



## DRAFT CALL SUMMARY

### Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG) Teleconference

Tuesday, May 1, 2018, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Calendar Page: [Link](#)

---

#### **Summary of Actions and Decisions:**

**Action:** VA's comments on the Boat Pump-out BMP Expert Panel report and recommendations will be incorporated and reviewed by the WWTWG for final approval at the June 5 WWTWG conference call and for a WWTWG recommendation to present the report and recommendations to the WQGIT, WTWG and Modeling Workgroup for further review.

**Decision:** The WWTWG approved the Onsite Wastewater Treatment BMP Expert Panel's recommendation to drip irrigation for further review by the WQGIT, Modeling workgroup, and WTWG, in order to incorporate drip irrigation practices for onsite wastewater treatment systems as a BMP in the Phase 6 Watershed Model.

**Action:** WWTWG jurisdictions will determine the availability of data in their jurisdictions to model SSO and bypass discharges. WWTWG members will also consider the planning implications and expected effort required for inclusion of SSO and bypass loads in a future version of the Watershed Model. Legal implications of modeling SSO and bypass discharges will also be considered.

**Decision:** The WWTWG approved the April 2018 meeting minutes.

---

10:00 AM      **Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements** — Marya Levelev, interim Chair

**Action item:** Approval of April Minutes.

**Decision:** The WWTWG approved the April 2018 meeting minutes.

10:10 AM      **Boat Pump-Out BMP Expert Panel Report** – Vic D'Amato, TetraTech, Ning Zhou, consultant

The Chesapeake Bay Boat Pump Out BMP Expert Review Panel was requested by the WWTWG and convened in February 2016. The panel developed the baseline load estimates for the recreational boating nutrient load into the Maryland and Virginia portions of the Chesapeake Bay and provided recommendations on related BMP crediting and verification.

**Decision Requested:** The WWTWG will be asked to approve the Boat Pump-Out BMP Expert Panel Report and recommendations for future inclusion in the Watershed Model.

*Discussion:*

- No comments on the report and recommendations have been received beyond comments from Lew Linker and Ning Zhou. Comments from VA are expected but will come in later this week from Allan Brockenbrough (not present at the call on May 1).
- Lew Linker: I asked Allan to get comments in last week so that we can get them and respond, but we have not received them so far. We are asking the WWTWG for approval to carry on with review, essentially for permission to go to the WQGIT, WTWG and Modeling workgroup for further review. The question today is if we have fatal errors that prevent this proceeding to the next round of review in the Partnership.
- Marya Levelev asked if there are questions about the presentation or recommendations today on the report and presentation from April.
- Levelev: I think the load estimates are very small compared to loads for other practices.
  - Linker: This is an incomplete assessment of loads. This is not a very impactful practice at the Bay scale but there are local jurisdictions that want to implement these practices, and there are certain localities that could see an outsized effect on their local waters through addressing these loads.
- Ning Zhou: VA Beach proposed this BMP initially. All they requested about was a thousand lbs. N reduction credit for their boat pump-out practices. One thousand pounds TN is very small on the Bay wide scale, but it is significant for the local government. VA Beach seems to be happy with the progress of the report and they want to know when this will be finalized.
  - Levelev: The group discussed this last month as well. The concern here is for local jurisdictions to be able to report reductions from boat pump-out.
  - Linker: Before we include this BMP in the Phase 6 model, we would need to model this load source in the first place. We just want to be able to offer localities this practice in the first place for any local jurisdiction in the Bay that wants to include these practices.
- Marya Levelev raised the issue of credits from these practices being low compared to the effort required for verification of this BMP.
- Linker: Can we get approval to incorporate VA's comments before going to the WQGIT? We would not be able to go before the WQGIT until about June, so we will have some time for the workgroup to review those comments in the interim.
- Levelev: We can call for preliminary approval now and final approval at the June 5 WWTWG meeting.

**Action:** VA's comments on the Boat Pump-out BMP Expert Panel report and recommendations will be incorporated and reviewed by the WWTWG for final approval at the June 5 WWTWG conference call and for a WWTWG recommendation to present the report and recommendations to the WQGIT, WTWG and Modeling Workgroup for further review.

10:30 AM      **Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems BMP Expert Panel Report and Recommendations** – Vic D'Amato, TetraTech; Marcia Degen, VDH; Ning Zhou, consultant

Vic, Marcia, and Ning reviewed the work of the Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems BMP Expert Panel, and presented the panel's analysis and recommendations regarding baseline nutrient loads and inclusion of Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems BMP for crediting and verification.

**Decision Requested:** WWTWG approval of the Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems BMP Expert Panel Report and recommendations for future inclusion in the Watershed Model.

