations. All other NDWAC members were present except where specifically noted otherwise.

Ms. Daniels motioned to approve the working group's consensus recommendations for Charge Two. All NDWAC members present agreed to adopt all three consensus recommendations in their entirety with no changes.

Deliberations on Consensus Recommendations for Charge Three: *Readability, Understandability, Clarity, and Accuracy of Information and Risk Communication of CCRs*

Ms. Daniels opened the discussion for the working group's consensus recommendations 1 through 3 for Charge Three. Mr. Tiberi motioned to approve these recommendations. The NDWAC voted on whether to adopt the working group's first three consensus recommendations in their entirety with no changes. The motion lacked consensus with Scott Boman voting against and did not pass. NDWAC members discussed the recommendations. Members raised the following points.

- The summary page in recommendation 1 may not be helpful for the reader because it would contain information that could already be found in the report. Members clarified that the summary page is intended as a way to gather important details, which could be especially useful for longer reports, and that it is a suggestion rather than a requirement.
- Under recommendation 1c, statements about where and how samples are taken should not be included in CCRs because of security concerns. Members clarified that the intent of recommendation 1c was to increase transparency about testing to help the public understand SDWA requirements for how samples get taken. In principle, the public should understand how samples are taken, but only if the water system feels that it is safe to provide that information and specific information about test locations is not included.
 - NDWAC members amended the language in recommendation 1 to include general terms that give flexibility for showing why and where samples were taken.

Ms. Daniels motioned to approve the modified recommendations. All NDWAC members present agreed to adopt the working group's consensus recommendations 1 through 3 for Charge Three in their entirety with the modifications to 1c.

Ms. Daniels opened the discussion for recommendations 4 through 6. Prior to voting on the recommendations Members raised the following points.

- Recommendation 5c should not be interpreted to mean that utilities must undertake additional testing. Members who participated on the working group explained that the intent of the recommendation was to give the public a general understanding of the testing parameters but CCRs would only include contaminants that are detected.

Ms. Daniels motioned to approve the recommendations. All NDWAC members present agreed to adopt the working group's consensus recommendations 4 through 6 for Charge Three in their entirety with no changes.

Ms. Daniels opened the discussion for the recommendations 7 through 10. There was no discussion. Ms. Daniels motioned to approve the recommendations. All NDWAC members present agreed to adopt the working group's consensus recommendations 7 through 10 for Charge Three in their entirety with no changes.

Deliberations on Consensus Recommendations for Charge One: *Addressing Accessibility Challenges, including Translating CCRs and Meeting Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Requirements*

Ms. Daniels opened the discussion for recommendations 1 through 3. There was no discussion. Ms. Daniels

motioned to approve recommendations. All NDWAC members present agreed to adopt the working group's consensus recommendations 1 through 3 for Charge One in their entirety with no changes.

Ms. Daniels opened the discussion for recommendations 4 through 7. Prior to voting on these recommendations, members raised the following points.

- Translation services in recommendation 4 were only being required of large systems, but many small systems also have populations of non-English speakers that may need translations.
 - The NDWAC amended the language in recommendation 4 to specify that EPA should provide guidance to small water systems regarding minimum thresholds for translations.
- Recommendation 4 should specify that EPA should develop translations of all required and example language for all systems, not just small systems.
 - The NDWAC amended the language in recommendation 4 to account for translation services being available for water systems of all sizes.
- Primacy agencies may not have the ability to verify the accuracy of translated documents beyond the water quality data. Members clarified that the aim of the recommendation is to ensure that primacy agencies could verify contaminant data, but not language translations.
- Not all water systems have access to the same resources. If a water system cannot afford high-quality translation services, it should have access to alternatives. EPA could solve this issue by providing extra guidance for small systems to assist them in finding translation services.
- Translation tools from EPA could help the translation process for water systems and improve the quality of those translations.

Ms. Daniels motioned to approve the recommendations. All NDWAC members present agreed to adopt the working group's consensus recommendations 4 through 7 for Charge One with the modifications to recommendation 4.

Deliberations on Consensus Recommendations for Charge Four: CCR Delivery Manner and Methods, Including Electronic Delivery

Ms. Daniels opened the discussion for the working group's consensus recommendations 1 through 3 for Charge Four. There was no discussion. Ms. Daniels motioned to approve these recommendations. All NDWAC members present⁴ agreed to adopt the recommendations in their entirety with no changes.

Ms. Daniels opened the discussion for recommendations 4 through 6. Prior to voting on these recommendations, members raised the following points:

- Text message may not be a reliable mode of communication since phone numbers change.
- Facebook is widely used among small systems as a form of communication with their consumers, particularly rural water systems serving Native Americans.
- While the use of social media could be encouraged, it is difficult for water systems to measure whether people have received the CCR through social media. Currently, EPA does not recognize social media as a

⁴ In addition to Macaroy Underwood, NDWAC members Yolanda Barney and Ann Marie Chischilly were not present for this vote.

valid form of delivery. If EPA retains this position, the best that the NDWAC can do is encourage EPA to recognize social media as a potentially viable channel to reach out to customers and evaluate how social media can be used to disseminate valuable information.

