



## Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)

Thursday February 26th, 2025  
10:00 – 11:00 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 briefing on E3 (Everything, by Everyone, Everywhere) Scenario Development and multiple decisions to finalize aspects of the optional inputs for the Sanitary Sewer Exfiltration estimation method.

### Minutes

#### I. Welcome and Announcements

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

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

#### Decisions:

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

#### Actions:

1. The WWTWG will have the opportunity to review the Sewer/Septic backcast in mid-March to flag errors. Please share any questions or comments with Jackie Pickford ([jpickford@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:jpickford@chesapeakebay.net)).

#### II. E3 Scenario Development Introduction

*Lead: Auston Smith, EPA CBPO*

Auston gave an [overview](#) of what scenarios are needed for setting planning targets, including No Action and Everything, by Everyone, Everywhere (aka "E3") Scenarios. Auston outlined what each scenario is and how they help determine the appropriate context for "controllable loads". Auston shared considerations for developing E3 scenarios for Phase 7 and noted the main decisions and tasks that the WWTWG will need to work on in the coming ~6 months. Auston also highlighted the assumptions made in Phase 6 for these inputs, which the WWTWG will need to determine what should be kept the same and what needs to be revised or added.

#### Actions:

1. Auston and CBPO Staff will put together a list of the ramifications of some of these decisions for E3 Scenarios, especially for the base year choice, to help guide source sector workgroups.

2. If you have any further questions or comments on E3 Scenario development, please reach out to Auston Smith ([Smith.Auston@epa.gov](mailto:Smith.Auston@epa.gov)). The WWTWG will revisit this in our March and/or April meeting.

**Discussion:**

- Dave Montali, WVDEP requested CBPO put out a list of the ramifications, particularly for the base year change, of these decisions. It's not clear what should be chosen, so having guidelines for the benefit of staying consistent with the previous base year, moving to more recent data, or other choices would be helpful.
- Dave proposed that he does not think it is worth extensive deliberation revisiting the detailed input decisions for the Phase 6 E3 Scenario. Not sure that much has changed and it's not worth going through each row piece by piece. It would be better to focus time and energy on what needs to be added that is new since last time, like exfiltration.
  - Bel Martinez da Matta, MDE (in chat): Agree with Dave about the existing concentrations for E3 scenarios.
- Dave shared that regarding the flow issue Auston brought up, the last time we did it WIP flows were used and, at least for WV, those are pretty well defined.
  - Auston confirmed WIP flows were used for significant facilities and 2006 data or newly submitted data was used for non-significant facilities.

### III. Sanitary Sewer Exfiltration Optional Inputs

*Lead: Joseph Delesantro, EPA and Alex Gunnerson, CBPO Contractor*

Joseph and Alex [presented](#) proposals for the remaining considerations for the optional inputs - percent gravity line and percent new/rehabilitated - for the Sanitary Sewer Exfiltration (SSE) estimation method for Phase 7. They walked through how the spatial scale standardization options would work and provided background on how the rest of the proposals were reached. WWTWG members provided comments and reached consensus on all four decisions outlined below.

**Decisions:**

1. WWTWG chose NPDES ID for the Spatial Scale Standardization for optional inputs to the SSE estimation method.
2. WWTWG approved the use 95% gravity lines as default for non-coastal plains model units and 90% gravity lines as default for coastal plains model units in the SSE estimation method.
3. WWTWG chose to use a 10-year sum as the reporting time scale for rehabilitation in the SSE estimation method.
4. WWTWG approved an amended definition of Rehabilitation:
  - *For the purposes of estimating sanitary sewer exfiltration loads, rehabilitation is the systematic repair, renewal, or replacement of existing sanitary sewer pipes, joints, laterals, manholes, and appurtenant structures to restore hydraulic integrity and to prevent or reduce infiltration of groundwater into the system and unintended exchange of wastewater with surrounding soils, groundwater, or stormwater conveyances.*

**Actions:**

1. If you plan to submit optional inputs for the SSE estimation for your jurisdiction, please send them to Alex ([agunnerson@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:agunnerson@chesapeakebay.net)) and Joseph ([jdelesantro@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:jdelesantro@chesapeakebay.net)) via email by April 3, 2026.

