



SUMMARY

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)

Conference call

January 16th, 2013

1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19074/>

Welcome & Introductions

- Tanya Spano (Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments; Chair, WWTWG) convened the call shortly after 1:00PM and reviewed the [agenda](#).

BMP Verification

- Ning Zhou (Va. Tech, Chesapeake Bay Program Office; Coordinator, WWTWG) described the latest Wastewater Verification Protocol ([Attachment B](#)), and the changes made following the December WWTWG conference call.
 - He noted the Review Panel felt confident with the Significant WWTP and CSO categories. The Review Panel is interested in more details about verification for on-site systems.
- Spano explained the Verification Review Panel is looking very closely at all sectors. The Review Panel would like additional specific details about existing and planned septic regulations in each of the jurisdictions. The two primary points are (1) reporting for credit and (2) verification of the practices reported.
- Dave Schepens (DE Dept. of Natural Resources and Environmental Control): We include these factors as conditions for permits. The state is working to pass new regulations, but there is a lot of pushback.
- Marya Levelev (Maryland Dept. of Environment): MDE is funding a lot of upgrades, and this involves inspections for about 10-15% of these (BET?) technologies
- Marcia Degen (VA Dept. of Health): we have some inspection requirements. Can provide the specific passage to Zhou.
- Dave Montali (WV Dept. of Environmental Protection): We don't intend to do anything about traditional systems that do not receive credit. WV doesn't have existing regulations for inspecting advanced systems, but to earn credit they feel there should be some kind of inspection frequency or documentation specified by the expert panel. Traditional systems are not a BMP, so it would not require verification since they are not reporting them for credit.
 - Spano: Good point. Will add language to clarify the point about traditional systems.
 - Montali: WV expects to follow whatever the expert panel recommends for verification.
- Spano: There is a need for further discussion offline about verification for on-site systems with Pennsylvania and New York. Verification would not apply if they do not plan to submit septic BMPs in the future, but if they plan to earn credit for on-site BMPs, they will need to provide more details about their
- **ACTION:** WWTWG members from MD, VA, and DE should provide a brief written summary of their specific septic regulations to Ning Zhou (zhou.ning@epa.gov) by January 25th.

- Levelev: the protocol seems to imply that the verification requirements would apply to all systems, including traditional systems. Was that the intent?
 - Zhou clarified that the protocol would only apply to BMP systems that reduce nutrient loads, it would not apply to traditional systems that earn no credit.
- Zhou noted he will be on leave from February 1st to February 15th.
- Degen: clarify what we need to provide: inspection requirements, frequency, applicability, etc.
- Spano: not everyone has background the same background knowledge, so we want to convey an idea of what verification exists under current or proposed regulations.
- Montali: Are we done talking about non-significant facilities? The bottom row of that column seems to imply that these DMR monitoring requirements would apply to all non-significant facilities.
 - Zhou: Similar to on-site systems, the DMR reporting would only be required if the jurisdiction seeks to earn credit for the non-significant facility.
 - Spano: we can add language to clarify that point.
- Trulear: Are there any cases where non-significants would be required to monitor, aside from expanding or new facilities?
 - Montali: Imagine this would be the case, e.g. facilities that improve their treatment, etc.

Discussion of Midpoint Assessment Activities and Schedule

- Zhou explained [Attachment C](#), which was provided for the WQGIT's October face-to-face meeting. The workgroup needs to decide which priorities it wants to tackle and which, if any, it wants to drop or pass to another group.
- He noted he will be on leave starting February 1st, so he will need to complete any workplans before then.
- Spano reviewed the workplan template ([Attachment D, opens in .docx](#)).
- Zhou noted the need for collaboration with the Trading and Offset workgroup.
- Spano: would it need to be a joint conference call with the TOWG and WTWG?
- Allen Brockenbrough (VA Dept. of Environmental Quality): For the most part they are trades for compliance credits, which are captured in the progress runs. Not sure to what extent it would need to be addressed.
- Levelev: This would be of interest in Maryland. She explained an additional request for the WWTWG to discuss NPDES permit limit requirements when incorporating trading and offsets into permits for compliance purposes.
- Glynn Rountree (National Association of Homebuilders) noted EPA is drafting Technical Memoranda, and some of these may tie into the WWTWG's discussions.
- Spano: Perhaps have a cross-workgroup discussion in March. Will communicate with the chairs and coordinators of the other workgroups to arrange a call.
- Brian Trulear (EPA, Region 3): When discussing this subject, might be useful to address an issue regarding nutrient load increases written into permits. If you allow increases in the permits it would be possible to sell those extra loads as credits. EPA didn't feel it was appropriate for the permittees to earn credit this way.
- **ACTION:** Anyone with suggestions about topics or ideas for a joint conference call with the TOWG should provide them to Ning and Jeremy.

