



Wastewater Treatment Workgroup Conference Call Tuesday October 18, 2011 Meeting Minutes

TetraTech Data Reporting System Development Proposal

[See presentation](#)

- Aim to reduce workload while improving data
- Data is submitted and report is provided to confirm submission
- Brockenbrough- is this system automated from PCS/ISIS or QA/QC'ed from State?
- A- It is whatever you would find useful, we will get into that in a bit
- Trulear- One request we have would be to gather info on non-sigs, can be a tool used to verify aggregates are met and this system could be a good way to do that
- Brockenbrough- at this point there is so little info in non-sigs, there will be more down the road but not now
- Montali- plan to continue reporting non-sigs at design flow
- Spano- appears to be closer to annual reporting than milestone
- Antos- Meeting milestones assessed based on annual reporting
- VA is not on ICIS and are not auto uploading to PCS, don't know what you can do that will improve our process
- Default pull from previous years won't help, VA has developed template to help in submitting
- Hurd- can you send me a copy of that report, with the understanding that it is similar to what you hope to submit for this year. That gives me a starting point
- Would you like Tetrattech to work w you to pull from your database?
- We have already done that, don't know what more you can do
- Marty will reach out to jurisdiction leads and then bring back to the group for review of progress
This is a new system, building out enterprise framework
- Will take a look at participant list and reach out to decide primary contact for each jurisdiction, may need 2 or 3 to participate from each jurisdiction
- Dave Schepens, Dave Montali leads for respective states

MD Proposal for Milestone Tracking

[See presentation](#)

- Goal is to use additional information to assess progress, supplement tracking w additional indicators, when public looks at MD site or EPA site they see similar results.
- Montali- is this all in terms of supplementing, or is this a new way of reporting all together?
- We are going to report number as well as additional information. EPA was asking for loads as well as programmatic updates in milestones.
- Are you submitting actual data, but then qualifying it based on upgrades? We would like to qualify based on upgrades etc, so when developing upgrades we can address lag in data
- Brockenbrough- the numbers are the only hard numbers, very careful about submitting loads that are not what actually occurred in first year.
- Trulear- for milestones, need to have actual loads

- VA will have an idea of all factors to consider for estimating end of milestones, they are able to come up with this number
- Spano having solid numbers has been a strength of wastewater, variability may be something so minor that it may not be worth focusing on
- MD wants to show progress, have consistency w Bay Program, want to give public a sense that we are making progress w upgrades even when wet years overrun the difference
- Information that MD chooses to share additionally is fine, as long as they are submitting what everyone else is sharing
- Antos - 2011 reporting goes to June 2011. EPA is looking for programmatic and actual numbers when evaluating suggested milestones, all will be considered when we evaluate success or failure of milestones EPA will not look at just the numbers but will consider programmatic as well, need best available data
- Lag is not addressed; we would like to see some acknowledgement. That progress has been made w upgrades, even though we will not see load reductions until the next year
- Concern in MD is that their numbers may not match CBP, but all states are facing same issues
- Montali- going to rely on words for milestones, to make input deck I will be conservative and report at default level.
- Completely separate annual progress and milestones reporting
- Would consider upgrades in place by 2012 for estimating 2013 milestone, allowing time to consider time needed to see reductions from upgrade
- Antos- is there a way to use 2010 progress run as a starting point and they can update w upgrades, considering that no action is design flow and progress is actual flow
- Antos- looking at upfront milestone progress and after the fact, EPA will first look state wide, if it missed somewhere that is where we will look further
- Antos- should it be design flow or 3 yr average?
- MD prefers 3 yr, it is more accurate
- PA uses design flow, not sure of question
- WV uses design flow, knowing they will be below, as long as load is below allocation we are good
- All states will be able to convey wastewater as a load in milestones but each state will have variations. Variations will lead to difficulties in equity of review but we will work w states on drafts to final

Wastewater/On-site System BMP Verification Approach and Framework

- In the coming months we would be asking WWTWG to provide input into this verification piece
- Can recommend what some have previously stated. they would not verify, it can be suggested that if a jurisdiction is not suggesting, they are reporting advanced systems, they would not need verification, but if reported they would need to be

Other Updates

- Real World Examples Workshop will be moving forward, Steering Committee should watch for updates
- Add Leo, Ann Carkhuff, Reggie Parish to relevant workgroup interested parties

On the Phone:

Ron Furlan
Jason Oylar
Dave Schepens
Dave Montali
Steve Luckman
Tanya Spano
Allen Brockenbrough
John Kennedy
Eric Aschenbach
Katherine Antos
Brian Trulear
Marty Hurd
Glenn Rountree
Rashid Ahmed
Marya Levelev
Ning Zhou
Victoria Kilbert