



MINUTES
Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)
Teleconference
Tuesday, November 3, 2015, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Summary of Actions and Decisions

DECISION: The October WWTWG meeting minutes were approved.

ACTION: A call for formal endorsement of the recommended approach to the point source data project will be issued to the WWTWG. Members will be asked for conceptual approval, as well as to comment on resource concerns. If no substantive comments are received by COB November 17, the approach will be considered endorsed by the WWTWG.

ACTION: Ning will remove the “Less treated” qualifier from the spray irrigation box of the table, and “standard” from the wastewater treatment effluent box.

ACTION: Jeff will return to the WWTWG to clarify whether the proposed wastewater load sources would be applied as load allocations or waste-load allocations.

ACTION: David will distribute the WWTWG Governance for final approval by the WWTWG.

- Update: The WWTWG Governance was approved by the WWTWG, with concurrence by the WQGIT on November 9.

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

DECISION: The October WWTWG meeting minutes were approved.

Point Source Data Project – *Laura Free, EPA*

In October, Laura presented a summary of conversations held with each jurisdiction, and proposed some options for the future development of a system that would support the point source QAQC and reporting.

Discussion:

- Free: During the last call, we asked jurisdictions to review the document that was sent out, as well as notes from individual meetings and to provide final approval of the recommended approach.
- David Wood (CRC): Were any comments received following the last call?
 - Free: We only received one comment, and it was a correction of a minor error. No feedback was provided on the recommended approach.
- Spano: Were there any changes to the memo?
 - Free: No findings or recommendations have changed. We are waiting on a recommendation from the workgroup to move forward.
- Megan Thyng (EPA): We really do need consensus from this group, because we would really like to start moving it up the chain.

- Marya Levelev (MDE): I was one of the ones who wanted time to look over the report. I did look it over and it did a good job of summarizing what we discussed. I think it would be helpful for the Bay Program to do some of the data processing, but we think the pilot could be really helpful. We need more information on funding availability, scope of work, and how many people it would require on our end. I think we would conceptually support the recommendations of automating the pre-processing process.
 - Spano: I think there was general agreement among others as well.
 - Thyng: If we can get general agreement on the approach, we can flesh out the other details as far as how to limit the burden on you all. We just want overall consensus on the approach. I think Maryland's feedback is really helpful.
- Dave Schepens (DE DNREC): I think Maryland and Delaware have similar feelings. The concern is about double entry of data.
- Spano: If we say that at least Maryland and Delaware can support this recommendation, we can email the recommended approach to our members and give them a time limit to provide formal approval. We can attach the full document as well as embed the recommendation language directly in the email. We should add another point that an endorsement allows us to further discuss timing, funding and level of effort-type details.
- Levelev: We cannot commit staff time to this. Conceptually we agree, but we need to better understand how much staff time would be required to move forward.
- Thyng: Is the issue solely a resource issue? Or a technical concern?
- Free: I think we need the conceptual endorsement in order for us to be able to go out and secure the resources. Maybe pose the endorsement as two separate questions: resources and conceptual.
- Spano: I want to be clear about the difference between EPA resources and local and state government resources.
- Thyng: We can take a first crack at estimating when the resources would come into play and what those roles would be.

ACTION: A call for formal endorsement of the recommended approach to the point source data project will be issued to the WWTWG. Members will be asked for conceptual approval, as well as to comment on resource concerns. If no substantive comments are received by COB November 17, the approach will be considered endorsed by the WWTWG.

Implementing New Wastewater Loads – Ning Zhou, VT and Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Ning provided updates to the proposed methodologies for including nutrient sources from rapid infiltration, spray irrigation, biosolids and non-traditional onsite systems in the Phase 6 modeling tools. Jeff elaborated on how those nutrient sources have been addressed in the beta version of the Phase 6 Watershed Model, and the process for reviewing those methods and data—particularly in the absence of information from the sources—prior to the final model calibration.

Discussion:

- Spano: For spray irrigation on agriculture lands, the table says it would be a load allocation, but isn't some of that load accounted for in the nonpoint source agriculture land?
 - Sweeney: You sort of have it right. We consider most loads from the land as being part of the load allocations with the exception of MS4s, CAFOs and wastewater treatment facilities (these are all waste-load allocations). Even though the source of the spray

irrigation loads may be the wastewater treatment facilities, they will be considered load allocations because they are applied to the land.

