

MEETING SUMMARY
Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
September 5th, 2012, 10:00AM – 12:30 PM
Conference Call

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18604/>

ACTION ITEMS & DECISIONS

DECISION: The WTWG will plan to convene its meetings and conference calls on the first Monday of each month beginning with October 2012:

- Monday, October 1st (face-to-face)
- Monday, November 5th (conference call)
- Monday, December 3rd (face-to-face)

ACTION: By COB Monday, September 17th, WTWG members should send their comments regarding the workgroup's top Midpoint Assessment priorities (Attachment B).

DECISION: The WTWG will refine the NEIEN open enrollment proposal among its members and proceed so the proposal can be forwarded to the WQGIT (by end of 2012), Management Board, and Principal's Staff Committee (early 2013).

ACTION: By COB Monday, September 17th, WTWG members should send their comments regarding the open enrollment proposal for NEIEN reporting (Attachment A).

ACTION: The WTWG will revisit the LUWG discussion on October 1st.

SUMMARY

1. Welcome & Introduction

- Alana Hartman (WV Dept. of Environmental Protection; WTWG Chair) began by introducing Matt Johnston (University of Maryland) as the new WTWG Coordinator.
 - Johnston serves as the new Nonpoint Source Analyst at the Chesapeake Bay Program Office (CBPO) in Annapolis; he formerly worked for the Chesapeake Research Consortium (CRC) as the Coordinator for the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC).

2. Approval of future WTWG meeting/call dates

- Hartman (WV DEP) noted the proposed dates for future WTWG meetings and calls:
 - To avoid conflicts with other Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT) workgroups, Jeremy Hanson (CRC) had identified the first Monday of each month, starting in October, as an option: October 1st (face-to-face), November 5th (conference call), December 3rd (face-to-face)
 - Hartman asked for objections to the proposal of meeting on the first Monday of each month; hearing none, the meeting dates were accepted
- Hartman noted that meetings can be held at different times if a holiday or other conflict falls on a first Monday

DECISION: The WTWG will plan to convene its meetings and conference calls on the first Monday of each month, beginning with October 2012:

1. Monday, October 1st (face-to-face)
 2. Monday, November 5th (conference call)
 3. Monday, December 3rd (face-to-face)
- Hartman observed that the WTWG may be asked to form an expert panel on Algal Turf Scrubbers™ (ATS) in early 2013.
 - Katherine Antos (EPA) clarified that when a best management practice (BMP) does not fall under a specific sector(s) (agriculture, wastewater, stormwater, etc.), then the WTWG convenes the panel for that BMP; this is the case for ATS.
 - Sarah Lane (Maryland Dept. of Natural Resources) described the Urban Stormwater workgroup's July 25th workshop that focused on ATS and floating wetland technologies
 - She expects Maryland to submit a request for an ATS expert panel

Post-meeting note: The recommendations and presentations from the floating wetlands/ATS workshop are available at the Chesapeake Stormwater Network (CSN) website:

<http://chesapeakestormwater.net/bay-stormwater/baywide-stormwater-policy/urban-stormwater-workgroup/floating-wetlands/>

3. Update on changes to NEIEN since last progress submission

- Martin Hurd (Tetra Tech) noted that there have not been many changes since the [WTWG's August 1st meeting](#); his 9/5 presentation is available [here](#)
- Hurd noted that there is now a newer version of the spreadsheet from August 1st; the latest version (.xlsx) is available on the [9/5 event page](#) [select "[Hurd--NEIEN NPS BMP data flow Appendix A](#)"]
 - He highlighted any rows that have been changed since last year's progress run (about 30 rows); differently colored cells in those rows indicate where the specific changes occurred.
 - The Appendix is also available to the jurisdictions through BayTAS; the BayTAS version is updated whenever changes are made, so it is always current when retrieved through BayTAS.
- Hurd pulled up the [current schedule](#) for progress reporting
 - He encouraged the jurisdictions to start submitting data so there is time to run validations and ensure the data will be accepted through the system
 - He commented that changes to the XML schema are only made one time during the year, when addressing parking lot issues from the previous progress run.
 - He provided examples of some proposed schema modifications [slide 8] that he would like to discuss with jurisdictions during and after the call, including BMP life-spans, verification date, soil type, etc.
 - He noted they could handle these issues on a state-by-state basis given their unique programs and data.
 - Nothing has been done or changed on these examples yet, but they are planning ahead for new data that may be provided in the future.
 - Olivia Devereux (Devereux Environmental Consulting) pointed to the NRCS data that USGS will be providing to the states as one such example of newly available data.

