



DRAFT CALL SUMMARY

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG) Teleconference

Tuesday, September 5, 2017, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Conference Line: 866-299-3188

Participant Code: 267-985-6222

Adobe Connect: <http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/wwtwg/>

Calendar: http://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/wastewater_treatment_workgroup_conference_call_september_2017

Summary of Actions and Decisions:

Decision: The WWTWG approved the recommended approach by MD to limit sediment and phosphorus delivery factors in the Phase 6 Watershed Model to less than one for wastewater treatment plants. This recommendation will be elevated to the WQGIT for consideration and approval

Action: 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 next WWTWG conference call.

Decision: The WWTWG approved the memo and white paper from the Biosolids Task Group for distribution and presentation to the WQGIT.

Action: The WWTWG will review the SSO and Bypass memo for full consideration and approval at the October WWTWG conference call.

Action: Workgroup members interested in participating on the development of the new wastewater data reporting system should contact Megan Thyng at thyng.megan@epa.gov.

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

Discussion

- The July and August draft call summaries were approved, with the following requested additions:
 - Inclusion of a header with workgroup name and call date for both the July and August minutes

Update on Phosphorus and Sediment Delivery Factors in the Phase 6 Watershed Model—

Greg Busch, MDE

- Greg Busch: MDE submitted a recommended approach to the issue of sediment and phosphorus delivery factors, as applied to wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) in the Phase 6 Watershed Model. We're requesting that the WWTWG review and approve our recommended approach.
- Busch: We want to adjust some of the calibration approaches to limit the presence of phosphorus (P) and sediment delivery factors in the model. There was no agreement on technical approaches, so the final model still has delivery factors greater than 1 in some places in the watershed. We need to make sure that those higher delivery factors are not also applied to WWTPs.

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup Conference Call, September 5, 2017

Delivery factors are related to stream bed and bank scour and that's not an issue with WW. We'd like to have language included in the resolution to confirm that WWTP delivery factors will be kept at 1 or below.

- Allan Brockenbrough: We are supportive of this recommendation, and VA has come to these issues previously as well.
- Ning Zhou: I also support this approach. This technical approach was also in Phases 4 and 5 of the Watershed Model and carried over into Phase 6, so there might be something built into the model that's difficult to change. For WWTPs there should be a work-around. Currently we just have to deal with that delivery factor as is since the model is final.
- Spano: When the model is used to generate loads, you can't have this both ways. I think we should raise this to the WQGIT.
- Representatives from NY, PA, DE, and WV also expressed support for MDE's recommended approach.

Decision: The WWTWG approved the recommended approach by MD to limit sediment and phosphorus delivery factors in the Phase 6 Watershed Model to less than one for wastewater treatment plants. This recommendation will be elevated to the WQGIT for consideration and approval.

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 August 15 calendar page and the Projects and Resources tab on the [WWTWG page](#).
- The final model review protocol, approved by the WQGIT 5/9/17
- Draft phase 6 model documentation chapters 1 and 8, and appendix F.

Discussion:

- Zhou: We haven't received that many comments and edits. We have comments from George Onyullo that I will share with the group.
 - Zhou: Section 8.4: We have an executive summary at the top. From this section we can see an overview of what's been changed and altered in Phase 6. We will move fig 8.2 to the executive summary section.
 - Brockenbrough: VA has a different definition for significant facilities.
 - Kumar: PA concurs with VA. Significant industrial facilities in PA is defined as over 75,000 lb per day TN or 25000 lb per day TP. That's different from the definition printed here.
 - Spano: Can we refine VA's definition to capture that distinction? Can we add some language to allow for those exceptions?
 - Zhou: Yes, we can do that. VA and PA both have updated definitions for significant facilities that we can capture here in this documentation.
 - Spano: Allan and Kumar, can you take the meeting materials and update with track changes and send back to Ning, Michelle, and myself for incorporation?

