

**Watershed Technical Workgroup Conference Call  
November 3, 2016  
Meeting Summary**

**Summary of Action and Decision Items**

DECISION: The WTWG approved the Impervious Disconnections BMP Expert Panel report and technical appendix as-written.

ACTION: Matt will present the top 12 (or so) practices reported for Phase 6, and review the default land use group for the December WTWG meeting.

DECISION: States will not be required to report Phase 6 BMPs for 2014, 2015 and 2016 by December 31, 2016 as many states are still working on transforming their databases to accommodate recently reported BMPs in the 2016 format.

ACTION: Matt will add a record for manufactured treatment devices to the Phase 6 NEIEN appendix, but will leave the status as default.

**Introduction and Announcements**

The FSA NRCS implementation data was sent out on Monday, aggregated to the county scale to protect producer privacy. It includes only counties that intersect the Bay watershed.

**Impervious Disconnections BMP Expert Panel Report**

Jeremy Hanson, VT and Bill Stack, CWP reviewed the panel recommendations and walked through the technical appendix for the report.

**Discussion:**

- Matt Johnston (UMD, WTWG Coordinator): Notice that there is a 5-year credit duration. It is cumulative for 5 years, and you would need to report a maintenance or inspection date to keep it active.
- Johnston: In terms of what you've seen in terms of implementation, are more likely to see treatment trains or standalone practices?
  - Reid Christianson (CWP): I look at it as a one-off kind of practice. Maybe you don't want a huge investment or want to use compost or something to treat runoff from a building, but you don't want to interrupt much. That being said, there is nothing to stop this from being the first in a train of practices.
- Bill Keeling (VA DEQ): This is a separate BMP than the reduction of impervious surfaces? This is what we submit if we apply a soil amendment to help infiltration?
  - Johnston: Correct.
- Johnston: Is there anyone who cannot live with the appendix and the report as written?
  - No objections were raised.

DECISION: The WTWG approved the Impervious Disconnections BMP Expert Panel report and technical appendix as-written.

**Phase 6 Nutrient Management BMP Expert Panel Update**

- Johnston: The AGWG approved a revised version of the report and it is now waiting on WQGIT approval. The agreement at the AGWG and WQGIT is that these are stand-in multipliers. If there is any new information in the future to suggest that those can change, they will be updated. Are there any concerns anyone would like to raise and pass along to the WQGIT?
  - None were raised.
- Johnston: If you do have any concerns, please work directly with your WQGIT members.

### **STAC Upland Buffer Credit Recommendation**

The WTWG discussed whether upland efficiency reductions for buffers should only be credited to the land use for which they were submitted, or if benefits should continue to be dispersed amongst agricultural lands.

#### **Discussion:**

- Alana Hartman (WV DEP): A lot of our buffers don't have a reported land use. How would that work?
  - Johnston: There is a default, which I believe is "crops". You would then take that default for the upland efficiency as well.
- Jason Keppler (MDA): Using that method, it would behoove them not to report a land use because they would get more credit applying it just to crop.
  - Johnston: Unfortunately, I think you could say the same about a lot of the BMPs. The grant guidance recommends you report on the most specific geographic scale you have available.
- Keppler: It puts jurisdictions with more refined data at a disadvantage.
- Hanson: The Wetland Restoration BMP also has an upland credit. Would the same decision be consistent for wetland restoration?
  - Johnston: I think that is something this group would definitely have to consider.
- Keeling: So Phase 6 Wetland Restoration will have an upland efficiency?
  - Hanson: Yes, it would work that way mechanistically. It would be a conversion to a wetland land use plus an upland benefit. Just like a forest buffer is a conversion to a forest land use with an upland benefit.
- Hartman: I think we do have Land uses for a lot of our buffers because we needed to know if they were pasture or not. It might not be as bad as I first indicated.
- Johnston: I think it behooves us to chew on this a while longer. We will call the question at the next meeting.
- Keppler: I'd suggest if you apply a default land use, that it in some way it not incentivize folks to not report land uses. Maybe limit the amount of cropland that can receive buffers as a default.
  - Johnston: That is a good point. That gets to a full scale review of the Phase 6 defaults by BMP, which are listed in the Phase 6 NEIEN appendix. There are a lot of years of work behind why those defaults exist, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't entertain changes.

ACTION: Matt will present the top 12 (or so) practices reported for Phase 6, and review the default land use group for the December WTWG meeting.

### **Phase 6 BMP Results**

DECISION: States will not be required to report Phase 6 BMPs for 2014, 2015 and 2016 by December 31, 2016 as many states are still working on transforming their databases to accommodate recently reported BMPs in the 2016 format.

**Changes to NEIEN for 2016 Progress**

ACTION: Matt will add a record for manufactured treatment devices to the Phase 6 NEIEN appendix, but will leave the status as default.

**Adjourned**

**List of Call Participants**

<b>Member Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Matt Johnston (Coordinator)	UMD, CBPO
David Wood (Staff)	CRC
Brittany Sturgis	DE DNREC
Robin Pellicano	MDE
Jason Keppler	MDA
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Sara Latessa	NYSDEC
Emily Dekar	USC
Bill Keeling	VA DEQ
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Alana Hartman	WV DEP
Bill Stack	CWP
Reid Christianson	CWP
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting
Skyler Golt	UMD, CBPO