



SUMMARY

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG) Conference Call

Tuesday, September 10th, 2013, 10:00 AM- 3:00 PM

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19152>

Welcome & Introductions

- Tanya Spano (Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments; WWTWG Chair) convened the meeting shortly after 10:00AM. She welcomed participants and reviewed the day's [agenda](#).
- Spano noted the minutes were recently distributed. She asked members to provide comments or corrections via email.
- **ACTION:** WWTWG members to provide any comments or corrections for the June minutes to Jeremy Hanson (jhanson@chesapeakebay.net) by September 17th.

Proposed Supplemental Indicator for Reporting Point Source Progress

- Greg Busch (MDE) recalled that the workgroup had discussed the proposed supplemental indicator during its May and June conference call. He noted that MDE provided a [technical memo](#) to accompany [their presentation](#).
 - Busch reviewed slides on the proposed supplemental indicator that would be based on a 10-year normalized flow for municipal wastewater sources. Industrial sources would still be based on 1-year flow under the proposed supplemental indicator.
 - Under the proposed supplemental indicator (if jurisdictions agreed to utilize it for their programs):
 - WWTP load and flow reduction implementation progresses could perhaps be credited in the same way as nonpoint source BMPs are credited.
 - And that all calculations would be done by the Bay Program and the facility upgrade information submissions are voluntary.
 - No submissions would be required for the flow adjustment.
 - Ning Zhou (Virginia Tech, CBPO; WWTWG Coordinator): if states submit this information, there would be two aspects: Flow reduction and process upgrades. What numbers would they submit for progress runs?
 - Busch: They would provide the NPDES facility number and year that the upgrade went online, along with the new permit limit numbers, e.g. 4 mg/l for TN in Maryland. If they do not have permit limits, they would provide the actual load after upgrade
 - Zhou: Would they submit design level for concentration?
 - Busch: No. Not for concentration.
 - Spano: if getting credit for an upgrade, would suggest that it gets defined through the load.
 - Brian Trulear (EPA Region 3) asked about if a facility upgrade goes online in the middle of the progress year and how that would be captured to accurately display progress under the proposed methods.

- Busch noted that there will still be a progress run based on all the DMR data. We considered using the DMR concentrations following the upgrade in the indicator, but that became very complicated. We wanted to keep the supplemental indicator simpler, especially for communication reasons.
- Denorah Delmasy (MDE): want to be clear that the Progress Run will still be based on the DMRs. We want the supplemental indicator so the treatment plants can receive some credit for practices or upgrades even if they were installed later in the Progress Year. Other sectors receive credit as soon as the BMP is installed and reported.
- Jeff Sweeney (EPA, CBPO): for normalizing the flow, you talked about using the average of the past ten years. There was mention of population, so when do you use population?
 - Busch: If we take an averaging period, e.g. 2000-2010, the average population of a WWTP over that area is closer to 2005 than 2010. The growth is handled by using the average flow.
 - Sweeney: So the population here is not necessarily the population served by that plant, but the county.
 - Busch: Correct, for ease of calculation. The Census provides annual updates of what they estimate the population is between the Census years.
 - Spano noted anomalies might arise, especially if we apply this methodology to Blue Plains.
 - Peter Claggett (USGS, CBPO; Land Use Workgroup Coordinator) noted it can be difficult to attribute sewer service areas to specific treatment plants. There could be ways to do that, with the right data.
 - Spano recalled a previous point. Sewer connections and service population continue to increase, but the wastewater flows are not increasing due to conservation and other factors. Something to consider.
- Sweeney: What does the CBPO do for jurisdictions that opt to not participate in the supplemental indicator?
 - Zhou: if they don't want to be included in the supplemental indicator and they do not report the data, then CBPO staff would not include them.
 - Spano noted that Dave Montali (WV DEP) was unable to attend, but had expressed concerns on this point. It is not just a manpower issue, but WV does not feel a need for the indicator for their purposes. They understand why Maryland wants the indicator.
 - Degen: Virginia feels the same way.
 - Spano: to clarify, the CBP would not characterize the jurisdictions using the supplemental indicator if they did not want to be included.
 - Spano noted another point from Montali about design flows. As time goes on, facilities will get closer to their load caps and design limits. Precipitation and variability may not be an issue for very

long. Dave asked for some additional time to digest the information and proposal before the work group takes formal action on this recommendation.

