

SUMMARY
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Teleconference
Thursday, December 5th, 2013
www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19144/

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

DECISION: The September WTWG minutes were accepted, pending the given changes.

DECISION: The October WTWG minutes were accepted as written.

ACTION: CBPO staff to work with Goulet and Schueler offline to determine path forward for homeowner BMPs proposal.

MINUTES

Welcome, Introduction and Announcements

- Matt Johnston (UMD, CBPO; WTWG Coordinator) welcomed participants and convened the meeting at 10:00AM. He verified participants and reviewed the day's [agenda](#).
 - Johnston: The WTWG will continue to meet in 2014 as in 2013, with conference calls with meetings as needed. Will continue to hold joint meetings with sector workgroups when they release BMP expert panel reports. As noted in the agenda, the workgroup needs a new regular meeting date. Options for a new date that do not conflict with other workgroups include the first and third Thursday of the month.
 - Johnston asked for a preference or other options. No comments were raised. Hearing no comments or preference, Johnston and Hanson will determine whether the first or third Thursday will work best based on the CBPO calendar.
 - **Post-meeting note:** The WTWG will meet the first Thursday of the month in 2014, unless otherwise noted.
- Jess Rigelman (J7 LLC) explained agricultural nutrient management (NM) will be an efficiency for 2013 Progress, per the approved BMP panel recommendations. The NM land uses are still in the system but will no longer be used.
 - Jeff Sweeney (EPA CBPO): Any BMPs in historic submissions or plans that were placed on nutrient management land uses will now be distributed amongst non-nutrient management land uses.
- Johnston noted the September minutes ([Attachment A](#)) and October minutes ([Attachment B](#)) were ready for the workgroup's consideration and approval. He asked for any comments or edits.
 - Jeremy Hanson (CRC, CBPO) noted that Alana Hartman (WV DEP) had pointed out a few minor edits to the September minutes. He also explained that he will add a post-meeting note to clarify that the FAQ for Urban Nutrient Management

was subsequently approved since no further comments were received following the September meeting.

- No other comments were raised on either set of minutes.
- Hanson noted that the November minutes would be available through the AgWG, since the November meeting was a joint meeting.
- **DECISION:** The September WTWG minutes were accepted, pending the given changes.
- **DECISION:** The October WTWG minutes were accepted as written.

Applying CBP-approved urban BMPs to homeowner BMPs

- Tom Schueler (Chesapeake Stormwater Network; Urban Stormwater Workgroup Coordinator) noted that two attachments had been posted to the CBP calendar. He explained that the term “policy” will be replaced with “protocol” throughout the materials going forward, per comments received from EPA. He reviewed his [slides](#) with participants. View the [memo](#) for more details.
 - Schueler explained CSN and many other partners have done extensive work to develop verification and tracking tools for homeowner BMPs, and the tools have been piloted in Howard County.
 - He explained the actions being requested from the WTWG:
 - Approve policy allowing localities to only report aggregate homeowner BMP data to states (still need to retain individual practice data).
 - Approve alternative verification methods for homeowner BMPs (sub-sampling, self-inspection, email transmittal of digital photos).
 - At the end of the presentation he outlined the next steps for the proposed homeowner BMP crediting protocols: WQGIT approval, followed by rollout by CSN of numerous webcasts in the first quarter of 2014, and further development of tools. Schueler recognized and thanked the many partners that worked on the effort.
- Johnston noted the homeowner BMPs are already approved through the performance standards and retrofit BMP reports.
- Schueler: The verification is not less stringent for these practices. If a homeowner BMP is not verified every five years, then the credit is lost. The memo discusses alternative methods for verification such as sub-sampling that could potentially be used.
- Bill Keeling (VA DEQ) felt the WTWG did not have authority to approve anything related to verification, especially since the verification effort was months away from being final.
 - Beth Horsey (MDA) agreed with Keeling.
 - Norm Goulet (Northern Virginia Regional Commission; USWG Chair): We can add language to make the proposal noting that the verification elements for homeowner BMPs will be subject to the final Partnership approved verification framework and process. This homeowner BMP proposal will still be a local option only, so nobody has to do this unless they choose to. We are trying to close the loop so local governments have the option to get credit for these homeowner practices.
 - Jenn Volk (U. of Delaware) noted the plan is to have a joint meeting for the BMP Verification Committee and BMP Verification Review Panel in the

February/March 2014 timeframe to approve the sector workgroups' verification proposals.

- Johnston: setting aside the verification issue, want the workgroup's thoughts about the first part of the request regarding reporting of aggregated BMP data.
 - Keeling: if CBP has questions about the aggregated data, the states would prefer CBP to direct its questions directly to the counties. We are not responsible for QA/QC of USDA or federal data, and would not be responsible for local data reported this way. Question if some of these homeowner BMPs are included in the approved panel reports.
 - Schueler: rain barrels and rains gardens are included in the scope of the definitions in the retrofits report.
 - Keeling: why would we need homeowners to calculate a reduction?
 - Schueler: the homeowner would not calculate the reduction. The homeowner enters basic design data that gets reported to the county.
 - Keeling: Not clear why Table 2 is in there then. Reported and credited BMPs have their reductions calculated by the Watershed Model.
- Johnston asked what the workgroup would need to see to wrap this up over email or bring this issue back to the workgroup in January.
 - Keeling suggested not requesting approval of alternate verification methods and including the "pending approval" of verification process language. Not sure why we need to worry about mass load reductions.
 - Johnston: We've made it clear that the model will make the final calculations.
- Sweeney asked for clarification about what would be aggregated and reported – acres treated? Volume?
 - Schueler described an example for 10 rain gardens, which would have a total roof area. There would be a volume treated based on the dimensions of the gardens. That information is plugged into the curves from the retrofits report to estimate the reductions for planning purposes, but the Model would ultimately calculate the reductions. The curves and equations from the report are embedded in the tools used by the locality.
 - Rigelman: Are there certain rules for aggregation? Could the state get the information at the statewide scale, or would it be on the county scale?
 - Schueler: For the Maryland pilot aggregation was at the county scale.
 - Volk: was the need for aggregation for protection of privacy or due to the number of practices or torture.
 - Schueler: It was a little bit of both.
- Keeling asked about the default rates in Table 2.
 - Schueler: The table is just a summary of how the data is computed. The default rates are just listed to use for calculations in Appendix B. The memo explains the general process how everything works together. The tools have the curves and reductions embedded into them so that a direct and verifiable calculation is made for the local governments.

