



**Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)**  
**Teleconference**  
**Friday, November 7, 2014, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM**  
**Meeting Summary**

---

**Action and Decision Items:**

**ACTION:** Tanya Spano will send a list of toxic contaminants of concern to the Onsite Soil Attenuation panel for their consideration.

**ACTION:** David Wood will schedule a status update on the Septic Data Sharing Project for the December 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. A full report will be provided in January or February 2015.

**ACTION:** Ning Zhou will contact Lucinda Power to ask for clarification about whether or not the WWTWG can reconvene the Advanced Onsite Systems expert panel to review the two proposed proprietary technologies.

**ACTION:** David Wood will schedule an agenda item for December to announce the final decision regarding the next steps for Virginia's proposals.

**ACTION:** Workgroup members will review the biosolid and spray irrigation data templates and submit any feedback to Matt Johnston ([mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net)) or Ning Zhou ([zhou.ning@epa.gov](mailto:zhou.ning@epa.gov)) prior to the December 2<sup>nd</sup> WWTWG meeting.

**ACTION:** Please identify and submit any other issues you feel should be WWTWG priorities for the next calendar year to Tanya ([tspano@mwco.org](mailto:tspano@mwco.org)), Ning ([zhou.ning@epa.gov](mailto:zhou.ning@epa.gov)), or David ([Wood.DavidM@epa.gov](mailto:Wood.DavidM@epa.gov)).

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

Tanya convened the meeting and David Wood (CRC) verified call participants.

**Onsite Soil Attenuation Panel Update -- Vic D'Amato, TetraTech**

Vic provided an update on the Onsite Soil Attenuation Panel. He discussed membership progress and the most recent panel meetings.

- For more information, please see Vic's [presentation](#).

**Discussion:**

- Spano: Could the panel please share any information that relates to the attenuation of toxic contaminants? It may be useful to the newly formed Toxics Workgroup.
  - D'Amato: Yes, please send a list of contaminants of concerns and we will share it with the panel.
- Spano: We will have another update from this panel again in the spring.

**ACTION:** Tanya will send a list of toxic contaminants of concern to the Onsite Soil Attenuation panel for their consideration.

**EPA Septic Data Sharing Project – Joyce Hudson, EPA and Mark Nelson, Horsley Witten Group**

Joyce and Mark updated the workgroup on an effort to get state onsite program managers to share data in order to facilitate more efficient approvals of onsite nitrogen reducing technologies.

- For more information, please see their [presentation](#).

**Discussion:**

- Spano: Thanked Joyce and Mark for their efforts.
- Spano: When do you expect to report back to the workgroup for another update?
  - Hudson: We talked about having a complete project by the end of this year, or January 2015. It is partially dependent upon having a place to house the data. We talked initially about having the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model house the data. We expect to have final documents completed within the next several weeks, and we will work with the Bay Program again at that point.
- Spano: We will ask for a quick status update at the next meeting, and we will key up January or February for a full presentation on how this project will be implemented.
- Ning Zhou (VT, CBPO): Do you have a preliminary database that can be shared with the Bay Program IT team?
  - Hudson: We will get something over to you as soon as we can.
- Zhou: Once you have the preliminary database, we need to talk about how to incorporate all of your data into the Bay Watershed Model. We will need to fit it into the BMP database format. We will also need to find a way to meet the BMP review protocol requirements. We will discuss these issues when the project is complete.

**ACTION:** David will schedule a status update on the Septic Data Sharing Project for the December 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. A full report will be provided in January or February 2015.

**VA Septic BMP Proposal -- Eric Aschenbach, VA DEQ and Marcia Degen, VA DEQ**

Eric and Marcia provided updated information on two technologies being proposed for credit under the WQGIT-approved protocols for advanced on-site wastewater treatment systems: American Manufacturing Drip System and Anua's Puraflo to a Pad.

- For more information, please see their [presentation](#).

