



SUMMARY

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG) Conference Call

Tuesday, December 4th, 2012 10:00 AM- 12:00 PM

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18611/>

Welcome and Introductions

- Tanya Spano (MWCOG; WWTWG Chair) convened the call shortly after 10:00 AM.

Report from WQGIT October 22nd-23rd face-to-face

- Spano recapped the major outcomes from the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT) [meeting](#) held October 22nd-23rd.
- Ning Zhou (Virginia Tech, Chesapeake Bay Program Office; WWTWG Coordinator) reviewed the WWTWG's six priorities.
- Spano: we have to develop a workplan for these priorities by February WQGIT call

Septic panel update

- Zhou noted that a new panel will be formed in 2013 to address attenuation rates.
- Mark Sievers (Tetra Tech): most recent call was mid-November. Verification was discussed, among other things. Panelists are still reviewing different technologies. The panel is considering some of the concentrations used in the model. A number of technology-specific papers will be included as appendices to the report. Tetra Tech has begun drafting the main body of the report. Draft for WWTWG review is expected in April. There has not been an official request for nominations for the attenuation panel yet.
 - Zhou: convening the next panel may be delayed; no clear timing for funding
 - Spano: suggest making request for nominations to the workgroup

BMP Verification protocol update

- Spano explained the workgroup has been asked to reach consensus on verification protocol by January 25th. If no consensus, can delineate majority and minority reports.
- Spano felt there could be greater clarity in the language in the non-significant column.
 - Dave Montali (WV DEP) agreed the language could be clearer. Would seem that verification is needed for the offsets of these new or expanded facilities.
- Edwal Stone (MDE): Suggest “for new or expanded facilities, monitoring requirements to verify any associated requirements for upgrades or offsets.”
- Ron Furlan (PA DEP): The non-significant facilities have a wasteload assigned to them. Anything new or increased has to be offset, but Pennsylvania is not depending on non-significants for its Bay reduction goals.

- Montali: WV has accounted for existing non-significant facilities and documented them for the TMDL, but anything new has to be offset. To document the offset they would need to monitor and report.
- Spano: we will work to find common ground as a workgroup, but will definitely acknowledge where the states may differ.
- Stone: WV and PA both have good points. Doubling in size, a non-significant is still non-significant. Need to find fair approach how to verify without being as strenuous as for significant facilities.
- Allan Brockenbrough (VA DEQ): Virginia is not expecting reductions from non-significant sources. Think the protocols should address verification or monitoring for new or expanding facilities only.
- Spano: current language may be too generic and does not distinguish between. She asked PA and WV to send her bullets summarizing what they said to help properly characterize their points.
 - Furlan noted PA plans to continue doing what they are doing as indicated in their WIP.
 - Montali: Can paraphrase language from our WIP. Liked Stone's proposed language for monitoring new or expanded facilities.
- Spano asked for thoughts from the other jurisdictions.
 - Brockenbrough felt the table was fine for VA.
 - George Onyullo (DDOE): table is fine for DC.
 - Stone: Seems when a facility falls into new or expanding category, the monitoring requirements (under NPDES) would kick in. We are not applying these to existing facilities. This fits for Maryland, but suggest clearing up the language.
 - Derrick Caruthers (DE DNREC) felt the table was fine for Delaware.
- Spano summarized the discussion and asked for thoughts or comments on the CSOs column. She noted there were no changes to the column.
- Brockenbrough: only three combined systems in VA; all have Long Term Control Plans that may extend beyond 2025, so may not achieve CSO allocation in some cases by TMDL deadline. The Control Plans are based on bacteria, but there may be some associated solids or nutrient reductions.
- Montali: we have a very tiny CSO issue in WV. Expect 85% reduction from combined systems if 6 or less overflows is achieved.
- Marya Levelev (MDE): In Maryland we did project some reductions for separation of specific combined systems. Since not all Long Term Control Plans will be fully implemented by 2025, there is some allocation to CSOs.
- Onyullo: not sure what is meant by second bullet. Don't know what "confirmation sampling" does that existing monitoring requirements do not already accomplish.
- Spano asked for the workgroup's input regarding the on-site systems column.
- Spano noted the table does not mention PA and NY perspectives. She asked the jurisdictions for their thoughts.
- Marcia Degen (VA Dept. of Health): reads alright for VA. Consistent with regulations. Don't want to convey expectation of sampling. Rather, we rely on operational inspections for BMP systems.

