

SUMMARY
Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Conference Call

Monday, January 7, 2013

10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Event page: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19093/>

Welcome and Introductions – *Alana Hartman*

- Alana Hartman (WV DEP; Chair, WTWG) convened the call at 10:00 AM and reviewed the [agenda](#).

2012 Progress Update

- Olivia Devereux (Devereux Environmental Consulting) described the status of the states' 2012 progress run submissions.
 - All states submitted progress by Dec. 31.
 - Deadline is March 1 so today Olivia is sending out e-mails with summary reports from the data that was run through NEIEN/Scenario Builder (SB) so you can see what validated in NEIEN, what was submitted/credited in SB and summary Jeff prepared for % implementation – also shows past 2 years' progress. Del, DC, MD please respond with your availability for the Doodle Poll from Tues of last week. Everyone should review the data in the email before your jurisdiction's call.
 - Jeff Sweeney noted that 5 of the 7 jurisdictions have also submitted their wastewater data, the other two will submit their data according to their legislative deadlines
 - Please see Marty Hurd's comment field where records failed – he recommends fixes for most of those. Olivia's email to each state is including the latest "Appendix" version.
 - Devereux asked for questions or concerns from the jurisdictions.
 - Pellicano: Did you say Maryland did not submit manure transport?
 - Devereux: Maryland did submit, but there was an error so it did not validate.
 - Evans: PA has not submitted its manure transport data yet.
 - Tesler: Correct. The data is ready.
 - No other questions were raised.

Prioritizing improvements to MAST/CAST/VAST – *Olivia Devereux and Jessica Rigelman*

- For more detailed information, view the [presentation](#) and associated [spreadsheet \(.xls\)](#)
- Devereux explained previous priorities that have been incorporated to CAST/MAST and VAST [slide 3].
 - She described completed and planned improvements to the user interface, and summarized the plans to improve agreement of loads with the Watershed Model. One of the errors in load was traced to Virginia's biosolids load – only applies to VA. The fix is ready but has not been deployed so other changes can be made at the same time, thus minimizing the number of changes. Also disposal load manure (when you have excess in a county after crop need is met); the way to fix it is known, but all the work has not been done to do the fix.
 - One can also review the update history on the www.casttool.org website.
- When we set priorities for one tool, the changes generally get made for all three.
- James Davis-Martin (VA DCR): Some of the priorities from the spreadsheet are not on the list, e.g. adding bacteria as a pollutant.

- Aaron Ristow (Upper Susquehanna Coalition): 1) uploading files; 2) costs Marcia Fox (DE DNREC): An additional training session would be beneficial for Delaware.
- Robin Pellicano (MDE): Are any of the items on the list higher priorities than other items?
- Devereux: That's what we're trying to identify in this discussion.
- Pellicano: costs, CSO data
- Sarah Lane: agree with Robin's list. 3) being able to identify homeowner BMP at a smaller scale; then within MAST it would be aggregated up.
- Tesler: Adding cost information would be very beneficial for local planners. Ability should be given to enter one's own local cost data.
- Hartman: Would appreciate some training due to WIPs being completed, all these improvements to CAST having occurred, and staff turnover.
- Davis-Martin: Virginia has requested several priorities for VAST, including: addition of cost information; ability for users to define acres of land use for each of the available land use types; ability for users to define alternate efficiencies, and a BMP implementation optimization module. Adding bacteria would also be useful for small watershed TMDL planning. Anticipated completion by current TT contract (beginning or end of May 2013).
- Devereux summarized that three jurisdictions prioritized costs as #1, and one as #2; only one (NY) mentioned uploading data.
- Devereux: the costs would be determined by state, and the jurisdictions would be able to specify their own costs for their scenario.
- Ristow: in that case, that would be useful to New York. New York would make it the number two priority, behind data upload.
- Sweeney: The contract with Tetra Tech is coming to a close. More of the work is falling to Devereux and Rigelman. We cannot make the requested changes to MAST/CAST/VAST until we sort out what resources are available.
 - Devereux: Once the data is incorporated into VAST, it can be expanded to CAST and MAST.
- Sweeney: "Costs" is not as easy as you might think. Costs were analyzed for Tributary Strategies ~10 years ago, considering Operation and Maintenance, etc. EPA developed it, but then jurisdictions analyzed separately and used different methods, resulting in widely different portrayal of Trib. Strategies' costs.
- Lane: As an example, Maryland Sea Grant is working on a residential BMP tracking and reporting tool. The counties and local governments have requested the ability to earn credit for these homeowner BMPs.
- Devereux asked if there were any objections to including Sarah Lane's item about homeowner BMP scale as the #2 priority.
- Davis-Martin: For Virginia, the second priority after cost is the ability for localities to enter their own land uses and acres in VAST. Hopefully this will be taken care of under the technical directive, but if not, Virginia would like this to be a high priority. Davis-Martin asked when we would know whether the technical directive items are funded and definitely going to happen? If they will not, he suggested we need to begin seeking alternate funding so Virginia can still use VAST to develop milestones.
- Sweeney: Unsure what will happen with the contract since it is such a large, national contract. There are multiple bids, so there is no guarantee that Tetra Tech will win the contract again. Rich Batiuk (CBPO) and Jennifer Sincock (EPA Region 3) are working on it.
- Davis-Martin: The ability to enter landuse acres was one of the biggest requests from local stakeholders when the local land use doesn't match up with the boundary on their books.
- Hartman agreed this is a big issue in WV and it would help the usability of this tool in the interim between now and 2017.
- Devereux said Cecil County, MD also told this to Olivia and Jessica on Friday.
- Davis-Martin added it would be very useful for MS4s to start with a simulation that represents

