



**Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Conference call
Thursday, May 5, 2016**

Minutes

Summary of Actions and Decisions

ACTION: Language will be added to the Manure Treatment Technology Panel Report's technical appendix to clarify that the BMPs are standalone practices that do not treat the same source as other Partnership-approved BMPs.

DECISION: The WTWG approved the proposed changes to Conservation Tillage within the Phase 6 NEIEN appendix.

DECISION: The WTWG approved Jason Keppler (MDA) as the WTWG representative to the Ditch Management Panel, and Tyler Monteith (DE DNREC) as the WTWG representative to the Cropland Irrigation Panel.

Welcome/Announcements – Matt Johnston, Coordinator

Discussion:

- Bill Keeling (VA DEQ) requested that meeting minutes be posted in advance of meetings and that formal approval of the minutes be sought at the start of each meeting.

Virginia Tech Panel Updates – Jeremy Hansen, VT

Jeremy provided the following updates for the active VT panels:

- Manure Treatment Technologies – Jeremy reviewed comments received to date which pertain to tracking and reporting this practice. He also reviewed a draft technical appendix and encouraged members to provide comments on the document.
- Urban Tree Canopy – Jeremy described a potential way to track, report and credit larger "woodlot" restoration projects apart from smaller, individual plantings. He also reviewed a draft technical appendix and encouraged members to provide comments on the document.
- Impervious Disconnection – Jeremy reviewed the draft technical appendix and encouraged members to provide comments on the document.

Discussion:

Impervious Disconnection Panel:

- Jeremy Hanson (VT): Webinar for the panel report is June 3rd, and a recording will be available online.
- Hanson: The main takeaway is that in most cases, jurisdictions will likely report impervious disconnections just like the stormwater performance standards. There is only one new practice in Scenario Builder, which represents a default practice for impervious disconnections. This is similar to how a lot of other new urban BMPs are handled because they are often part of a much bigger water treatment plan.

- Hanson: Comment period closes on June 21st.
- Keeling: Does this practice replace what we currently report as a reduction of impervious surface in our BMP history?
 - Matt Johnston (UMD): In the Phase 6 appendix, that was changed. There is one BMP name for reduction of impervious surface, which is a land use change. The others were included in the stormwater performance standard report, and are wrapped up into those practices. This does not replace the reduction of impervious surface BMP.
 - Hanson: Right, the default practice is specifically for disconnections to amended soils.

Urban Tree Canopy:

- Keeling: The panel is saying that the practice increases infiltration. When other reports have done that, we have broken out the percent of nitrogen that the Model simulates as nitrate, and don't reduce that portion. Be prepared for similar comments.
 - Hanson: We have already gone through the partnership with the loading rates table and the full methods for how those were calculated, and they were approved by the partnership.
 - Keeling: I questioned those methods in the Modeling Workgroup. Expect written comments requesting that this be looked at in more depth.
- Keeling: Is this BMP replacing the current urban tree planting BMP?
 - Hanson: Yes.
- Hanson: Comments raised at the Forestry Workgroup have led to a change in the report that will add an "urban forest plantings" BMP to account for plantings of larger contiguous acres that meet certain qualifying conditions for forest-like conditions.
- Johnston: I recommend not saying "no qualifying conditions" for the urban tree canopy practice. Every BMP has qualifying conditions.
- Keeling: I suggest you look at the NRCS standards for what is needed to create an acre of forested buffer or something similar. They talk about the stems per acre needed to qualify and how they arrive at the definitions. Definitions for forest conditions in urban and agriculture should be similar in terms of qualifying conditions.
- Alana Hartman (WV DEP): Would we just be approving the Urban Tree Canopy report the way it is written now, and approval of the urban forest planting practice would wait, since it is being brought up late?
 - Hanson: We are asking the panel to consider adding it on as part of their recommendations. If the panel chooses to incorporate that recommendation, we would ask for approval of the report as-amended on June 23rd.
- Hartman: For the BMP history, is Scenario Builder able to convert everything for us so we don't have to enter it again?
 - Johnston: At a minimum, you have the acres of planting, so you will have the ability to go in and break it out.
- Keeling: I don't agree with the land use conversion to the tree canopy land use. We would prefer it to stay as a conversion to forest.

Manure Treatment Technology:

- Johnston: This sounds a lot like stream restoration or shoreline management, where the report will say one thing, but the technical appendix will depend on the decision about how to deal with air deposition. The best we can do for this group in July is to say these are the findings of the panel and that they will be impacted by the air deposition rule. I don't know if people will be comfortable approving the whole report until air deposition is figured out.
 - Hanson: Thanks, I agree that it will be up to the partnership to decide.
- Jim George (MDE): Are there estimates for the reactive N coming out of the manure treatment technologies?

