



**MINUTES**  
**Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)**  
**Teleconference**  
**Tuesday, October 6, 2015, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM**

---

**Summary of Action and Decision Items**

DECISION: The WWTWG approved the July and August WWTWG minutes.

ACTION: Jurisdictions should review Laura's [report](#), as well as the detailed notes from their conversations, and contact Laura ([Free.Laura@epa.gov](mailto:Free.Laura@epa.gov)) if they have any further feedback. Jurisdictions should come to the November WWTWG meeting prepared to reach agreement on moving forward with this proposal. During the November call, the workgroup will also decide if they want to make recommendations regarding WIP assistance funds.

ACTION: Jurisdictions should send Amanda Pruzinsky ([Pruzinsky.Amanda@epa.gov](mailto:Pruzinsky.Amanda@epa.gov)) a list of data elements that they wish to have covered by the E-rule data requirements, along with an explanation of why each element is necessary.

ACTION: Ning will revise the table of the new wastewater loads to include an explanation of what is new to the Phase 6 Model and what is already there but using a different methodology, and whether the new load would be part of a waste load allocation or load allocation. The revised table will be brought to the November WWTWG for final approval.

ACTION: David will check to see whether the analysis on the uptake equation was completed. If so, Greg will present at November meeting.

ACTION: David will make revisions to the WWTWG planning calendar including adding a date mark and finding different ways to mark items that are completed versus past deadlines.

ACTION: WWTWG members should review the planning calendar and notify David ([Wood.DavidM@epa.gov](mailto:Wood.DavidM@epa.gov)) if there are any items missing from the timeline that should be included.

ACTION: David will provide draft language for a WWTWG membership definition.

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

DECISION: The WWTWG approved the July and August WWTWG minutes.

**Point Source Data Project-Update** – *Laura Free, EPA*

In March, Laura introduced a project aimed at documenting the current process for receiving and manipulating/correcting point source data that is fed into the Bay Watershed Model. She [updated](#) the WWTWG on early conversations with each jurisdiction and proposed some options for the future development of a system that would support the point source QAQC and reporting.

**Discussion:**

- Amanda Pruzinsky (EPA): On the last statement, regarding what data is legally definitive, many states are CROMERR approved or grandfathered in. We are actively working with those that were grandfathered in, to get them fully approved. CROMERR isn't requiring states to submit data electronically, but if they are, they have to be CROMERR approved in order to make the reports legally definitive.
  - Spano: So it is a way of ensuring the electronic versions of submittals have the same legal verifications as the paper copies?
    - Pruzinsky: Correct.
- Spano: Does this mirror the kinds of conversations all folks had in the states? We need to make sure your feedback is represented.
  - Marya Levelev (MDE): My recollection is that Laura's document is correct. I'd like to look at the write-up and get back to the workgroup to be sure. I would like to talk to a number of people at MDE before we provide feedback on this. We would like to know a little more about grants available to help with the effort. That would be useful.
    - Spano: I suspect other states might have similar thoughts.
  - Matt Richardson (VA DEQ): I am filling in for Allan Brockenbrough today, and the only thing he shared with me is that our staff is working on updates to communicate with ICIS-NPDES more effectively, so I need to confer with him.
  - Brian Churchill (DE DNREC): I am not the one to speak to this. Bryan Ashby (DE DNREC) doesn't seem to be on the call.
  - Kumar (PA DEP): I need to confer with Ron Furlan (PA DEP).

ACTION: Jurisdictions should review Laura's report, as well as the detailed notes from their conversations, and contact Laura ([Free.Laura@epa.gov](mailto:Free.Laura@epa.gov)) if they have any further feedback. Jurisdictions should come to the November WWTWG meeting prepared to reach agreement on moving forward with this proposal. During the November call, the workgroup will also decide if they want to make recommendations regarding WIP assistance funds.

- Pruzinsky: EPA will be prioritizing E-rule data requirements and it would be useful for the Bay Program partners to review what we are collecting and make sure we aren't getting rid of anything you want to be reporting on. It would be sort of a wish list of data elements you want to have covered. Having that wish list and an explanation of why each data element is necessary would be really helpful. I would be happy to contact headquarters and be one of the voices on that.

ACTION: Jurisdictions should send Amanda Pruzinsky ([Pruzinsky.Amanda@epa.gov](mailto:Pruzinsky.Amanda@epa.gov)) a list of data elements that they wish to have covered by the E-rule data requirements, along with an explanation of why each element is necessary.

