



**Minutes  
Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)  
Teleconference  
Tuesday, May 3, 2016, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM**

---

**Summary of Action and Decision Items**

DECISION: The WWTWG approved the April minutes.

ACTION: CBPO Staff will make revisions to the Large Monitored Onsite Systems Draft Proposal and recirculate it to the WWTWG by May 13<sup>th</sup> for Workgroup review and approval by May 23<sup>rd</sup>. The final memo will be sent to the Watershed Technical Workgroup for review and approval during their June meeting.

ACTION: David Wood will re-send the email with the Boat Pump-Out Panel draft charge and membership to the WWTWG and summarize the changes to each since the panel was first proposed.

DECISION: The WWTWG conditionally approved the draft charge and membership for the Boat Pump-Out BMP Expert Panel, pending any concerns raised by the Partnership prior to the May 13<sup>th</sup> deadline for comments.

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

DECISION: The WWTWG approved the April minutes.

**Large Monitored Onsite Systems** – *Angela Redwine, VDH and Marcia Degen, VDH*

Angela and Marcia presented the proposed recommendations for tracking and reporting large monitored onsite systems in the Phase 6 Watershed Model.

**Discussion:**

- Jay Prager (MDE): In Maryland, there is a concern about double counting because we have identified septic system users. I would want to know the method for determining individual septic systems.
  - Spano: Does the Bay Program see an issue with using the shapefiles? It would seem they would have ability to verify that those kind of problems don't occur.
  - Jeff Sweeney (EPA): Maryland is different because they report based on the number of systems they have. I am not that concerned about Maryland. I don't know how this would work in other jurisdictions because they aren't reporting other systems. So the assumption is that somehow the systems are captured already in the method we're using to determine the septic load, and you want to pull out these large systems by telling us how many people are served or by giving us the location?
    - Redwine: Yes, that is the goal. We are trying to remove the portion of population served by large systems from the estimated onsite septic load because we have monitored data.
- Derrick Caruthers (DE DNREC): We track all of our large systems and sample quarterly for effluent concentrations and know the service area for all large systems.

- Dave Schepens (DNREC): Currently we are not reporting that information because we were under the impression that all systems were treated equally in the Phase 5.3.2 Model. In Phase 6 because large systems are treated to a higher degree and monitored, we thought we may be able to take some credit for that.
- Sweeney: The question is whether we subtract the monitored load for large systems from our estimate or add it in. How big is this load?
- Schepens: We are in support of the addition of large monitored systems to the Phase 6 model, because we are just trying to get an accurate accounting of the large systems versus a small system.
- Sweeney: So states would need to provide the annual load from systems, where they are located, or and the number of people served by the system. We would need that data for 1985-2013. How long have these systems been out there?
  - Schepens: Some are very old, maybe back to 1985. The older systems were more for commercial uses. We should have most of that data for the large systems back in time.
- Sweeney: We would need all of this data by June 20<sup>th</sup> so we can take a look at it and see how it fits in. Would states be able to get that to us by then?
  - Schepens: I can't guarantee that. We have a database that tracks everything but we are trying to update it.
- Sweeney: Could Virginia get it to us by June 20<sup>th</sup>?
  - Redwine: That is our goal.
- Sweeney: You just need to get what you have available for that 30 year period. It is not an easy thing to work into our database, so the earlier you can provide the data, the better. I would suggest going to the WTWG next with this proposal. It would be written into the implementation grants to make sure we get the data each year.
  - Spano: I think that all makes sense.
- Sweeney: Populations served by the systems is actually easier for us to incorporate than shapefiles. We can use the shapefiles, but population served would be a lot easier.
- Marya Lelev (MDE): Let's say a large system for Maryland is included in the planned sewer area. Peter already accounts for the population served. I thought if it was in the service area it was considered to be served by a Wastewater Treatment Plant. Do we need to check with him anyways?
  - Sweeney: You are right. What we are saying is that these large systems have been captured in the septic load outside the sewer service areas Peter specifies, and so the idea is we would take these loads out of the septic population.
  - Lelev: But what if the school is in the sewer area, but served by a large system?
    - Sweeney: It wouldn't include areas where there are large treatment systems. To me, it is whether we add or subtract it to the accounting. We are trying to accommodate what states do have, and that is data on these large systems.
  - Lelev: Don't we permit these large systems? We have probably provided this data to Ning.
    - Sweeney: If it is permitted and tracked through normal non-significant reporting, that is different.
- Lelev: I just wouldn't want to see adding additional septic load.
  - Ning Zhou (VT): It isn't adding, it is separating it out.
  - Sweeney: This doesn't really apply to Maryland because of how you currently report your systems. Just keep reporting the way you always do. You seem to have a good record of what that load is.
- Zhou: For reporting frequency, I would like to add a little more language. It is different than monitoring frequency, because we want to make sure the annual average is not just a one-time sample event. Delaware said they have quarterly monitoring, which is better than just one time.

