



AGENDA
Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)
Teleconference
Tuesday, March 7th, 2017, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Conference Line: 866-299-3188, code: 267-985-6222#
Adobe Connect: <http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/wwtwg/>

Actions and Decisions:

Decision: The WWTWG approved the February minutes as submitted.

Action: The WWTWG will continue to look at CSO and sewer service spatial data coverage for phase 6 and provide feedback using the online tools on the Phase 6 land use viewer tool **by COB March 17th**. Michelle Williams (CRC) will send a reminder to the workgroup with information on how to do so. The WWTWG will also discuss feedback on the CSO coverage at the April WWTWG meeting.

Action: the WWTWG will provide comments by jurisdiction on the draft BMP impacts/co-benefits report to Ning Zhou (EPA) and Michelle Williams (CRC) for compilation **by COB March 17th**. Ning and Michelle will send compiled feedback to Mark Sievers (TetraTech) by March 24th.

Action: Peter Claggett (USGS) will send out a draft table of populations on sewer and septic in the Bay watershed before the April WWTWG meeting.

Action: WWTWG members will identify any minor wastewater facilities in their jurisdictions that have implemented upgrades as potential topics for a webinar hosted by the workgroup.

Action: Jurisdictions are asked to submit feedback to Ning Zhou (VT) on the proposed table showing CSO load reductions **by COB March 17th** in time for final data submission by April 1st.

Action: Ning Zhou (VT) will incorporate feedback on the CSO Phase 6 table and present a second draft table to the WWTWG in April.

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

Discussion:

- Spano: DE and PA have been held up, their feedback will be done offline.
- No changes were proposed to the February minutes. Tanya Spano (MCOG) moved to approve the February meeting minutes as submitted.

Decision: The WWTWG approved the February minutes.

Comments on Sewer Service Areas in Phase 6 Model – Jurisdictions

CSO and sewer service area spatial coverage that is currently available on the Phase 6 land use viewer website. WWTWG members agreed to do an initial review and **submit any major comments using the online tools by COB March 2nd**. The workgroup also agreed to hold follow-up discussions on data gaps during the next workgroup call.

Discussion:

- Peter Claggett (USGS): Quentin called in sick and I'm not prepared to discuss in his absence, but I will try to address any new questions or comments people have today.
- Spano: Who has reviewed online tools and provided comments?
 - George Onyullo (DE): Still going through, but no major changes. We're pretty confident of all the data we submitted. More of a QA/QC to make sure nothing got missed.
 - Greg Busch (MD): The land use viewer displayed older version of coverage map, but we're addressing that directly with Peter's Group
 - Angela Redwine (VA): We didn't submit any comments before March 2nd. Our only comment is that a sewer polygon in Powhatan County is missing
 - Spano: PA, WV aren't present for this meeting, so they'll have to give feedback offline.
 - Rashid Ahmed (NY): Can you clarify what kinds of feedback we're giving here?
 - Spano: We're making sure loads are properly attributed to land uses, and making sure the data is correct.
 - Claggett: Angela, if you have a missing polygon, then we need that data.
 - Ahmed: So you are looking for all the sewer service areas, significant and nonsignificant?
 - Zhou: Yes, we need all the sewer service areas including both significant and nonsignificant.
 - Tanya: I suggest that we need an offline session with NY, so you can follow up with Peter and Quentin afterwards.
- Spano: After this call, we need to recraft our email reminder with a link to the viewer, reminder of what we want folks to do, and next deadline for submitting. We also need to figure out what ASAP means, especially given the two-month delay in the watershed model review timeline.
- Spano: Does anyone have any questions about use of the tool? Anything Peter wants to re-emphasize?
 - Claggett: By the beginning of next week, we'll have tabular summaries on populations on sewer and septic, and we'll send out a draft version of that table.
 - Spano: Is there a GIS component of table?
 - Claggett: the GIS component is the SSA (Sever Service Area). We look for single, occupied housing units outside SSAs as our counts of septic systems. We won't be sending out a separate GIS layer.
 - Spano: We have some other things we can link to population. We might check in with you to get that info to our GIS layers.
 - Claggett: We're using Round 9 of MWCOC's cooperative forecast:
<https://www.mwcog.org/documents/2016/11/16/cooperative-forecasts-employment-population-and-household-forecasts-by-transportation-analysis-zone-cooperative-forecast-demographics-housing-population/>
- Spano: Given that we haven't fully addressed our action item, we need a continuation offline to get this feedback completed.

Action: The WWTWG will continue to look at CSO and sewer service spatial data coverage for phase 6 and provide feedback using the online tools on the Phase 6 land use viewer tool. The WWTWG will also discuss feedback on the CSO coverage at the April WWTWG meeting.

Action: Peter Claggett (USGS) will send out a draft table of populations on sewer and septic in the Bay watershed.