- Brockenbrough: Virginia determined it was at 67% of capacity for significant facilities, so it assumed the non-significant loads were at a similar level.
- Spano: Rather than going through each state, suggest Zhou should characterize the current loads. This may be a task for April or May.
- Montali: This seems to be an issue about two things for each jurisdiction: their inventory of facilities and how they report progress.
- Spano: This is more of a communication issue than a data issue.
- Brockenbrough: Need to discuss the communication to ensure that the public does not misinterpret increased loads as negative progress.
- Spano: Need to consider how to educate people about the loads so that it is not portrayed as negative progress.
- Zhou noted that Number 4 was raised by Delaware.
 - Spano: We can address this as part of number 2.
- Spano: Is number 5 another joint conference call or
 - Spano explained the Verification Committee raised this issue since there was confusion about how the application of biosolids is accounted for by the jurisdictions and incorporated in the model.
- Spano: Feel we should at least have conversation to clarify how biosolids are handled and captured to see if it is or is not an issue. This is not as big of an issue, maybe do it in the summer timeframe.
- Brockenbrough: Is this an attempt to push the responsibility back on the point source sector?
 - Spano: No. It was more of an inquiry.
- Spano: What are members' thoughts about the priority to improve septic data?
 - Zhou: The jurisdictions would need to help provide the data to the extent possible.
 - Spano: This strikes me as a potential topic for a face-to-face meeting, perhaps June or July.
- Montali: Priorities 2 and 3 for septic seem to fall under the expert panel. 3(c) seems like a separate issue from the others.
- Zhou and Montali noted the second expert panel on attenuation will not start until the summer.
- Montali explained he is refining some West Virginia's septic data using Bay Program methods. He can collaborate and provide a presentation in June or July.
- Ron Furlan (PA Dept. of Environmental Protection): what about jurisdictions that don't have this data, like Pennsylvania?
- Montali: Like Pennsylvania, WV does not plan to achieve any reductions from septic. However, WV has been finding that the CBPO's data for sewer areas are sometimes smaller than the state's documents show. So PA could potentially benefit just by ensuring that the sewer-shed areas are accurate, without necessarily taking a full inventory of on-site systems.
- Furlan: PA does not have the same data as other states. PA does encourage municipalities to look at best technologies, meet applicable standards, and collect necessary information, but the state does not centrally collect the septic data.

Septic Panel Update

- Zhou: The Panel is waiting for draft recommendations on specific technologies. Tetra Tech is taking the white papers and combining them into a full report in the March timeframe. Expect to have a full report of the panel's recommendations at the end of April or early May.

2013 workgroup schedule and agenda items

- Spano noted that a few items were already highlighted during the discussion.
- She asked members to send any ideas for the workgroup's 2013 schedule to Ning and Jeremy.
- **ACTION:** WWTWG members should send any 2013 (or 2014) agenda topic ideas to Ning (zhou.ning@epa.gov) and Jeremy (jhanson@chesapeakebay.net).

Miscellaneous updates

- The cutting edge technologies workshop was funded in 2012, though the septic proposal was not funded. The septic proposal will be adjusted and resubmitted for STAC's next fiscal year.
- Zhou noted that NY, PA, MD, DE, and WV have submitted their data for the 2012 progress run. He reiterated that he is taking two weeks leave starting February 1st, so he would appreciate any feedback before he leaves.

Adjourned

Next conference call:

Tuesday, March 5th, 2013

10:00AM – 12:00PM

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19145/>

Conference Call Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Tanya Spano	MWCOG
Ning Zhou	Va. Tech, CBPO
Jeremy Hanson	CRC, CBPO
Eric Aschenbach	VA Dept. of Health
Allen Brockenbough	VA DEQ
Greg Bush	MDE
Marcia Degen	VDH
Joyce Hudson	EPA
Dharmendra Kumar	PA DEP
Marya Levelev	MDE
Lori Mitzel	PA DEP
Dave Montali	WV DEP
George Onyullo	DDOE
Glynn Rountree	NAHB
Dave Schepens	DE DNREC
Brian Trulear	EPA Region 3