- Hanson: The panel is taking another look at the available information on reactive N from thermochemical systems to see if they can provide a little more detail, but the information is very limited. The preference is to use published data rather than relying strictly on system data.
- George: There is uncertainty in the emissions, and the modeling group would be looking at transport and fate of the emissions?
 - Hanson: Correct, because the fate and transport would be applicable to other BMPs as well.
- Hanson: The MTT panel recommendations are all standalone BMPs and do not impact existing BMPs. Continue to report the others as you would otherwise.
 - Keeling: But they are treating more or less the same source. I just need clarity in the panel report that the technologies are treating the same source even though they are different BMPs.
 - Johnston: We can definitely put that clarification into the technical appendix.

ACTION: Language will be added to the Manure Treatment Technology Panel Report's technical appendix to clarify that the BMPs are standalone practices that do treat the same source as other Partnership-approved BMPs.

Preliminary BMP Expert Panel Reports – Mark Dubin, UMD

Mark presented revised preliminary reports which outline the structure, definition, and applicable land uses for each Agricultural Workgroup Phase 6 panel. He focused on tracking and reporting changes needed to accommodate the BMPs.

Discussion:

Conservation Tillage:

- Mark Dubin (UMD): There were no major changes to the tillage preliminary report. It was approved by the AgWG.
- Dubin: States will be responsible for reporting CTIC or their own state data to NEIEN as an annual BMP.
- Keeling: The high res no till should be greater than or equal to 60%, not just greater than.
- Hartman: Can we please have a conversion rule for what we have already entered?
 - Johnston: Yes, we will have those for you.
- Johnston: Is everyone comfortable with the proposed changes to the NEIEN appendix?
 - No objections were raised.

DECISION: The WTWG approved the proposed changes to Conservation Tillage within the Phase 6 NEIEN appendix.

Manure Incorporation/Injection:

- Keeling: Wouldn't this practice get tied into the Nutrient Management Panel recommendations on incorporation and loss?
 - Dubin: Yes, that is what the panel is looking at. They want to review the qualifiers in the nutrient management programs and biosolids programs. Tracking and reporting will be hinged on those nutrient management and biosolids plans.
- Keeling: I have seen injection resulting in pastures that wouldn't pass a high residue till inspection.
 - Dubin: When the panel fully defines this BMP, some of those technologies will probably not qualify for injection, but may fall back into incorporation. They will look at the

amount of inversion that's acceptable, enclosure over the site, etc., and it will all be part of the definition. If your technology can't be held to the standards in the definitions, it will drop out.

- Johnston: We will want to know if the group is row crop, row crop with hay, row crop with hay and pasture, or any eligible for manure.
- Keeling: Why would it be on acres when you could be putting different amounts on the acres? Wouldn't it be due to the volume of material being injected or incorporated?
 - Dubin: I don't know if we have any data on an application rate basis.
 - Johnston: The panel would have to shift their whole focus. It would be very challenging. The efficiency is easier from a modeling and verification perspective.
 - Dubin: I don't think the panel would be favorable towards going to a rate application system, but please feel free to follow up with me and we can talk through that a little more.
- Johnston: As definitions and qualifying conditions are released by the panel, we will give you updates as to whether or not it is ready for a NEIEN appendix update.

Nutrient Management:

- Keeling: If you are just using fertilizer, would the manure analysis and spreader application analysis required in order to receive credit?
 - Dubin: It would be your fertilizer analysis and calibration of the spreader that would be required. It might not be the farmer doing the calibration, though. If you are getting Southern States to do your application, they are required by law to calibrate the equipment.
- Keeling: States that didn't require field level planning in the past, can they report this in their history?
 - Dubin: The Panel will go through each item and lay out what qualifies, what doesn't and what is an equivalent. They will lay out in a lot of detail the definitions that will help states sort through those questions.
- Keeling: Can you stack these practices if you are doing multiple?
 - Dubin: Yes.
- DUBin: For historic implementation, we start at 0 acres in 1985 and use that up until the initiation year when each state began reporting. Then we use 2015 as the high point and interpolate between that and the initiation year.
 - Johnston: To be clear, CBPO will not enter any data into NEIEN. This is what we had to do to estimate for a test run, but the acres you submit will always be the acres that are used.
 - Dubin: Correct. This was just developed as a default for you all to use if you would like.
- Keeling: Nitrogen core non-nutrient management for pasture would have a lower application rate than nutrient management?
 - Dubin: It is an adjustment to rate change.
 - Johnston: We have two methods to set the baseline application on pasture. It depends on how the states define the baseline. That is part and parcel of the whole nutrient management process and has been going on with the states the last few weeks. Once the crop application rates are out, the panel can go through and adjust the rates. The numbers are placeholder and will change.
 - Dubin: We need to look at adjusted land grant values to set the baseline.
- Lindsay Thompson (DMAA): You expect the states to submit updates to crop application tables prior to the Beta 3 calibration?
 - Johnston: Yes, actually prior to June 16th, which is the date of the next AGWG call.
- Jason Keppler (MDA): Is the winter ban of manure application factored into the recommendations at all?
 - Dubin: I think that has more applicability to cover crops. You don't put application on a