Also, on avoiding double counting, we have determined that for commercial systems we don't have to cut off the population. When I discussed this with the expert panel, the baseline load we use for onsite systems is based on a regular residency situation, which accounts for the fact that people are often not at home. So for commercial systems, we don't have to apply an adjustment factor because the load isn't currently accounted for, but for residential we still need the population number to subtract out the current estimate.

- Spano: Before this is transmitted, has it been vetted by CBPO staff enough to send it to the Watershed Technical Workgroup?
  - Sweeney: I think so, yes. We need to add some details to the document, to address the questions the Watershed Technical Workgroup would need to know.
- Spano: I ask that before we transmit it, that we update it and approve it via email.

**ACTION:** CBPO Staff will make revisions to the Large Monitored Onsite Systems Draft Proposal and recirculate it to the WWTWG by May 13<sup>th</sup> for Workgroup review and approval by May 23<sup>rd</sup>. The final memo will be sent to the Watershed Technical Workgroup for review and approval during their June meeting.

### **Biosolids Task Force Recommendations** – *Karl Berger, MWCOG*

Karl shared a summary of the final recommendations of the Biosolids Ad Hoc Task Force with WWTWG members. The WWTWG will be asked to approve the recommendations during the June conference call.

#### **Discussion:**

- Berger: We hope to produce a brief report documenting our recommendations. We hope to have that to the WWTWG by the end of May, once the Task Force has had a chance to review and sign off on it. The report will outline the definition of biosolids for the Phase 6 Model, a series of decision rules for how to fill data gaps, a crop application scheme, and a recommendation that the Bay Program look further into phosphorus fate and transport in biosolids separately from manure. The Task Force would like to reconvene in September to look at the outcome of the calibration that uses these recommendations.

### **Wastewater Quality Assurance Plans** – *Ning Zhou, VT*

Ning provided an update on the status of the wastewater QA plans reported to the Chesapeake Bay Program.

#### **Discussion:**

- No questions or comments were raised.

### **New Source Data Collection and Cleanup Update** – *Ning Zhou, VT*

Jurisdictions were asked to provide updates on their data collection plan and efforts for the new sources, such as spray irrigation, rapid infiltration and large onsite systems.

#### **Discussion:**

- Redwine: Virginia will not be reporting rapid infiltration.
- Spano: We have some information from some of the MWCOG wastewater treatment plants, but we will follow up with Ning.

### **Wastewater Treatment Technology STAC Workshop** – *Tanya Spano, Chair*

Tanya led a discussion of potential options for the Wastewater Treatment Workgroup to sponsor a workshop on new developments in wastewater treatment technologies.

**Discussion:**

- Spano: I am not necessarily tied to the idea of it being a STAC workshop, but there have been a number of advances in wastewater treatment technology and I think it is time to pull together another event to discuss those advances. Are there any particular technologies we want to address, and is anyone interested in working with me to pursue what this workshop might look like?
  - Zhou: The limit of technology definition could be revisited and I think that this could be a good opportunity. For modeling purposes, that is a reference point and it would be good to have it updated.
- Spano: I am gathering a list of people to be involved in the conversation, so please feel free to contact me if you are interested. There may be a two tiered way of looking about it. First could be a discussion to look at the current state of the technology, and a second part could have case studies and technical presentations. Where we are, then what the future holds.

**Boat Pumpout Panel Charge and Membership** – *Ning Zhou, VT*

WWTWG members were asked to review the charge and scope of the Boat Pumpout BMP expert panel.

**Discussion:**

- Spano: An email was distributed on April 27<sup>th</sup> with the draft charge and membership for the panel. I saw a few concerns were raised by Norm Goulet (NVRC), but the response addressed those concerns. Who has been added to the membership since we last looked at this?

ACTION: David Wood will re-send the email with the Boat Pump-Out Panel draft charge and membership to the WWTWG and summarize the changes to each since the panel was first proposed.

- Spano: We can wait and ask for approval in June, do an offline review and approval, or if no one has major issues at this point, we can grant a conditional approval barring any changes by the close of the comment period on May 13<sup>th</sup>.
  - Schepens: I have no objections to a conditional approval as stated.
  - Redwine: No objections.
  - Levelev: No objections.
  - Matt Richardson (VA DEQ): No objections.

DECISION: The WWTWG conditionally approved the draft charge and membership for the Boat Pump-Out BMP Expert Panel, pending any concerns raised by the Partnership prior to the May 13<sup>th</sup> deadline for comments.

**Updates and other business**

- Attenuation Panel is waiting on the SPARROW model run, which will happen in June. Results are expected to come in by the end of June, with a report to follow.
- Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems panel held its open stakeholder session on April 27<sup>th</sup>.
- Point Source Data Project group held their first call on April 25<sup>th</sup>.

**Adjourned**

**List of Call Participants:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Tanya Spano (Chair)	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Ning Zhou (Coordinator)	VT, CBPO
David Wood (Staff)	CRC, CBPO
Dave Schepens	DE DNREC
Derrick Caruthers	DE DNREC
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO
Marya Levelev	MDE
Jay Prager	MDE
Lana Sindler	MWCOG
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Rashid Ahmed	NYSDEC
Matt Richardson	VA DEQ
Angela Redwine	VDH
Megan Browning	WV DEP