- The NDWAC altered language in recommendation 4 to include a suggestion that EPA examine the possible use of social media or other applications to help the agency develop guidance on what qualifies as “direct delivery” of a CCR. They also highlighted that the rule should clarify that advertising the availability of CCRs through social media should be encouraged and potentially considered a form of “direct delivery.”

Ms. Daniels motioned to approve the recommendations. All NDWAC members present agreed to adopt the working group’s consensus recommendations 4 through 6 for Charge Four in their entirety with the modifications to recommendation 4.

Ms. Daniels opened the discussion for recommendations 7 through 9. Prior to voting on the recommendations, members raised the following points.

- In recommendation 7, EPA should encourage landlords to provide CCRs to tenants. NDWAC members acknowledged that there is no legal authority for EPA to monitor or regulate landlords’ dissemination of information.
 - The NDWAC amended the language of recommendation 7 to say that EPA should gather best practices from states that have successfully encouraged landlords to communicate the availability of CCRs to tenants and summarize those best practices in official guidance documents.

Ms. Daniels motioned to approve the recommendations. All NDWAC members present agreed to adopt the working group’s consensus recommendations 7 through 9 for Charge Four in their entirety with the modifications to recommendation 7.

Deliberations on Non-Consensus Additional Guidance

After the discussion and confirmation of the Council’s consensus recommendations for all four charges, the NDWAC moved on to consideration of the non-consensus additional guidance.

Deliberations on Non-Consensus Additional Guidance for Charge Two: Advancing Environmental Justice and Supporting Underserved Communities

The NDWAC voted on whether to adopt the non-consensus additional guidance relating to the inclusion of information about a system’s overall health, including financial health, in the CCR. The motion lacked unanimity and did not pass. One member abstained hoping that the issue would become a consensus item. Others felt that the CCR should be focused on water quality and not include other information about the water system. Other members of the NDWAC discussed dropping the item entirely. Saeid Kasraei motioned to eliminate the non-consensus additional guidance from the recommendations, and Mr. Tiberi seconded the motion. The motion lacked unanimity and did not pass.

NDWAC members discussed the non-consensus additional guidance. Members raised the following points.

- The term “overall health” is a vague descriptor.
 - Language was added to the list of arguments against the guidance that financial information be

included in the CCR to reflect this point.

- Primacy agencies would have a difficult time confirming that financial information in a CCR is accurate. Primacy agencies should not be required to certify information other than water quality data.
 - Language was added to the list of arguments against the guidance that financial information be included in the CCR to reflect this point.
- Information proposed in the recommendation is not currently a legal requirement and primacy agencies are not required to certify financial information.
 - Language was added to the list of arguments against the guidance that financial information be included in the CCR to reflect this point.
- Additional information about the overall health of a water system should be included in the CCR, especially in terms of financial information, which is critical information for providing safe drinking water. Water systems should provide financial information in CCRs because this information is not easily accessible and including this information will increase transparency.
 - Language was added to the list of arguments in favor of the guidance that financial information be included in the CCR to reflect this point.

Members of the NDWAC who were against the non-consensus additional guidance stated that they approved of the newly added language. Ms. Daniels motioned to vote and all NDWAC members present voted to include the non-consensus additional guidance with the added language in the deliverable for EPA.

Deliberations on Non-Consensus Additional Guidance for Charge Three: *Readability, Understandability, Clarity, and Accuracy of Information and Risk Communication of CCRs*

Prior to voting on the non-consensus additional guidance, members made the following points about removing the requirement to convert data into CCR units.

- Units reported in the CCR should be consistent with primacy agency reports to avoid confusion among readers.
 - Language was added to the list of arguments in favor of removing the requirement to convert data into CCR units to reflect this point.
- The purpose of the CCR is not to be consistent, but to find better ways to communicate what the units mean to the public. The audience for the CCR is the general public rather than the primacy agency, and the CCR units that are currently required are most appropriate for that audience.
 - Language was added to the list of arguments against removing the requirement to convert data into CCR units to reflect this point.

Members made the following points about clarifying Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs).

- The CCR would contain too much information if it includes information about MCL rulemaking. CCRs should instead contain a link to EPA's rulemaking process.
- Including information about how MCLs are developed would build public trust by providing consumers with details of how authorities set drinking water standards.
 - This issue remained non-consensus, but the NDWAC agreed that the information should be available

for EPA to consider. The NDWAC added language against the guidance to say that water systems could include a link in their CCRs to either EPA or primacy agency websites that describe the standards-setting process in detail, rather than including those details in the CCR.

