



**Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Conference call
Thursday, August 4, 2016
Minutes**

Summary of Action and Decision Items

ACTION: If WTWG are uncomfortable with CBP staff deleting draft versions of past Progress runs, please contact Matt Johnston (mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net) as soon as possible.

DECISION: The WTWG approved the June meeting minutes as-written.

DECISION: The WTWG approved the Floating Treatment Wetlands BMP Expert Panel Report and technical appendix, as written.

ACTION: WTWG members should submit comments on the Manure Treatment Technology report, Urban Tree Canopy report, or Impervious Cover Disconnections report to Jeremy Hanson by COB August 11th.

ACTION: Matt will send Marty the acres of permitted construction for D.C.

ACTION: WTWG members should contact Matt Johnston if they have any questions or concerns related to the proposed changes to NEIEN. If no comments are received, Matt will make the proposed changes to the NEIEN appendix.

Welcome/Announcements – Matt Johnston, Coordinator

- Johnston: Are WTWG members alright with deleting the old versions of Progress runs. Last year we had 13 versions, but only the 13th is the official Progress run, so we would like to delete the rest of the versions. Please let me know over email if you are not ok with us deleting v 1-12.

ACTION: If WTWG are uncomfortable with CBP staff deleting draft versions of past Progress runs, please contact Matt Johnston (mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net) as soon as possible.

DECISION: The WTWG approved the June meeting minutes as-written.

Floating Treatment Wetland Expert Panel Report – Tom Schueler, CSN

Tom will provided an overview of the FTW Expert Panel's report and technical appendix.

Discussion:

- Marty Hurd (DOEE): Is there some kind of monitoring component associated with these systems?
 - Schueler: There is no water quality monitoring component for floating treatment wetlands. The panel recommend ongoing operation and maintenance criteria to maintain the pollutant removal function.
- Hurd: Is there required harvesting and removal of materials?
 - Schueler: The panel recommend thinning, but not actual removal.
- Hurd: It seems like the difference in removal efficiency between FTW-1 and FTW-5 is disconnected to the size of the raft.
 - Schueler: If you had a 100 acre pond, you would have a larger load than a smaller pond,

- o so the reduction is proportional. It would probably be more cost effective if applied to larger facilities because you are treating a larger load.
 - o Johnston: In NEIEN, we are asking for acres treated, just like wet ponds. That is how we differentiate large wet ponds to small wet ponds.
- Bill Keeling (VA DEQ): So we need to define the wet pond and the percent coverage of the pond. How does that work for wet ponds that have already been reported?
 - o Schueler: It is an enhancement retrofit, so the original guidelines for reporting those were defined in that expert panel.
 - o Johnston: This is an add-on BMP. You can discover a new wet pond and a floating treatment wetland and you could report both at the same time. If you had a wet pond and just now installed a floating treatment wetland, you would re-report the wet pond, you would just report the FTW. They would be reported as two separate records.
- Keeling: Does it need to be tied to the wet pond?
 - o Johnston: In reality yes, but in the model, it doesn't really need to be.
- Keeling: It doesn't matter if we reported it using the stormwater performance standards or just a wetpond. We would use the enhancement strategy you put forward?
 - o Schueler: Correct. More communities would likely want to use the performance curves.
- Hurd: How many of these are expecting to see installed?
 - o Schueler: They are not very common in the watershed at this point. I would say the average jurisdiction would have no more than a handful. However, it is good to have a new option, considering there are so many wet ponds in use throughout the watershed.
- Johnston: Do we have a motion to approve the Floating Treatment Wetlands Expert Panel report and technical appendix?
 - o Greg Sandi (MDE): Motion to approve.
 - o Hurd: Seconded.
- Johnston: Are there any objections?
 - o Hearing no objections, the report was approved.

DECISION: The WTWG approved the Floating Treatment Wetlands BMP Expert Panel Report and technical appendix, as written.

Virginia Tech Panel Updates – Jeremy Hansen, VT

Jeremy provided updates for all of the active Virginia Tech panels. No decisions were requested, but comments were encouraged:

ACTION: WTWG members should submit comments on the Manure Treatment Technology report, Urban Tree Canopy report, or Impervious Cover Disconnections report to Jeremy Hanson by COB August 11th.

Manure Treatment Technology (MTT) Discussion:

- Alana Hartman (WV DEP): Was there a webinar providing an overview of these recommendations?
 - Hanson: Yes, the recording is available on the April 14, 2016 Calendar Page.
- Keeling: Have we addressed my comment that language should be added to the technical appendix to clarify that the MTT BMPs are standalone practices that do treat the same source as other Partnership-approved BMPs?
 - Johnston: We will make sure it is clear in the technical appendix. MTTs are basically their own BMPs that is being treated like the transport BMP.
- Keeling: Did the panel weigh in on verification?
 - Hanson: Yes, there is a section in the report on verification, but the AGWG guidance is fairly comprehensive and the chapter mainly shows how to interpret the AGWG

guidance.

- Johnston: I recommend that you all look at Q7 in the technical appendix, in particular, for a good example for how to report this BMP.

