



## Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)

Thursday, May 28th, 2025  
10:00 AM – 11:10 AM

[Visit the meeting webpage for meeting materials and additional information.](#)

**Purpose:** This is the monthly meeting of the Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG). Main topics included a discussion on E3 (Everything, by Everyone, Everywhere) Scenario Development and a recap of the Phase 7 sewer/septic data review.

### Minutes

#### I. Welcome and Announcements

*Lead: Jamie Heisig-Mitchell, WWTWG Co-Chair*

Jamie welcomed WWTWG members and gave an overview of the meeting's agenda.

#### Decisions:

1. The WWTWG approved the [February 2026 WWTWG Meeting Minutes](#).

#### Actions:

1. CWGT is holding a two-day, hybrid meeting in Baltimore, MD on June 22-23. Day 1 will focus on Nutrients and Modeling and Day 2 will focus on Goal Team Operations and Management Strategies. If you are interested in attending (in-person or virtually), please complete this [RSVP form](#) by Friday, May 29.

#### II. Phase 7 Sewer/Septic Data Review Recap

*Lead: Jackie Pickford, USGS*

Jackie provided a recap of the WWTWG and other relevant groups' review of the sanitary sewer and septic data for Phase 7. Jackie highlighted key feedback and associated changes from the most recent, and final, review period. These included odd trends in certain counties' population values over time, minor inconsistencies in counts and population values due to an outdated summary unit file, discrepancies between local septic system counts and modeled septic system counts, and overcounting of septic population in blocks that have households on sewer and septic.

The third item was determined to be a data limitation and should be noted and considered for a future phase of the model. The discrepancies were mostly driven by local data including septic systems within the sewer service area when the model methodology excludes those systems or local data reporting multiple septic systems in a single parcel when the model methodology only maps one system per parcel.

**Materials:** [Presentation](#), [Summary of Feedback](#), [Sewer/Septic Population Counts Spreadsheet](#)

**Discussion:**

- Bel Martinez da Matta, MDE (in chat): Was it considered at any point to use data where septic data was available and model areas where data is missing?
  - Jackie responded this was only brought to her attention recently. It could be possible, but it would introduce variation across the watershed given inconsistencies in data so a lot of time would need to be spent vetting the data. While it's great to have local data to validate the model, there are a lot of differences between counties in how the data is collected - some include active and inactive systems (e.g. Loudon Co., VA), some are not comprehensive lists (e.g. in WV) and some include areas that are sewerred by separate entities (e.g. Onondaga Co., NY).
  - Bel responded she understands vetting the data for such a large area would take a long time. They are just considering the consequences for counties that have their septic systems undercounted.

**III. E3 Scenario Discussion**

*Lead: Auston Smith, EPA CBPO; Alex Gunnerson, CBPO Contractor; Joseph Delesantro, CBPO Contractor*

Auston reminded WWTWG about the request from the CWGT on providing sector recommendations for Everything, by Everyone, Everywhere (E3) Scenario inputs and scenario base year. Auston outlined the main considerations for a choice of scenario base year, likely 2010 or 2022, and Alex provided background on the rationale for the partnership's decision on scenario base year last time.

Auston highlighted a few of the wastewater inputs that may need to be revisited or added for Phase 7, including CSOs, septic systems, sanitary sewer exfiltration, and expectations of non-significant facilities. Alex gave context for the past septic input assumption, which was based on the [2014 OWTS Expert Panel Report](#), suggesting an update to account for higher efficiency BMPs outlined in the [2018 Expert Panel Report](#) could be considered for Phase 7.

Joseph provided considerations for including sanitary sewer exfiltration in the E3 scenario. If WWTWG wants to include them, then a 70% max reduction could be set for the new or newly rehabilitated percentage of the pipeline. However, given limited reporting, it could also be determined to leave it out of the E3 scenario for this model phase.

**Materials:** [Presentation](#), [Additional Reference Slides](#) (compiled)

**Actions:**

1. If you have any suggestions or requests for materials or information that would be helpful to have discussion within your jurisdiction about these E3 Scenario inputs or base year choice, please reach out to Auston and Alex.
2. Please share initial thoughts on the wastewater E3 Scenario inputs and base year choice with Auston, Alex, Jamie, Justin and Petra by **Monday, June 15th**. WWTWG will discuss a draft recommendation based on these initial thoughts at the June 25th WWTWG meeting and plan to approve recommendations at the July 23rd WWTWG meeting in advance of the requested presentation to the CWGT at their August meeting.

