



## Wastewater Treatment Workgroup Conference Call Draft Minutes

January 26, 2011 12:30PM- 3:00PM

Conference Line: 866.299.3188 code: 517.628.4390

Adobe Connect: [http://chesapeake1.na4.acrobat.com/wastewater\\_conf\\_call/](http://chesapeake1.na4.acrobat.com/wastewater_conf_call/)

---

### **TMDL Discussion- Zhou, Antos**

- Thank WG for WIP input and discuss TMDL and request to id corrections
- Look forward to working w you on P2
- Inform EPA of corrections by Jan 31
- Jen Sincock is the contact for this correspondence- [sincock.jennifer@epa.gov](mailto:sincock.jennifer@epa.gov)
- \*\*\*\*Tanya- Request that everyone email changes for Sincock, and deadline (directly to Jen)
- This detail is on the calendar event, all info can be found there
- Andy- Permittee contacted us and directed to Jennifer to ask their question. What happens after errata sheet, what if errors after that. Way to address this w/o opening TMDL?
- KA- Errata sheet would go out and Bay TAS will pull from TMDL and errata sheet to have most up to date info, want to capture all corrections by deadline. Not looking to post a new errata sheet every month, maybe wait to be address in P2 WIPs. Don't want it to interfere w permits
- Andy- Appreciate that you are giving this opportunity, and recognize process
- Buckley- Table Q specific questions
- KA- Go to Sincock and then to Ravi if Jen is unable to answer. We will work to get you an answer
- PA WIP came in a little below so we corresponded w Andy and discussed putting it into a reserve
- Trulear was WW Lead, follow up w him on permitting questions etc

### **Onsite BMP Review- Zhou, Kilbert**

- Kennedy- Agreed on Consistent way of representing Onsite across the watershed, does this list suggest that we are looking to allow for different approaches?
- Ning- Attenuation numbers, Different Attenuation rate in MD for critical areas, all others the same
- 40% attenuation rate around the watershed before the BMP application
- Two BMP is advanced w denitrification, about 50% reduction credited for this, pumping is 5%
- PA-Not asking for review but saying this is what we have found through our research.
- Should MD's approach be accepted, can it be applied throughout the watershed
- Right now it is only applied in MD
- That is unfair, it should be able to applied throughout
- VA- It captures what is said and we understood we will need to provide documentation

- PA- no not looking for data for review by EPA, in future versions, remove PA's entry for further versions
- \*Remove PA entry
- Can be new, or an update all states need to be part of review and it will be applied overall
- WV- Will need to review, this is new to me
- \*Follow up w Dave Montali on Removing BMPs
- WV- before talk of representing septs in relation to waterways, losing something here in how it would be pulled off, might not be BMP but attenuation. Not sure how we would do it, but needs review.
- Brosch- MD submits on CB segment scale number of systems that have less or more attenuation based on proximity (GPS data) certain distance from waterways was represented as attenuation.
- DE- 1, 2, 3 depends on size of system. Want credit for each of those depending on (taking into account for performance standard prior to discharge into soil)
- Randy- Doc at office, we will forward it off to you.
- EPA will be willing to consider and use placeholders, as long as documentation is provided and approved. P2 can still have placeholders. Issue is we will not accept in annual progress runs until value is officially approved by CBP through protocol
- Dave Montali- Questioning validity of WV on request. Failing systems are not represented in the model, so crediting them is valid?
- Brosch- if we are able to determine the number of failing we would be able to input the impact of repairing
- Suggest removing this BMP (WV item 31)
- Comes down to whether or not you can track the failing systems
- Would changing septs numbers to represent that some are failing versus and average of all require a model change? Yes, most likely and we need to know if this data is available
- To get it truly right we would need historic data from 85 to current for calibration
- Marsha VA- specifically for small systems, for larger systems our regulations say we will not have discharge. I have no idea how we will represent. (1000+ gallons a day has no load)
- May not model those systems having a load now or not, would have to check and VA agriculture numbers are there (lots of data from VA). More of the 2017 modeling question, not a BMP review for this round
- Kennedy- Overview, each jurisdiction has priority, need to follow protocol for documentation to CBP
- KA- Did receive documentation, need workgroup to convene panel to review efficiencies, taken through WTWG and to WQGIT.
- Brosch- also relies on which BMP has the most support as of now.
- VA is not ready

- DE is ready to go, will be keyed up first. VA second, WV pull or reconsider (think about it a bit more, talk w others)
- WV- WIP does not call for reduction from septic, this is not vital to us to achieve
- Is workgroup asking that we revisit attenuation rates for revisiting model in 2017?
- Need to at least inform group next meeting, need to make plan to take care of this issue again
- Need to get septic right, one quarter of the population is on septic so need to be sure of this number
- Equity issue, attenuation of MD in non tidal is 30%, where as other areas is 40%?
- MD has a higher release of N than modeled situations, so this is not to their benefit
- Overall MD is higher load than average
- Brosch- Pt of clarification BMPs are open for changing in P2 WIPs. As long as wg and WTWG can give approval
- Clarity on constraints, would be helpful to have something to right this up
- WG Endorses modified table- PA drops, WV might drop, DE is priority
- Action item- Ning work w DE to solicit members for panel and nominate chair of panel. Do your homework between now and the next meeting.
- \*send Tanya updated table
- \*send around Protocol for BMP

