

Harbor TMDL Oversight Group Meeting

June 20, 2007

(Draft July 12, 2007)

1. The meeting was convened at EPA offices at 10:30. Participants included Kevin Bricke, Wayne Jackson, Bob Nyman, Marco Al-Ebus (on phone), Shadab Ahmad, Kerry Kirk-Pflugh, Jeff Reading (on phone), Deb Hammond, Narinder Ahuja, Barbara Hirst (on phone), Phil O'Brien, Dick Draper, Phil DeGaetano (on phone), Robin Miller, Tim Bradley and Bridget McKenna.
2. The minutes from the previous meeting were approved with a slight modification to item 3.
3. Tim Bradley from Metcalf and Eddy, a consultant to the NJHDG, gave a presentation on the findings of their nutrient removal cost analysis work. A copy of the presentation is available. He said that actual plant flows were used, rather than design flow or future projections. He also noted that unlike NY, NJ does not permit any bypass of the secondary treatment process at the treatment plant. Further, no allowance was made for seasonal effluent limits. These two constraints appear to prevent low cost load reduction options. It was also pointed out that seasonal variability of treatment plant performance was captured within the range of values assessed. One additional point made was that increased nutrient removal will necessarily require additional energy usage, which will result in increased CO₂ emissions. These findings will be shared with Ed Linky, Ray Werner, and Walter Mugdan at EPA. Comments on the report were requested in 3 weeks.
4. Robin Miller gave the nutrient presentation on the carbon component results. It was noted that there was no cost information for Yonkers. Nyman will alert Yonkers about the current effort. Ms. Miller highlighted a number of questions that need to be answered by the NWG prior to moving on to the next modeling steps, including: conditions at the Oradell Dam, status of Bergen County outfall relocation, level of NPS reductions, and the level of carbon reduction to include at each plant. Barbara Hirst said that for the Oradell Dam, the measured values less CAIR should be used. Regarding the North Bergen plant, she said that it should be assumed that there will be no discharge in 3 years as it will be rerouted to PVSC. Ms. Miller's revised presentation will be circulated to the oversight group.
5. Jeff Reading discussed the status of the Hackensack River Model. Bergen County agreed to do the upgrades, but needed significant time to complete the work. It was decided that NJDEP will pursue working with BCUA to get the upgrades done. Further, it was decided that the NWG should proceed with a Phase 1 TMDL for the Hackensack using SWEM, but allow the opportunity for Phase 2

TMDLs for the Hackensack using the BCUA model. Implementation schedules under the Phase 1 TMDLs will provide the opportunity for the Phase 2 TMDL to be completed before costly implementation requirements kick in.

6. Due to time constraints on the current oversight group meeting, pathogens was taken off the agenda. Mr. Bricke gave a quick overview of the Water Quality Standards Implementation Plan Approach that is being developed for the Delaware and noted that it may be useful for the harbor. He also mentioned the proposal for the new toxics TMDL implementation work group and said that the proposal would be circulated for future discussion. The group then broke for lunch.
7. Robin Miller gave a presentation on the work completed to date to determine which toxics are likely to need a TMDL, based on CARP data and modeling. Comparisons of measured and modeled data to water column endpoints was completed for 23 contaminants. Of those, TMDLs will likely be needed for 15 of the chemicals. Wayne, Rosella and Robin will review the list of chemicals to ensure that it is complete (e.g. are standards available for other CARP pollutants). Next steps include completion of the analysis and preparation of a report. A number of questions were noted in the presentation that need to be answered prior to moving on to the next phase of work. A copy of the presentation is available.
8. Action items: NWG to provide answers to questions in ppt presentation; next nutrients assignment will be developed; information to be gathered on NPS (see Chesapeake tributaries as an example); review new work group proposal and add representatives; resend work group proposal.
9. Next meeting will be scheduled for mid-September.