Urban Tree Canopy Discussion:

- Keeling: Has it been explained to the panel that the partnership would rather have the forest conversion BMP than the tree canopy conversion BMP if it came to one or the other?
 - Neely Law (CWP): The panel has not heard that ultimatum.
 - Hanson: I don't think there will be consensus support from the panel either way.
- Jeff Sweeney (EPA): In the report or the technical appendix there needs to be justification for why the planted trees would load the same as a large, old growth forests. There needs to be a scientific explanation.
- Keeling: I proposed that we base the qualifying criteria on a density of planting. Regardless of the area, if you meet the state requirements for stems per acre to create forest-like conditions, then that is an attempt to recreate forest, and is something we can verify and track. If you are below that density, the planting would be a conversion to tree canopy.
 - Sweeney: That sounds fine as long as there is a statement in the technical appendix that clarifies if you don't have your own state planting density requirement, then you could use another state's number or something like that.
- Johnston: Can the panel define a minimum stems per acre density for creating forest-like condition?
 - Hanson: The difficulty is quantifying how many stems survive, etc., which was a major criticism of the Phase 5 tree planting definition.
 - Keeling: I would recommend it be based on the number of stems per acre at the date of planting.
 - Hanson: I can work with the FWG on that if we want a number for reference.
- Keeling: I have no information for urban tree canopy to put in the history.
 - Johnston: We want to give you all the option to report by September 30th. Whether or not the BMP is turned on for the Beta 4 version of the model is dependent on the report approval.
- Keeling: The problem with the core acre minimum is that we don't put a distinction on riparian forest buffers, so why do it for these? I would rather stick to a density. If you meet the density requirement for forest, you get the conversion to forest.
 - Johnston: In Phase 6 we do have narrow forest buffers defined for buffers with a width of less than 35 ft.
- Keeling: I am concerned that by doing this, we are going to put at risk our riparian forest plantings that are less than a quarter of an acre.

Impervious Disconnection Discussion:

- No additional discussion.

Wetlands Discussion:

- Johnston: AS we come up on the Beta 4, there may not be any credit for some of the NRCS practices for wetlands reestablishment or enhancement. We should strongly encourage the Wetlands Workgroup to get to work on this. It will clearly be missed for the initial Phase 6 Model.
- Hartman: The Wetlands Workgroup always start out with a chart that shows the acres that have been submitted in our WIPs for wetlands. I think it is good that there is a workgroup keeping an eye on that implementation.

Animal Waste Management Systems Discussion:

- Keeling: I'd suggest a default loss and recoverability value for cases where all we know is that it is some kind of system. Sometimes with the NRCS codes, I just know it is 1, 313 without knowing the animal type or anything else.
 - Hanson: The panel will likely approach it as one number for AWMS for the animal type. If the animal type, system type, or the size of operation is unknown, there will be a default.
- Johnston: The AWMS panel is expected to provide pre and post AWMS storage handling numbers, and a default size, which will allow us to replace the assumption that 1 system is 145 animal units.

Beta 3 BMPs – Matt Johnston, UMD

Matt reviewed the status of BMP submissions being used in the Beta 3 calibration and emphasized that, to this point, historic data reporting has been very poor.

Discussion:

- Hurd: Can you please send me what you have from D.C. for acres of permitted construction?
 - Johnston: Yes.

ACTION: Matt will send Marty the acres of permitted construction for D.C.

- Hartman: I could only find Beta 2 on the ftp site.
 - Johnston: We just got the Beta 3, so we don't even have the loads yet. I will get summary sheets for Beta 3 on the ftp site as soon as possible.
- Hartman: If you can make the format similar to the last time, that would be great.
 - Johnston: They should be the exact same report format.

Changes to NEIEN and Historic Data Cleanup Update – Matt Johnston, UMD

Matt reviewed the proposed changes to NEIEN and the status of historic data cleanup efforts.

Discussion:

- Hartman: Is there still uncertainty about the conservation tillage numbers?
 - Johnston: The panel defined what each category was, and CTIC has broken it out into those categories, so the conversions should all work out fine. If you are using other acres besides CTIC, you will need to refer to the panel report for the definitions for the different BMPs.

ACTION: WTWG members should contact Matt Johnston if they have any questions or concerns related to the proposed changes to NEIEN. If no comments are received, Matt will make the proposed changes to the NEIEN appendix.

- Sweeney: As a reminder, you also need to update your QAPPs with the new information on these BMPs. You should explain where the data comes from and how you differentiate the BMP categories, etc.

Adjourn

List of Call Participants:

Member Name	Affiliation
Matt Johnston (Coordinator)	UMD, CBPO
David Wood (Staff)	CRC
Tyler Monteith	DE DNREC
Marty Hurd	DOEE
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO
Paul Emmart	MDE
Greg Sandi	MDE
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Bill Keeling	VA DEQ
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Alana Hartman	WV DEP
Samantha Wood	UMD, CBPO
Tom Schueler	CSN
Peter Thomas	CoalTech
Neely Law	CWP