



SUMMARY

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)

Conference Call

Tuesday, June 4th, 2013, 10:00 AM- 12:00 PM

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19149/>

Welcome & Introductions

- Tanya Spano convened the call shortly after 10:00AM. She welcomed participants and reviewed the morning's [agenda](#).

Action Item: Approval of May WWTWG Minutes

- Spano asked for any comments or corrections to the May minutes ([Attachment A](#)) as written.
 - None were raised; the minutes were approved.
- **DECISION:** The May conference call minutes were accepted as submitted.

MDE Proposal on the Wet Weather Issue

- Greg Busch (MDE) described Maryland's proposals to potentially improve wastewater performance evaluation.
 - View MDE's [presentation](#) for more details
- Ron Furlan (PA DEP): assign concentrations in permits rather than loads?
 - DMR loads coming out of the plants.
- Busch described Maryland's proposed flow averaging method. Flow would be adjusted based on a ten year average and population increase.
 - He requested that feedback be provided to MDE by the end of June.
- Allan Brockenbrough (VA DEQ): No questions. If we choose to go down this road, the approach seems reasonable.
- Furlan: we are load based, so this does not affect Pennsylvania.
- Jim George (MDE): we are judged on annual basis for progress. Milestones are short-term evaluation. Looking at long term data and trends show clear decreases from management actions; a ten year average removes the noise, but that is not how we are judged.
- Spano commended MDE for the thoughtful presentation.
 - Spano expressed concern that this method could potentially mask other problems, issues, or challenges in the sector. Past trends in flow do not always hold into the future, given factors such as low-flow features and efficiency, groundwater, and climate change. With all these factors we are seeing increasing concentrations across the country, and there are concerns in some areas that load capacity may be hit before hydraulic capacity.
 - She suggested to consider the issues she mentioned in the method development.
 - Spano noted the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) has proposed a wastewater workshop in July and feels this would be an important topic. Still need to confirm a date and details.

- Busch: projecting flows was not included in this proposal, but MDE would be interested in COG's input on projected flows.
 - George thanked Spano for her deep thought on this. Two things come to mind to discuss on this. One, the possibility to run simulations of this methodology under some of the situations raised by Spano, e.g. flows are not increasing and concentrations are increasing. Also, it's possible to observe some of these issues through other metrics or analyses separate from a tool that's used to assess our annual progress. We would not be as concerned about this methodology if we were not assessed year by year.
- Antos: to clarify, is this methodology being proposed to replace the current DMR data for the reducing pollution indicator, or is it proposed as a replacement for the supplemental wastewater indicator?
 - Busch: We did not really address this. We want the WWTWG to look at this for now. Ultimately we are interested in the milestones. It is harder to set milestones for wastewater when a wet year can affect the load so much.
- Antos: When EPA evaluates milestone progress, we look at a few different things. We consider the annual progress run with the DMR data. We also look at the supplemental indicator. If the workgroup chose to change the supplemental indicator, EPA would consider the new supplemental indicator. Third, we consider the states' programmatic milestones. The programmatic milestones allow the jurisdictions to provide additional information about their capacity building efforts or other impacts from their actions. Perhaps the programmatic milestones could be another place for Maryland to capture their progress on this issue.
 - George: We are still interested in the matter of how the progress runs are defined. There's an inconsistency for how precipitation is captured between point sources and nonpoint sources. After this discussion a couple years back we developed the supplemental indicator. We may want this to replace the supplemental indicator.
- Antos: Recall that the supplemental indicator was developed in response to Maryland raising the issue. The indicator was developed so every jurisdiction could agree to it, though it was not exactly what Maryland was looking for. It sounds like none of the jurisdictions are thrilled with the supplemental indicator, and perhaps the workgroup will want to replace it with something else.
- Spano: We will need to look at this more closely as a workgroup to ensure this works long term and we don't send mixed messages.
- Antos: if we are talking about a partnership indicator, we want something that can be consistently applied to all major facilities in the watershed.
- Spano thanked MDE for their presentation and transitioned to the next item.

Spray Irrigation & Biosolids

- Zhou recalled May's discussion of biosolids. Following that conference call, CBPO staff developed a draft data wish list ([Attachment B](#)). He encouraged states to compare the wish list with their databases to see what could be provided.
 - Zhou reviewed Attachment B.
- **ACTION:** Workgroup members to indicate data availability for biosolids by Friday, June 14th. Send comments to Jeremy (jhanson@chesapeakebay.net), Ning (zhou.ning@epa.gov), and Tanya (tspano@mwecog.org).

