



## SUMMARY

### Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)

#### Conference Call

Tuesday, February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2014, 10:00 AM- 12:00 PM

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/21134>

#### Welcome and Introduction

- Tanya Spano (Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments; WWTWG Chair) convened the call and reviewed the day's [agenda](#).
- Jeremy Hanson (Chesapeake Research Consortium) verified participants on the call. He directed participants' attention to the January WWTWG minutes ([Attachment A](#)) and asked for any comments or corrections. None were raised; the minutes were accepted as submitted.
  - **DECISION:** The January WWTWG minutes were approved as submitted.

#### Wastewater Treatment Workgroup Priorities

- Spano directed participants attention to the [draft WWTWG priorities table](#). She reviewed and explained the table with participants. She noted the workgroup is still evaluating biosolids and spray irrigation and not yet to the collaboration stage with the Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG).
- Allan Brockenbrough (VA DEQ) and Dave Schepens (DE DNREC) were fine with the table.
- Marya Levelev (MDE): accounting for trades is "ongoing." There is no current reporting system to track or indicate which practices are part of a trade. Just wanted to point it out that this is an issue.
  - Spano: This is our first cut and we did not have a target date on this. This was a priority coming out of the MPA discussion and October 2012 WQGIT meeting. If no preferences or drivers for the schedule on this, suggest we reach out to Trading/Offsets Workgroup (TOWG) and have an update during the March WWTWG call and determine when to discuss this later this year. We can discuss more offline and report back to the workgroup.
  - Zhou: Based on what I've heard from the TOWG and EPA, there is no clear policy on how this tracking would be done yet.
  - Glynn Rountree (NAHB): this is something I tried to bring up in the STAC on-site workshop. There is a new program in North Carolina that I will follow-up on. Feel this is an important topic from perspective of homebuilders.
  - Jeremy Hanson (CRC, CBPO) noted that EPA was designated as the lead on this trade tracking priority and developed the initial workplan following the October 2012 WQGIT meeting.
  - Allan Brockenbrough suggested the workgroup needs a conversation about the intent of this priority. Is this for transparency or to put all these trades into a single database? Need an understanding of the intent.
    - **Post-meeting note:** All the Midpoint Assessment Priority workplans are posted under the "projects & resources" tab on the WQGIT page: [http://www.chesapeakebay.net/groups/group/water\\_quality\\_goal\\_implementation\\_team](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/groups/group/water_quality_goal_implementation_team)

- Spano: We know we have to coordinate with the AgWG on biosolids and spray irrigation. We will need to agree on when to coordinate with the AgWG on the substance.
- Eric Aschenbach (VDH): asked if there was a particular reason why June 30, 2014 was listed as the date for identifying/quantifying loads and splits from commercial and residential onsite systems.
  - Zhou: We added June as a placeholder. This is something we can approach after we finish testing the biosolids and spray irrigation data template. We usually only estimate the individual systems based on population, but we know we have some larger on-site systems out there. Perhaps we can collect that data since there is no accurate way to estimate them based on population and larger systems are normally monitored.
  - Dave Schepens (DE DNREC) noted that Delaware has been pushing for this distinction since they have community systems.
  - Spano summarized that June 30, 2014 is a placeholder to queue up this discussion by that time.
- Spano: We need to coordinate with the LUWG to see where they stand and what assumptions they are making or considering regarding the septic service areas and septic numbers.
  - Montali: we are talking about the number of septic, not the quality or the types of systems.
    - Zhou: Correct.
  - Zhou: When we dig into the data we may find it will take longer than expected, so it is better to start on this earlier.
  - Montali: LUWG plans to finalize the land uses and input decks for the phase 6 model calibration in December 2015. We may need to move earlier on this.
- Spano: We will clarify which dates are placeholders for planning, and match up deadlines with modeling and other phase 6 model deadlines. Any other questions regarding the Midpoint Assessment?
- Montali asked for clarification about annual progress reporting as an “other priority.” Is it simply an annual activity that this workgroup needs to ensure happens?
  - Spano: Correct. Included it in the table to make sure the workgroup remains aware of it.
  - Montali suggested to refer to it as “other activities” rather than “other priorities.”
- Spano: The WWTWG has not proposed a STAC workshop yet this year. In March, would like to discuss potential ideas for future STAC proposals.
  - Rountree: Hope to have the report finished no later than end of March. Will be retired in April. Would be happy to report to the workgroup in March.
- Spano noted the deadline for this year’s proposals for STAC workshops are due February 14<sup>th</sup>, so this will be a discussion for the following fiscal year.
- Spano: the calibration input deck would fall under the Midpoint Assessment. Anything else missing from the workgroup’s perspective?
  - Levelev: question about how the Model simulates CSO separation. What happens to the loads from CSOs? Perhaps that is something to include in the “other” category.
  - Zhou explained the CSO land is transitioned to urban land, and the CSO load for that area is reduced to zero when the combined system is eliminated.