- Beth Horsey (Maryland Dept. of Agriculture) felt that adding a “Yes/No” field for Animal Waste Management Systems (AWMS) is probably overkill and is likely prevented by state regulations [the yes/no would be in response to: “excess manure applied?”]
 - Ted Tesler (Pennsylvania Dept. of Environmental Protection) agreed that the definition should already cover this issue.
 - Jeff Sweeney (Chesapeake Bay Program Office) pointed out that they are finding AWMS data that does not meet the definition
 - They want to point it out now so they can find a way to verify that the data meets the CBP’s definition before another problem arises similar to street-sweeping.
- Bill Keeling (Virginia Dept. of Conservation and Recreation) asked if it’s necessary to modify the schema if verification will occur outside the NEIEN reporting system.
 - Hurd clarified differences between “schema modifications” – which are changes to the database structure, adding extensions or optional elements, etc. – and “Appendix modifications” – which are made more frequently as the jurisdictions have new codes or practices that they want to report.
 - He reiterated that there is currently no tool/method for the jurisdictions to confirm that a data element has been verified; the system can handle the data accordingly if it knows the element is verified (coding change, etc.)
 - Horsey (MDA) asked if the jurisdictions can easily populate that data field
 - Hurd replied that if a jurisdiction knows that a practice is verified and meets the definition then it is relatively simple to add that field
 - Greg Sandi (Maryland Dept. of Environment) confirmed this would not be a big deal.
- Hartman asked for clarification of a deadline for updates to the plug-in
 - Hurd plans to contact the jurisdictions’ technical folks (i.e. the NEIEN e-mail group) for comments and their thoughts; the next step is to get approval on whether to make those schema modifications. Once the Partnership approves the changes, it is just a matter of identifying exactly where to make the changes in the schema and updating the documentation, ensuring all jurisdictions have access
- Sandi asked if there will be a testing node available
 - Hurd noted that Tetra Tech had discussed this internally and generated three options they plan to share with the CBP and WTWG for a decision on how to proceed:
 - (Most desirable) make a submission but highlight in state unique identifier that it is “TEST,” then later request for that submission to be removed, or overwrite it with the same identifier when you submit the actual data.
 - Use TetraTech’s test node through their office
 - reinstall the needed database and software at CBP office
 - add something to the schema to enable you to say it is a test submission
 - Sweeney asked if other jurisdictions were interested in a test node
 - Keeling would need to check with his staff on this.
 - Tesler pushes the data through and did not feel a need for PA.

- Hartman pointed out that there is still a separate email group being used by Hurd as a NEIEN stakeholders group, and although that group is now included in WTWG communications, there is still a need for them to meet separately at times.
- Sweeney reminded the jurisdictions that a final product is needed by 3/1/2013; there needs to be QA/QC prior to that deadline and the 12/31/2012 deadline; states should start submitting what they can
 - Keeling mentioned that his agency plans to relocate in November/December so they will be without internet access for a period of time; his director will send a letter to CBP with more details
 - The move does not affect the submission of VA's wastewater data
- Hartman asked for final questions for Hurd; none were heard

4. Consideration of “lock-down” period for NEIEN reporting

- [Attachment A](#) describes Bill Keeling's proposal, which was also discussed at the WTWG's 8/1/2012 meeting
- Keeling (VA DCR) suggested that the open enrollment period could run from about April to August; the Appendix would not be changed from September through March.
- Sandi (MDE) noted that localities want to add new stormwater BMPs as soon as the CBP approves them; the open enrollment period may force them to wait until the next period if an expert panel is not completed in time
- Hurd (Tetra Tech) commented that Keeling's proposal makes a lot of sense from a software development standpoint, but noted there are definitely pros and cons.
- Sweeney pointed out that this is definitely a decision that needs to be made at higher levels, starting with the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT)
 - He explained that there is often a significant push to include new or additional practices at the last minute, so it is important for the administrators and agency heads to consider and accept/reject the open enrollment proposal.
- Keeling (VA DCR) planned to discuss this with his WQGIT representative, and he encouraged other WTWG members to do the same
 - He suggested that the proposal be phrased and considered as “open enrollment,” rather than a “lock-down,” noting that enrollment would be open longer than it is locked-down
 - Jenn Volk (University of Delaware Extension Service) suggested the most up-to-date NEIEN Appendix be pasted on the “Watershed Tools” page of the Bay website, and there seemed to be general agreement that that could be done.
- Sandi (MDE) was not opposed to the proposal, but wanted to be sure that everyone gets an opportunity to weigh-in before a decision is made.
- Tesler (PA DEP) would like to keep the flexibility in case of last minute needs.
- Hartman (WV DEP) noted that there was no consensus on the issue, and suggested that the proposal should be clarified by the WTWG before it is sent to the WQGIT.
- Hartman asked if the WTWG should proceed with refining the proposal so it can be considered in time to take effect for the 2013 reporting cycle.
 - There were no objections.
 - Keeling (VA DCR) urged the WTWG to move forward in the process now, given the time it will take to move through the process.

