



SUMMARY

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG) Conference Call

Tuesday, November 6th, 2012 10:00 AM- 12:00 PM

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18610/>

Welcome and Introductions

- Tanya Spano (Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments; Chair, WWTWG) welcomed the participants and convened the call shortly after 10:00AM.

Report from WQGIT October 22nd-23rd face-to-face

- For more details on the outcomes of the WQGIT meeting, see [Attachment E3](#) and [Attachment E4](#)
- Spano noted that the WWTWG will need to have conversations with the Watershed Technical Workgroup and Agriculture Workgroup on biosolids.
 - She also noted the Urban Stormwater Workgroup (USWG) has an expert panel on Illicit discharge detection and elimination (IDDE); she and Zhou will coordinate with Tom Schueler (Coordinator, USWG)
- Ning Zhou (Virginia Tech, CBPO; Coordinator, WWTWG) explained the WWTWG's priorities all deal with inputs, so the workload falls to the workgroup members, not the CBPO modeling team or staff.
- Spano noted the surprisingly low attendance due to the election; she asked the participants for their thoughts on the workgroup's six priorities:
 1. Improve data for non-significant facilities, especially industrials
 - Allan Brockenbrough (VA Dept. of Environmental Quality) felt that non-significant industrial facilities are most important from his perspective, but other states may have different priority, e.g. Maryland probably feels they have a good grasp on its industrial facilities.
 - Zhou agreed
 - Spano: We do have information in the database, so it would be important to enhance that data, but may not need to improve it in every state.
 2. Standardize methods to account for net loads from industrial facilities
 - Spano: Feel that #2 is actually a subset of #1, but they are separate.
 3. Evaluate how biosolids land applied and accounted for
 - Spano explained this was not on the WWTWG's original list of priorities, but arose from discussion with the BMP Verification Committee. So the WWTWG agreed to take a look at the issue.
 4. Determine how to incorporate local septic data
 5. Develop methods for identifying/quantifying loads from commercial and residential onsite systems
 6. Agree on methods to account for reduced septic loads
 - Spano asked for input on septic (4, 5, and 6).
 - Brockenbrough: Personally do not see septic as a real high priority since it represents a relatively small load that is not growing too rapidly in Virginia. Virginia collects data from permits for new septic systems, so it does not need to rely on projections for new systems.
 - Eric Aschenbach (VA Dept. of Health): Virginia has already submitted several years of this septic data to Peter Claggett (USGS).

- Spano: The WWTWG may want to see what other jurisdictions gather and if they have, or plan to, provide that data to the Bay Program.
- Brockenbrough: That would make sense, will not necessarily see same answer in each state.
- Zhou: Maryland and Delaware have similar datasets, but have not submitted it to the CBP yet.
- Marcia Degen (VA Dept. of Health): Midpoint assessment included discussion of projections for septic systems, there won't be need to make projections for septic into the future, at least in Virginia, given the state will know how many are being built. There are different opinions on the accuracy of the historical data.
- Spano: Our job is to clarify that and report back to the Partnership. Are we differentiating between commercial and residential?
- Degen: Regarding #5, right now the Watershed Model looks at all on-site systems as single-family residential; does not accurately represent community or commercial systems in the model. So the question is how we handle these larger decentralized systems. Currently the load from these systems is very small, but going forward we expect more and more of these large decentralized systems.
- Zhou: First we need to look at is what kind of data and classifications the jurisdictions have. We need a way to quantify the on-site system.
- Degen: How do we modify the base data which is estimated from population and census data?
- Zhou: time to update the data...estimated the population based on census data...9 lbs per person per year...the current BMP panel is looking at individual systems
- Spano: not necessarily
- Spano: item #6 has to follow #4 and #5. Cannot account for reductions without improved identification and quantification of
- Degen: phosphorous
- Spano: right, there hasn't been a P load associated with septic systems in the past.
- Degen: perhaps a case-by-case basis for P-loads would make sense
- Brockenbrough: don't have a feel for number of systems going offline in the jurisdictions
- Spano: see a need to clarify and repackage these. We have some flexibility on how to move forward.
- Aschenbach: Peter did ask for splits for residential/commercial, but as Marcia said, some of the multi-family or community systems get lumped into commercial.

Discussion of draft wastewater reference sheet

- Spano explained the sheet was compiled by CBPO staff for her reference during the October WQGIT meeting. She asked CBPO staff to expand on some of the septic info; perhaps the sheet will prove useful again in the future.

Other Updates

- Spano: Intend to hold a STAC workshop on septic
 - Zhou: proposal was not accepted last year, will resubmit for next funding cycle

Adjourned

Next conference call

Tuesday, December 4th, 10:00AM to 12:00PM

Conference Call Participants

Eric	Aschenbach	Virginia Dept. of Health
Allan	Brockenbrough	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Marcia	Degen	VA Dept. of Health
Maureen	Krudner	EPA
Jeremy	Hanson	CRC, CBPO
Glynn	Rountree	National Association of Home Builders
Jim	Sizemore	Alexandria Renew Enterprises
Tanya	Spano	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Megan	Thynge	EPA, CBPO
Brian	Trulear	EPA, Region 3
Ning	Zhou	Virginia Tech, CBPO