## Discussion:

- Standardizing Reporting Scale
  - Joseph noted that the third option of using a custom service area is not the preferable option from their view because it could introduce some confusion since people would have to understand what the scale is. It would also require more work for jurisdictions to compile this and considering the small effect on the model, it's probably not worth the extra effort.
  - Bel Martinez da Matta, MDE shared a preference for using NPDES ID and asked if it is possible to apply the percentage/fraction to facilities in a county and submit it as NPDES ID fractions since they are still unsure what scale this data is available at in Maryland.
    - Joseph responded it is possible. It is just a matter of whether or not other jurisdictions took issue with that. Many networks have multiple treatment facilities or outflows so in those cases you'd still be assigning that value to all of the NPDES IDs within it. Hampton Roads data fits this as well, where they likely will have a single value for a whole jurisdiction that would then be applied to each of the NPDES IDs.
  - Dave Montali, WVDEP asked to clarify what the model units depicted on the diagram on slide 11 represent and how the actual exfiltration load is distributed in the example scenario.
    - Joseph responded that the actual exfiltration load will be calculated at the summary unit scale and then summed up to the Land-River Segment scale for the management version of CAST.
    - Dave asked for confirmation that if a jurisdiction reports a certain percent rehabilitation and discharge is all in one catchment then it would all go there. And if the service area overlaps multiple catchments, then would there be some distribution based on population?
    - Joseph clarified the distribution based on population is just for dry weather flows, not for the optional inputs. If there is a service area with a single NPDES outflow that crosses multiple model units, its reported percent rehabilitation for that service area would be applied to each of those model units.
  - Dave shared a preference for using NPDES IDs. If jurisdictions have the ability to pre-process their data, this seems the most practical way to go.
    - Joseph noted that a lot of other data submitted in the Point Source App is also reported at this scale.
  - Dave noted that their data is more 1:1. Some of their significant facilities are an NPDES permit number and an outlet number. Some facilities may have more than one wastewater treatment outfall. Could this be reported at the outlet level?
    - Joseph responded the data he uses is to the outlet level.
    - Alex responded that in the Point Source App each outfall is assigned to an NHD catchment, Phase 7 Land-River Segment and a summary unit. So, we have all that information down to the outfall level, so I don't see any reason why that couldn't be done.
    - Dave confirmed that if they report anything then they can prescribe it to the permit and outfall number.
  - Jamie Heisig-Mitchell, HRSD shared that for HRSD if they can make NPDES IDs work (and it seems we could) then I have no concerns.
    - Ivy Ozmon, HRPDC (in chat): No concerns, that all sounds great!
    - Ivy elaborated that if we were to try and make it more specific to where we request the data from each locality for their fraction rehabilitated, we would

- be up against a considerable effort trying to maintain accurate and current data. I think for Hampton Roads, using NPDES IDs is the best approach.
- Clifton Bell, Brown and Caldwell (shared via email, read by Joseph): I would favor either method #1 (LRseg scale) or method #2 (NPDES IDs). Method #2 is more spatially accurate, but given the other uncertainties in the calculation, method #1 would also be acceptable. I don't think it is worth it to derive new polygons as in method #3.
  - Percent Gravity Defaults
    - Clifton Bell (shared via email, read by Alex): I have performed a brief investigation into these values, limited primarily by data availability. I found largely the same sources cited in the slide deck. I believe these are reasonable defaults for % gravity lines.
    - Jamie shared support for these default values.
  - Reporting Time Scale for Percent Rehabilitated
    - Bel shared support for using a 10-year sum as it would be the most flexible option. If jurisdictions receive the data annually, they can still calculate a 10-year sum, but if they only have a multi-year sum it would be harder to do the reverse calculation back to annual reporting.
    - Ivy (in chat): I agree with Bel.
    - Clifton (shared via email, referenced by Joseph): I would lean toward the 10-yr timeframe because: (1) the exfiltration calculation only uses the 10-year sum anyway; (2) some utilities might not have great annual values; (3) for those that do, it's easy to do the ten-year sum. However, I'm not sure this needs to be one or the other. Why not let utilities report the annual values if they have good data and 10-year values otherwise. Just a little extra processing.
    - Dave asked how HRSD plans to do this reporting. Not sure WV will, but curious.
      - Jamie responded HRSD has data back 10-years for an overarching summary but not at the year level. Maybe moving forward we'll have more granularity at that level.
      - Dave asked if he was going to try to get this info then should he ask for the sum of all new/rehabbed sewer from this 10-year period?
      - Jamie responded yes, that's essentially what we're doing.
    - George Mwangi, DNREC (in chat): 10 yr sum could be easier for municipalities to report since most of the rehab projects probably span over years. Unless they track rehab completed by the year.
    - Ivy (in chat): Hampton Roads localities typically have a lag in reporting to HRSD, so 10 years makes sense for our region.
  - Defining Rehabilitation
    - Clifton (shared via email, read by Alex): Pretty good definition. If I were to quibble, it would be a slightly broader list of structures that are sometimes rehabbed to reduce I/I, like manholes, clean-outs, pump stations: e.g., "...existing sanitary sewer pipes, joints, laterals, manholes, and appurtenant structures..."
    - Dave shared he is good with the definition. He asked what was defined as "new". Did we previously agree to a definition for that?
      - Joseph responded "new" is defined as new lines in the last 10-years.

#### IV. Recap of Actions and Decisions

*Lead: Petra Baldwin, WWTWG Staffer*

#### V. Adjourn

**Next Meeting: Thursday, March 26, 2025**

**Attendees:**

- Jamie Heisig-Mitchell, HRSD (WWTWG Co-Chair)
- Justin Carl, AlexRenew (WWTWG Co-Chair)
- Petra Baldwin (WWTWG Staffer)
- Auston Smith, EPA CBPO
- Joseph Delesantro, EPA ORISE/CBPO
- Alex Gunnerson, CBPO Contractor
- Dave Montali, WVDEP
- Bel Martinez da Matta, MDE
- Dylan Burgevin, MDE
- George Onyullo, DC DOEE
- Kevin Bronson, DNREC
- George Mwangi, DNREC
- Zach Steckler, PA DEP
- Erica Duncan, VADEQ
- Dana Hales, EPA R3
- Marel King, CBC
- Ivy Ozmon, HRPDC
- James Grandstaff, Henrico WRF
- Ed Cronin, Brown & Caldwell
- Melissa Kret, VDH
- Jackie Pickford, USGS
- Rebecca Ransom, USGS
- Jess Rigelman, CBPO Contractor
- Suzanne Trevena, EPA R3
- Ellen Egen, AquaLaw
- Bill Mann, William & Mary
- (301) 752-6291