- Spano: no judgments or determinations about which data is most important, but we would like a sense of what data exists. The wish list is a laundry list of what could possibly be provided to the Bay Program, if it's available for the jurisdictions to report.
- Antos believed that inorganic fertilizer and biosolids have different mineralization rates.
- Spano: nutrients are better bound to biosolids than to chemical fertilizer.
 - She also noted that at least in the case of Blue Plains, none of the biosolids remain in that area but are transported elsewhere.
 - Dubin: this is information we could use to develop better datasets in the next version of the Watershed Model. There's a number of reasons to consider biosolids, as Antos described. We're looking to change characterization of nutrient applications in the next version of the Watershed Model. Blue Plains could potentially generate the data about where the biosolids are transferred to.
- Spano: in addition to availability, could be helpful to note what form and to what extent it is available.
- Mark Dubin (UMD, CBPO; Agriculture Workgroup Coordinator): in addition to form, also suggest including the dates when the information is readily available, e.g. starting in 1985, 1990, 2000.
 - Zhou asked the jurisdictions to indicate data availability by June 14th
- Zhou moved on to the spray irrigation portion of Attachment B.
 - Based on last month's presentations, there is confidence in the available data for spray irrigation, since there are permit and monitoring requirements. The details vary state by state, but the data availability is good overall. There is no transport issue like biosolids.
- **ACTION:** Workgroup members to indicate data availability for spray irrigation by Friday, June 14th. Send comments to Jeremy (jhanson@chesapeakebay.net), Ning (zhou.ning@epa.gov), and Tanya (tspano@mwkog.org).
 - Brockenbrough noted that he will have to refer to a different office at DEQ on spray irrigation.
- Spano: are water reuse applications, such as golf courses, included in this spray irrigation category? Something we should consider.

EPA's model program for onsite systems in the Chesapeake Bay

- Joyce Hudson updated the workgroup on EPA's draft model program for onsite systems, which was called for under the EO Strategy and the CBF settlement agreement. The deadline for the report is June 30th, 2013. It will be posted to the EO13508 website.
 - View her [presentation](#) for details
- EPA committed to develop a technical assistance manual for onsite systems for states can use to augment their programs and reduce nitrogen.
 - She summarized some of the comments received and EPA's responses.
 - She pointed out the major change was made to the nitrogen treatment recommendations for setback distances to tidal waters.
- Antos clarified the changes in the model. Under 5.3.2 septic account for 3.4% as Hudson noted. Not sure where the 8% figure came from.
- Hudson asked for questions.
 - None were raised.

- Glynn Rountree (National Association of Homebuilders) explained the proposed STAC workshop has multiple purposes: review/discuss new technologies, and; consider/discuss EPA's model program guidance. Will be re-presenting the proposal to STAC next week following their request for some clarification and additional information. If the workshop proposal is chosen, the target date would be late Fall 2013.
 - **Post-meeting note:** The proposed workshop was selected for funding by STAC.

Improving On-site system data

- Zhou explained this discussion was similar to the previous items. The goal is to get a better idea of what data is available in the jurisdictions to help inform work towards the next version of the Watershed Model. He asked the states to describe their available data.
- Eric Aschenbach (VA Dept. of Health): VENIS brought online in 2003. He summarized the data tracked for onsite systems in the system and sampling data requirements for Virginia.
 - View his [presentation](#) for details.
- Dave Schepens (DE DNREC) described the data Delaware collects for onsite systems.
 - View his [presentation](#) for details.
- Jay Prager (MDE) gave a verbal description of Maryland's data.
 - The state has a pretty comprehensive inventory of all the systems in the state, but does not have individual files.
 - Some information is available online for performance and cost of different technologies.
- Furlan: PA DEP does not collect this data, but have been reaching out to regional offices to see what forms or data they collect. We are looking to perhaps revise regulations in the future.
- Zhou thanked the presenters. He noted this is the first time the workgroup has discussed the issue and will likely need to revisit this in the future.
- Zhou noted he will be on vacation starting early July until mid August. Workgroup-related questions can be directed to Jeremy Hanson in his absence. Questions pertaining to progress runs and wastewater reporting can be directed to Sucharith Ravi.
- Spano thanked participants for their time and input.

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
Katherine	Antos	EPA, CBPO
Brian	Ashby	Delaware DNREC
Allan	Brockenbrough	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Greg	Bush	MDE
Denorah	Dalmasy	MDE
Vic	D'Amato	Tetra Tech
Ron	Entringer	NYS DEC
Ron	Furlan	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Ron	Graeber	Delaware DNREC
Joyce	Hudson	EPA
Matt	Johnston	University of Maryland, CBPO
Dharmendra	Kumar	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
David	Montali	West Virginia Dept. of Environmental Protection
Jay	Prager	Maryland Dept. of Environment
Jeff	Sweeney	EPA, CBPO
Suzanne	Trevena	EPA, Region 3
John	Weidman	New York State Dept. of Environmental Conservation