



SUMMARY

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)

Conference Call

Tuesday, April 2nd, 2013, 10:00 AM- 12:00 PM

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

Welcome & Introductions

- Tanya Spano convened the call shortly after 10:00AM. She reviewed the morning's [agenda](#).
 - She noted she needed to leave the call early. Marya Levelev (MDE) agreed to chair the remainder of the call on Spano's behalf.

Action Item: Approval of March WWTWG Minutes

- Spano asked for any comments or corrections to the [March minutes](#) as written.
 - None were raised; the minutes were accepted.
- **DECISION:** The March conference call minutes were accepted as written.

Wet Weather & Point Source Load Evaluation

- Jim George (MDE) acknowledged the workgroup has discussed the issue in the past.
 - For more details, view the [narrative handout](#) and associated [presentation](#).
 - He explained Maryland's concern that precipitation obscures the effect of management actions on annual point source loads. To stay on track for its 2025 target, Maryland needs to reduce the point source load by an average of 1.35 million lbs nitrogen annually. Slides 4-6 illustrate how precipitation can make loads fluctuate by more than that amount.
 - He noted a decision on the issue would need to be a higher level than the workgroup, but asked the workgroup to consider making a recommendation. Noting that other states may not share Maryland's concern, he proposed that other jurisdictions would not need to modify their reporting process if they did not feel the need to do so.
- Spano summarized the key points and asked if anyone had questions on the technical aspects or the issue.
 - Mohsin Siddique (DC Water and Sewer Authority): interested in hearing more about alternative reporting methods like this.
 - Spano suggested using Blue Plains as an example under Maryland's proposed methods.
 - **ACTION:** MD, DC, and VA staff will apply Maryland's proposed methods to Blue Plains as an example for the May WWTWG call.
- Allen Brockenbrough (VA DEQ): as far as isolating management actions, are we looking at nutrient concentrations only? How does this method separate the management actions versus growth and hydrology?
- George: Not completely settled yet, but one idea is to use an average hydrology over multiple years.
- Dinorah Dalmasy (MDE): We're still looking into technical issues, e.g. how to account for flow, growth, concentration, and inflow and infiltration (I/I). We want a methodology

consistent with the progress runs and are still looking at the details. Could present to the workgroup next month.

- Ning Zhou (Virginia Tech, CBPO; WWTWG Coordinator) confirmed that the jurisdictions provide facility-specific data to the Bay Program for progress runs.
- Katherine Antos (EPA, CBPO): For the indicators, the CBP strives for consistent methodologies across all the jurisdictions so it can be rolled into one Baywide indicator. The milestones are more a product of the individual jurisdictions, so there has been more latitude with jurisdictions and their milestones. If we are discussing a CBP indicator, we should try to have a consistent methodology across the jurisdictions. In response to some of the points raised, do not want to overstate the importance of precipitation. Glad the workgroup is working on and discussing issues such as I/I.
 - George felt this may raise a question of the applicability of annual progress to milestone evaluation.
- Spano: In the metropolitan Washington area we are seeing increases in incoming concentrations. She felt this would need further discussion with additional details. At this point the workgroup is not in position to make a decision, but can recognize that there may be a policy question here. Can give the WQGIT a heads up that this issue is on horizon.
 - Brockenbrough: Do not disagree. Do not see Virginia having the resources to do a facility-by-facility evaluation/report for milestones. The state has no central planning authority so we would need to go to the locals.
 - Ron Furlan (PA DEP): Do not see Pennsylvania having the resources either.
- Spano asked members for any objections to continuing the discussion to better understand Maryland's proposal.
 - None were raised.
- George thanked the workgroup for their time and consideration on the issue.

