



MINUTES
Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)
Teleconference
Monday, January 11, 2016, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Summary of Action and Decision Items

DECISION: The WWTWG approved the December meeting minutes.

ACTION: States should send contact information for participants in the Biosolids ad hoc task force to David Wood (Wood.DavidM@epa.gov) as soon as possible

ACTION: MWCOG will finish a draft scope of work for the biosolids ad hoc task force and send it out to WWTWG along with the names of task force participants.

DECISION: The WWTWG approved the proposed Level of Effort and tentative schedule for the Point Source Data Project, and requested to revisit the schedule in summer 2016.

ACTION: David will send out second call for at-large members along with the definition from the governance. That call will also include a request for vice-chair nominations.

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

DECISION: The WWTWG approved the December meeting minutes.

Biosolids Ad Hoc Task Force – Karl Berger, MWCOG and Ning Zhou, VT

Karl discussed the proposed path forward for an ad hoc task force that will help inform how biosolids will be represented in the Phase 6 Watershed Model. Ning discussed data needs from each of the jurisdictions.

Discussion:

- Berger: I have reached out to folks to gauge their interest in participating in an ad hoc workgroup to help CBP incorporate biosolids data into the Phase 6 model. The focuses will be on: 1) data availability and making sure we have the best data from the states in terms of how application is occurring; 2) fitting the data into the framework of the model, particularly Scenario Builder. I have reached out to a few industry folks and received commitments from 3 individuals so far. I have also reached out to state biosolids regulators, primarily from Virginia, Maryland and Pennsylvania because they include bulk of land applications in the watershed. I haven't received answers from the states yet. We have between now and sometime in March to submit the data from the states and review it, address any holes and how it is treated in Scenario Builder. We will likely have 2-3 conference calls to accomplish that. I see this primarily as a data submission and review exercise.
- Tanya Spano (MWCOG): Do Delaware and West Virginia wish to have active participation in this task force effort? If so, please get back to us quickly, and we will separately reach out to New York.

- Dave Schepens (DE DNREC): I just sent an email to Brian Churchill (DNREC), he would like to participate. I will send his contact information.
- Dave Montali (WV DEP): I have someone with a history in the regulatory side of land application who helped prepare our data. It might be helpful to have him there to explain our data. If the issue will be with how to interpret poor past data, maybe our data can stand on its own. With respect to Scenario Builder and spread methodology, he may have some insights into where it is land applied in West Virginia.

ACTION: States should send contact information for participants in the Biosolids ad hoc task force to David Wood (Wood.DavidM@epa.gov) as soon as possible

ACTION: MWWCOG will finish a draft scope of work for the biosolids ad hoc task force and send it out to WWTWG along with the names of task force participants.

- Zhou: Because this biosolids data is relatively new, we took what the states submitted and did simple processing to load into Scenario Builder. We were not able to do true QA/QC with this data because I am not familiar with biosolids. However, we do see dramatic swings from year to year, so this task force would need to take a look at how to address those swings. We need to find ways to make the biosolids data more meaningful and more accurate. The task force will help develop a method for how to QA/QC the data.
- Ning reviewed the biosolids data received from each of the jurisdictions and the default methodology used for filling in missing years. Data should be resubmitted and cleaned up by March 31 if possible for the next version of the model calibration. Draft deadline is June 30 and final by September 30.
- Marya Levelov (MDE): If the data is available from previous years, I have concerns about the accuracy of old point source data points. Is there a protocol for selecting the data that is being carried back through time?
 - Zhou: I think the task force will be helping to answer that.
- Berger: When we schedule the first call for this group, I think it would be very helpful for Ning and Matt Johnston (UMD) to show the actual data you have and explain the simple methodology you currently are using.
- Spano: I would like to chat offline about MWWCOG helping to check the MD and VA Blue Plains data. I understand the need for default methods, but this method is seriously flawed. It needs to relate to the flows. Biosolids production should track with the wastewater production, so there clearly needs to be work there. In terms of the data swings, I agree with Karl's point about looking at the data at the start of this group.
- Ron Furlan (PA DEP): We don't have the resources to start finding and formatting the biosolids data in the way that would fit in the model. We had discussions about Tetra Tech doing it but that fell through. There is information here but I see several problems with getting it to you. It is not a significant load, so we have not expended many resources to tracking it down. We will get someone for the ad hoc group, but I can't confirm that it is me.
 - Levelov: We have a similar issue in that we have a lot of data, but many records are paper, and we are suggesting the Tetra Tech support to help with that process.