**Discussion:**

- Dave Schepens (DNREC): Delaware already offers a 50% nutrient reduction credit for these two systems. A Puraflo could be lumped in with a sand filter. I don't know if they should be eligible for more credit.
- Jay Prager (MDE): I don't think the initial report was giving all of those technologies a 50% reduction over a traditional trench system. I think it gave them a 50% reduction in total.
- Spano: Dave, do you feel that in Delaware you would have accepted these two systems as fitting into already approved protocols laid out in the Advanced Onsite Systems expert [panel report](#)?
  - Schepens: Yes.
- Degen: We are suggesting these systems are reducing 50% more nitrogen than the baseline that is described in that panel report, not just 50% total.
- Matt Johnston (UMD, CBPO): According to the Onsite Septic BMP panel report technical appendix, if you have a proprietary system, you currently get a total reduction of 69%. If a state comes forward with a proprietary system and wants that base 50% reduction, they can do that without this process. But if they want more than 50%, we need to go through this process.

- Degen: So our request is that these systems should receive 50% N reductions, rather than the 38% currently allotted in the Model according to Table 1 of the Technical appendix of the Onsite Septics Systems report. Our request is to move these forward to a review by the Onsite Systems panel.
- Schepens: We approved these systems for a 50% reduction, but most of the systems have advanced treatment in front of it.
  - Prager: Maryland requires advanced treatment in front of a drip system.
- Spano: Is this proposal something we believe needs to be moved up to the BMP expert panel? Or with more info, can Virginia fit this into a slot that has been already approved?
  - Dave Montali (WV DEP): The cleanest thing would be to have this go to the Advanced Onsite Systems panel if they are still in place.
  - Zhou: We no longer have the TetraTech contract, but we have the list of panel members and we could have the panel review this proposal if Virginia can come up with some type of white paper.
- Montali: Could the Wastewater Treatment Workgroup form a subgroup to make a recommendation?
  - Spano: As chair, I think that would be a good idea. It would be best if we can work it out at the workgroup level.
- Marya Levelev (MDE): My understanding is the workgroup can either recommend to the WQGIT that this BMP is a priority, or they can pass it on to the expert panel, but that is all the workgroup can do.
- Degen: I think these practices can eventually fall into one of the existing categories for percent reductions, they just need to be approved to move into one of the larger reduction categories. I am uncomfortable going out and accepting these two technologies as a new category, and I would like the support of the other states.
  - Schepens: Delaware shares that discomfort.
- Degen: I suggest I reach out to the old expert panel and see how many members would be willing to look at these two technologies. I can have the companies present the rationale behind their requests.
- Spano: If the expert panel is convened to take an official position, do they have the ability to do so?
- Johnston: I just want to point back to the appendix, per the CBP BMP protocol, the WWTWG has the discretion to determine if a system should receive greater than a 50% reduction. You can convene the panel, then ask the WQGIT later.
- Spano: Does anyone have a problem with Virginia convening the panel or sending it forward?
  - Schepens: Maybe it should be a broader question. I'm leery of approving a proprietary technology. I know there are different types of peat systems that have similar literature.
- Spano: Are there any other problems with it going forward?
  - Montali: No, and I don't think it will need to be the complete expert panel, as long as there are some good representatives.

- Spano: I ask David and Ning to send me the information used to make the determination as to whether or not we can send this proposal on to the expert panel.
- Spano: Maybe we should make a call for other proprietary technologies so the panel can review them all at once.
- Spano: On the next call we will answer the question about the between difference between the process discussed in the BMP protocol and what was laid out in the Advanced Onsite Systems report's Technical Appendix. Matt and Ning will check with Lucinda Power (EPA) to make sure they are interpreting the process properly.

**ACTION:** Ning will contact Lucinda Power to ask for clarification about whether or not the WWTWG can reconvene the Advanced Onsite Systems expert panel to review the two proposed proprietary technologies.

**ACTION:** David will schedule an agenda item for December to announce the final decision regarding the next steps for Virginia's proposals.