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup Conference Call, September 5, 2017

- Zhou: In addition, any jurisdictions that have changes to definitions or procedures that are different from the document up here, please let us know so we can include those changes.
- Ning Zhou also presented the edits and comments received from VA.
 - Spano: We will put a special case title here. We will need to update that and make it very visible. We also made the language more precise.
- Spano: Whatever document changes the workgroup sends in, please let us know what the changes are. We will do more cleanup of the documentation in the coming months.
- Zhou: We still need the septic updates from the modeling team as they update the mechanism. That part of the documentation is still coming. I will put a placeholder in this document that will be finished by the modeling workgroup.
- Spano: I just want to make sure that I have the copy of the edited documentation that you have up here.

Action: 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 next WWTWG conference call.

Biosolids Task Group Recommendation, Draft Memo—Karl Berger (MWCOCG)

Karl Berger presented a draft [memo](#) from the Biosolids Task Group with recommendations for how to further improve the simulation of biosolids phosphorus in future iterations of the watershed model.

Discussion:

- Spano: If we approve of this memo then we will simply send along to the WQGIT with the report.
- Karl Berger: That task force is sunsetted by now. The task force funded a consultant (Chip Elliot) to look into simulation of biosolids P in the Watershed Model. I would suggest that the workgroup look at the white paper that was attached to the email transmittal and is posted on the calendar page.
- Berger: There were three recommendations in the memo. 1 was already included in the Phase 6 Watershed Model. The other 2 recommendations need consideration for a future phase of the Watershed Model. Adopting the WEP as sensitivity is one way to make it more accurate, and other recommendations included adopting organic chemistry parameters for biosolids P loads. The recommendation exists but has not yet been acted on. There might be an opportunity to get new BMPs in the model at the next milestone period. The third recommendation is to look into altering APLE (applied phosphorus load equation) to include biosolids P modeling. The purpose of this memo and report is to make the Modeling Team and the WQGIT aware of these recommendations. We would also like the memo and report to be available in Bay Program archive of documents on chesapeakebay.net. We can elevate this recommendation to the WQGIT, but this is all for the future so it might be lost in the WQGIT if it went to the WQGIT now.
 - Spano: For some context: this is a follow up from last year's WQGIT Face-to-Face meeting. There was a request at that meeting to better address biosolids in the Watershed Model, so I'm following up on that. We want to report back to the WQGIT that we've done what we were asked to do. In terms of planning for an expert panel, this is just a record of the decision and we can come back to it later when we start planning new tasks once the model is finalized.
- Zhou: In the next year or two, this workgroup will work closely with the AgWG on this issue and on spray irrigation. AgWG is still thinking of setting up a new BMP panel to evaluate the impact

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup Conference Call, September 5, 2017

of spray irrigation and biosolids in the future. When we applied biosolids and spray irrigation in CAST we got negative loads for P on agricultural land. It's early to say definitively, but that looks like a positive sign. That's something we will have to explore in the future with AgWG.

- Representatives from NY, VA, MD, and DE concurred with this recommended approach.
- Kumar: I don't know enough about the issue, so PA will abstain.
- Tanya Spano asked for contact information on task force to thank them and inform on follow up actions.

Decision: The WWTWG approved the memo and white paper from the Biosolids Task Group for distribution and presentation to the WQGIT.

Draft Recommendation to Include SSO and Bypass in a Future Model—Ning Zhou (VT)

Ning Zhou presented a [draft recommendation](#) to the WQGIT to consider inclusion of bypass issues and sewer service overflows as an input category in a future phase of the Watershed Model.