### **Implementing New Wastewater Loads – Ning Zhou, VT**

Ning [reviewed](#) and provided updates to the proposed methodologies for including loads from rapid infiltration, spray irrigation, biosolids and non-traditional onsite systems in the Phase 6 modeling tools.

### **Discussion:**

- Zhou: I presented this table at the last call, but we didn't have time to go through it one by one. It summarizes all new sources we will add to wastewater sector for the Phase 6 Watershed Model. We will take this to the WQGIT, and once it is approved it will be implemented into the Model.

- Spano: In the table, can you add the status for each load source? For example, biosolids exists in the Model, but we need to provide the data. For the other ones, make it clear that while we are responding to the WQGIT request to include biosolids data in the Model, we are also recommending these other loads be incorporated as well. We already agreed to this in-part, we are just confirming on the biosolids and recommending inclusion of other elements.
- Levellev: Maryland has data for rapid infiltration basins, but what kind of data would you include from the states that did not have data?
  - Zhou: I don't know if others have a similar practice. If they don't, they can just submit zero. If there is no submission, we would assume a zero.
- Levellev: I have some questions specific to Maryland that I will follow-up on offline.
- Marcia Degen (VDH): The BMP reduction credit is zero for Rapid infiltration and large onsite systems. Why is that?
  - Zhou: BMP reduction here is a little different. For all of these new sources, except boat pumpout, when you submit the data, it will already reflect any reduction in the inputs. We don't want to provide an additional discount that is implicit in the number.
    - Degen: Ok that makes sense.
- Levellev: How will this be shown as a wastewater load? Where would the load go?
  - Zhou: We haven't reached that point yet. The next step is how to put this in different load allocations.
  - Levellev: I'd prefer to understand this a little better before approving it. I'd like to see the estimates you have for different states for each of these sources.
    - Zhou: Right now they are listed in the Model as individual sources and they will fall under the wastewater sector.
  - Spano: This brings up a good point. For our November call, we should all understand how incorporating these load sources would be reported.
    - Zhou: Only permitted wastewater discharges are considered point sources and would be waste load allocations. All of these new sources listed here would fall under nonpoint source and would be load allocations.
- Degen: Some of these loads are already estimated in the model and some are new. It might be good to know which these are.
  - Zhou: Only Virginia biosolids is in the Model now. All the rest are new to Phase 6.
  - Degen: But large monitored onsite systems are already estimated as single family homes in the Model.
    - Zhou: But they haven't been separated out previously. It is not totally new.
  - Degen: This new method would replace the estimated loads for these systems.
- Spano: The table should be turned into more formal documentation including an explanation of what is new to the Phase 6 Model and what is already there but using a different methodology, and whether the new load would be part of a waste load allocation or load allocation.

ACTION: Ning will revise the table of the new wastewater loads to include an explanation of what is new to the Phase 6 Model and what is already there but using a different methodology, and whether the new load would be part of a waste load allocation or load allocation. The revised table will be brought to the November WWTWG for final approval.

- Churchill: Was mineralization of nitrogen considered in the Model?
  - Zhou: I unfortunately don't have the answer to that question. I am sure that has been considered.
- Spano: I would also raise the question about how much phosphorus is bound. It was mentioned at the last meeting as something we should look at. Mechanistically, there are ways to address that.

- Greg Busch (MDE): Regarding the uptake equation that would be used for incorporating non-ag spray irrigation, I've been discussing with Matt Johnston (UMD). We use a mass balance approach for nitrogen on turf, and we have about 0.6mgd of wastewater being applied to turf throughout the state, and the application rate works out to 50lbs per year. So we have been estimating no net export of nitrogen from these systems. Matt doesn't seem comfortable with a "no net export" and wants to try to run the Model to see what net uptake would be using the N and P uptake rates of hay. I am awaiting that before making any definitive statements. That is kind of where it stands.

ACTION: David will check to see whether the analysis on the uptake equation was completed. If so, Greg will present at November meeting.

### **Historic Data Cleanup, Biosolids, and Phase 6 model land segments** – Ning Zhou, VT

Ning provided an [update](#) on the historic data cleanup status and reviewed progress towards the biosolids data collection effort. New phase 6 model land segments were introduced. New model input decks will be compiled based on the new segments.