Non-significant & industrial facilities data

- Spano noted that she need to leave and asked Levelev to chair the remainder of the call.
- Zhou noted there are two aspects for non-significant facilities data: progress run data, and data for calibration of the Phase 6 Watershed Model. Working with Tetra Tech to create a database, building from legacy data and incorporating new data.
- Zhou reviewed how the jurisdictions handle their non-significant facilities data:
 - Maryland has portion of non-significant data through monitoring.
 - Virginia developed a database following the non-significant facility project with Tetra Tech. May be able to factor in population data to back-forecast historical loads from this information.
 - New York proposed to use WIP data for 2012, need to determine how they will handle back-forecasting
 - Same for West Virginia.
 - Delaware has only one non-significant facility that has monitoring data, so there is no issue.
 - District of Columbia has also used its WIP data for recent progress runs.
 - Levelev: what is meant by WIP data?
 - Zhou explained that each state developed its own database, starting with Tetra Tech dataset. Each state updated the Tetra Tech numbers. It is a state

- decision how to handle the data. We encourage the states to improve on their datasets. It would be up to the workgroup to decide if they would like a more consistent approach across the jurisdictions.
- Zhou explained that, under the proposed verification protocol, upgraded facilities that earn credit in the progress runs would need to go through DMR reporting.
 - He pointed out that permitting trends indicate more and more non-significant facilities have monitoring requirements. So down the road there will be better data for non-significant facilities.
 - Zhou: still working on project with Tetra Tech. May report to the workgroup next month with a summary of the data.
 - Zhou: We have monitoring data for significant industrial facilities. For non-significant industrial facilities there is a net value issue. For example, a facility in Delaware draws from a river that sometimes has higher nutrient concentrations than the discharge, and there is a net negative load. The previous decision was to ignore the negative number and only consider positive values.
 - He noted the facility in Delaware is a fairly unique situation. He asked if other jurisdictions had any concerns or thoughts on the matter.
 - Brockenbrough: We certainly have that issue with power plants in Virginia. How does the model handle those loads?
 - Zhou: the model has two simulations, one for hydrology and one for load. For hydrology simulation, there is no flow from the facility if the flow is from the river itself. For the load simulation, it only accounts for net loads from the facility.
 - Brockenbrough: Believe we report gross discharge loads from all the facilities.
 - Zhou: For the model we treat that as a net load. Non-significant facilities will only appear in the aggregate load.
 - Levelev: How do you adjust or interpret the data to derive the net load?
 - Zhou: we consider the reported data as net contribution load from those facilities. The grant guidance specifies that the Bay Program needs the net load, if available; if not, the gross load is best estimate.
 - Levelev asked if the jurisdictions would like this discussed at future meetings.
 - Brockenbrough: Feel we should be aware of the issue, though it would really only apply to a few high flow facilities in Virginia.
 - Levelev suggested that each state look at their submissions. If any of the jurisdictions have comments, share with Ning (zhou.ning@epa.gov) and Jeremy (jhanson@chesapeakebay.net) for discussion during a future call.
 - Levelev: what's the specific definition for significant industrial facility?
 - Zhou: it is in the grant guidance and was a decision of the workgroup many years ago.
 - **ACTION:** WWTWG members should submit any questions or comments on their non-significant facilities data or net loads to Jeremy and Ning for discussion at a future workgroup call.

Septic panel update

- Vic D'Amato (Tetra Tech) explained the panel most recently met on March 19th. Panelists are also developing a protocol for proprietary technologies. The panel will

hold another two or three calls before submitting its report to the workgroup for review and approval.

