



SUMMARY

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG) Conference Call

Tuesday, June 24th, 2014

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/21138>

Welcome and Introductions

- Tanya Spano (Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments; WWTWG Chair) convened the call and reviewed the [agenda](#).
- Spano asked for comments or corrections to the May minutes ([Attachment A](#)).
 - None were raised; the minutes were approved as submitted.
 - **DECISION:** The May conference call minutes were approved as written.

Nutrient discharges from grey infrastructure expert panel report

- Tom Schueler (Chesapeake Stormwater Network) explained that he facilitated the expert panel in conjunction with Cecilia Lane (CSN). He thanked Bill Stack (CWP) and the panel members for their hard work and input. He noted the panel's recommendations were presented to the USWG the previous week, and that comments are requested by July 8th. Will seek USWG approval of the recommendations in July.
 - View [his presentation](#) for more details
 - View the report ([Attachment B](#)) for the complete panel recommendations
- Spano: We know SSOs happen and we have some idea of what concentrations to expect, though the volumes will vary case by case. Other types of discharges have more variability in the concentrations, and the table on slide 28 illustrates that.
 - Schueler: Exactly. The panel was very mindful that an empirical crediting approach needs to be based on solid data.
 - Spano: Sampling is expensive. If we can build a better database of samples taken throughout the watershed to improve the estimates or defaults, it would help everyone.
 - Schueler: Right now we need sampling to define credit for some of these discharges, but as more communities collect samples perhaps there can be a shift towards using more defaults as those estimates improve.
- Spano thanked Schueler and the panel for their effort. Appreciate fact that this becomes another reason why repairing our aging infrastructure is important. Eliminating these systemic discharges is important and this helps.
 - Ron Furlan: appears we are giving credit for compliance. Has there been a cost analysis for the programmatic approach.
 - Schueler noted the difference between discovered and reported discharges. A community can comply with their permit without doing anything beyond visual screening. This approach would credit communities that go above and beyond by enacting an advanced, nutrient-focused, program. Not aware of cost studies.
 - Bill Stack (CWP): The sewersheds in Baltimore City that were in compliance with consent decrees could still have many problems such as leakage. This crediting approach provides incentive for communities to look at day-to-day leaks or other infrastructure problems. These discharges

- may be small compared to wet weather overflows, but eliminating them can be very cost effective.
- Dave Montali (WV DEP): Has there been coordination regarding how this relates to the Phase 5.3.2 model calibration?
 - Schueler: this is a new BMP and it would apply to the urban pervious load. Still need to discuss with the CBP modelers how the BMP might be applied in the Phase 6 Model.
 - Montali: seems there would be spatial variability in the discharges based on the age of the infrastructure.
 - Schueler: Some of the panelists noted that there are sometimes problems with younger infrastructure too. Some of the advanced programs use GIS to target problem areas.
 - Spano: Age is an indicator, but there are many other factors. Different materials were used at different points in time, and it will vary based on each community's situation and history.
- Montali: there were a couple examples with 2 years of pre-monitoring.
 - Schueler: The panel was aware that such monitoring can be expensive, but felt because of changing conditions and variability it is important to have an established baseline. The decision to go with 2-years was based on their best professional judgment.
- **ACTION:** WWTWG members should send any feedback on the expert panel report to Tom Schueler (watershedguy@hotmail.com) and Cecilia Lane (watershedgal@hotmail.com) by July 8th.

Biosolids and spray irrigation

- Matt Johnston (University of Maryland, CBPO) described his discussion on biosolids with each of the states, and spray irrigation. The states all appear to have data on tons of biosolids applied in each county and years when it was applied. Other variables such as nutrient concentrations can be pulled from literature or other states' data as a default. All states have at least some biosolids data. Ideally we are looking for 1985-present, but there are cases where some data will not exist and we will have to evaluate those situations. By next summer, the states have been requested to provide their biosolids data record. Next year staff can come back to this workgroup to present what data was available.
 - Marya Levelev (MDE): last time we discussed we discussed that dedicated staff time can be problematic. What kind of assistance from EPA or CBPO might be available?
 - Johnston: The workgroup might want to ask Rich Batiuk (EPA, CBPO) about what resources could be available for the states as they compile their biosolids data.
 - Furlan asked for clarification on how the data would be applied in the Watershed Model.
 - Johnston: We are setting up the nutrient balance for the next version of the Model that combines the estimated nutrient inputs from manure, fertilizer, etc. It would improve the accounting of the inputs, not affect the loads.
 - Montali: Application of septage. West Virginia sometimes applies biosolids from septic tanks.