#### **Discussion:**

- Zhou: Historic wastewater data was not received from New York, Pennsylvania, or D.C. (Blue plains 001). I know they are still working on this and we are expecting to receive it later, hopefully as early as possible, in order to give us more time to review and fix any issues. As it stands currently, data from the Phase 5.3.2 Watershed Model will be used for the beta version of the Phase 6 Watershed Model.
- Churchill: The most recent spreadsheet I sent you did include 2014 biosolids data.
  - Zhou: You are right, I did include 2014 in the final data set, and I just forgot to update the slide.
- Zhou: Our original request was monthly biosolids data based on the template. We have now simplified it due to the data differences among jurisdictions, and the final input deck has annual total dry ton by county by facility. We dropped acres, assumed they are applied to whatever agriculture lands are available. For seasonal variation, we will follow the Model, and biosolids will be applied at the appropriate time for fertilizer application. Some jurisdictions have good speciation data, and for those where there was no speciation, Matt did an averaging approach using the available data to get the species. If a state doesn't have any info, he will use a Bay-wide average from total dry tons.
- Spano: We need to have all the assumptions Ning just stated about biosolids, outlined. Even if the estimates are good enough for the Model, there are other implications such as on the ground challenges of applying the material, and we need to make sure the Bay Program assumptions are not inconsistent or skewed in a way that could harm these critical programs. We need to ask that the assumptions be laid out very clearly.
  - Zhou: When we finish the beta run, we will put everything on paper. All the assumptions and estimated data will only be used for missing time periods.
    - Spano: Waiting until after the Model calibration is too late. The assumptions that go into the Model are just as important as getting the pounds of biosolids and where they are applied, right.
  - Zhou: The assumptions are just what we used for this moment at where state data is incomplete or no data available because we had to run the beta version on October 1 and we didn't have any other information. The workgroup can accept, change or update

the assumptions during the review period and include that in the next round of the calibration

- Spano: Offline I would like you to identify some of that information. I might want to bring it back to the workgroup for further discussion. MWCOG would want to talk to you about our plants and the assumptions being made. We might have better information.
- Zhou: That would be great, actual data is always better than assumption.
- Spano: I want to understand why we are making these ties to the land segments.

#### **WWTWG Planning Calendar** – Tanya Spano, Chair

During the WWTWG face-to-face meeting in July, the workgroup outlined their priorities for the next two years. Tanya reviewed the resulting [planning calendar](#) document and asked for member feedback.

ACTION: David will make revisions to the WWTWG planning calendar including adding a date mark and finding different ways to mark items that are completed versus past deadlines.

ACTION: WWTWG members should review the planning calendar and notify David ([Wood.DavidM@epa.gov](mailto:Wood.DavidM@epa.gov)) if there are any items missing from the timeline that should be included.

#### **Updates and other business**

- BMP Verification Program Plans – David Wood, CRC and jurisdictions
  - Verification documentation can be found at:  
[http://www.chesapeakebay.net/about/programs/bmp/additional\\_resources](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/about/programs/bmp/additional_resources)
- Boat Pump-Out BMP Expert Panel – Ning Zhou, VT
  - No contractor support was available. We will convene the panel ourselves in December. We still need more candidates for the panel, if there are recommended experts, please send them to Ning.
- Onsite Systems Attenuation Expert Panel Report – Ning Zhou, VT
  - Attenuation panel report was postponed again. We hope to have their presentation in November, or December at the latest.
- WWTWG Governance and Membership Definition
  - Governance: WWTWG will need to revisit the issue of chair and vice chair and clearly define their membership. We should key that up for November call.

ACTION: David will provide draft language for a WWTWG membership definition.

#### **Adjourn**

**Next conference call:**  
November 3, 2015

### List of Call Participants

Name	Affiliation
Tanya Spano (Chair) Ning Zhou (Coordinator) David Wood (Staff)	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments VT, CBPO CRC, CBPO
Andrew Whitman	DE DNREC
Brian Churchill	DE DNREC
Laura Free	EPA
Brian Burch	EPA
Amanda Pruzinsky	EPA, R3
Greg Busch	MDE
Marya Levelev	MDE
Alex Yeboah	MDE
Jay Prager	MDE
Lana Sindler	MWCOG
Rashid Ahmed	NYSDEC
Kumar	PA DEP
Angela Redwine	VDH
Marcia Degen	VDH
Matt Richardson	Virginia DEQ