their landuse.

- Ristow’s reasoning for “uploading BMPs from files” was that it is easier to enter something into Excel, cut/paste/drag, etc. It would be a time-saving measure. Davis-Martin observed it might make it easier for local government to share its scenario with the state in a common, understandable format.
- ACTION: Devereux will update the spreadsheet based on the discussion and distribute it to the WTWG.
- Devereux: We will work out at a future meeting which of these is appropriate as a next priority.

Recommended Reporting Requirements for Stormwater BMPs – Matt Johnston

- **Post-meeting note:** *Following the conference call, Johnston discussed the Stormwater Performance Standards and Retrofits report with Schueler. Schueler indicated that the expert panel did include a section titled, “Non-Complying Projects.” In this section, the expert panel recommended that states could continue to report stormwater BMPs using the existing CBP-approved reporting requirements, and they would continue to receive nutrient reductions for these BMPs based upon the existing CBP-approved nutrient reduction efficiencies. A state may choose to submit stormwater BMPs using the new, recommended reporting requirements and receive nutrient reductions calculated using the recommended stormwater treatment and runoff reduction curves.*
- Johnston explained the two stormwater BMPs – performance standards and retrofits – have been approved. He described a list of reporting elements that will likely be required in order to track urban stormwater BMPs for 2013 Progress and beyond. [View his presentation.](#)
- Keeling: Thought that the panel report recommended a new set of stormwater performance standard and retrofit BMPs that would be added to the existing set of stormwater BMPs, rather than replacing the existing set entirely.
 - Johnston: clarified that exact point with Tom Schueler before today’s meeting, and the answer was that these two BMPs will replace the previous way of reporting and calculating reductions.
- Keeling: Still believe the states will need the option to report BMPs in the previous format.
- Sweeney: Whether it is a new development or a retrofit, we will need to get different parameters than in the past.
- Johnston described the recommended reporting requirements [slide 5] and optional fields [slide 6]. Two things that are essential to the nutrient reduction calculations: 1) Runoff or storage volume in acre-feet, and 2) Impervious acres treated. Additionally, there are many other elements that the Scenario Builder Team recommends the states report so that individual stormwater BMPs can receive maintenance upgrades and retrofit upgrades in future progress years. Johnston encouraged everyone to read over the reports again as these recommendations will entirely change the way stormwater BMPs are reported and credited in the future.
 - Tesler: For a retrofit, concerned about first reporting degraded facilities, given the scope of the data.
- Keeling: if you have already reported the BMP and you are currently getting full credit for it, somehow you have to re-set the clock and call it degraded before getting retrofit credit. Keeling: Do not see the model supporting such detailed data reporting.
- Pellicano: Concerned about duration of practice and lifespan. These should be something taken up in the maintenance and verification task, at least for urban BMPs. Think we do need the total drainage area to help count and track the number of urban acres.
- Davis-Martin: Suggest limiting the number of *required* elements to as few fields as possible. For example, the state may track its BMPs using unique identifiers, but may not need to submit this field to the CBP.