#### **Biosolids and Spray Irrigation Data Discussion – Ning Zhou and Matt Johnston, CBPO**

At the meeting early this month in Pennsylvania, the WQGIT made it a priority to gather the biosolid data for the phase 6 model. Ning will present the summary of the data received from some jurisdictions and retrieved from the EPA ICIS database. Matt will lead the discussion on technical details of the biosolid and spray irrigation data collection

- Please see Ning and Matt's documents on the [event page](#).

#### **Discussion:**

- Zhou: The Bay Program staff has begun compiling a Biosolids database but some data is still missing.
- Zhou: We received data from Maryland, Virginia, and New York. Maryland provided a very detailed spreadsheet, and we hope to get more information like that. We received a similarly rich dataset from Virginia, just in a slightly different format. This information could be available in other states as well and we are going to start working with individual states to get that information.
- Zhou: Another task is spray irrigation data, and we are trying to collect it as part of a similar effort. We have some data from Maryland already. Permit numbers can be used to estimate how many acres are receiving this fertilizer. I would like to point out that plant uptakes have already been simulated, so it is good info, but not required. The flow and concentration are what we need, and we can use that information to populate the other columns. For biosolids we need flow, concentration, and species information. We would like the land location information, at least at the county-scale, and we use crop species information to calculate plant uptake. If you don't have the monitoring data, the default will work. For species, we have standard speciation default ratio.
- Zhou: The workgroup must decide if we can officially launch this data collection. We need to discuss how to approach this next.
- Spano: We need more time for people to look at the template and we need to think about modeling considerations.

- Zhou: We expect this discussion will take several meetings, but we need the data by the Phase 6 calibration next summer.
- Johnston: Please don't be concerned if you don't have all of the data. Maryland, for example, had to estimate. The WWTWG may have to help us determine averages for missing data etc.
- Spano: I ask the workgroup to take a look at the templates, and if you have any concerns, please bring those to the group prior to the next call. We will put this on the December agenda.
- Spano: Thanked Ning and Matt for all of the work to gather the data and the states who helped to provide it.

**ACTION:** Workgroup members will review the biosolid and spray irrigation data templates and submit any feedback to Matt Johnston ([mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net)) or Ning Zhou ([zhou.ning@epa.gov](mailto:zhou.ning@epa.gov)) prior to the December 2<sup>nd</sup> WWTWG meeting.

**Updates and other business – Tanya Spano**

- Spano: Please take a look at who is on the current WWTWG membership lists from your organizations, and the CBPO staff will send out a request for changes to group membership.

**ACTION:** Please identify and submit any other issues you feel should be WWTWG priorities for the next calendar year to Tanya ([tspano@mwco.org](mailto:tspano@mwco.org)), Ning ([zhou.ning@epa.gov](mailto:zhou.ning@epa.gov)), or David ([Wood.DavidM@epa.gov](mailto:Wood.DavidM@epa.gov)).

**Adjourned**

**Next conference call:**

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/S=0/calendar/event/21144/>

**List of Call Participants:**

Name	Affiliation
Tanya Spano (Chair)	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Ning Zhou (Coordinator)	Virginia Tech, CBPO
David Wood (Staff)	CRC, CBPO
Eric Aschenbach	Virginia Dept. Of Health
Marcia Degen	Virginia Dept. Of Health
Joyce Hudson	EPA
John Diehl	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection
Dharmendra Kumar	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection
Andrew Zemba	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection
Kim Childe	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection
Matt Johnston	UMD, CBPO
Lana Sindler	MWCOG
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Dave Schepens	DE DNREC
Bryan Ashby	DE DNREC

Mary Levelev	MDE
Jay Prager	MDE
Rashid Ahmed	NYSDEC
Dave Montali	WV Dept. Of Environmental Protection
Vikram Patterkine	STAC
Victor D'Amato	TetraTech
Mark Nelson	Horsley Witten Group