- Spano recapped that the workgroup's decision will boil down to two yes-or-no questions:
 - Does your jurisdiction have any technical questions or reservations about Maryland's proposed supplemental indicator?
 - Does your jurisdiction plan to participate for the new indicator?
- Spano noted that since the supplemental indicator would be voluntary, jurisdictions would have the opportunity to start or stop reporting for it at their discretion.
- Other questions for MDE.
- Spano asked about the combined sewer systems and I/I efforts as a BMP. Would that need to go through the BMP Review Protocol?
 - Busch: No, since it would only be counted in the supplemental indicator.
- Zhou reiterated that the data submission for the supplemental indicator would be for states that choose to submit. No assumption of a default.
- Spano noted there do not seem to be any objections on the technical merits of the proposal.
- Spano summarized the follow-up actions:
 - **ACTION:** Any final questions or comments on Maryland's proposed supplemental indicator should be sent to MDE (courtesy of Greg Busch, gregory.busch@maryland.gov) by Tuesday, September 17th.
 - Use of the proposed supplemental indicator would be voluntary, at the discretion of each jurisdiction.
 - **ACTION:** Each jurisdiction should indicate by Sept. 24th if they:
 - a) Are okay technically with Maryland's use of this supplemental indicator for their WWTP Milestone reporting;
 - b) Whether your jurisdiction is:
 - 1. Interested in reporting for this supplemental indicator at this time or in the near future.
 - 2. Not interested in reporting for the proposed supplemental indicator at this time.
 - MDE intends to report out on their planned use of this supplemental indicator at an upcoming WQGIT conference call, following the WWTWG's recommendation.

Forecasting/Back casting Septic Systems in MDP and CBP Models

- Peter Claggett (USGS, CBPO; Land Use Workgroup Coordinator) explained that the Land Use Workgroup will depend on the WWTWG's feedback on how to develop a finer resolution of land uses for on-site systems. He reviewed the CBP's current methods for estimating population on sewer and on-site septic systems in 2010 and 2015.
 - View his [presentation](#) for details and graphics.
- Spano noted there are differences between zoning for sewer service and sewer service areas.
 - Claggett: That is an issue and the LUWG has asked for land use information from local jurisdictions, including zoning and sewer service areas. We will be getting information from all Maryland counties. We received data from a handful of localities across the other states.
 - Claggett: we would like data from the states on numbers of septic systems. That allows us to check our assumptions and methods for accuracy.
- Jason Dubow (MDP) noted that as part of the 2013 Progress Run, there is a backcast of how many septic systems were installed over the preceding time period. There is also a projected baseline used in planning for the 2014-15 Milestones. Maryland is asking that MDP's projections be used to calibrate the Land Change Model septic projections used for annual progress runs and projected baselines.
 - View the [MDP presentation](#) for more details.
 - Stephanie Martens (MDP) explained the MDP growth simulation model.
- Claggett noted some differences in the data and methods. For example, CBP used the sewershed data in place of Priority Funding Areas (PFAs).
 - Dubow: This does not consider impacts of policy, but is rather based on what has been installed or constructed over time. Sewersheds do change over time. MDP processes about 50-100 amendments to sewer planning areas each year.
- Spano noted the time and explained more specific information is needed for a real understanding of the impact. She called for questions; hearing none, she asked for clarification on when a decision needs to be made on this, and when the workgroup can see more specific data on the result of this decision.
 - Claggett: A couple things going on. We have over two years to define terms for the Phase 6 Watershed Model under the Midpoint Assessment. How we depict land uses between now and then is not static. Second, we have the progress runs and milestones. We just released the draft 2013 Progress and draft 2015 milestone land uses and septic projection numbers. Would be ideal for states to compare the projections with their data and communicate any differences in the numbers. It would also be helpful to look at more local scales to see where some of the differences are, and try to understand why.
 - Sweeney: there is a protocol for what we can use in the model. What is being asked here is whether the MDP methods acceptable to supplant Peter's methods in the 2013 progress run. We would not be replacing the absolute numbers, just the trends for this version of the model. We would apply the trends from the data for the 2013 progress run and 2015 milestones.
 - Marcia Degen (VA Dept. of Health): so this would just change the trends for Maryland?
 - Dubow: Correct.

- Spano noted that the requested action was worded misleadingly. See two distinct questions. First, what's the timing for input about Maryland using this data? Second, what is timeline for discussion of potentially larger implications?
 - Zhou: This is the first time we've been briefed on this issue. There is confusion about how detached and attached (type of house) would matter if we look at PFAs or not, versus the sewershed.
- Spano noted the time.
 - Dubow noted there is a fairly tight turnaround on feedback for the draft progress run (i.e. by Oct 5th). If the WQGIT would need to make a decision then we need to move quickly.
- After lunch Spano summarized that the workgroup will revisit this issue on October 1st, with more specific information on how Maryland's estimates of septic systems affect their 2013 Progress and 2015 milestones relative to CBPO estimates. After considering recommendations from the Land Use Workgroup, the WWTWG will make a recommendation about accepting Maryland's estimates in place of CBP estimates.

