



**MINUTES**  
**Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)**  
**Teleconference**  
**Tuesday, March 3, 2014, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM**

---

**Summary of Action and Decision Items**

DECISION: WWTWG members approved the February WWTWG minutes as written.

ACTION: MDE will develop a graphic representation of their Rapid Infiltration project to present to the WWTWG at a later meeting.

ACTION: Ning Zhou will ask the CBPO modeling team how loads from rapid infiltration basins are currently accounted for in the Bay Watershed Model and will follow up with Maryland and the other affected jurisdictions.

ACTION: Jurisdictions should send their points of contact for Laura Free to David Wood ([wood.davidm@epa.gov](mailto:wood.davidm@epa.gov)). Laura will then reach out to those contacts to obtain feedback on the point source data review process.

ACTION: David Wood will send out a package of information regarding historic data cleanup, biosolids data, and spray irrigation data to the workgroup. He will also post those materials on the meeting's calendar page.

DECISION: The WWTWG approved the proposed interim steps as a path forward for their historic data cleanup effort.

ACTION: Ning will contact jurisdictions individually to schedule one-on-one calls to work out any technical details regarding historic data cleanup.

ACTION: Ning will provide monthly updates to the WWTWG on the status of the historic data cleanup effort in each jurisdiction.

ACTION: David Wood will distribute the Toxics work plan from Tom Schueler. WWTWG members should send feedback or contact information for any individuals interested in helping out, to David or Tom.

ACTION: WWTWG should send Ning research need requests for EPA Region III by COB Thursday, March 5<sup>th</sup>.

**Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements**—*Tanya Spano (Chair)*

- Tanya convened the call and verified call participants.

DECISION: WWTWG members approved the February WWTWG minutes as written.

**Maryland Rapid Infiltration (RI) project** – *Greg Busch, MDE*

- MDE presented a rapid infiltration (RI) project for a significant WWTP in MD and proposed a methodology to estimate the nutrient loads from this practice.

#### Discussion:

- Spano: Are other states using this technology or doing anything comparable in terms of the calculations?
- Dave Schepens (DE DNREC): We do use Rapid Infiltration (RI) basins and actually have a big one that isn't online yet. We usually take samples from effluent going into the surface, and we use monitoring wells. Our RI basins are required to treat 5mg/L prior to being discharges. We are interested in this practice.
- Dave Montali (WV DEP): We don't have a lot of this technology but we will need to consider these kinds of assessments for facilities doing land application. In terms of attenuation, isn't the component you're counting as 30% counted within the attenuation the systems receive? Should it be additive?
  - Ching-Tzone Tien (MDE): They are different than the septic tank effluent. I think with RI exposed to the air, the potential of nitrogen removal would be greater than the septic tank effluent.
  - Marya Levelev (MDE): In Maryland we have three zones and that's what we have used to calculate the loads to the Bay. That is why it is additive. Overall most of the states are using 40% attenuation to stream.
- Montali: You would take DMRs and make a 65% reduction from those loads and that would go to edge of stream, and that is counter to the septic systems which only get 50%. Is this a little too optimistic? Is there double counting of benefits here? If it is not, then that's fine.
  - Marcia Degen (VA Dept of Health): They are taking the in-drainfield and the attenuation and lumping them together. The net delivery is the same. It is just hard to see it as presented.
- Spano: Maybe we can get a graphic sketch of the system to show the process.
- Degen: When you looked at groundwater data, did you look at impacts of dilution?
  - Greg Busch (MDE): We would have to look into that.
  - Tien: The county landfill may interfere with the groundwater data.
- Spano: We don't need a decision right now. Are you hoping the Onsite systems attenuation expert panel will come back with some guidance so Maryland can better track these and get some credit?
  - Busch: Yes, and we will bring in a graphic to present our project more clearly moving forward.
- Levelev: Where are these loads being reflected in the model?
  - Ning Zhou (VT): I think this is considered as a zero in the current approach.
  - Levelev: I would think this is part of the groundwater discharge. Not part of our point source load. What are the modelers' assumption for where these loads are shown currently? We need to know what source it should be assigned to.
  - Zhou: I think they got a sewer map from the Maryland Department of Planning. If this is covered by the sewer collection area, that will be considered as point source. The problem is there will be no surface discharge so that will be missed.
- Spano: Ning, please follow up with Maryland to confirm how these are being counted currently. To see if it is already covered by the septic data that has already been submitted. Check for other states as well.

**ACTION:** MDE will develop a graphic representation of their Rapid Infiltration project to present to the WWTWG at a later meeting.

ACTION: Ning Zhou will ask the CBPO modeling team how loads from rapid infiltration basins are currently accounted for in the Bay Watershed Model and will follow up with Maryland and the other affected jurisdictions.

