AGENDA
Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)
Teleconference
February 21, 2017, 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Meeting Summary

Actions and Decisions:

Action: Greg Allen will distribute the Toxic Contaminants Workgroup PCB project draft workplan around mid-March to the WWTWG in order to solicit feedback and comments from workgroup members by the end of March

Decision: The WWTWG approved the meeting minutes from December as submitted.

Action: The WWTWG members agreed to review the CSO and sewer service area spatial coverage that is currently available on the Phase 6 land use viewer website, and submit any major comments using the online tools by **COB March 2nd**. The workgroup will hold follow-up discussions on data gaps during the March 7th meeting, and discuss how to address any gaps.

Action: WWTWG members agreed to identify innovative and/or highly successful nutrient reduction projects within the watershed that would be appropriate for a webinar hosted by the workgroup.

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

- Greg Allen: The Toxic Contaminants Workgroup is undertaking an effort to assess the benefits of WWTP nutrient control upgrades to reduce PCB contaminants. The project will entail a literature review to aid jurisdictions in development of their PCB TMDLs and waste-load allocations, and Pollution Management Plans. The award has been granted to Tetra Tech.
    - Greg Busch: Maryland is in the process of collecting monitoring data for pre- and post-upgraded WWTPs, and will be looking at PCBs.
    - Spano: In many cases PCB data may only have been collected for screening-purposes. I would caution against making generalizations from limited data sets.
- Spano: Greg Busch should coordinate with the Toxic Contaminants Workgroup on the status of the MDE work for their PCB TMDL, and present back to the WWTWG in April. Greg Allen agreed to distribute the Toxic Contaminants workplan and request workgroup feedback.

Action: Greg Allen will distribute the Toxic Contaminants Workgroup PCB project draft workplan around mid-March to the WWTWG in order to solicit feedback and comments from workgroup members by the end of March

Decision: The WWTWG approved the meeting minutes from December as submitted.

Wastewater Sewer Service Areas in Phase 6 Model – Quentin Stubbs, USGS

Quentin summarized the methods that were applied to update the previous wastewater treatment plant sewer service area layer. The updates consisted of a three tier approach:

1) Replacing a county or jurisdiction's existing sewer layer with more recent sewer data from the local (where applicable),
2) Using parcel or US Census block shapefiles to represent a locality's sewer layer when the local data had spatial gaps due to the exclusion of infrastructure (e.g., roads and waterways) or error (e.g. automated or human), or
3) Using a hybrid approach of merging local data with an automated sewer layer based on a synthesis of ancillary data in order to spatially account for densely populated and developed areas that were probable to having sewer systems, but were not identified using the local data.

He also summarized the model updates made to the MS4, CSO and septic system layers.

- Spano: Has QAQC on this data been done?
    - Stubbs: It was done more on the front end – checking for agreement/disagreement. If there was disagreement, we would contact the locality.
    - Spano: From my perspective, I would like to make this available to my MWCOG membership - perhaps have a webinar where you could demonstrate what you've done with a focus on our MWCOG interests. That way, this we can make sure this information properly represents the boundaries. So when would you need feedback from us?
    - Claggett: What data we have right now is going into the calibration, and any review would be during the fatal flaw review.
- Spano: Lastly, how did you treat the difference between areas where the wastewater might be part of a future wastewater service are, but it's currently not actually served by sewers? Or an area that's zoned for septic, but those systems don't exist yet?
    - Stubbs: Mainly with the base year starting approximately in 012, we accepted data until 2016. So we focused on current infrastructure and use, not future infrastructure or potential uses.
    - Spano: Requested that Quentin do a more localized, MWCOG focused webinar on this subject.
- Virginia noted there were numerous gaps, likely due to limited capacity for statewide planning. Allen Brockenbrough asked if these CSO layers reflected input they received from the localities.
    - Stubbs: Yes.
    - Brockenbrough: What did you do to estimate CSO boundaries if you didn't receive that information?
    - Claggett: If we didn't get those CSO boundaries, it didn't get represented in our model.
    - Zhou: We relied on Tetra Tech to collect those boundaries from localities where available. For those that didn't have CSO GIS layers, Tetra Tech defaulted to use the sewer service areas as the CSO areas.
    - Greg Busch: It looks like some of our CSO updates haven't been uploaded to that USGS viewer tool yet, so there is another round of updates pending. Just offhand, there's a CSO coverage area around Baltimore City that's being represented in Anne Arundel County, Baltimore Co & City – it's actually a smaller area just in Baltimore City itself. Also Allegheny County has coverage that should basically be eliminated.
    - Marya Levelev: What happens when a CSO system is eliminated via separation??
    - Zhou: In Scenario Builder, when a CSO system is eliminated via separation, the land is converted to urban.
- Spano - Requested that WWTWG members review the coverage data hosted on the Phase 6 land use viewer website, and asked Peter Claggett and Quentin Stubbs to summarize the

feedback they get and to come back to the WWTWG to discuss any issues with workgroup members.