- Spano suggested that the issue of septage discussed at a future WWTWG discussion.
- Spano asked CBPO staff to create a spreadsheet to track what we are doing on biosolids, with deadlines, request made, etc. We will follow up with staffing and resources available. Staff will report to workgroup on progress in a few months, and key up discussion on septage and consider whether we want to include that as part of database efforts.

WWTWG and STAC workshop recommendations

- Spano reviewed [Attachment C](#) with participants. She asked CBPO staff to revise the table with headers, etc. to make it more helpful. She reviewed each row and asked for workgroup thoughts or comments on each recommendation. [Note: the numbers below correspond to the numbers in Attachment C]
 - 1. Spano felt there should be an action item that the WWTWG will review and approve the panel's recommendations.
 - 2. Spano felt there should be a subject header about outreach. Should also add specificity to schedule discuss this topic at a future conference call.
 - 3. Spano asked if it would be useful to discuss revolving funds and see what some states are doing and what we might be able to learn from each other.
 - Montali: We are using the revolving fund in WV for septic areas, but not sure about success stories offhand. Can this discussion also apply to cluster or community systems?
 - Spano noted the workshop looked at both individual and cluster or community systems. The workgroup can definitely look at both.
 - Dave Schepens (DE DNREC): Our state has some revolving fund programs for on-site systems, e.g. low interest loans.
 - Lelevel: Would the discussion be limited to revolving funds or other programs too?
 - Spano noted the workshop recommendation started from discussion of federal funding, but the workgroup could broaden the discussion.
 - Lelevel: Maryland does have state programs. Will share information and links with Jeremy Hanson.
 - **ACTION:** Workgroup members to provide links and information about state programs based on federal or state funding mechanisms. Staff will work with Chair to schedule a more robust discussion on this topic in the future.
 - 4. Spano felt the workgroup may want to combine all of these issues into the survey. Use the workshop recommendations as a check to make sure the major issues are covered.
 - 5. Spano asked to clarify the statement and add an action that we will be hearing from EPA on this.
 - Joyce Hudson (EPA) offered to work with Zhou and Hanson to fill this out. Do not have a target date, but can perhaps outline some of the expected milestones for the data-sharing effort. Have made quite a bit of progress, but still some work to do with the states and industry. We

haven't talked much about the website. It has been a very collaborative effort and very thankful to the states. Definitely need technical support from CBP to house data from the effort.

- 6. Spano noted it is very closely related to number 2. Asked staff to add more specificity on what the workgroup may be able to do.
- **ACTION:** CBPO staff to update the table based on the discussion.

Updates and other business

- Spano noted the new WQGIT governance protocol and encouraged workgroup members to review it. The jurisdictions are currently designating their voting members. Maryland has already submitted theirs.
 - Montali noted the overall idea is to still strive for consensus. The voting aspect of the governance protocol would only apply in the rare the instances when a consensus can't be reached.
 - Jeremy Hanson (CRC, CBPO) reiterated Montali's point and thanked him for making that comment.
 - Spano encouraged the workgroup participants to work with their state WQGIT reps as they identify their voting workgroup members.
- Zhou noted that the Soil Attenuation Expert Panel had its first conference call earlier in June. The current draft BMP review protocol asks the workgroup to review and approve the charge and panel membership.
 - View the draft panel charge and list of panel members for more information.
 - **ACTION:** WWTWG members should send an final input on attenuation panel members and charge Jeremy Hanson (jhanson@chesapeakebay.net) and Ning Zhou (zhou.ning@epa.gov) by July 1.
- Spano noted the WQGIT wants to hold a face-to-face meeting in October. Will ask WQGIT for clarification on what they want to hear from the workgroups. She asked the workgroup to share any ideas for STAC workshops, workgroup agendas, or other workgroup activities. Ideas can be sent to Hanson (jhanson@chesapeakebay.net).
- Spano also encouraged WWTWG members to consider a leadership role as a workgroup Vice-Chair or as the next Chair.
- Zhou noted he will be taking leave for four weeks in July. If any assistance before then, contact him by July 4th.
- Spano asked for other updates from the workgroup. None were raised.
- Spano thanked participants for their time and valuable discussion.

Adjourned

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
Eric	Aschenbach	Virginia Dept. of Health
Karl	Berger	MWCOG
Allan	Brockenbrough	Virginia Dept. of Environmental Quality
Greg	Busch	MDE
Jon	Diehl	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection
Marcia	Degen	VDH
Nick	Hong	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection
Joyce	Hudson	EPA
Matt	Johnston	UMD, CBPO
Marya	Levelev	MDE
Dave	Montali	WV Dept. of Environmental Protection
George	Onyullo	DC Dept. of Environment
Dave	Schepens	DE DNREC
Tom	Schueler	Chesapeake Stormwater Network
Lana	Sindler	MWCOG
Bill	Stack	Center for Watershed Protection
John	Weidman	NYS DEC