



## **SUMMARY**

### **Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG) Conference Call**

**Tuesday, March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2013, 10:00 AM- 12:00 PM**

**<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19145/>**

#### **Welcome and Introductions**

- Tanya Spano (MWCOG; WWTWG Chair) convened the call at 10:00AM, reviewed the [agenda](#), and verified participants.

#### **Midpoint Assessment Priority Workplans & Timeline**

- Spano discussed the workgroup's draft workplans and associated timeline for their completion ([Attachment A](#)).
- Spano noted the tentative trading/offsets discussion for April. The workgroup could cover some background and discuss where it wants to go from there.
- Marya Levelev (MD Department of Environment): Would like to broaden the subject to not just include how the trades are addressed in the permits, but also in the progress runs. Each state is doing things a little differently in addressing trading or offsets in permits. Think it is a good idea to have the discussion together with the Trading & Offsets Workgroup, and possibly the permitting group from EPA. She noted this was mentioned during the WWTWG's 1/16 call.
- Ning Zhou (Virginia Tech/CBPO; WWTWG Coordinator): trading and offsets are currently outside the scope of the Bay Program models and tracking. So one goal is to have some information sharing so the CBPO is more aware of trading/offset activity in the states and how it affects wasteloads or progress runs. First, the workgroup needs to determine if there's a need for this or if it should remain as is.
- Spano asked for comments or thoughts from the other jurisdictions.
- Dave Montali (WV Department of Environmental Protection) noted West Virginia is different from other jurisdictions. Do not see this trading/offsets as the most pressing of the lower priorities for the workgroup; there is still a lot of flux. Also, important to remember that trading is separate from offsets. West Virginia is more interested in offsets. Seems that leveling the playing field on biosolids is something that needs to be done during the Midpoint Assessment process.
- Eric Aschenbach (VA Department of Health): Virginia does not have a way of aggregating wasteload allocations for on-site systems. The offset program originally developed by the state does not include on-site systems.
- George Onyullo (DC Department of Environment): DC does not have a trading policy, but the new stormwater retention standard will be in place by July. The new regulations will allow stormwater offsets within the District; plan to create database to track these offsets. We made it clear to EPA that we are not tracking anything right now while the regulation is not in place.
- Spano asked if there were other priorities or things the workgroup should keep in mind during the midpoint assessment discussion.

- Spano suggested the workgroup plan an initial discussion to review and understand background info and the current status of these priorities. From there the workgroup can discuss where to go, or if there is a need to continue with the priorities. She asked the CBPO staff to compile and gather background information of each priority's status for the coming months.
- Jim George (MDE): At least for Maryland, the evaluation of point source progress in the 2012-2013 milestones is a time sensitive issue. It is also a higher level policy issue that may be discussed through other channels as well. The Milestones Workgroup has agreed to do model runs that separate evaluations of BMP management actions from the effects of growth; currently these effects are co-mingled and it's difficult to understand the different effects. Another issue is the effect of annual precipitation. The way point sources are currently reported, precipitation can cause large fluctuations in the load. For VA and MD where point sources are about one-fourth of the load, this can have a significant impact on progress; this noise can drown out the benefits of management actions.
  - He noted the Bay Program website already reports and demonstrates changes due to precipitation. Maryland suggests that the variability should be averaged out. During discussions last year there were concerns about potential workload burden for states, so consensus was not reached.
- Spano: Did the supplemental indicator address this issue, at least partially?
  - George: we reached an agreement, but we felt the supplemental indicator did not fully address the issue. There were some time constraints back then. The period ends June 30 and the states collect and report their data by December 1.
- George: Perhaps the jurisdictions with lower proportions of point source loads (PA, NY, DE, and WV) could report differently since it will not affect them as much. As long as there is consensus and the process is transparent, perhaps MD or VA could report differently to account for these point source fluctuations.
- Spano asked for thoughts from the other jurisdictions.
- Montali asked if this a Midpoint Assessment issue, or a communications, or milestones issue? Since allocations are based on design the loads will go up over time, so this seems like more of a communications issue.
- George: the choice of evaluation methodologies will affect the midpoint assessment.
- George agreed to share a proposal with the workgroup for more specificity at a future meeting.
- Spano: biosolids was flagged by Montali as a priority, and Trading/offsets is also a question
- Spano asked CBPO staff to expand [Attachment E](#) based on MPA priorities, including any applicable deadlines.
- Montali felt May is a fine start date for biosolids; do not need to move it ahead of trading/offsets.
- Spano: suggest CBPO staff works to flesh out and line up these issues accordingly to address over coming year. If other thoughts, please contact Tanya, Ning, and Jeremy.

- **ACTION:** CBPO staff will expand the workgroup schedule to include the Midpoint Assessment priorities and relevant deadlines.
- **ACTION:** Workgroup members are encouraged to provide input or thoughts on the schedule to Ning, Tanya, and Jeremy.

### **Refresher of BMP Approval Process**

- Spano reviewed the WQGIT's protocol for BMP review ([Attachment B](#)).
- Hanson reviewed the list of BMPs that are currently under review, or planned for review ([Attachment C](#)), highlighting Illicit Discharge Detection & Elimination, and Algal Turf Scrubbers as two possible BMPs of interest to the wastewater sector.
- Spano asked if the workgroup members had any questions about the list of BMPs
  - Aschenbach: what is the septic part 2?
    - Zhou explained the part 2 panel will deal soil attenuation; the first panel is focused on the system efficiencies. There is currently only one attenuation rate for septic systems in the watershed, aside from Maryland.
- Spano noted that requests for new BMPs for review can come in at any time.
- Spano was curious how Animal Waste Storage Structures may relate to biosolids and application.
- **ACTION:** WWTWG members are asked to submit any new BMPs for expert panel review. This is an ongoing request.