### **Implementation of CSO WLAs in NPDES permits**

- Moved to before STAC
- Held to limits under dry weather conditions
- Concentrations based permit above dry weather flow, would like to continue to permit high
- Flows using technology based limits, characterized using hydrology.
- Ann PA- Where did table Q info come from? Was it in the draft?
- Ning- Number from Tetratex, 10 yr average based on estimate (Tetratex), used model to simulate overflow from 85 to 05, used 10 yr average as baseline, number in TMDL is baseline and long-term control plan reduction rate (from community or EPA default, 80% overflow reduction, after applied we arrive at TMDL
- KA will confirm app q between draft and final should be the same. Will confirm after call
- Just need to report reduction rate, not flow concentration, target is 85% reduction.
- VA- Is the approach we spelled out in our WIP kosher? If a facility reports 0 overflows, we report 0, if less than 6 we report 85% reduction, if more than 6 overflows, we report no action.
- 85% reduction is from 10 baseline, not from no action
- NPDES will be responsible for further discussions on permitting

### **Proposed STAC-Sponsored Wastewater Conference- Spano, Zhou**

- One or two day workshop
- WG needs to decide on scope and topic, decide if we are going to propose this
- Determine how to select panel
- Need proposal ready w details for March STAC meeting
- Randy- where are issues?
- Tanya- in agenda
- Randy- had two workshops on POTW and efficiencies, may be a benefit to this process (in KT and IN), would be helpful on Bay side
- Tanya- Thinks we should not duplicate, but think it will be a benefit
- Volunteers for proposal- Marsha (septics), Ed Reilly NY, Randy Sovic (been through process on OH Basin can help)
- Marsha VA- target audience?
- Depends on workshop proposed, agriculture workgroup , can include state manager and plant implementer
- First question for action team to address
- Email offline to get this done by March 3

### **Model Calibration and WIP II Schedule**

- Schedule in coming months
- Email from Garvin
- On track to complete agreed upon changes, recalibrate and runs
- Principle Staff meeting in Feb, hope to provide dates from this meeting
- Feedback on schedule, taking this feedback to GIT and PSC
- Are we able to be flexible w Feb 7<sup>th</sup> deadline? We will be finalizing w states until the 22<sup>nd</sup> but data needs to be in by the 7<sup>th</sup>. Send to Ning, PA will need to talk
- Clarification for calibration on non sig, what are you proposing to use for cal?
- Want all proposed facilities, need ones added since calibration
- \*Ning can provide list of ones currently in calibration (what he has in data base if there are any additions please highlight and send in)
- For calibration we need historic number, need to come up w how to do that
- What is default information? Will use WIP number
- Dave- are you familiar w what we provided in the WIP?
- Some are not in current calibration, we need you to provide estimate 91-00 loading.
- Most are little Sewage TP and don't have the data
- N 18, P 3 is default
- Will use WIP unless you absolutely know if something was changed and you reduced your load
- Provided tables where we removed stormwater and included supporting spreadsheets, need to work w you to ensure that you used all that data
- MD has new facility to get in, VA has submitted but needs to ensure that Ning has everything you need, WV says it is in the WIP

- VA dealing w non sig, looked at percent of design flow occurring and applied ratio across non sig, probably do something similar
- PA will need to regroup looking back on WIP, will follow up w Ning
- BY next meeting we will have feedback from PSC and will have definite dates
- Reporting schedule- what is plan from here? Reporting year? Sync permits to December or June?
- March Nita Sylvester will be reporting this to GIT, transitioned to calendar year, future milestones will be calendar yr based. Advise that it is looked at calendar yr
- Advised there is a PSC issue, PSC only allows for annual updates to load and anniversary of permit
- Pravin Rana and BayTAS team will be alerted to this concern and WV rep on workgroup to this
- Permit guys are working through this
- ICIS does not have this issue
- \*Ning will follow up
- Refer to appendix of TMDL (app Q) before info from Ning, Ning info should
- Interest in viewing Septic and Sewer GIS file, only NY for now, anyone else? WV would like that as well

**Participants:**

Ning Zhou-  
 Katherine Antos- EPA CBPO  
 Victoria Kilbert- CRC CBPO  
 Tanya Spano-  
 Lana Sander-  
 Dave Schepan-  
 Pat Buckley- PA DEP  
 Steve Luckman-  
 Allan Brockenbrough-  
 Randy Sovic-  
 Dave Montali-  
 Ed Reilly-  
 Chris Brosch- UMD CBPO  
 Scott Hines-