- Onyullo noted DC has no on-site systems so this part of the protocol does not apply, but suggested adding “(if applicable)” for on-site systems.
- Jay Prager (MDE): table is pretty consistent with Maryland’s program and requirements.
- Spano asked how PA and New York would like their perspectives reflected
 - Furlan: if chart is attached to overall document, may not need to make changes. The text already notes that PA and NY are not participating in this part, since PA is not seeking reductions in this area.
 - Rashid Ahmed (NYS DEC): not sure what NY’s view is, will touch base with program manager.
- Aschenbach: the second cell seems to conflict with the one above it and with Virginia’s regulation.
 - Zhou: Good point. The panel’s recommendation for inspection frequencies would apply for states without regulation like WV.
 - Montali: Either the workgroup or the panel discussed this, and noted that some types of systems might need more frequent inspections than others. Perhaps minimum frequencies could be recommended by the expert panel.
 - Degen: not sure we could recommend or mandate anything more frequent than annual for these BMP systems.
 - Prager: hard for us to commit now. There may have to be some variance from that recommendation.
 - Spano: perhaps better to say that panel will make recommendations and workgroup will evaluate and consider whether changes are appropriate.
 - Spano: do we need to distinguish between annual reporting and inspection frequency?
 - Zhou clarified that annual BMP reporting refers to annual progress reporting.
 - Degen: need to split it into two bullets.
- Spano: We will make the discussed changes. She asked workgroup members to review the narrative text and email comments or corrections to Tanya, Ning, and Jeremy
- **ACTION:** Workgroup members should review the narrative BMP protocol text and email comments or corrections to Tanya, Ning, and Jeremy.
- Furlan: noted there are different percentages for on-site loads
- Spano: clarify that there are 50 existing CSO communities, 14 have been eliminated.
- Maureen Tooke (EPA): ensure the septic load numbers are accurate and consistent. Suggest adding footnote for reference and caveats.
- **ACTION:** CBPO staff will send out a Word version of the verification protocol.

Other Updates

- Draft model Chesapeake Bay on-site system program
 - Jeremy Hanson (CRC, CBPO; WWTWG staff) sent email to the workgroup on 11/20 about the opportunity to comment.
 - Maureen Tooke (EPA) noted that comments on the draft are due by December 28th to decentralized@epa.gov

- Draft report is available on [Executive Order webpage](#)
- Spano: If workgroup members have issues or ideas for the workgroup to cover or discuss in 2013, contact Ning and Jeremy with your suggestions.
- Spano thanked the workgroup for all their time and effort during

Meeting Adjourned

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
Rashid Ahmed	NYS Dept. of Environmental Conservation
Eric Aschenbach	Virginia Dept. of Health
Jason Baumgartner	DE Dept. of Natural Resources and Environmental Control
Joe Bledsoe	
Allan Brockenbrough	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Derrick Caruthers	DE Dept. of Natural Resources and Environmental Control
Kumar Dharmendra	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Joyce Hudson	EPA
Marya Levelev	Maryland Dept. of Environment (MDE)
Lori Mitzel	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
David Montali	West Virginia Dept. of Environmental Protection
George Onyullo	District of Columbia, Department of Environment
Jay Prager	MDE
Glynn Rountree	National Association of Home Builders
Mark Sievers	Tetra Tech
Lana Sindler	MWCOG
Edwal Stone	
Maureen Tooke	EPA
Brian Trulear	EPA, Region 3