Mark Sievers will present the draft report to the work group. The workgroup will be asked to review the draft report and associated appendices, in order to **combine all the comments from the workgroup into a single file for submission by March 24th**. Comments should identify any text that needs further explanation, results that need to be expanded, scoring that needs to be revisited, or provide suggested text to be added. If there are conflicting comments, the workgroup is asked to indicate which comments take precedence.

Discussion:

- Onyullo: Within the framework, BMPs are viewed as measures of progress. What does that mean with the scoring here, in terms of measuring progress?
 - Sievers: These are more for planning purposes. If a jurisdiction is coming up with a plan and they're choosing between BMPs that cost the same and are just as easy to implement, they can use this as a differentiating factor. We're not indexing performance.
- Spano: There have been concerns about using this tool, and whether it will be used as a standard by which BMPs are assessed internally, or whether this is just a tool for implementers to use to look at BMPs differently.
 - Sievers: I do have a section saying how the data should be used and how local jurisdictions can use this report.
 - Spano: I think that consideration should be repeated throughout the document to remind audiences the purpose of this data.
 - Onyullo: All these issues need to be fleshed out so people know exactly what these scores are intended to do.
- Onyullo: What does it mean when you talk about addressing goals with BMPs? What do these relative values really mean?
 - Sievers: This looks at the relative benefits of BMPs, for example with septic, on other management strategies.
 - Onyullo: This table assumes that you maintain all as equal, but most BMPs have site specific considerations. BMPs are really variable by site, so there are limitations here. That goes a long way towards alleviating some of our concerns about misuse of these scores.
- Spano: Are there any numbers in here that strike you as not generally making sense?
 - Dave Shepen (DE): Why wouldn't you have nutrient removal as part of the BMP that was assessed with this?
 - Ning Zhou (VT): This is an example of separating the main benefit and the co-benefit of BMPs. Nutrient reduction is the goal of the BMP, like a medicine to treat an infection, but this study looks at the side-effects, the co-benefits. These are secondary considerations for planning purposes and not modeling purposes.
 - Sievers: We didn't want to duplicate the other reports that look at nutrient reduction efficiencies. N reduction isn't really a co-benefit and there's already documentation on it out there.
 - Spano: This is an attempt to develop relative BMP scores to aid in strategic planning done through CBT grants. It's not part of the WIP process and it's not a replacement for unique characteristics or nutrient removal effectiveness.
- Spano: Each jurisdiction should internally coordinate and submit consolidated comments by state level and send comments to Ning and Michelle by March 17th. Then we'll look at it and send comments to Mark.
- Zhou: If you have your own scoring for BMPs, feel free to submit comments on the scoring based on your jurisdiction's practices.

- Spano: Text explanation for scores are in the appendices. If you have an opinion that a score in the report needs revision, you should have some justification for why the scores should be different.
- Spano: We can send out a reminder and link to where you can find these documents. The report and appendices D and E are on the calendar page and will be there for the foreseeable future.

Action: the WWTWG will provide comments by jurisdiction on the draft BMP impacts report to Ning Zhou (VT) and Michelle Williams (CRC) for compilation by March 17th. Ning and Michelle will send compiled feedback to Mark Sievers (TetraTech) by March 24th.

Potential webinar topics – WWTWG members

WWTWG members agreed to identify innovative and/or highly successful nutrient reduction projects within the watershed that would be appropriate for a webinar hosted by the workgroup.

Discussion:

- Spano: Has anyone identified particular projects that might be good webinar topics? We have the Alexandria plant and DC Water that may be good resources for webinars. What others?
 - Zhou: We previously discussed nonsignificant facilities. The TMDL does not require action on minor facilities, but there is potential to tap into this area with low cost retrofits. Some minor facilities upgraded not for the nutrient removal purpose, but to save money in operation; we have several small plants in PA that did this to save money. Maybe we can invite them to share their stories as a case study for minor facilities.
 - Spano: Ning, can you touch base with PA folks to see if they can recommend the facilities you're thinking about? We will return to this topic later on. Check with your jurisdictions and see if your facilities have a worthwhile story to share, especially minor plants.

Action: WWTWG members will identify any minor wastewater facilities in their jurisdictions that have implemented upgrades as potential topics for a webinar hosted by the workgroup.

Updates and other business

- **Progress Run 2016 and 2-Year (2017) Milestone review--Ning Zhou, VT**
 - Overall, 2016 progress is the same as what was presented at the last call. EPA is evaluating the 2017 milestone with the 2016 progress. Overall, there are no major issues for WW in this evaluation. The next progress year will use Phase 6 that requires data submissions for new data—those new data requirements are already included in the grant guidance-- so progress 2017 could be very different from the current progress run.
- **CSO reduction timing verification. --Ning Zhou, VT**
 - We will use the CSO implementation data provided by jurisdictions in the past to determine the timing when CSO reduction happened and adjust its loads and service areas accordingly in the model. There are mainly two reduction methods: Separation and storage. Separation will return the CSO land to urban land in the model. The CSO areas will stay as CSO land with the Storage method. A table of the reduction timing and methods will be presented to the workgroup. Jurisdictions should provide updates/corrections by March 17.

