



## SUMMARY

### Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG) Conference Call

Monday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2013, 10:00 AM- 12:00 PM

[www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19155/](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19155/)

#### Welcome & Introductions

- Tanya Spano (Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments; WWTWG Chair) convened the meeting shortly after 10:00AM. She welcomed participants and reviewed the morning's [agenda](#).
- Spano noted the November minutes ([Attachment A](#)) went out late, so the workgroup would approve them in January. She asked WWTWG members to send any comments or corrections to Jeremy Hanson in the mean time.
- **ACTION:** WWTWG members to provide any comments or corrections for the November minutes to Jeremy Hanson ([jhanson@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:jhanson@chesapeakebay.net)) by the next WWTWG call.

#### BMP Verification

- Spano explained that the WWTWG will need to revise its BMP verification protocol in response to feedback and recommendations from the BMP Verification Review Panel. Jeremy Hanson (Chesapeake Research Consortium, Chesapeake Bay Program Office) had taken initial shot at reorganizing and revising the protocol in response to the Review Panel's comments, and worked with her and Ning Zhou (Virginia Tech, CBPO; WWTWG Coordinator) to get a revised draft out for the WWTWG's consideration. She noted the revised verification document will need to be submitted by February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2014, so there were no decisions on the table, but the workgroup needed to determine a schedule to meet the deadline.
- Jeremy Hanson (CRC, CBPO) encouraged WWTWG members to read through [Attachment B](#), which provides the full, detailed recommendations from the Verification Review Panel. He reviewed the latest BMP Verification schedule ([Attachment C](#)).
- Hanson reviewed the revised draft verification document ([Attachment D](#)) with the workgroup and highlighted the major changes to the document. He explained the revisions were made so the workgroup could provide their reactions and comments over the next few weeks.
- Spano highlighted septic pumping and Table 3 as a couple of the major changes. She asked for participants' thoughts.
- Dave Schepens (DE DNREC): if we agree to this, would we then need to track or inspect each shallow-pressure dosed system annually? Not clear what we would be agreeing to. Delaware will definitely be submitting comments.
- Marcia Degen (Virginia Dept. of Health) pointed out the document should make distinction between Operations & Maintenance (O&M) and verification.
- Spano: We will need to review the language to make distinctions in the language between the states' requirements and programs when necessary.

- Zhou noted the inspections called for in the document would need to track and document these BMP systems that are reported for credit, but it is not specified who would conduct the inspections.
- Schepens: There are many shallow-placed pressure dosed systems in Delaware, so requiring additional inspections would not be feasible because the additional cost would be too high. We track and permit these systems, and verify installation, but beyond that annual inspections would be too costly. Though we do want to get credit for them.
- Spano: the main challenge of verification is that the partnership will eventually have the approach that if we can not verify a practice as installed and functional, then it will not receive credit forever.
- Degen: how often are other sectors suggesting verification for practices before credit expires?
- **ACTION:** Hanson to extract examples of lifespan and inspection frequency and rationale for non-annual practices from the agriculture and stormwater workgroup verification narratives.
- Schepens noted that Delaware takes a soil-based approach when determining what on-site system should be used. The workgroup and others should understand that Delaware is different than other areas.
- Spano asked Zhou what the status of the On-site Systems Expert Panel was.
  - Zhou explained the contract with Tetra Tech is completed, though we can add more hours if needed. As we look at this language
- Schepens: In reality there are too many systems to inspect on an annual basis.
- Degen: Are there minimum expectations for verification of these systems?
  - Hanson explained that the options for verification are wide open. The Review Panel asked the workgroups to “aim high” in their guidance to the states, but since BMP verification is a partnership effort, there is an understanding that resources are limited. So the workgroup can definitely consider options like sub-sampling or spot checks instead of inspections to minimize costs.
- Schepens noted that according to the real estate industry, property transfers approximately every 5-10 years. Delaware inspects the on-site systems when property transfers. Could use that mechanism for verification purposes.
- Hanson: Based on my understanding of the states’ programs for on-site systems, they very likely meet or exceed the Review Panel’s expectations for verification.
- Spano: We can outline options based on Delaware’s and other states’ approaches and distinguish where the states take different approaches.
- Schepens: for innovative and alternative systems we are set up to do what is outlined in the draft, but for common technologies like shallow placed pressure dosed. Should make distinction between O&M and verification in the document.
- Degen: Alternative systems in Virginia require annual inspections under existing law, so we will do that regardless of verification.
- Allan Brockenbrough (VA DEQ): Would like the same philosophy that is applied to traditional septic systems applied to CSO areas where not seeking nutrient reductions or non-significant facilities that are not upgrading or expanding.
  - Zhou clarified that verification will only be needed for practices that are reported for credit. That is if no credit is sought/not in WIP, then no verification is required (at least for purposes of the Bay process).