*Discussion:*

- Zhou: Before this panel report, we had a formal BMP expert panel report approved for onsite wastewater treatment systems. VA proposed two additional onsite BMPs, and we found that these practices were different enough to merit a separate panel to develop a report and recommendations.
- Marcia Degen presented an overview of the OSWWT panel, charge, and recommendations. Included overview of two BMPs (peat treatment system and shallow placed drip dispersal). The panel found that load reductions from drip irrigation practices should merit recognition as a BMP under the specified design criteria and site conditions. However, the panel recommended against peat treatment for inclusion as a BMP, due to the variability of the dataset and uncertainty in drawing conclusions regarding load reductions from peat treatment practices. More sampling and data collection needs to be done to support peat treatment reductions as a BMP.
- Vic D'Amato: Thank you Marcia. This is a really good background to what has already been done in the septic treatment sector.
- Marya Levelev asked for more clarification on the recommendation on slide 40: that CBP takes a more proactive approach to verification of BMPs.
  - Degen: The problem the onsite sector has is that these are all on private homeowners' properties, which makes annual inspections for verification difficult. We could consider a N sensor or some other remote tracking method to support monitoring of these BMPs on a yearly basis.
  - D'Amato: These efforts are usually data limited. The more data we can get to support our recommendations, the better. EPA has supported developing sensors for other projects to support other nutrient reduction practices. We need this data to know if we are on the right track and what the potential benefits can be to scaling up these practices and maintaining them.
  - Zhou: We have a good monitoring program on streams and surface waters. These N sensors could be another piece to allow us to track N on the land.
  - Levelev: It sounds like it might be one cost-effective option to enhance monitoring.
- Levelev: The drip irrigation has a lot of criteria associated—how will that be reflected in the model when the states submit these practices for credit?
  - Degen: The states have to identify BMPs applied to individual systems. The model has a global default of no action and the BMPs are overlaid on top to reduce down from the default loads of the model. The states report whatever reduction the BMP is. Our criteria are usually design and not operational criteria. VA has a statistical monitoring program for permitting and verification.
  - Zhou: We rely on the states to do the technical review and verification. We assume the state has done all their due diligence to maintain and verify and we just take care of tracking what the states are reporting.
- Levelev: When the states report this to the CBP, you will just count this as the 50% flat rate?
  - Degen: We have some tiers of design—you have some options for reductions based on various criteria your system is meeting.
- Zhou: We can take comments to get a final draft of the OSWT report, and will tee that up for the June WQGIT call.
- Levelev: Let's take comments on the report and include any comments in our presentation of this report and recommendations to the WQGIT in June 11 WQGIT call.

**Decision:** The WWTWG approved the Onsite Wastewater Treatment BMP Expert Panel's recommendation to drip irrigation for further review by the WQGIT, Modeling workgroup, and WTWG, in order to incorporate drip irrigation practices for onsite wastewater treatment systems as a BMP in the Phase 6 Watershed Model.

11:10 AM      **Draft Recommendation to Include SSO and Bypass Issues in a Future Model** –Lew Linker, EPA; Jeff Sweeney, EPA; Ning Zhou, consultant

The WWTWG continued to review the SSO and bypass flows/loads issue and consider the issue's applicability for a future input category for the Watershed Model. Additional review includes study of wet weather flows in other tributaries across the Bay watershed, and the individual aspects of the SSO and CSO bypass issue. The WWTWG considered a recommendation to the WQGIT to approve the SSO and bypass flows/loads for incorporation into a future watershed model.

**Decision Requested:** WWTWG to recommend adding SSO and bypass flows/loads as a future input category for the Watershed Model; and briefing to the WQGIT at an upcoming conference call.

*Discussion:*

- Marya Levelev asked what the availability of data is to model SSO and bypass.
  - Zhou: SSO and bypass are required to be monitored through federal discharge permits. The best data is in MD, and other jurisdictions have some data in spreadsheets that are not available online. But, it all should be available in ICIS by 2020. I would like to remind the workgroup that the Partnership has always started with the limited data we have and then we include new data as we get it.
  - Levelev: I would like to see what kind of data you'd need for this modeling effort before I start collecting that data if I am in a jurisdiction that is not MD.
- Levelev: The loads from SSO and bypass are not very high compared to the loads that are already in the model for CSO. Before we go forward, I'd like to know what the assumptions are going to be for the states and what effort would be involved here.
- Zhou: All the jurisdictions collect this data through a federally required monitoring/tracking programs, it's just that some of the states don't have this information available online.
  - Levelev: That will be a large effort so we'd like to know what kind of data you'd need for the model. We need to know that before moving forward.
- Dave Montali: Ning has some direction from the modeling team. This is not a big issue related to model calibration, but seems like an issue related to public concern that the bypasses are not modeled. The reason that these are not modeled is perhaps because bypass is illegal and should be eliminated anyway under NPDES. The other issue is that if these loads are included, that means that the E3 component is 0 and that will be an expected load source reduction that will be included in the planning target methodology for the Phase III WIPs. I think this will be a large effort for not much benefit. I think if the only issue is public concern, then I think the best course of action is to continue implementation through existing permitting programs and regulations rather than trying to include this in our modeling.
- Sweeney: If we are already modeling CSOs, why would we not also include SSOs? That seems inconsistent. If the load is similar, would you want to remove the CSOs?
  - Montali: CSOs have WQ standards requirements, but SSOs are illegal and shouldn't be permitted or modeled because they aren't happening.