DECISION: The WTWG will refine the proposal among its members and proceed so the proposal can be forwarded to the WQGIT (by end of 2012), Management Board, and Principal’s Staff Committee (early 2013).

ACTION: By COB Monday, September 17th, WTWG members should send their comments regarding the open enrollment proposal for NEIEN reporting proposal (Attachment A).

5. Discussion of Midpoint Assessment requests and priorities

- Attachment B lists Midpoint Assessment (MA) comments relevant to the WTWG; Attachments C and D list all the comments that were received by the WQGIT. The attachments are available online: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18604/>
- Johnston (UMD/CBPO) recapped the request for the workgroups to identify their top priorities from the comments they submitted, so the WQGIT is better able to set the agenda for an extensive discussion of the MA during its October meeting
 - He asked if the WTWG had all had an opportunity to read Attachment B, noting they were sent out late Friday (8/31) afternoon
 - Horsey (MDA) felt more time was needed
- Keeling (VA DCR) reiterated the 1st need is for at least 6 months to test the new model and 2nd, suggested that EPA should ensure its schedule accounts for when the model is complete.
- Lee Currey (MDE) asked if EPA can identify which comments are already being addressed and when they are expected to be complete. He suggested this would help narrow down the list.
 - Sweeney noted that the modelers at CBPO are still going through this exercise; yes, they hope it will boil the list down to much more manageable length.
- Hartman (WV DEP) noted the issue of “Regional Factors” appears to be prominent in the Attachment B summary of comments. Regional Factors were explained to be an issue within the model calibration topic: they are applied to bring all modeled sources within a geographic area “up” or “down.”
- Keeling asked what was meant by “2017,” i.e. will the new model be ready by January 2017, or by December?
 - Sweeney was unsure and will follow up with CBPO staff to find out.
- Tesler noted that there are definitely some items everyone can agree on, e.g. improved septic and animal numbers through better incorporation of local data.
 - Norm Goulet (North Virginia Regional Commission) noted that there has been incredible resistance to these types of efforts in the past, which is why Goulet has pushed for newly formed Land Use workgroup (LUWG) that will hopefully address such problems.
 - Sweeney noted that the CBPO would be able to both (1) use local land use data when it’s available or has gone through the LUWG process, or (2) use default land use data; it’s not all-or-nothing
 - Sweeney stated they would need the data 6 months before calibration
 - Participants proposed several data sets (e.g. septic numbers and NPDES stormwater permit land use area) that could be requested of the local governments, with a deadline applied

- Johnston asked WTWG to continue to review the MA comments and identify their “interim” priorities to share with the WQGIT; the WTWG will continue to refine and share its priorities at the next meeting

ACTION: By COB Monday, September 17th, WTWG members should send their comments regarding the workgroup’s top Midpoint Assessment priorities (Attachment B)