- Ted Tesler (PA DEP; WTWG Chair): We have had a lot questions about how we might verify down to this level in Pennsylvania. Worth further discussion to talk about verification options. Hopefully we can come up with something that is more workable.
- Johnston noted the lack of consensus. Perhaps it is worth a discussion by the WQGIT about what the WTWG should be considering. CBPO staff will talk with Schueler and Goulet offline before January about next steps. The workgroup will revisit homeowner BMPs issue in January.
- **ACTION:** CBPO staff to work with Goulet and Schueler offline to determine path forward for homeowner BMPs proposal.

MAST/CAST/VAST priorities

- Olivia Devereux (Devereux Environmental Consulting): Last time we had this discussion was last January, when we asked what the different priorities were. We have accomplished a number of these priorities over the past year. Have improved agreement with WSM. Still working on BMP costs. New tasks have come up, such as a Facility Assessment Scenario Tool (FAST). Federal facilities partners have been having some difficulty and have requested a tool for their use, so we are working to have a workable FAST by February 2014. Some of the other tasks do tie in to development with FAST.
 - Robin Pellicano (MDE) noted there was some concern from the Management Board about the integration of some of the information coming out of FAST. We would like to be included in discussions about the scenarios and how FAST may integrate
 - Devereux: They could not be integrated since FAST looks at the facility scale, while CAST functions at the land-river segment. So a scenario from one tool could not be transferred to the other tool.
 - Rigelman: There are perhaps some elements of FAST that could be integrated into the CAST/MAST/VAST tools, but we would need to have discussions with users about this.
- Johnston noted the WTWG is responsible for considering priorities for C/M/VAST, so the workgroup will continue to discuss this issue moving forward.

2013 Progress Update

- Johnston thanked the states for submitting their XMLs. States received detailed NEIEN error reports this morning. When reviewing the reports, remember to look at successful submissions as well, to double check the figures match, etc. Johnston reminded the group that CBP will run the submissions through SB to get the submitted vs credited reports, which CBP will review with the states. He also reminded members that February 15th was the final deadline to approve progress.
 - Keeling: please put everything in an email for the Virginia team, since they are not all on this call.
 - Robin Pellicano (MDE): To clarify, February 15th is the final submittal date?
 - Johnston: That is the final approval.
 - Pellicano: So if we need to change data, it needs to be done before February 15th .
 - Johnston: That is correct. Actually changes to data should be made by February 6th as the CBP expects to run the final submissions

through the modeling tools on February 7th in preparation for review and approval by the states the following week.

- Keeling: so between Dec 13 and late Jan, there may be reiterations of submittals,
 - There will absolutely be resubmissions.
- Sweeney: it will be similar to previous years. We will have calls with each state to go through the back and forth discussions throughout month of January.
- Sweeney explained all the states are doing very well on providing their data so far.
 - Keeling: there is some data that we will not be submitting because we do not have time to process it due to the shorter deadline.
 - Sweeney: There is a tight deadline for the Virginia and Blue Plains point source data. Ning Zhou (Virginia Tech, CBPO) expects it late January, so there is time to get it in by the February deadline.

Agenda topics for January WTWG

- Johnston: Expect agenda to be shorter in January. We will revisit homeowner BMPs once we have a path forward. We may cancel our meeting and hold a joint meeting with one of the sector workgroups if one or two BMPs panels are rolled out.
- Keeling asked when the WTWG will discuss the new NRCS mapped BMPs? Not sure if some of the released BMPs are mapped correctly.
 - That's definitely a discussion for next year. The new BMPs added in the Appendix are just draft right now. Have talked with Mark Dubin (UMD, CBPO; AgWG Coordinator) about going item by item, but with the flurry of BMP panel reports this has not happened yet. We can make it a priority for next year if the workgroup feels it is important to tackle.
 - Keeling: Maybe we can discuss how to get the necessary groups together to work on this.
- Tesler suggested the workgroup may also want to discuss milestones.
- Hartman: include another Progress update if we meet in January.

Adjourned

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Ted Tesler (Chair)	PA DEP
Matt Johnston (Coord.)	UMD, CBPO
Jeremy Hanson (Staff)	CRC, CBPO
Chris Brosch	Virginia Tech/ VA DEQ
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting
Barry Evans	Penn State
Marcia Fox	DE DNREC
Steve Gladding	NYS DEC
Norm Goulet	Northern VA Regional Commission
Alana Hartman	WV DEP
Beth Horsey	MDA
Marty Hurd	DDOE
Bill Keeling	VA DEQ
Neely Law	Center for Watershed Protection, CBPO
Tyler Monteith	DE DNREC
Robin Pellicano	MDE
Lucinda Power	EPA CBPO
Tom Schueler	CSN
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO
Jenn Volk	U. of Delaware