- ACTION: Johnston asked the WTWG to submit their comments to him, Alana Hartman, and Jeremy Hanson.
- Johnston explained the recommended defaults [slide 7] of 1” – RR:56% TN 66% TP 71% TSS ... ST: 33% TN 52% TP, 66% TSS. He suggested these defaults would be used if a state could NOT report all of the required elements. However, he stressed that if a state did not report impervious acres, there would be no way to properly credit the efficiency reductions.
- Tesler: Think there could be a more specific way to calculate the default. These parameters are out there when a project is done, so the state agencies will want to get this information if it would like to get more specific credit.
- Sweeney: this is how it was determined through the BMP expert panel approval process. It will resolve a headache of all the potential double counting, predominant practice, other thorny issues in the past. It is similar to the ag sector’s nutrient management credit problems.
- Davis-Martin suggested one could provide land-river segment or other location, and receive amount of credit appropriate to that geographic area. Johnston: would not work because the expert panel recommended the reduction values be based on site-specific engineering values.
- Hartman agreed with Keeling’s concern that this is the first time we’re hearing that we can no longer report things the “old way,” but realizes that what Johnston is proposing with the defaults is that one could report a minimal amount of information and receive a default value. The big change is that instead of just reporting area, one would need to report impervious area as well.
- Keeling: Never interpreted these reports as superseding what we have reported in the past. Concern about the historical BMPs.
- Johnston encouraged the WTWG members to review the reports and submit their comments on reporting requirements, for discussion in February.
- Hartman noted that two other expert panels – urban nutrient management and urban stream restoration – were presented as draft to the WTWG in December. Comments on the reports are due January 31st to Norm Goulet (ngoulet@novaregion.org) and Tom Schueler (watershedguy@hotmail.com), copy Jeremy Hanson (jhanson@chesapeakebay.net)

Approval of Algal Turf Scrubbers Panel Members ([Attachment 2](#))

- Sarah Lane (UMD, MD DNR) explained the recommended panel organization and panel members.
- She described changes that were made since her presentation on Dec. 3. It was split into 2 groups for separate tasks as described in the attachment.
- Hearing no comments on the recommended panelists, Johnston will distribute the list to STAC and the jurisdictions. Will ask for approval via email prior to the February WTWG call.

2013 Topics

- Hartman reviewed some of the tentative topics for the WTWG’s consideration in 2013:
 - Algal Turf Scrubber Panel
 - Review of other expert panel reports
 - Land Uses for 2017 Model
 - Use of MAST/CAST/VAST and continual feedback from states on these tools
 - 2013 Progress – Final NEIEN-submitted progress data due on December 1, 2013
 - Clean-up of historical BMPs
- Keeling noted that he will be presenting to the modeling committee tomorrow a revised memo based on one from Kenn Pattison (PA DEP) in 1999 that describes an alternate way of using the model for progress runs. The memo will probably be coming to WTWG to discuss.
- Sweeney: The CBPO wants to know if the jurisdictions plan to ask for technical contractor support from EPA or if they will handle the clean-up on their own.
- ACTION: Each jurisdiction should describe their plans for the historical BMP clean-up and submit their write-up to Hartman and Johnston prior to the next WTWG call. Especially indicate if you will request contractor support for a task or will it all be done internally.

Adjourned 12:01 p.m.

Next conference call:

Monday, February 4th, 2013

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19119>

Participants

Name	Affiliation	Email
Alana Hartman	WV DEP	alana.c.hartman@wv.gov
Matt Johnston	UMD, CBPO	mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net
Bryan Bloch	DE DNREC	bryan.bloch@state.de.us
Bill Brown	PA DEP	willbrown@state.pa.us
Sally Claggett	USFS	sclaggett@fs.fed.us
James Davis-Martin	VA DCR	James.Davis-Martin@dcr.virginia.gov
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting	olivia@devereuxconsulting.com
Barry Evans	PSU	bme1@psu.edu
Marcia Fox	DE DNREC	marcia.fox@state.de.us
Steve Gladding	NY DEC	smglassdi@gw.dec.state.ny.us
Jeremy Hanson	CRC	jhanson@chesapeakebay.net
Marty Hurd	Tetra Tech	martin.hurd@tetrattech.com
Bill Keeling	VA DCR	william.keeling@dcr.virginia.gov
Sarah Lane	UMD/MD DNR	sweammert@dnr.state.md.us
Neely Law	CWP, CBPO	nll@cw.org
Robin Pellicano	MDE	rpellicano@mde.state.md.us
Beverly Quinlan	VA DCR	Beverly.Quinlan@dcr.virginia.gov
Jess Rigelman	J7 LLC	jrigelman@j7llc.com
Sheryle Quinn	U.S. Dept. of the Navy	sheryle.quinn@navy.mil
Aaron Ristow	Upper Susquehanna Coalition	aaronristow@tcswwd.org
Julie Scarangella	Tetra Tech	julie.scarangella@tetrattech.com
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO	jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net
Ted Tesler	PA DEP	ttesler@state.pa.us
Doreen Vetter	EPA, CBPO	vetter.doreen@epa.gov
Jenn Volk	U. of Delaware	jennvolk@udel.edu
Dana York	Green Earth Connection, LLC (on behalf of MDA)	dyork818@yahoo.com
Danielle Dills	NACD	danielle-dills@nacnet.org