## Discussion:

- Base Year Discussion
  - Bel Martinez da Matta, MDE shared that this is something they need to discuss internally and appreciated the background information from 2017 on their considerations then.
  - Auston shared that Dave Montali, WVDEP had previously shared that as a headwater state, where WV has not seen as much growth, they would likely prefer 2010. Using 2022 would also change how the model had performed in the past and would make comparisons harder from previous progress years so may be a communications challenge. Auston added that 2022 is not necessarily harder, though.
  - Alex walked through a chart [\[slide 7\]](#) from Phase 6 to indicate how planning targets were set in the past, noting that the line for significant facilities (orange) would not change based on this conversation and base year. That is a separate decision. The only thing that would change would be the intercept of the grey line, which includes septic systems, CSO loads and non-significant facilities. It is hard to say now whether it would go up or down and how it would impact things on a basin-by-basin basis, especially since there are other decision that would impact things.
  - Cassie Davis, NYSDEC noted she had gone through prior documents and saw that NY had pushed for a 1985 base year back in Phase 4, which may have been due to this consideration of growth. She is still trying to understand how the base year will affect planning targets.
  - Jamie Heisig-Mitchell shared that this was helpful for setting the stage and framing considerations. She asked WWTWG members if there are any materials or additional information that would be helpful to have this discussion in their jurisdictions. If they come up with any, reach out to Alex and Auston.
    - Ivy Ozmon, HRSD (in chat): I want to follow up with colleagues in house and if we come up with any requests we'll be sure to get in touch, Auston & Jamie.
- Wastewater Inputs Discussion
  - Bel Martinez da Matta shared her immediate reaction is that it makes sense to exclude exfiltration in this phase and update the septic assumptions to the more recent effectiveness percentages from the 2018 Expert Panel report. However, she still needs to talk internally.
  - Cassie Davis agreed with updating the septic assumptions to 75% from the more recent Expert Panel.
  - Jamie Heisig-Mitchell agreed with the comments from Bel.
  - Alex requested members look at the definition for non-significant industrial as well and noted there was a lot of discussion last time about whether or not those numbers should be updated to reflect the level of technology that is available at significant plants.
    - Jamie shared that from their perspective as a wastewater operator with both small and large facilities, with the small facilities it's not necessarily just about having the right resources or the right technical skill. It's that those small facilities can be more overwhelmed by perturbation in the influent flow to the facility. Due to temperature or rainfall related weather events, or other events, they're more susceptible to disruption in their biological treatment. From a reliability perspective, even if you put the right money, people and resources in those facilities, you still will likely experience challenges with achieving the same level of nutrient performance.

- Alex (in chat): Regarding Jamie's comments about the influence of weather on those really small facilities, this was a justification that was used last time for having a different standard for non-sigs.

#### **IV. Recap of Actions and Decisions**

*Lead: Petra Baldwin, WWTWG Staffer*

#### **V. Adjourn**

**Next Meeting:** [June 25, 2026](#)

#### **Attendees:**

- Jamie Heisig-Mitchell, HRSD (WWTWG Co-Chair)
- Justin Carl, AlexRenew (WWTWG Co-Chair)
- Petra Baldwin (WWTWG Staffer)
- Jackie Pickford, USGS
- Auston Smith, EPA CBPO
- Joseph Delesantro, CBPO Contractor
- Alex Gunnerson, CBPO Contractor
- Bel Martinez da Matta, MDE
- Dylan Burgevin, MDE
- George Onyullo, DC DOEE
- Kevin Bronson, DNREC
- George Mwangi, DNREC
- Cassie Davis, NYS DEC
- Cass Klingaman, NYS DEC
- Marel King, CBC
- Norah Carlos, CBC
- Ivy Ozmon, HRPDC
- Jun Fang, DC Water
- Bob Buglass, WSSC
- Sarah Ryan, PADEP
- Melissa Kret, VDH
- Deborah Sward, MDP
- Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG
- Megan Thyne, EPA CBPO
- Jess Rigelman, CBPO Contractor
- Kelly Yachera, EPA