Discussion:

- Zhou: The deadline for submitting this data is April 1st. We need reviews and updates from jurisdictions to me by March 17th.
- Spano: Is this acreage based on what Peter Claggett has?
 - Zhou: Yes, that's based on the newest CSO shapefiles
 - Spano: There should be a note on the table saying what the acreage is based on.
 - Zhou: All the acreage on here represents the original CSO data before the reduction. I've asked for specific dates when the reduction started but states doesn't seem to have that info.
 - Spano: Is there a GIS component to go with this table?
 - Zhou: There are CSO shapefiles identified by CSO NPDES. We could also add the land river segments into this table. For tracking the time series changes in CSO reduction, we thought making time series shapefile would be too much trouble. We can track reductions by time through the database, not on the shapefiles.
 - Spano: So that original acreage represents the original CSO area? If you eliminate a certain percent, then what's left should have the current acreage that's in Peter's shapefile, correct?
 - Zhou: We used the original CSO in the LU shapefile. That shapefile serves as baseline, and we take reductions off that.
 - Spano: So Peter's current coverage shows the old boundary, and you'll use this to make the acreage reduction and put that into a shapefile later?
 - Zhou: We may do the time series shapefiles later, but we don't have time right now. We have the reduction by year through data tables, not through shapefiles.
- Spano: We need to understand that the percent acreage reductions may not have a linear relationship with actual loads.
 - Zhou: It's a 1:1. If acreage reduced 4%, then loads reduce 4%
 - Spano: I don't really agree with that methodology but we can talk about that later. I also think this table is overly simplistic. There's a flaw in presuming that the percent has a direct relation to load. I'd also like this table to include the definitions of what you mean by these categories. In terms of storage, you need to be prepared for loads to be variable in the way they are expressed. I think loads should be reported, and not storage.
 - Zhou: For load, if jurisdictions reported the actual overflow numbers that already include the actual reductions, we used that directly. That's part of the hybrid approach we took.
 - Spano: I think the table needs to be modified to reflect some of those considerations.
 - Zhou: Yes, I'll incorporate those and send out a new table, with more description.
 - Allen Brockenbrough (VA): All these systems are different, so I don't know if you can categorize only by storage and acreage.
 - Zhou: Let me know what recommendations you have for me to incorporate into the table.
 - Spano: Do you have the load data? Have you already shared what you do have?
 - Zhou: I presented that a couple months ago. This time we decided on the hybrid approach that used whatever CSO data is available?
 - Spano: Can you send that original data to today's calendar page or send out a reminder with a link to that data?
 - Zhou: Yes.
- Spano: We're working through mechanics and all this will become regular progress reporting practices as we bring things into the watershed model.

- Zhou: We'll talk next call about SSO. One of the current model's problems is that it underestimates during storm events.
- Spano: I wonder why the Bay model even cares about daily CSO loads?
- Zhou: The Bay model runs on daily basis. Storm events are some highlighted points to present how well the model responds. It's not an issue for TMDLs, but we do need those accurate storm event loads to understand how well the model responds to the observed.
- Spano: Can you line some numbers up to give some context on those loads?
- Zhou: Yes, I'm actually putting together numbers from MD right now. I'll present those at April's call.

Action: Jurisdictions are asked to submit feedback to Ning Zhou (VT) on the proposed table showing CSO load reductions by March 17th in time for final data submission by April 1st.

Action: Ning Zhou (VT) will incorporate feedback on the CSO Phase 6 table and present a second draft table to the WWTWG in April.

Adjourned

Next conference call:

April 4th, 2017 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

April Agenda Items:

- **SSO and Bypass:** Ning Zhou will present some MD SSO and bypass data with modeling findings to show their relative importance to the model simulation. The workgroup can decide whether to continue investigation on this issue or act on this issue for future models.
- **Toxics Workgroup PCB project update**
- **Partnership and Jurisdictional Review of the Suite of Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership Models: A Proposal**

List of Call Participants

| Name | Affiliation |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Tanya Spano, Chair | MWCOG |
| Ning Zhou, Coordinator | EPA |
| Michelle Williams, Staffer | CRC |
| Rashid Ahmed (NY) | NY DEC |
| Dave Shepen (DE) | DE |
| Greg Busch (MD) | MDE |
| George Onyullo (DC) | DOEE |
| Diane Davis (DC) | DOEE |
| Angela Redwine (VA) | VDH |
| Allen Brockenbrough (VA) | DEQ |
| Matt Richardson (VA) | DEQ |

| | |
|----------------|-----------|
| Mark Sievers | TetraTech |
| Vic D'amato | TetraTech |
| Peter Claggett | USGS |