### **Wastewater BMP Verification Guidance – Update**

- Hanson thanked the workgroup members for their feedback on comments during and following the January WWTWG meeting. He noted the revised guidance was submitted to the Verification Review Panel and Verification Committee on February 3<sup>rd</sup> after incorporating the final round of comments from the workgroup.
- Spano thanked Hanson and Zhou for their work on the verification guidance and the workgroup members for their input on the various drafts.

### **Biosolids and Spray Irrigation – data template**

- Zhou explained that following the January 14<sup>th</sup> WWTWG call he met with Matt Johnston (UMD, CBPO) and Jeff Sweeney (EPA, CBPO) to discuss the [potential data requirements](#) in the [draft template \(.xlsx format\)](#).
- Spano expressed concerns that have previously been raised by the workgroup or MWCOG members. Even if the data is available for some sites at the described specificity, may not be proper to expect that detail for all sites and set default assumptions.
- Schepens: Essentially this would imply the data is required and the optional items are not really optional because then defaults are applied. Do not see how we could come up with a default for crop type or some of the other elements.
  - Spano felt this gets to a fundamental issue and these concerns have been raised before. We want to ensure we can capture these loads in a way that is reasonably accurate, and this may not always mean feeding the Model detailed information. Post processing or some other option might be the better way to handle this. Would not spend a lot of time coming up with defaults. Some more clarity on the modelers' thoughts would be helpful.
  - Brockenbrough: we have a pretty good database for biosolids in Virginia and we can dump the data for submission to CBPO, and maybe that is how it was done previously. Getting it into a specific spreadsheet format at the field scale would be a significant effort. We do not have a comparable database for spray irrigation and would have to reference other records or forms.
  - Schepens: Delaware has Total Nitrogen and Total Phosphorous for our spray irrigation data, but not specific species. Would have to defer to default numbers, which sometimes seem way off.
  - Montali: If we are going to represent nutrient loads from biosolids we would have to massage the data we have. We can sit down and look at our data and work with the modelers to apply the data in a way that makes sense. As time goes on we will not have the detail to know how much went on what crops. We will have to make assumptions on this.
  - Levelev: how would biosolids affect nutrient applications in agriculture in the model?
    - Montali explained that the nutrients associated with biosolids are not represented in the model right now, except in Virginia, so those nutrients are getting lumped in elsewhere since they are not explicitly defined. Right now it is a very detailed and mechanistic way to determine what the

inputs are for agriculture lands. It may change when we switch to the Phase 6 Model in PQUAL, instead of AGCHEM.

- Spano: does not seem we are ready to endorse this template or test its application at this time, but perhaps the states are able to look at the template and get a better feel for their state programs and data. Will need to consider what the significance is for switching loads from manure or fertilizer to biosolids. What matters is whether the information is accurate enough for the state to manage the load and reduce it.
  - Schepens noted that there may be a potential for double counting in cases where biosolids are applied under a nutrient management plan.
  - Montali: next step might need to be to ask the modelers how the new model will simulate how nutrient loads and inputs are applied to the land. If it comes down to a more simplified approach to capture the loads coming off the land, with and without nutrient management, then there may not be a need to put so much effort into biosolids or spray irrigation.
- Spano noted the time and noted it will likely take a couple more meetings before the workgroup can take an action or make a decision on this.
  - Spano summarized that if the workgroup determines that biosolids and spray irrigation are important and should be included in the model, we will need to know how far back to provide the data. It will be very difficult to go back very many years at all.
- Spano noted the workgroup was not taking actions indicated on the agenda. Will revisit this for further discussion over the next couple months.

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

- Spano asked for updates from the states; none were raised.
- Spano: DC Water has a CSO proposal out for public comment. They are proposing a hybrid approach to their Long Term Control Plan that would utilize green infrastructure in combination with grey infrastructure. The Deep Tunnel would proceed as planned, but they are hoping to integrate more green infrastructure. Reduced costs are not the driver, but they hope to reap additional benefits from green infrastructure. They have support from the Department of Justice and EPA, and they are seeking stakeholder input.
- Spano thanked the participants for their time and discussion.

#### **Adjourned**

### Teleconference participants

<u>Name</u>		<u>Affiliation</u>
Tanya	Spano (Chair)	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Ning	Zhou (Coord.)	Virginia Tech, CBPO
Jeremy	Hanson (Staff)	CRC, CBPO
Eric	Aschenbach	Virginia Dept. of Health
Allan	Brockenbrough	Virginia Dept. of Environmental Quality
Greg	Busch	MDE
Joyce	Hudson	EPA
Marya	Levelev	MDE
Dharmendra	Kumar	PA DEP
Dave	Montali	WV DEP
Glynn	Rountree	NAHB
Dave	Schepens	DE DNREC
John	Weidman	NY DEC