



DRAFT CALL SUMMARY
Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)
Teleconference
Tuesday, July 11, 2017, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
[Calendar Page](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions:

Decision: The WWTWG approved the June meeting minutes.

Action: The WWTWG will submit comments and suggestions to Olivia Devereux (olivia@devereuxconsulting.com) through July in order to revise the Conowingo cost-benefit analysis. The revised analysis will be presented to the PSC as a tool to inform the decision on addressing Conowingo infill loads.

Action: Michelle and Ning will send a reminder email in two weeks to remind the workgroup to send in comments on the new CAST data sources prior to the August WWTWG conference call.

Action: The WWTWG will review calibration data available on the ftp site and submit any comments, suggested corrections, and gaps to fill to Ning Zhou. Ning and Michelle will draft a schedule of planned updates to the calibration data and share that schedule with the workgroup.

Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements —Tanya Spano (Chair)

- Phase 6 resources for the WWTWG are up on the [WWTWG web page](#) under the Projects and Resources tab. If there are any resources missing that you would like to add to this page, please email Michelle Williams (Williams.michelle@epa.gov).
 - A log of fatal flaw comments received will also be added to the Phase 6 resources page. This log will be updated every Tuesday through July and is also available on the [WQGIT](#) Projects and Resources tab under Phase 6 Model and Midpoint Assessment.
- Phase 6 [CAST](#) is up and available to run scenarios. A schedule of training webinars has been distributed over email and has been added to the Phase 6 resources list on the WWTWG page (link above).
- Phase 6 CAST will be updated Friday, July 14. The WWTWG should wait for CAST to be updated before running and analyzing scenarios. CAST upgrade history available here: <https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/About/UpgradeHistory>

Decision: The WWTWG approved the June meeting minutes.

Presentation: Accounting for Additional Loads from Conowingo Dam—Bruce Michael (MDNR) and Olivia Devereux (Devereux Consulting)

Bruce and Olivia [briefed](#) the WWTWG on updates to the additional loads from Conowingo Dam and Reservoir and discuss options for accounting for those loads in the wastewater sector.

Discussion

- Spano: We as a workgroup have to identify technical or policy aspects that relate to wastewater. This issue is not wastewater-specific but all loads in all sectors are important in this situation.
- Will Hunley: I looked at the materials in [the report](#), and I took away that MD and VA have no point source reductions anticipated.
- Devereux: Yes, we were looking at more cost effective BMPs that were on the agriculture side, not the wastewater side. But the re-analysis will likely include wastewater BMPs.
- Bruce Michael: Looking at N-P exchange might also allow us to reduce P further.
- Hunley: Basing this as a % reduction from the WIP gets confusing since the BMPs change a lot from the Phase 5 model to Phase 6. Could we make incremental reductions based on the phase III WIP as it stands? It would be more understandable as a WIP than as a percent reduction.
- Devereux: We can't keep that the same in WIP II vs WIP III because of changes in phase 5 to phase 6. We can also take the WIPs and find ways to make them more effective as a way to reduce Conowingo loads.
- Spano: you could revisit the WIPs and make suggestions as to how to meet current obligations, and then describe how incremental increases in implementation with cost effective logic can be done to accommodate additional loads. That second option separates what happens with a WIP vs what happens when you add in an additional load.
- Michael: That would be a better representation, if you implemented the most cost effective BMPs across the states anyway and then describe implementation on top of that for Conowingo loads.
- Spano: I've stated this before, but you really need much more clarity in your documentation and presenting your methods and logical flows.
- Devereux: Some of that has already been documented.
- Olivia left the call and invited members to send in comments to her via email.
- Spano: Since you'll be redoing this in phase 6, you don't want to edit the current documentation, but look at the logical framework and figure out how to improve it going forward, correct?
- Michael: Yes, that's right. We want to make it a little more realistic using input from the source sector workgroups.
- Spano: So that's what we need to focus on, the substantive part. We have to make sure any logical framework issues are addressed, as well as constraints.
- Michael: We have such a short time frame that we wanted to get something out to you as early as possible so you have a chance to give input.
- Spano: Anyone who wants to make any points here, the floor is yours.
- Hunley: One more comment relating to effectiveness in VA: Analysis considers P loads and costs, but another important consideration is DO in those segments. This is really only a 1-3 percent change we're looking at. I am interested in how much percent change you would expect to see in VA from state tributary basins. The James and the York have less influence on Bay DO levels. There needs to be some quantification of the load contributions from the state basins—what load reduction from a state basin would translate to X amount of DO in segment CB4?
- Michael: All the scenarios we've proposed will meet DO attainment if implemented. I don't know if we would be able to get that information to you of the individual contributions from state basins.
- Hunley: Can we ask the modeling team about doing that? I can articulate this better in a written comment.

- Spano: When we did geo runs, we looked at relative impacts of each tributary. One comment I made is if we can identify the load contributions that these states make to the Conowingo loads?
- Michael: We don't have that from the modeling side, we were really looking at monitoring data.
- Spano: I have some broader policy level concerns. In the wastewater context, if you're looking at scenarios trading up wastewater with other BMPs, you need to articulate as early as possible the wastewater related assumptions you're going to make. For example: What happens if you max out PA plants, where do returns start to diminish? What's the tradeoff there? We need to help you agree on what realistic wastewater assumptions should be for this issue.
- Michael: I agree, and that's the specific input we're looking for as we revise this analysis.
- Spano: I would ask that you share the cost effectiveness information you got from the states, like MDE, so that Michelle and Ning can share in the transmittal email to the WWTWG.
- Michael: I agree. It might already be in the report but I can check and make sure.
- Spano: Thank you, you both have done a great job so far and we look forward to helping you redo this analysis. Please CC myself, Ning and Michelle when you send in comments.
- Zhou: This Conowingo issue is an important one, and if it turns out that they need to find a solution through wastewater, then we will have a lot of coordination work to do in the workgroup next year to help implement the proposed strategies.
- Spano: Thanks for bringing that up. If your WIP III has only continuing information in wastewater from WIP II, you are just doing the WIP II and you're not necessarily implementing all the reductions your jurisdictions need to do. If wastewater is a part of this mix for Conowingo accommodation, then you will have to address that in your WIP III for WW.
- Zhou: In the past we just assumed Conowingo was a P sink, but that's no longer true and we don't know what impact that will have on our policy going forward, esp. if offset loads go to Potomac (MD, VA) and Susquehanna (PA, NY)