- Spano: we have to find the reality that the workgroup can agree on and recommend for on-site systems in table 4. Clearly not wholesale adoption of table 3. Dave agreed.
- Zhou noted that the Verification Review Panel had pointed out that the septic pumping BMP was not included in the workgroup's previous document. There was no language in the expert panel report on how to inspect or validate the BMP, so we added the paragraph in Attachment D for the workgroup's reaction. He asked for thoughts and comments from participants.
  - No comments were raised.
- Spano asked for the workgroup to consider the process over the next several weeks. She noted the next call was currently scheduled for January 7<sup>th</sup>. Could WWTWG members provide comments over next three weeks on Attachment D?
  - Schepens suggested delaying the next call by a week or so.
  - Eric Aschenbach (VDH) agreed.
- Spano: If we asked for comments by January 9<sup>th</sup> and held a call the following week, would that work for everyone? We could make judgment on what comments/feedback is most substantive and focus on those points during the rescheduled call and get agreement for a final draft based on that discussion. We could meet the February 3<sup>rd</sup> deadline that way.
  - Participants agreed the process outlined by Spano was reasonable.
  - Hanson committed to sending a Word version of Attachment D so that members can more easily provide their comments.
- **DECISION:** The workgroup will delay its January call until the week of January 13<sup>th</sup>. Exact date TBD.
- **ACTION:** Workgroup members should submit comments on Attachment D by **Thursday, January 9<sup>th</sup>** to Tanya ([tspano@mwcog.org](mailto:tspano@mwcog.org)), Ning ([zhou.ning@epa.gov](mailto:zhou.ning@epa.gov)) and Jeremy ([jhanson@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:jhanson@chesapeakebay.net)).

## Other Updates

### *Biosolids/Spary Irrigation Data*

- Zhou briefly discussed the [draft template for biosolids and spray irrigation data \(.xlsx\)](#). Based on comments from the states we developed this template to make it as clear and simple as possible. Roughly the same template for biosolids and spray irrigation. Would be great if we can finalize this by March 2014. We will discuss over next couple months, but encourage states to review to see if they could provide the data using the template. Would appreciate any comments on the template.
- **ACTION:** Members should review the draft template for biosolids and spray irrigation and send comments to Ning, Jeremy, and Tanya.
- Spano noted the workgroup will revisit this discussion in January and again in February.

### *Revised data requirements in the Bay grant guidance*

- Zhou explained the progress run data submission date changed to December 1<sup>st</sup>. Virginia and DC point source data will still be due on January 31<sup>st</sup>. Starting for 2014 Progress, CBPO will require states to submit non-significant facility data at the same time as significant data to ensure the non-significant facility data up to date. The submitted data can still be the estimated one time data developed for the WIPs if no new estimates or monitored data available, but need to reflect any updates happened during the progress

year, such as removal of old facilities, addition of new facilities and facility status change from non-significant to significant, or from significant to non-significant. Do not require new data for non-significants, just want each submission to include all facilities, significant and non-significant, that need to be included in each progress run.

#### *Fate of the older supplemental indicator*

- Spano noted the workgroup still needed to determine the fate of the old supplemental indicator now that the new supplemental indicator was approved by the workgroup for Maryland's use.
  - Brockenbrough noted the old indicator had changed so it was less useful by the time it was approved. Suggest we drop it.
  - Greg Busch (MDE): Maryland would be fine if we get rid of the old supplemental indicator.
- Spano: barring any concerns, we will drop it, though we will want to check with the jurisdictions not on the call.

#### *Update on the septic BMP expert panel report*

- Spano asked for an update on the on-site systems BMP expert panel report.
- Zhou: Marcia is working up language for report. Will have revised version for workgroup in January.
- Degen: Sending out language to the panel as we speak. Also asking about the verification frequency issue.

#### *Misc updates*

- Spano noted the STAC on-site workshop will be held the following two days. Look forward to robust discussion and hope to see workgroup members there.
  
- Spano thanked everyone for their time and input.

#### **Adjourned**

## December 16, 2013 WTWG Teleconference Participants

<u>Name</u>		<u>Affiliation</u>
Tanya	Spano (Chair)	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Ning	Zhou (Coord.)	Virginia Tech, CBPO
Jeremy	Hanson (Staff)	CRC, CBPO
Nasser	Ameen	MWCOG
Eric	Aschenbach	Virginia Dept. of Health
Brian	Ashby	Delaware DNREC
Allan	Brockenbrough	Virginia Dept. of Environmental Quality
Greg	Busch	MDE
Marcia	Degen	Virginia Dept. of Health
Dharmendra	Kumar	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Dave	Schepens	DE DNREC
Lana	Sindler	MWCOG
John	Weidman	New York Dept. of Environmental Conservation