small grain wintering crop. The land grant university recommendations should cover application to bare ground. We will have to check.

- Keeling: On the pasture discussion, let's try to remember that Virginia has the majority of the pasture in the watershed, so I want to avoid us being hamstrung because another state does it differently.
- Johnston: This report is not yet ready for changes to the NEIEN appendix. For now, we will continue to report nutrient management acres under the Phase 6 nutrient management BMP name with the measurement name Tier 1 acres, just as you have for previous calibrations. That will qualify for change in nitrogen application rate in the July calibration. I will hopefully have a proposal in July for changes in the NEIEN appendix that will provide a better idea of how to break what you used to report into these new varieties.

Cover Crops:

- Dubin: New preliminary report will be released for the June 16th AGWG meeting, but we don't have a lot of details yet.
- Johnston: There are again no changes being proposed to the NEIEN appendix at this time. The crops are mostly staying the same, so keep reporting as you have been. When and if definitions do change, that is when we will reach out to you all and let you know if there need to be any changes to the NEIEN appendix.
- Keeling: Can we report cover crops with manure?
 - Dubin: The AGWG hasn't had a preliminary report that is complete enough to take an action on. Once they make a decision, we will bring it back to you all. The panel is looking at that.

WTWG Representation for Cropland Irrigation and Ditch Management

Matt asked the workgroup to approve volunteers for these two panels.

Discussion:

- Johnston: We reached out to Maryland and Delaware prior to the call, and Jason Keppler (MDA) said he would be comfortable serving as the WTWG representative on the Ditch Management Panel, and Tyler Monteith (DE DNREC) said he would be comfortable serving as the representative on the Cropland Irrigation Panel.
- Johnston: Are there any objections to those two nominations?
 - None were raised.

DECISION: The WTWG approved Jason Keppler (MDA) as the WTWG representative to the Ditch Management Panel, and Tyler Monteith (DE DNREC) as the WTWG representative to the Cropland Irrigation Panel.

- Keeling: Will the Ditch Management Panel look at the water control structures, or just look at other aspects of ditch management that haven't been looked at before?
 - Dubin: They will look at water control structures, but they may decide to leave it alone. I think the majority of the focus will be on other practices that are not currently simulated in the model.
- Keeling: Have you found a representative for the boat pump out panel?
 - Johnston: Not yet.

NEIEN Appendix Changes – Matt Johnston, Coordinator

Matt reviewed the changes that were discussed and approved at the last WTWG meeting.

Discussion:

- Keeling: On the moisture percentages: for poultry, we transport litter, not treated manure. The broiler number makes sense as a litter number, but the layers, turkey, and pullets don't.
 - Johnston: That is because it is an as-excreted value until we have better data to support litter values. That is why we offer the option to report dry tons if you know the moisture content.
- Johnston: Conservation plans have a credit duration of 10 years and I think some states are reporting them annually, so that didn't work out in the April calibration. We are going to work on that with you all so we can make a consistent rule for how to report that.
 - Keppler: If there is any way to change the lifespan that would allow us to report it annually, it would be a big help.
- Hartman: Are you still scheduling meetings with states about historic BMPs?
 - Johnston: Yes, I will send West Virginia's invite today.

Adjourn

List of Call Participants

Member Name	Affiliation
Matt Johnston (Coordinator)	UMD, CBPO
David Wood (Staff)	CRC
Neely Law	CWP
Chris Brosch	DDA
Tyler Monteith	DE DNREC
Lindsay Thompson	DMAA
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Jason Keppler	MDA
Jim George	MDE
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Bill Keeling	VA DEQ
Mark Dubin	UMD
Samantha Wood	UMD
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Alana Hartman	WV DEP