Action: The WWTWG will submit comments and suggestions to Olivia Devereux (olivia@devereuxocnsulting.com) through July in order to revise the Conowingo cost-benefit analysis. The revised analysis will be presented to the PSC as a tool to inform the decision on addressing Conowingo infill loads.

Discussion of Documentation for Phase 6 Model – Ning Zhou (VT), Tanya Spano (MWCOG)

The WWTWG will review comments and proposed edits to chapter 8 of the draft phase 6 model documentation. Background resources include:

- Resources listed in the one pager (Phase 4 and phase 5 model documentation), available on the June 1 calendar page and the Projects and Resources tab on the [WWTWG page](#).
- The final model review protocol, approved by the WQGIT 5/8/17
- Draft phase 6 model documentation chapters 1 and 8, and appendix F.

Action Item: The WWTWG will continue collecting comments on the draft chapter 8 model documentation, and a final draft will be presented to the workgroup for approval at the August WWTWG conference call.

Discussion:

- Spano: We might have to continue discussion offline.
- Zhou: I haven't received any comments or feedback so far for chapter 8 documentation. We would like those comments to revise the chapter 8 documentation. We need to take a broad

focus on what content we need to cover still and find what we need to discuss more clearly. We will keep taking feedback over email in the next couple weeks so we can discuss at the August call. We will finalize through August to submit in September.

- Spano: I haven't had a chance to look at the document yet. A reminder: We want this document to be solid, we don't want to make assumptions, and we want it to be clear in communicating direct loads in the model. Audiences who have not used this document in the past who are new to the model history should be able to read this and come away with some understanding. We don't want to short-hand things. If you're new to this, please give us some insight as to what needs clearer explanation.
- Zhou: Should we divide and conquer and ask people to take different sections?
- Spano: George and I will take a first cut at it as a whole and then see what we need to do. If there's an obvious omission, please send that to Ning and Michelle ASAP to correct.
- Zhou: I want to show you the [calibration data](#). I have included a log of changes, as well as a spray irrigation folder where I will be uploading new documentation.
- Spano: Can you and Michelle draft an action item in the meeting summary that includes a link to the ftp site and ask members to look for updates on the ftp site, comment on revisions or corrections needed, and comment on what gaps need to be filled. Ning and Michelle will draft a schedule of planned updates to the calibration data, so that members know when and where to look.
- Zhou: I don't have biosolids data yet because it's mixed with manure in CAST. Septic and biosolids will be coming in next.
- Spano: draft an email to share with workgroup, note upcoming updates and schedule of updates. This is data review, different from land use viewer review, different from documentation review. That can be sent out in the next couple weeks.
- Zhou: We will do weekly updates to the ftp calibration data, and Michelle will send out reminders to the workgroup with reminders on the updates.
- Spano: Make sure it's a standalone email, and include links to places for folks to go.

Action: The WWTWG will review calibration data available on the ftp site and submit any comments, suggested corrections, and gaps to fill to Ning Zhou. Ning and Michelle will draft a schedule of planned updates to the calibration data and share that schedule with the workgroup.

[CAST Pass through and New Scenarios and New Data Sources](#)—Ning Zhou

- Zhou: We want to see how much load we're getting from new sources in the model. New load sources include: biosolids, spray irrigation (Ag and Non Ag), large monitored onsite systems, septic, and boat pump-out (not ready, still under expert panel review).
- Spano: Do you have an ETA for when septic and biosolids will be available for CAST?
- Zhou: Jess Rigelman has indicated that these will be available to present to the workgroup at our next call, August 1.
- Tanya: The Maryland data looks really off. Is Greg on the line, do you have any comments on this? Do these things make sense geologically, from piedmont to coastal areas—it looks like something really weird is going on with MD.
- Zhou: MD provided their own soil data, that might be part of the problem there.
- Spano: I might go back and look at the choice to use red in the color representation there as well. That has to be acknowledged for the audience. Let us know what's going on at the next call.

Action: Michelle and Ning will send a reminder email in two weeks to remind the workgroup to send in comments on the new CAST data sources prior to the August WWTWG conference call.

Adjourned

Next conference call:

Tuesday, August 15, 10 AM – 12 PM

Tanya Spano will be on leave first week of August. Workgroup members who cannot attend are asked to contact Michelle Williams (williams.michelle@epa.gov).

Call Participants:

Tanya Spano (COG), Chair
Ning Zhou (VT), Coordinator
Michelle Williams (CRC), staffer
Nasser Ameen, COG
Rashid Ahmed, NY
Dharmendra Kumar, PA DEP
Angela Redwine, VDH
Meghan Browning, WV DEP
Greg Busch, MDE
Jack Hayes, DNREC
Lana Sindler, COG
Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting
Bruce Michael, MDNR
Will Hunley, HRSD
Kurt Stevens, STAC