Discussion:

- Spano: I have real doubts about any bypass event being 20 mg/L for TN.
 - Zhou: That number is the first catch is the SSO after the overflow, which will be very concentrated since stormwater is being mixed with the wastewater already in the plant.
 - Spano: Blue Plains flows have been extensively monitored and modeled, and extrapolating trends from Blue Plains may not be accurate to other plants. I'd request that you make a note on this to make that clear and that we go over the spreadsheet offline.
 - Zhou: I can send you the spreadsheet and we can go over the data. This is draft, and I do make a note that these values are draft and not citable.
- Busch: Where is this request coming from for inclusion of these loads in the model?
 - Zhou: The model needs data during certain time periods. We also have inquiries from local governments and from Blue Water Baltimore on how the model handles sewage spills and if there's a way to link reduction efforts to the TMDL. This is also overdue for WW loading sources in the WSM because we had no data when the model was first created. But, we have data after 2005, and we now have more than 10 years' worth of data that can be included in the model.
 - Spano: For context: We need to decide as a workgroup whether we're comfortable doing this in tracking, evaluating, and make a proposal for bringing this recommendation forward. There may not be a decision today, and we need to make sure that we are doing our due diligence in conveying this to the WQGIT. There is also a difference between accounting for loads and taking credit for reductions in the model, so there are really two distinct information needs there.
 - Zhou: Please send your comments to Michelle and Tanya. When the workgroup has finalized this, Tanya can present to the WQGIT. The USWG is also interested in this and has invited us to present this to them as well.
 - Tanya: I ask that we defer this action and revisit this memo in October for full review and approval.

Action: The WWTWG will review the SSO and Bypass memo for full consideration and approval at the October WWTWG conference call.

CBP Wastewater Data Reporting System—Megan Thyng

Megan gave an [overview](#) of the point source data reporting project for WWTWG feedback. Presentation will include an update on the status of the project and timing for next steps, including a timeline of user testing and solicitation of jurisdictional feedback.

Discussion:

- Spano: I like the QA/QC piece. I understand the process, but there needs to be some point of contact for submission and QA/QC. IF this is done internally that's fine, but there needs to be some contact information for whoever will be doing that.
- Megan Thyng: That's a good point. We also have a part of the application where we can track who made what change and why, so we will be discussing that.
- Zhou: QA/QC is a tool. How the user does it is up to them, we just want them to be able to use this tool to do their own work, and we want that QA/QC to be user guided.
- Spano: In the future, in the documentation and the message conveyed by the graphics, let's note what's done automatically and what is done by the user manually.
 - Thyng: We will have some documentation for the user. This will be a very transparent tool, where the user can see everything that happens. Some QA/QC is done by states and some done by the CBP. This will be an iterative process, but we want this application to be used for all of that and get the data in the format that can be used by the model.
- Zhou: one major way we want this to be used is to keep up to date on facilities that are operating, being built or being shut down.
- Spano: I hope that there's something that allows for commentary on these plants for context.
 - Zhou: We can document any changes in the comments column. When the facility changes, we treat it as a new facility as long as there's a new ID. The old one will be put under inactive status in those scenarios.
- Zhou: We hope that this database will allow us to track historical changes to facilities in the Bay watershed. We are at the phase right now where data collection and selection are nearly done, and we will begin adding more QA/QC functions. We need state input on that, since each state handles QA/QC differently. Megan will contact the states and get input on that. That's all I have.
- Megan Thyng invited workgroup members to follow up via email with more questions at thyng.megan@epa.gov. If anyone wants to work more closely with us on developing this tool, please contact me.
- Thyng: I want to address Tanya's question about timeline: For 2017 progress, states probably won't be able to use this, but states would submit data the way they have done with spreadsheets, and my team would use the application to do the checks for this year. It shouldn't be on the states to do double submission. That would be on us to do the test run on this application.
 - Spano: Instead of doing a normal calendar year data submission, you won't have it up for states to use this year, but you will have it up by 2018 submission?
- Matt Richardson: I have a couple questions. How does this new tool affect agreement dates in the grant guidance? I ask because VA has to submit by end of January, and we go through December 31. If it has to run through the ISIS tool and EPA has to get back to use on that, is that an adequate turnaround time?
- Zhou: We've considered that. We can work this out when the system is in place, but right now we are not at that point. We don't want to change the date in the grant guidance, and we will see how the app works for the 2018 submission. We don't have a final decision on that yet.