- Spano: How about septic?
 - Sweeney: It depends on whether or not they are permitted.
- Levelev: What sector will spray irrigation, rapid infiltration basins and large monitored be applied to?
 - Sweeney: If it is applied to agricultural lands, it would be nonregulated agriculture, which is a load allocation. For urban, it could be either a load allocation or a waste-load allocation depending on whether it was applied to an MS4 area or non-regulated lands.
- Schepens: Under rapid infiltration, it is not standard WWTP effluent. We have limits that the wastewater has to be treated to. Wouldn't you subtract that?
 - Zhou: That would be the input above ground. All monitored data will be the initial input, and we will then apply an attenuation factor just like a regular septic.

ACTION: Ning will remove the "Less treated" qualifier from the spray irrigation box of the table, and "standard" from the wastewater treatment effluent box.

- Levelev: Where is the monitored effluent data from rapid infiltration basins and large monitored onsite coming from? We don't have that data because it isn't an NPDES permit.
 - Schepens: Same in Delaware. I am confused on how we will be able to submit this data.
- Spano: My concern is that there are critical aspects like the allocation categories, that remain unclear. We wanted one table that summarized what was happening with these loads. At some point there needs to be a cutoff, but for the load allocations, there clearly needs to be another level of detail.
- Sweeney: It seems that this table is just for internal use, so I would suggest sending it around and allowing for edits and then discussing it.
- Spano: Do we have major concerns with moving forward in the efforts to capture these loads?
 - Levelev: I don't have a major concern. The questions are being asked because we want to understand later on how we will address these loads.
- Sweeney: I will check and make sure I am correct in terms of where the loads from a permitted large monitored onsite system would be applied. I will check on the other load sources as well, to see if the permit make them a waste-load allocation, or if because they are land applied, they are load allocations.

ACTION: Jeff will return to the WWTWG to clarify whether the proposed wastewater load sources would be applied as load allocations or waste-load allocations.

- Spano: What is the timeline for taking these new loads to the WQGIT?
 - Wood: We have until the final Model calibration, but the earlier we get workgroup endorsement, the more time there will be to collect and report the necessary data.
- Spano: I can work with DC Water staff to review the Maryland and Virginia Blue Plains biosolids data.
- Spano: Blue Plains has had a reduction to the pounds they are producing. Any wastewater derived loads will go up because as you increase flow, the loads go up. When assessing the biosolids contributions, it needs to be tracked with the flows, to give a complete picture.
 - Sweeney: I agree.
- Spano: As we move this forward, that there is a real concern with the fact that biosolids are not the same as manure in many ways, such as nutrient uptake. The different characteristics of

biosolids mean that the assumptions used for manure application in the Model does not appropriately address biosolids.

- Sweeney: That is a good point, we are counting on this workgroup to educate us on biosolids. We know it is different, but we need this group to tell us how to handle it in the Model.
- Greg Busch: No jurisdictions have provided spray irrigation data?
 - Zhou: We received some sample data to get a sense of what was available. Maryland, Delaware and Virginia provided some sample data.
- Busch: About a year ago we provided data based on permit limits for facilities. We are still working through the DMR data. Is it possible to use the permit limit data to inform this version of the Model so we have a placeholder in there for the spray irrigation and we can refine it later?
 - Zhou: Yes, that is fine. Permit data can be the default used for now.

WWTWG Governance – *Tanya Spano, Chair*

On August 24, 2015 the WQGIT approved overall Governance Protocols to be used by all of its Workgroups, but provided the flexibility for Workgroups to define their own membership. CBPO staff have drafted a version for the WWTWG's consideration.

Discussion:

- Schepens: I have no objections to the approach.
- Levelev: I have no objections.

ACTION: David will distribute the WWTWG Governance for final approval by the WWTWG. (Update: The WWTWG Governance was approved by the WWTWG, with concurrence by the WQGIT on November 9).

Adjourn

List of Call Participants

Name	Affiliation
Tanya Spano (Chair)	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Ning Zhou (Coordinator)	VT, CBPO
David Wood (Staff)	CRC, CBPO
Dave Schepens	DE DNREC
Laura Free	EPA
Megan Thyng	EPA
Greg Busch	MDE
Marya Levelev	MDE
Lana Sindler	MWCOG
Angela Redwine	VDH