### **BMP Verification Follow-up**

- Zhou and Hanson described changes made to the Verification Protocol ([Attachment D](#)) following January's conference call. The Protocol was presented to the BMP Verification Committee during their February 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. They explained the Verification Committee was thankful for the additional information on septic regulations in Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware. The WWTWG's protocol is essentially final at this point.
- Spano asked for questions
  - None were raised.

### **Septic Panel update**

- Vic D'Amato (Tetra Tech) noted some of the panelists were present on the call.
  - He reviewed the schedule and described the panel's current status ([Attachment F](#)).
- Montali explained the panel's difficulty with defining the baseline. Some factors, e.g. edge of drain field, are difficult to define prior to the attenuation panel.
  - Marcia Degen (VA Dept. of Health) noted there could be significant ramifications if we change the baseline, but this might be necessary due to refinements in available information.
- Spano thanked Vic and the panelists. She asked workgroup members for comments or questions.
- Glynn Rountree (National Association of Homebuilders), question on constructed wetlands technologies: Presume these are associated with cluster systems?

- D'Amato: constructed wetlands have been used effectively for single family homes in the past. The panel's focus has been more on residential than cluster systems. There is a limited number of cluster systems and they can be handled on a case-by-case basis, while residential systems can be addressed in more standardized way.
- Rountree: Larger cluster systems are more important than ever. From a practical perspective, would be difficult for homeowner to deal with necessary permitting requirements for a wetland.
  - Degen noted there are different O&M requirements among the states.
  - D'Amato: a constructed wetland for these systems is different from a restored wetland.
- Joyce Hudson (EPA): there has been discussion about data-sharing, especially for proprietary technologies, to streamline implementation of innovative technologies. Could be helpful if this workgroup could facilitate discussion with and make recommendations to state agencies. We look at it as an opportunity for reciprocity; EPA is willing to help develop that function.
  - Spano asked Hudson to consider the timing for the topic so the workgroup can build it into the schedule for the coming year.
- Spano: Regionalization factors can be very hard to explain. Has the panel discussed these?
  - Montali: need to be careful about semantics. We are not talking about delivery factors that translate edge-of-stream loads to delivered loads. Do not believe that regional factors are not applied to wastewater loads.
  - Zhou clarified that in the current model there is no regional factor applied to septic systems, except in Maryland.
    - Montali felt that regional factors would be better addressed by the Modeling Workgroup.

### **WWTWG 2013 Schedule**

- Spano noted the workgroup had addressed Attachment E in the earlier discussion. She encouraged workgroup members to share additional
- **ACTION:** Workgroup members are encouraged to submit ideas or topics for future discussion to Tanya, Ning, and Jeremy.

### **Other Updates**

- DC, VA, MD, and PA had nothing to report.
- Montali noted he is ready to coordinate with Peter Claggett on the draft shapefile for West Virginia's sewer service areas.
- Zhou noted the 2012 Progress Run is not quite finalized; some nonpoint source issues are still being resolved. The first draft of the progress run was completed by end of January, which was a major acceleration from previous years. He asked members to submit any point source updates to him, else the run will be considered final.
- Spano highlighted that, generally, water conservation is keeping water use level even as service population continues to increase. However, incoming strength (i.e.

influent concentrations) are increasing. There are larger implications to consider and discuss. Asked if others had similar discussions or thoughts on their side.

- Montali: have not been hearing this, but it would be interesting to hear examples from POTWs that are experiencing these trends.
- Degen: I know it has been an issue in areas that have been focusing on I/I reduction and reuse, e.g. Alexandria.
- Hanson noted that the on-site system workshop proposal from last year had been resubmitted to the Scientific & Technical Advisory Committee (STAC).
- Spano thanked the participants for their time and discussion.

## Adjourned

### Next conference call:

Tuesday, April 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2013

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19147/>

### Conference Call Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Tanya Spano (Chair)	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Ning Zhou (Coord.)	Virginia. Tech, CBPO
Jeremy Hanson (Staff)	Chesapeake Research Consortium, CBPO
Nasser Ameen	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Eric Aschenbach	Virginia Dept. of Health
Greg Bush	Maryland Dept. of Environment
Vic D'Amato	Tetra Tech
Marcia Degen	Virginia Dept. of Health
Paul Emmart	Maryland Dept. of Environment
Jim George	Maryland Dept. of Environment
Joyce Hudson	EPA
Dharmendra Kumar	Pennsylvania Dept. of Environmental Protection
Marya Levelev	Maryland Dept. of Environment
David Montali	West Virginia Dept. of Environmental Protection
Lisa Ochsenhirt	VA/MD Association of Municipal Wastewater Agencies
George Onyullo	District of Columbia Department of Environment
Glynn Rountree	National Association of Home Builders
Greg Sandi	Maryland Dept. of Environment
Lana Sindler	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Jim Sizemore	Alexandria Renew Enterprises
Suzanne Trevena	EPA