- Levelev asked how denitrification systems are currently modeled.
 - D'Amato: the current model offers a 50% efficiency for denitrification systems, but the panel is considering a more refined way to categorize and credit BMP systems.
 - Zhou: currently there are only three BMPs: connection (100%), pumping (5%), and denitrification (50%).
- Levelev: when will the new efficiencies be in place? By the next progress run?
 - Zhou: we don't have a timeframe yet. It depends when it can be incorporated into the model; will need to check with CBPO modeling staff on this.
- Antos clarified that the panel will first submit the report to the WWTWG, then the Watershed Technical Workgroup, and finally the WQGIT. The panel report will include recommendations on the tracking and reporting of the BMPs, and this is one reason why the report goes through the Watershed Technical Workgroup.
- Dave Schepens (DE DNREC): (1:27--) if you're using a BMP on-site system with multiple steps or practices, how would that be incorporated or reported? We would want to be able to track those systems on our runs.
 - D'Amato: Good point. The panel has been considering how to possibly stack or combine these practices. This is one reason why the panel is looking at the total efficiency at the edge of the drain field and a future panel will address the soil attenuation issue.
- Levelev: so these will be two separate reports, one for BMP systems and one for attenuation.
 - Zhou: That's correct.
- Zhou: Hopeful the workgroup will have the chance to review the report next month.
- Levelev asked for remaining questions.
- Furlan: is the panel considering the total contributions or non-contributions from septic systems? Pennsylvania maintains on-site systems are such a small part of the overall load.
 - Zhou clarified the panel is only addressing the issue of credit for installation of nitrogen-reducing technologies.
 - D'Amato noted the technologies were all recommended by panelists from the Bay jurisdictions, so they should be relevant to the Bay watershed. The panel has had difficulty with what happens past the drain field.
- Furlan noted Pennsylvania released new guidance for onsite systems proposed in high quality and exceptional value watersheds. He agreed to share the document and links with Jeremy for distribution to the workgroup.
- **ACTION:** Jeremy will send the draft Pennsylvania guidance to the workgroup.

WWTWG Work Plan & Schedule

- Spano had previously indicated this would be covered during the next conference call.

Updates

- Zhou noted he sent the draft supplemental indicator to the workgroup. The indicator was updated following the 2012 progress run.
 - He asked the states to review their individual charts and figures for accuracy and .

- Antos: the goal is to update the restoration/pollution indicators on the website by the end of April, including the supplemental wastewater indicator.
- Brockenbrough: The indicator was developed in response to Maryland's concerns about wet weather impact. Since it did not address those concerns, perhaps the supplemental indicator is no longer needed.
 - Antos: Recommend we keep it for 2012, especially since it is almost ready, but consider whether it should be kept for 2013 progress.
 - Antos noted the [online version of the indicator](#) is less detailed than what Zhou shared with the WWTWG members.
- Antos: the workgroup should provide recommendation on whether to include 2011 in the online chart or not. Will include this as a question in the follow-up email to the group.
 - No other comments were raised.
- Antos noted the Management Board had approved the header and the language for the indicator. The language was also shared with the WQGIT and WWTWG.
- **ACTION:** WWTWG members should confirm the accuracy of their jurisdiction's data and figures for the supplemental indicator. Any corrections or questions should be sent to Ning (zhou.ning@epa.gov), with a cc' to Brian Trulear and Katherine Antos (Trulear.brian@epa.gov; antos.katherine@epa.gov).
- **ACTION:** WWTWG members should indicate their preference for how the indicator will be displayed on the website, specifically, choosing one of two options:
 - Display 1985, 2009, 2011, and 2012 bars in the supplemental indicator chart, i.e. as it appears in the attached spreadsheet, OR
 - Show 1985, 2009, and 2012 bars in the chart (these are the years that are included in the Reducing Pollution Indicators for nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment).
- Zhou: some jurisdictions have raised issue on land application of outputs from WWTPs. Currently the model counts zero discharge if it is not a discharge to surface waters.
 - Levelev: Suggest we give a little more time to this next month.
- Levelev asked the jurisdictions for remaining updates; none were raised.
- Levelev thanked participants for their time and participation.

Adjourned

Next conference call:

Tuesday, May 7th, 2013

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19148/>

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
Katherine Antos	EPA, CBPO
Eric Aschenbach	Virginia Dept. of Health
Brian Ashby	Delaware
Allan Brockenbrough	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Greg Bush	MDE
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Marcia Degen	VDH
Ron Furlan	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Marty Hurd	Tetra Tech
Dharmendra Kumar	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Marya Levelev	Maryland Dept. of Environment
David Montali	West Virginia Dept. of Environmental Protection
Glynn Rountree	National Association of Home Builders
Dave Schepens	DE DNREC
Mohsin Siddique	District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority
Megan Thyng	EPA, CBPO
Suzanne Trevena	EPA Region 3
John Weidman	New York Dept. of Environmental Conservation
Vic D'Amato	Tetra Tech
Lisa Ochsenhirt	VA/MD Association of Municipal Wastewater Agencies