New Wastewater Sources – Ning Zhou, VT

Ning discussed the path forward for spray irrigation, rapid infiltration basins, and large monitored onsite systems including timelines and data needs.

Discussion:

- Zhou: Based on last discussion, I changed one row to be titled “reduction crediting” in order to more accurately reflect what is occurring.
 - George Onyullo (DOEE): Would it be better to call it “load reduction crediting”?
 - Zhou: I can make that change.
- Furlan: Are you going to develop an algorithm to give some kind of load reduction for each of these loads, based on uptake, etc.?
 - Berger: Those processes are already built into the Model.
- Spano: I would say that the status is not captured because some of these items are still “to be determined”. I would like to see us expand this table so we know where we are going over the next few months.
- Zhou: We need to start the data collection of these different load sources. We only received some sample data from spray irrigation. We also currently have no data for these other sources. We encourage you to start to collect this data. A template for spray irrigation data is provided in the source loads summary table that is on the calendar page. Next call we will probably ask each jurisdiction to provide an update on their action on the data collection and provide an opportunity to help you address any issues. This will be joined with an update from the Watershed Technical Workgroup on data collection/historic data.
- Spano: If you have a strong interest in these other loads, it would be great to have some leadership to help develop these further.

Point Source Data Project – Laura Free, EPA

Laura and Megan updated the WWTWG on an ongoing project on point source data that is fed into the Bay Watershed Model. They referred to an approach proposed on the November 3rd WWTWG call, which outlines a pilot project with data from significant facilities and other facilities with data available in ICIS-NPDES. Laura and Megan presented a description of expected Level of Effort for this pilot, along with a tentative schedule for development.

Discussion:

- Free: Our request was to receive feedback on the call today based on our projected level of effort for a pilot project.
- Megan Thyne (EPA): This is based on a similar effort we put together previously on water quality nonpoint source data we had done previously.
- Spano: Who would need to be involved in the additional calls?
 - Thyne: There are probably only 1-2 people per jurisdiction and those could be self-determined. I figured we could provide a brief status update with the whole group, with larger discussions as-needed.
- Spano: Any questions or comments on this proposal?
 - None were raised.
- Spano: Do we have names identified yet?
 - Zhou: I think we would be working with the data managers at each of the jurisdictions.
 - Spano: I would like to make sure the workgroup knows who is involved. That should be clarified.
- Thyne: From my perspective, the schedule is very tentative. This could change, but I think it is fair to say that if we discover the LOE is much higher than we anticipated, I think we can revisit our schedule commitments. I think as far as data, we need to just see what you are providing to Ning and look for a way to streamline the existing data.

- Spano: I would suggest adding in an item around May/June as a check-in to see if any modifications to the schedule are needed. Also, does this align with the current data submission cycle?
- Spano: Do we approve moving forward?
 - No objections were raised.

DECISION: The WWTWG approved the proposed Level of Effort and tentative schedule, and requested to revisit the schedule in summer 2016.

Updates and other business

- The following topics were recommended for the February agenda: decision about the chair, vice-chair and membership; Toxics memo; state updates on new source data; update from biosolids task force.
- Montali: I'd like to suggest that if we can't get the SPARROW information for the Onsite Treatment Systems Attenuation BMP expert panel, that we move forward without it.

ACTION: David will send out second call for at-large members along with the definition from the governance. That call will also include a request for vice-chair nominations.

Adjourn

Next conference call:

February 2, 2015