- MCLs should not be framed as a “compromise” between acceptable health risk and what is financially feasible as that would indicate that the MCL rulemaking process accepts a potentially less-than-satisfactory health risk protection depending on the financial capacity of the water provider.
 - The NDWAC altered language in the non-consensus additional guidance to frame MCLs as a “balance” between acceptable health risk and what is financially and technically feasible.

Ms. Daniels motioned to vote for including this non-consensus additional guidance, as modified, in the deliverable for EPA. All NDWAC members present⁵ voted to approve including the non-consensus additional guidance in the deliverable.

Deliberations on Non-Consensus Additional Guidance for Charge Four: CCR Delivery Manner and Methods, Including Electronic Delivery

Prior to voting on the non-consensus additional guidance, members made the following points during the discussion:

- Updated contaminant information can be available upon request but would be too burdensome for small systems to provide every six months to consumers.
 - The NDWAC added language, in favor of guidance related to both CCRs for a given year containing identical information, to state that CCRs can include a statement that consumers can request, at any time, the most current testing results from their water system.
- A biannual CCR with new data would reflect data from the past year and deadlines would change to a six-month period. Because agencies require time to process this data, CCRs would operate on a one-period lag. Six-month data sets would potentially distort sampling data or compliance data within CCR reporting.
 - The NDWAC added language, against guidance that CCRs should be issued once every six months and should reflect the most current data, to state that the approach of adding new data every six months may allow for more recent monitoring data to be included in the CCR, but it would likely not include a compliance determination or identification of a violation.
 - The NDWAC also added language against this guidance to convey that providing new data every six months may contribute to affordability problems.

Ms. Daniels motioned to vote for including this non-consensus additional guidance, with the modifications, in the deliverable for EPA. All NDWAC members present⁶ voted to approve including the non-consensus additional guidance as modified in the deliverable.

Council’s Final Recommendations to the Administrator

Ms. Daniels introduced the topic of the NDWAC’s letter to the EPA Administrator. She explained that the NDWAC would use past letters as templates and would decide how the non-consensus additional guidance

⁵ In addition to Macaroy Underwood, NDWAC member Saeid Kasraei was not present for this vote.

⁶ In addition to Macaroy Underwood, NDWAC member Saeid Kasraei was not present for this vote.

would be presented to EPA. Options were presented as: Include the non-consensus additional guidance in the letter with the consensus recommendations; include the non-consensus guidance in an attachment to the letter; or have two attachments, one with the full working group report and another with the non-consensus additional guidance. Ms. Littlewood motioned to send the letter with the recommendations to EPA, with the non-consensus additional guidance in an attachment. All NDWAC members present⁷ approved the motion.

Closing Remarks

Ms. Corr thanked the NDWAC members and provided information about the process for submitting the recommendations to EPA. Ms. Daniels and Ms. Littlewood added concluding thoughts, and Dr. McLain made closing remarks, thanking everyone for their hard work. Ms. Corr gave instructions for next steps in the process of developing the letter to EPA and adjourned the meeting.

⁷In addition to Macaroy Underwood, NDWAC member Saeid Kasraei was not present for this vote.

ATTACHMENT A

National Drinking Water Advisory Council

Members, National Drinking Water Advisory Council
Lisa D. Daniels, NDWAC Chair: Director, Bureau of Safe Drinking Water, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Yolanda Barney: Environmental Program Manager, Navajo Public Water System Supervision Program, Navajo Nation Environmental Protection Agency
D. Scott Borman: General Manager, Benton/Washington Regional Public Water Authority
John L. Brady: Deputy Director, Operations and Engineering, Central Coast Water Authority
Alexandra Campbell-Ferrari: Co-Founder and Executive Director, The Center for Water Security and Cooperation
Shellie R. Chard: Director, Water Quality Division, Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality
Ann Marie Chischilly: Executive Director, Institute for Tribal Environmental Professionals, Northern Arizona University
Saeid Kasraei: Administrator, Maryland Water Supply Program, Maryland Department of the Environment
Jana Littlewood: Board of Directors, Alaska Representative, National Rural Water Association
Jennifer L. Peters: National Water Programs Director, Clean Water Action/Clean Water Fund
James M. Proctor, II: Senior Vice President and General Counsel, McWane, Inc.
Nancy A. Quirk: General Manager, Green Bay Water Utility
Jeffrey W. Szabo: Chief Executive Officer, Suffolk County Water Authority
Jeffrey D. Tiberi: Montana Association of Conservation Districts Member
Macaroy Underwood: Principal Consultant, Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc.
Liaisons, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Arthur S. Chang, PhD: Chief Medical Officer, Division of Environmental Health Science and Practice, National Center for Environmental Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Vincent Hill, PhD: Chief, Waterborne Disease Prevention Branch, Division of Foodborne, Waterborne and Environmental Diseases, National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention