



SUMMARY

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)

Teleconference

Tuesday, September 9th, 2014

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/S=0/calendar/event/21141/>

Welcome, Introductions, and Announcement

- Tanya Spano (Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments; WWTWG Chair) convened the call and reviewed the [agenda](#).
- Spano introduced David Wood (CRC), new staffer for the WQGIT and WWTWG.
- Spano asked for comments or corrections to the June minutes ([Attachment A](#)).
 - Spano: Typo under recommendation #2 on Page 3.
 - No other comments or corrections were raised; the minutes were approved.
 - **DECISION:** The June conference call minutes were approved.

American Manufacturing Drip System and Anua's Puraflo to a Pad

- Eric Aschenbach (Virginia Department of Health) presented two technologies being proposed for credit under the WQGIT-approved protocols for advanced on-site wastewater treatment systems: American Manufacturing Drip System and Anua's Puraflo to a Pad. For both technologies he recommended advancement to onsite BMP panel for detailed review.
 - View his [presentation](#) for more details.
- Dave Montali (WV DEP): How is the Anua Puraflo to a Pad different from a mound? Would it be easier to get approval as a mound?
 - Aschenbach: That is a good point.
 - Montali: The old expert panel was closed down, do we have a new review panel on hand that could review that possibility?
 - Ning Zhou (VT, CBPO): The protocol asks for the workgroup to evaluate the proposal first. The workgroup needs to determine if the proposed BMPs could be credited with the existing BMP efficiencies in the panel report or they should be recommended to the expert panel for consideration. In the future, to help the workgroup to understand, presentations should first compare proposed new technology with the existing report to demonstrate that it is completely unique.
 - Spano: We may need follow up from Eric to address whether the technology is unique.
 - Jay Prager (MDE): Is this process separate from the efforts of the data sharing committee to have each state come up with an avenue for BMPs to be reviewed at the multi-state level?
 - Zhou: This is not part of that effort. This is for BMP crediting in the model

- Spano recommended the group key up this conversation again in October.
 - **ACTION:** Chesapeake Bay Program staff resend BMP review protocol in order to clarify questions about the review process.
- Marya Levelev (MDE): Maintenance aspects and costs of the systems?
 - Aschenbach: Peat replacement will be a concern down the road, and will likely be necessary after 7 to 10 years. Will have to follow up on costs of the systems.
 - Prager: That timeline may have been revised.
 - Spano: How does that replacement timeline differ from sand?
 - Prager: They are going more than 20 years without sand replacement.
- Montali: The issue is really the process. The WWTWG should not make any decisions until we know the process.
 - Levelev: I thought the initial recommendation comes from the expert panel.
 - Zhou: This proposal was requested before the new protocol was released, so Virginia made the proposal. I don't feel comfortable with a direct proposal from the vendor without a state sponsorship, though the new protocol allows anyone to submit a proposal. This is our first opportunity to evaluate and test the new BMP proposal process, and we can figure out how we want to handle it for the proposals in the future.
- Montali: The attenuation panel does not have the charge to review BMPs. We should not dump it on the attenuation panel.
 - Prager: There should be a standing panel that these requests go to.
 - Zhou: Reviewing BMP is not a task for the attenuation panel. Upon the workgroup recommendations, CBPO will either call back previous onsite system BMP expert panel or convene a new one. Jay made a good point on the need for a standing panel. I will check with WQGIT to find out more about it.
- Spano: The workgroup is not ready to recommend that these BMPs be adopted. We would like to have them reviewed by a panel, but we must figure out which one. At the next call we need to look at existing procedure and test it against this proposal so we can revise protocol.
- Ron Furlan (PA DEP): Are other states having third party, independent testing done, or is the info coming directly from the vendors? I recommend a third party, rather than taking vendor information.
 - Montali: Good point, in preparation for our next call, someone ought to look at the panel report on how to deal with proprietary technologies.
- Prager: It would be good to know if the company is saying whether or not you should always have secondary treatment.
- Spano: Thanked Eric for his work and for bringing this issue forward. Thanked Dave and Jay for the concerns and insights they raised.
 - **ACTION:** Eric should find cost information. Ning should look into the expert panel report and what would be required to turn the existing panel into a standing panel.
- Aschebach: Are there examples from other workgroups for how to proceed with BMP review?
 - Prager: The data sharing workgroup is looking at proprietary proposals, so people are coming forward with BMPs.

- Zhou: Data sharing is a separate process not for crediting in the model. The BMPs going to the model need to be reviewed as required by the protocol. Right now efforts are parallel but we will hopefully soon merge them.
- Spano recommends we understand the data sharing process at the next agenda.
 - Zhou: We will invite Joyce Hudson (EPA) to come to our next meeting and explain their data sharing process.

WWTWG and STAC workshop recommendations

- Zhou reviewed the WWTWG's recommendations in response to STAC recommendations from the OWTS workshop ([Attachment B](#))
 - Zhou: We modified the action statements based on feedback from our previous call. Major text remains the same. Highlighted sections represent changes.
- Spano recommended we include a descriptive header or cover page.
 - **ACTION:** CBPO staff will include a cover page on WWTWG response to STAC OWTS workshop recommendations document.
- Spano: Is anyone else in the Bay Program expecting to see this feedback?
 - Zhou: We will send it to the WQGIT for their approval
 - Spano recommended we include an update to explain that Joyce Hudson will be at the next meeting to explain the data sharing process.
- Levellev: With regards to item #2, are there any discussions on the process itself and how to educate the public?
 - Spano: No, the workgroup generally does not do outreach directly, but it could recommend that the Bay Program take up the suggested outreach efforts, or it could publish the outreach efforts of others.
- Prager: Is this the assumption that we agree with the STAC recommendations?
 - Spano: Yes.
 - Prager: With regards to item #6, we need to promote that all options need to be considered, not just a blanket statement that "viable onsite options will save communities money".
 - Spano: These are just the recommendations from the STAC workshop, we can disagree with the wording of the left column. So in terms of outreach we just want to know if there is something specific you would like the group to pursue, or someone you would like to have come talk to the group.

Updates and other business

- Zhou: Reviewed nutrient attenuation expert panel charge ([here](#)). It has been moving along quickly, establishing fundamental issues like the boundaries of this project and the boundaries of the drain field. We need approval from the workgroup. At next call, Tetrattech will likely provide a formal update.

- **ACTION:** Workgroup members should review nutrient attenuation expert panel charge and provide feedback to David (dwood05@chesapeakebay.net) or Ning (zhou.ning@epa.gov) by September 19.
 - Montali: One change from the original charge is the clarification that attenuation isn't really a BMP. That was noted in the three bottom bullets.
 - Zhou: That is true. Although we characterized this as a BMP panel, attenuation is not a BMP. It is an important factor for estimating the septic loads.
 - **ACTION:** CBPO staff will send out the revised panel charge with the tracked changes.
- Spano: When will we need to confirm and handle any suggested edits? What is our timeframe for an absolute decision?
 - Zhou: There is no specific deadline, but we would like to finish this by September 26th.
- Spano: Recommended that the charges be changed from a bulleted list to a numbered list.
- Spano: Recommended clarification of what is being "reported tracked and verified" in the second bullet at the bottom of the page.
 - Montali: Recommended the removal of the language "reporting, tracking and verifying because it does not apply to this particular panel.
 - Zhou: This is a standard format language for all BMP expert panels but since attenuation is not a BMP, we can report it differently in the final report of this panel.
- Levelov: What does it mean that recommendations are not required for phase 6 modeling?
 - Zhou: Based on timing, they may not be available and therefore are not required.
 - Montali: This is specifically recommendations on improving attenuation in Phase 6.
 - Prager: We are looking at what is the default. My assumption is if the states don't do this, the default remains in place. If it is accepted, it provides the states another option for providing information to the model.
 - Montali: The jurisdictions may not have to do anything.
 - Prager: I think states that can improve will invest, those that can't will not expend the effort.
 - Spano: It could play into phase 6, but only if it is ready and agreed to.
- Spano recommended we revise the wording of the second bullet on the panel charge.
- Spano: Thanked Dave and Jay for their comments and perspectives.
- Zhou reviewed the list of participants for the expert panel and their bios ([here](#)).
 - Spano: Ning Zhou and Lewis Linker (EPA, CBPO) should not be listed as part of the expert panel because they are coordinators, but cannot be vetted as experts on soil attenuation.
 - Spano recognizes work group members Marcia Degen (VA DEH), Joyce Hudson, and Dave Montali who will be participating on the panel.
 - Spano: There is missing information on Carol Ptacek.
 - Montali: Ning's role as coordinator could be placed in parentheses. There is BMP expert panel guidance which mentions avoiding conflict of interest. Panel members must be experts in the field or jurisdictional representatives, and they must not have conflicts of interest.
- Spano discussed the October WQGIT Face-to-Face meeting and asked if there were any concerns the workgroup would like to raise that did not appear on the agenda.

- Montali: History cleanup relative to point sources. That issue needs to be cleaned up by next summer or next fall.
 - Zhou: We have not revisited this since a year ago but we need to start this process. I will start first with my database, then I will forward what I have to each state. We may need to use defaults since there are many new facilities that do not have historical data. States can review the data, fill in any missing data, and replace the defaults with any actual data they have.
 - Spano: Please send me that data so I can verify.
- **ACTION:** Ning will send historic data to Tanya when he begins the historic data clean-up process.
- Spano: Can we have written workgroup updates prepared for the Face-to-Face so we know what everyone is doing?
 - **ACTION:** CBPO staff prepare workgroup updates for the Face-to-Face.
- Spano: Date of next conference call will be determined. Will likely be November.
- Spano: Thanked Eric for his presentation and again welcomed David to the group.

Adjourned

Next conference call:

Tuesday, October 7th, 2014

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/21142/>

Teleconference Participants

Name	Affiliation
Tanya Spano (Chair)	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Ning Zhou (Coordinator)	Virginia Tech, CBPO
David Wood (Staff)	CRC, CBPO
Jay Prager	MDE
Eric Aschenbach	Virginia Dept. Of Health
Greg Busch	MDE
John Diehl	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection
Ron Furlan	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection
Nick Hall	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection
Tony Hummel	DE DNREC
Mary Levelev	MDE
Dave Montali	WV Dept. Of Environmental Protection
George Onyullo	DC Dept. of the Environment
John Weidman	NYDEC