6. Discussion of WTWG’s relationship to new Land Use workgroup

- The LUWG co-chairs – Karl Berger (Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments) and Jennifer Tribo (Hampton Roads Planning District Commission) – joined the WTWG to discuss the two workgroups’ relationship and potential issues that the WTWG would like the LUWG to address
 - The LUWG’s first meeting is on Monday, September 17th at CBPO in Annapolis: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18602/>
- Berger (MWCOCG) described some of the issues that the LUWG will consider, e.g., more differentiation of urban land uses, different loading rates for different types of urban land. He noted that some issues will occur in tandem with the LUWG and WTWG, and he asked for the WTWG to provide comments on what the LUWG’s priorities should be.
 - Hartman (WV DEP) asked how loading rates were determined in the past.
 - Keeling and Sweeney clarified that they were based on literature reviews.
 - Currey (MDE) noted that they had worked on loading rates a while ago, noting that there did not seem to be major differences across developments, but there is a large amount of variability in the data.
 - He commented that it might be of more interest to investigate different loading rates between high-density residential lands and rural residential lands, rather than focusing on (for example) differences between high-density residential and medium-density residential.
 - Berger noted that it will be important to consider what the next model does and what it will be able to do in Phase 6.
 - Sweeney explained there may eventually need to be a second LUWG to address agriculture land use issues.
 - He noted that the LUWG is currently dominated by urban experts, so he expects another call for nominations as the urban issues are winding down; LUWG members with cross-sector expertise would transition, but this will all be worked out as the LUWG moves forward.
 - He also pointed out the need for growth projection tools for the ag-sector similar to those already used by the urban sector; the ag-LUWG could help with this, among other things.
 - Currey commented that the need for different land use distinctions, and other issues, depends what types of information are needed.
 - Berger agreed that this is an important consideration; even if there is not a different loading rate, perhaps there could be a distinction between MS4 and non-MS4 areas, or between rural areas that are/aren’t connected to storm drains

- Goulet (NVRC) observed that it is still a struggle to figure out what tool is being developed, and more importantly what the tool will be used for.
 - Keeling reiterated the challenges of making everything spatially, temporally, and categorically consistent across all jurisdictions and localities; available scale and resolution data further complicate the issue.
 - Currey commented that perhaps the data and resolution should be tied to the scale of engagement, since localities may be more receptive of the model if they are more confident in its local accuracy.
- Berger hopes that the LUWG will be able to clarify its charge and priorities in the near future.
 - Sweeney reiterated the potential need to transition the LUWG from an urban focus to an agriculture focus, keeping cross-sector experts through the transition.
 - Currey suggested that a key focus for the LUWG should be the development of the best possible land use data set that allows for incorporation of local data.
- Berger emphasized that the LUWG will not be able to settle everything, so it needs to manage its efforts to develop the best possible land use data set, allowing for incorporation of local data, as Currey suggested.
- Hartman welcomed regular updates and check-ins between the WTWG and LUWG, and asked to include the LUWG on the WTWG's October 1st meeting agenda.

ACTION: The WTWG will revisit the LUWG discussion on October 1st.

Next Meeting:

Monday, October 1st, 10:00AM to 3:00 PM – Joe Macknis Memorial Conference Room (Fish Shack) at Chesapeake Bay Program Office in Annapolis, MD.

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18737>

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Email</u>
Alana Hartman, Chair	WV DEP	alana.c.hartman@wv.gov
Matt Johnston, Coordinator	UMD	mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net
Jeremy Hanson, Staff	CRC	jhanson@chesapeakebay.net
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO	jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net
Katherine Antos	EPA, CBPO	Antos.Katherine@epamail.epa.gov
Jess Rigelman	J7 LLC	jrigelman@j7llc.com
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting	olivia@devereuxconsulting.com
Marty Hurd	Tetra Tech	martin.hurd@tetrattech.com
Sarah Sand	DDOE	Sarah.sand@dc.gov
Jenn Volk	U. of Delaware	jennvolk@udel.edu
Bryan Bloch	DE DNREC	bryan.bloch@state.de.us
Greg Sandi	MDE	gsandi@mde.state.md.us
Beth Horsey	MDA	elizabeth.horsey@maryland.gov
Lee Currey	MDE	lcurrey@mde.state.md.us
Sarah Lane	MD DNR/UMD	sweammert@dnr.state.md.us
Ted Tesler	PA DEP	thtesler@state.pa.us
Bill Keeling	VA DCR	william.keeling@dcr.virginia.gov
Naomi Detenbeck	EPA-ORD	detenbeck.naomi@epamail.epa.gov
Danielle Dills	National Assn. of Conservation Districts	Danielle-Dills@nacdn.net
Karl Berger	MWCOG	kberger@mwkog.org
Jenny Tribo	Hampton Roads Planning District Commission	jtribo@hrpdca.gov
Norm Goulet	NVRC	ngoulet@novaregion.org
Jim George	MDE	jgeorge@mde.state.md.us