Action: The WWTWG members should review the CSO and sewer service area spatial coverage that is currently available on the Phase 6 land use viewer website, and submit any major comments using the online tools by **COB March 2nd**. The workgroup will hold follow-up discussions on data gaps during the March 7th meeting.

CSO Data Submission Round Robin – Jurisdictions

The Bay jurisdictions provided updates on the status of their additional CSO data submission for the Phase 6 model.

- Data has been received for Virginia and Maryland, the District's is underway, and West Virginia does not anticipate submitting additional data. Partial data from PA and NY. Otherwise there are no other CSO systems within the watershed.
- **Virginia:**
    - Ning Zhou: Data has been received for Richmond, Alexandria, and Lynchburg. Values from the Phase 5 concentration default table will continue to be used in Phase 6.
    - Tanya Spano expressed concern over the Bay Program using their own methodology to determine default concentration values over values that are reported from individual CSOs. Ning Zhou reminded everyone that default values are only used in instances where local data is unavailable.
- **Maryland:** Based on analysis, there is a significant decrease in flows and loads between Phases 5 and 6. The movement to reported data is likely an improvement over the previous modeling technique; however, there is still significant uncertainty.
    - Tanya Spano: What happens to areas that were part of combines systems we sewer separations come to completion?
    - Busch: We have two separate CSO approaches in MD – for the majority, we separate the sewers out. However, there are a few that will continue to be represented as a CSO in the model.
- **District** – Data efforts are underway but not yet complete.
- **Pennsylvania**: CSO elimination data were provided and will check for daily overflow data.
- **New York**: Partial monthly data provided for recent years.

STAC Workshop Proposal and Future Information Opportunities – Ning Zhou, VT, and Tanya Spano, MWCOG

Ning and Tanya reported back on the status of the STAC workshop proposal – noting that because of the timing for submitting a proposal, that there are no major/new technologies to highlight, and that most plants are just now implementing ENR, that a formal STAC workshop at this time does not appear to make the most sense. They then lead a discussion with the workgroup on opportunities for addressing questions/sharing information in the wastewater sector through other communication avenues. The workgroup was asked to brainstorm issues or questions they have within the context of innovative and successful wastewater nutrient reduction treatment.

- Spano - Suggested the workgroup begin to consider topics for webinars, potentially on projects within the Bay watershed. Allen Brockenbrough agreed this was a good idea.

Action: WWTWG members should consider projects within the watershed related to the wastewater sector that would be appropriate for a webinar hosted by the workgroup.

Updates and other business

- Point Source Project Update – Megan Thynge, EPA: Megan will be working to schedule another meeting of the Point Source Data Team.
    - The team has made progress developing an application for an interface for the point source data, and they hope to be able to present this back to the WWTWG.
    - The Point Source Data project would like to involve a state volunteer to do a preliminary review and check of the data. If you would like to volunteer to help with this effort, contact Megan Thynge (thynge.megan@epa.gov).
- WQGIT update
    - At their November 28th meeting, the WQGIT agreed to the wastewater treatment decision rules for the Phase III WIP planning target methodology. In order to define the two wastewater treatment "hockey stick" lines, total nitrogen concentrations will remain at 4.5 mg/L and 8 mg/L and the total phosphorus concentrations at 0.22 mg/L and 0.54 mg/L. These are the same concentrations used during the development of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL in 2010.
- 2016 Progress Update
    - All states except Virginia have provided final draft data for 2016 progress. If any jurisdictions notice errors in their data, there are avenues available to request additional runs.
    - A summary spreadsheet of 2016 draft loads is available on the calendar event page.
    - Tanya Spano also requested facility-specific data for COG region plants. She also reminded members about the need to put the loads into perspective moving forward, specifically in anticipation that wastewater loads will increase over time – as expected/planned for.
    - If workgroup members have specific suggestions on how to visualize the wastewater data, they should submit requests to Ning Zhou.
- BMP Expert Panel Update
    - There are 2 BMP panels: Onsite BMPs and Boat Pump-Out that have been paused due to running out of contractor funding for current FY. Work will resume in April when next FY starts.

Next conference call:
March 7, 2017 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Participants:

Name	**Affiliation**
Tanya Spano, Chair	MWCOG
Ning Zhou, Coordinator, CBP staff	VT
Lindsey Gordon, CBP staff	CRC
Michelle Williams, CBP staff	CRC
Quentin Stubbs	USGS
Peter Claggett	USGS
Angela Redwine	VDH
Dave Schepens	DE

George Onyullo	DOEE
Greg Busch	MDE
Jack Hayes	DE
Joel Blanco	EPA
Kumar	PA DEP
Matt Richardson	VA DEQ
Megan Thynge	EPA
Rashid Ahmed	NYSDEC
Allen Brockenbrough	VA DEQ
Greg Allen	EPA