- Sweeney: But we also model CAFOs which are illegal, because we thought it was important to reflect the reality of loads to the Bay.
- Sweeney: You've just included boat pump-out which is a very small credit. If you don't include SSO in the model, then you will not get any credit for addressing bypass and SSO discharges. Let it be in the record that any reductions of loads from SSO and bypass would not get credit in the Watershed Model if the load source itself is not tracked and modeled.
- Levelov: We have asked jurisdictions to review the available data for feasibility of including this in the model.
  - Megan Browning: WV does not have this data in any electronic version so we would not be able to do this now.
  - Sweeney: We are not approving this for immediate inclusion in the model. We expect data to be available by 2020, and the model will not be updated before that anyway. We are just looking for approval to move forward with this exploration.
- Levelov: At this point, can we postpone the decision until data is available?
  - Sweeney: When the time comes to put this in the model, we would need all the states to submit data that should be used in the model rather than defaults. We would need to start early here, and start thinking about this now if we want to include this in a future model a few years from now. And, if states are not expected to have this data available to report by 2020, we will consider what the defaults should be for states with no available data.
- Marya Levelov asked what the process is in evaluating and approving default numbers,
  - Sweeney: The WWTWG would be the lead in developing and recommending those numbers for inclusion in the model.
- Montali: We need to separate SSOs from the general bypass class. We need to pursue systems that are functioning at nonzero for most of the time. We need to be focusing on chronic overflows.
- Schumack: PA does not have the data readily available for that, so we'd have to do more internal review before committing to a decision on this.
  - Levelov: We will have to also evaluate at the workgroup level to determine the feasibility of this modeling effort based on state data availability.
- Sweeney: We need to know what the availability is for data in all the states. We need a yes/no from the states to see where we are and whether MD is the only default we could use.
- Montali: We would also need legal counsel from the EPA here, since we are essentially modeling illegal discharge. We need to hear from Region III What the terms and conditions might be of including this illegal discharge.

**Action:** WWTWG jurisdictions will determine the availability of data in their jurisdictions to model SSO and bypass discharges. WWTWG members will also consider the planning implications and expected effort required for inclusion of SSO and bypass loads in a future version of the Watershed Model. Legal implications of modeling SSO and bypass discharges will also be considered.

11:30 AM      **2017 Progress Overview** – Sucharith Ravi, UMCES

Sucharith presented submitted 2017 point-source progress in the Phase 6 and Phase 5.3.2 versions of the Watershed Model.

- Sucharith summarized the 2017 wastewater progress results and compared with previous year and WIP. He gave an overview of the new WW treatment data portal that Megan Thyng is working on. Megan will give a more detailed description of the project on the next WWTWG call, and the plan now is to have a functional tool by September 2018. The deadline for submissions of progress data is December 1 for all states, although DC has requested an extension.
- Zhou: for the June call, WWTWG will work on evaluating the data submission deadline, especially since DC has requested to change their data submission deadlines to be consistent with the other jurisdictions. If we can get everyone reporting on the same timeline, we can expedite modeling of progress data for wastewater.

12:00 PM      **Adjourn**

**Updates & Topics for Next/June 5<sup>th</sup> WWTWG Call**

- Decision on Wastewater 2025 forecast analysis
- New Wastewater Data Reporting Application
- Wastewater Data submission deadlines for DC and VA
- Review of Wastewater Hockey Stick Assumptions
- State updates on wastewater aspects of Phase III WIP developments
- WWTWG Vice Chair – Calling for nominations
- Other WWTWG topics?

**Next conference call:**

*(Tentative)* Tuesday, June 5, 2018 (10:00 am to 12:00 pm)

**Call Participants:**

Marya Levelev, MDE  
Ning Zhou, Consultant  
Michelle Williams, CRC  
Bryan Ashby, DNREC  
George Mwangi, DNREC  
Jack Hayes, DNREC  
Marcia Degen, VDH  
Maria Schumack, PADEP  
Matt Richardson, VA DEQ  
Megan Browning, WV DEP  
Mindy Ramsey, WV DEP  
Nasser Ameen, MWCOG  
Ray Tighe, VDH  
Vic D'Amato, TetraTech  
Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO/WTWG Coordinator  
Sucharith Ravi, UMCES  
Lew Linker, EPA CBPO/Modeling Workgroup Coordinator