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup Conference Call, September 5, 2017

- Thyng: If using this app takes you longer to produce final data than what you were doing before, then we aren't doing our job. This is supposed to make it easier for you, so if it's not we will have to go back to the drawing board with this.
- Richardson: Can this tool pull all that ISIS data together and link to that for VA?
 - Zhou: Anything not linked to ISI will be up to the user to upload.
 - Thyng: I can follow up with you online to work on making sure that data is comprehensive, Matt.
- Bryan Baker: You will be testing the tool this year then. Will this tool be used in the future to upload ISIS regulated facilities right now? Reports are prepared in NY We use ISIS to send data to CBP to QA/QC.
 - Thyng: Instead of you using ISIS, we will grab some of that material for you and have it already prepared.
 - Zhou: There is a line here that we try to draw between ISIS and our data. ISIS is for compliance purposes, and our data is for modeling purposes. For instance, we have a lot of data for nonsignificant facilities that ISIS doesn't track. Any corrections from the states have to go back through ISIS, and you can always send us a request to consider.

Action: Workgroup members interested in participating on the development of the new wastewater data reporting system should contact Megan Thyng at thyng.megan@epa.gov.

Updates

- Point Source Data QAPP status —Ning Zhou (VT)
 - Zhou: I have new data from DE and VA, and we are waiting on DC to complete this process in order to meet the BMP verification requirement.
 - Tanya: That's something that George Onyullo and I will work on wrapping up.
 - Ning: The due date is passed, so just wrap that up as soon as possible.
- Boat pump-out and the second onsite system BMP expert panels have resumed work. Ning Zhou (VT) gave an update on status and progress towards completion.
 - Ning: Tetra Tech has picked these panels up. They will wrap up reports early next year. Other than that I don't have detailed progress to report.
- Zhou: I spoke with Rich Batiuk about my replacement as coordinator. He will work it out with EPA Region III and CBP management, so at this time there is no information on a coordinator for WWTWG.

Thank-you and Send-off for Ning Zhou

Long-time coordinator for the WWTWG and point source data manager for the Bay Program, Ning will be leaving the Bay Program on September 8. We wish him a fond farewell and good luck on his next endeavor!

- Spano: I'd ask the workgroup to join me in thanking Ning for all his work over his 19 years at the Bay Program and as WWTWG coordinator.
 - Brockenbrough: I want to second Tanya in thanking you for all your professionalism and your help over the years.
 - Busch: Agreed, thank you a lot.

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup Conference Call, September 5, 2017

- Baker: Thank you from NY, for all your hard work and attention to detail and progress towards protecting the Bay.
- Zhou: My grant officially ends in November, so I have to take leave much earlier than my official end time. Michelle will send a follow up with my contact information. MY VT email (ning@vt.edu) will still be up, so you can drop me an email anytime you want to talk about WW.
- Spano: Maybe we can find another occasion to thank you in person at our next face to face meeting and give you a proper send off.

12:00 PM **Adjourned**

Next conference call:

Tuesday October 3, 10 AM – 12 PM

- Finalizing the phase 6 model documentation.

Call Participants

Tanya Spano, Chair (MWCOG)
Ning Zhou, Coordinator (VT)
Michelle Williams, Staffer (CRC)
Katherine Wares, Staffer (CRC)
Rashid Ahmed, NYS DEC
Bryan Baker, NYS DEC
Dharmendra Kumar, PA DEP
Greg Busch, MDE
Jack Hayes, DNREC
George Mwangi, DNREC
Matt Richardson, VA DEQ
Allan Brockenbrough, VA DQ
Megan Browning, WV DEP
Karl Berger, MWCOG
Joel Blanco, EPA R3
Megan Thyng, CBPO