#### **Point Source Data Review Project** *Laura Free, EPA*

- Laura introduced the point source data review project that will document the current process for receiving and manipulating/correcting point source data that will be fed into the Bay Watershed Model. Laura will be following up with jurisdictional representatives for feedback about the process, and any challenges that the project might be able to address.

#### **Discussion:**

- Free: I hope to follow up with each state on their perspectives on this process. We are finishing up a map of the process from data gathering to input into the model.
- Spano: Resources and level of effort has been a key issue among the Workgroup. If you are doing the mapping, it may show the flow of the project, but it may not reflect the level of effort and staffing associated with the effort. I recommend finding some way to recognize that. If there are improvement you can come back to the group and suggest, I would like to hear that feedback from talking to each of the states as well as observations.
- Free: As I reach out to the states I will coordinate with David Wood (CRC) to figure out the best time to get back on the WWTWG agenda.
- Spano: In terms of QA/QC, how much effort is spent dealing with errors and QAQC would also be good to hear about.
- Montali: I also recommend talking to Megan Browning (WV DEP) as well as myself from West Virginia.
- Spano: If states could please send David and Ning the points of contact for this project so they can pass them along to Laura.
- Spano: Is there a timeline for this project?
  - Free: Through July, but there is a possibility of extending it.

ACTION: Jurisdictions should send their points of contact for Laura Free to David Wood ([wood.davidm@epa.gov](mailto:wood.davidm@epa.gov)). Laura will then reach out to those contacts to obtain feedback on the point source data review process.

#### **Historic Data Cleanup** – *Ning Zhou, VT*

- Ning reviewed the framework draft that outlines the steps for completing the historic data cleanup effort in time for the phase VI model.

#### **Discussion:**

- Zhou: Last week I sent out my recommended plan to the states and an inventory summary of the data we have in the phase 5.3.2 model. I hope everyone will take a look at that, but it is also summarized in the presentation.
- Montali: Will there be a new evaluation of what a no action default NMP will be?
  - Ning: That will depend on the states, I put that in my plan. It is a chance to go back and revisit historic default values to see if it is still reasonable or if it needs updates. We used to take the default as secondary treatment, I think that number is still valid. Some states use a higher number for non-significant facilities. If there are any improvements or updates, this is the time to take a look.
- Spano: The focus is on whether we are properly accounting for loads in the TMDL context.

- Montali: It is different for no action scenarios than for progress reporting. I don't think we will have a lot of information upon which to make changes because we have linked the two in the past.
- Zhou: The accuracy in the historic data is important for the model accuracy. The quality of the model depends on your calibration data.

Recommended Step 1 Action for data clean up: Jurisdictions should complete the facility table in the excel file Ning sent out last week, focusing particularly on starting dates and offline dates. They could then QA/QC the active facility list for each particular year.

- Allan Brockenbrough (VA DEQ): I don't know if we have the means to even do the first couple steps. We don't have a permit cycle that would have the start date in it. And that's just a permit date, not a discharge date. I think we will have to rely heavily on assumptions.
  - Zhou: If there is no date available, we can assume they started before 1985. If you have any information to confirm a date though, please use your best judgment to pick a date.
  - Spano: I also expressed that concern to Rich Batiuk (EPA). I asked him to try to provide resources to the jurisdictions to help with these efforts.
  - Montali: We did this stuff before, and as far as double counting stormwater facilities, we found a big overrepresentation in our state. Maybe you can use a GP dates to help differentiate those.
- Zhou: We can put all of this information into a package and David will distribute to the group.

ACTION: David Wood will send out a package of information regarding historic data cleanup, biosolids data, and spray irrigation data to the workgroup. He will also post those materials on the meeting's calendar page.

- Spano: It appears to be a logical way to proceed. Any problems with the conceptual path forward? Hearing nothing, we will assume that in general, it makes sense.

DECISION: The WWTWG approved the proposed interim steps as a path forward for their historic data cleanup effort.

- Spano: In terms of the schedule, we are talking about four months to get whatever we can get done, done. I would like to be able to see each month, that Ning give a status report on the progress being made with each of the states.
- Ning: I would also like to offer my time to schedule a one-on-one meeting to each jurisdiction to work out any technical details.
- Spano: I would like to follow up with Ning separately to do a double check on the COG wastewater plants.

ACTION: Ning will contact jurisdictions individually to schedule one-on-one calls to work out any technical details regarding historic data cleanup.

ACTION: Ning will provide monthly updates to the WWTWG on the status of the historic data cleanup effort in each jurisdiction.

#### **Biosolids and Spray Irrigation Data** – Ning Zhou, VT

- Ning reviewed the interim steps to develop a complete biosolids and spray irrigation database in time for the phase VI model.