Spray Irrigation, Biosolids, and On-Site Systems Data

- Insufficient time to address this topic. Deferred until October conference call.

Updates

- Spano provided two updates:
 - STAC released the report from the 2012 STAC workshop sponsored by the wastewater workgroup.
 - The report is available on the STAC website here: http://www.chesapeake.org/pubs/303_Spano2013.pdf
 - Planning is still underway for this year's STAC workshop for on-site systems
 - Glynn Rountree (National Association of Homebuilders): The workshop is tentatively scheduled for December 17th. WWTWG members can contact him if interested in seeing the draft agenda or in attending. Names for suggested invitees can be sent to him at grountree@nahb.org or Matt Ellis (EllisM@si.edu).
- Maureen Tooke (EPA) noted that EPA is planning a week to raise awareness of septic systems among homeowners. First year for this effort, hope it will grow each year. Can pass on information to Jeremy. Will be sharing draft press releases and social media blurbs to partners such as CBP and COG.

Recommendations of the On-Site System Expert Panel

- Tanya Spano reconvened the meeting at 1:00PM and introduced Vic D'Amato (Tetra Tech).
- D'Amato described the expert panel's charge and membership. He provided background on baseline loadings for on-site systems and reviewed the panel's recommendations.
 - View [the presentation](#) for more details. Post-meeting note: The slides were updated to correct a couple errors pointed out during the discussion.
 - View the [draft recommendations of the on-site systems expert panel](#) for additional details and the full recommendations.

- He noted the panel only addresses TN reductions from treatment technologies, not the attenuation between edge of system and edge of stream.
- Spano: anything in the report about the long term sustainability or cost of these BMP systems?
 - Jay Prager (MDE): The panel discussed some technologies that may be viable at some point in the future, but we selected and made recommendations for technologies that we felt were established and viable.
 - Degen: in lieu of sampling we have operation and maintenance requirements to ensure the systems are installed and functioning.
 - Degen: We tried to be conservative in our recommendations to account for potential performance and function issues.
 - Joyce Hudson (EPA) noted the Model Program recently developed by EPA under Executive Order 13508 has an appendix that discusses technologies. That report did not go in depth on cost issues.
 - Prager: compromise would be that individual systems should not be sampled, but a statistical confidence level by sampling a subset of the systems. For example, Maryland already has 4000 of these systems and expects 2000 more per year, so it would be a lot of effort to sample all of them, but could get a very good statistical confidence level by sampling a small subset of those practices.[?]
- Hudson mentioned that EPA-Office of Water is considering to move forward with a discussion of data sharing and reciprocity among the states. Still in very preliminary stages, so no specifics at this point.
- Sweeney commended the panel for the excellent draft report. Especially appreciate the effort on investigating the baseline since we need a default in the event that a state does not provide specifics about the denitrification system.
- Zhou: Later we will develop a template and outline the specifics of what will need to be reported by jurisdictions to receive credit in the progress runs.
- Degen noted that new Virginia regulations take effect in December, so Virginia would like to earn credit for these practices in the phase 5 WSM.
- Spano asked workgroup members to provide feedback on the report by September 13th.
- **ACTION:** WWTWG members to provide feedback on the draft report by September 13th.
- Spano thanked the expert panelists for their tremendous effort.

Adjourned

Next meeting:

Tuesday, October 1st, 2013

10:00AM – 12:00PM

www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19153/

Meeting and Teleconference Participants

<u>Name</u>		<u>Affiliation</u>
Tanya	Spano	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Ning	Zhou	Virginia Tech, CBPO
Jeremy	Hanson	CRC, CBPO
Eric	Aschenbach	Virginia Dept. of Health
Brian	Ashby	Delaware
Jay	Conta	VDH
Denorah	Dalmasy	MDE
Vic	D'Amato	Tetra Tech
Marcia	Degen	VDH
John	Diehl	PA DEP
Karen	Fenchak	PA DEP
Robert	Goo	EPA
Alana	Hartman	WV DEP
Joyce	Hudson	EPA
Marty	Hurd	DDOE
Jim	Kreissl	
Dharmendra	Kumar	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Marya	Levelev	Maryland Dept. of Environment
Lew	Linker	EPA, CBPO
George	Onyullo	District of Columbia, Department of Environment
Glynn	Rountree	National Association of Home Builders
Greg	Sandi	Maryland Dept. of Environment
Dave	Schepens	DE DNREC
Brian	Trulear	EPA, Region 3
John	Weidman	New York Dept. of Environmental Conservation
Beth	Zinecker	USGS, CBPO