**Discussion:**

Zhou: New York, Maryland and Virginia have submitted biosolids data. There are still some problems with the data however. I don't have any spray irrigation data from states except for Maryland, and I only have estimated loading from permits.

Brian Churchill (DE DNREC): I submitted 2 years (2012/2013) of biosolids data from Delaware, I just want to make sure you have it.

Spano: One of the problems is it is hard to gauge whether the degree to whether it is significant because there is no load associated with it. I am concerned there is no talk about the loads involved.

Montali: Although we are slow to start, we are on this. I took it to the TMDL source tracking staff to get on this. Soon I will have the data and we can start talking about the simplifying assumptions. I don't think any jurisdictions wants things based on data in ICIS.

Spano: In terms of data review and notion of ICIS, if there is notion of one-stop-shopping in terms of a database, I keep hearing questions about the integrity of the ICIS data, and I think this is a serious issue, and could be something Laura Free could address in her project as well.

Montali: I agree.

Zhou: If we keep going on the current path, ICIS is a compliance system, but if the Bay Program's TMDL database does not match, there will be some issues in the future. The question is whether you go by the TMDL or the compliance system.

Zhou: I didn't put it on the slide, but at WQGIT request, all assumptions and data updates and changes should be documented.

Spano: When gathering data from local governments, is it is not just a concern of collecting it, but what happens to it once it goes into the Watershed Model. There are concerns about phosphorus solubility, how biosolids are treated compared to manure, etc., and I don't want to lose that fact. I would like at an upcoming meeting, a presentation to talk about that.

Montali: I can see Matt Johnston making a manure spread concentration to this group, and how it is done for manure compared to biosolids. We have problems in West Virginia about spread being nitrogen-based and phosphorus coming along for the ride.

Spano: I would like to relate it to the gathering of the data as well.

**Updates and other business**

- 2014 Progress Run – *Ning Zhou*
  - Zhou: Progress is almost finished. For point source, there is no major change since the last time I sent summary sheet and detailed numbers. Maryland had an update, but that data table is still valid. I will send summary sheet to you all again and David can put that all in one package.
  - Spano: Keep in mind that we need to be looking at the data compared to the load cap. As populations increase, the plants operating at the capacity they have, will have loads start to increase and that is to be inherently expected.
  - Zhou: I will have that information in the summary table.
- STAC Feedback on Cutting Edge Wastewater Technology report & Proposed Response
  - Spano: They were essentially a series of recommendations that called for the need for flexibility and ways of recognizing that running some of these technologies is at the edge of their performance limits. On some level, our report and findings are already a bit dated. We are going to recommend developing another workshop to represent the latest data. It would be no earlier than summer 2016. In the fall we can possibly start planning that workshop.
- Toxic Contaminants Project – *Ning Zhou*
  - Zhou: Tom Schueler from CSN is working on the project and is asking for crosswalk of data and any interested volunteers.

**ACTION:** David Wood will distribute Toxics work plan from Tom Schueler. WWTWG members should send feedback or contact information for any individuals interested in helping out, to David or Tom.

- EPA region 3 priority needs
  - Zhou: EPA Region III wants us to come up with research needs in our sector that could be used for our TMDL effort. There is a template, we likely just need to provide topics 1 or 2.
  - Spano: Is there context for this request on the EPA website?
  - Zhou: I haven't seen that yet, I just got this recommendation late last week.
  - Spano: This is being asked internally at EPA?
  - Zhou: Correct.
  - Spano: Any really obvious items to suggest for this? If not, get Ning some input by COB Wednesday or Thursday morning.

**ACTION:** WWTWG should send Ning research need requests for EPA Region III by COB Thursday, March 5<sup>th</sup>.

- Zhou: I proposed continuing development on attenuation.
- Spano: Climate change, toxic contaminants, and precipitation also come to mind as topics that will require quite a bit more research. Filling out the template would be useful.

### **Adjourn**

#### **Next conference call:**

Tuesday, April 7, 2015

#### List of Call Participants

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Tanya Spano (Chair)	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Ning Zhou (Coordinator)	VT, CBPO
David Wood (Staff)	CRC, CBPO
Marty Hurd	DDOE
Dave Schepens	DE DNREC
Brian Churchill	DE DNREC
Bryan Ashby	DE DNREC
Marcia Fox	DE DNREC
Laura Free	EPA
Mary Levelev	MDE
Greg Busch	MDE
Ching-Tzone Tien	MDE
Lana Sindler	MWCOG
Rashid Ahmid	NYSDEC
Ron Furlan	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection
Lori Mitzel	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection
Marcia Degen	Virginia Dept. Of Health
Allen Brockenbrough	Virginia DEQ
Dave Montali	WV DEP