



**Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Conference Call**
Thursday, December 6, 2018
10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Meeting Minutes

Actions and Decisions

- Decision: The September 6th meeting minutes were approved.
- Decision: The WTWG approved the interim BMP: Broiler Mortality Freezers and will move on the WQGIT for approval.
- Decision: The WTWG approved the recommendation based on input from DOEE and CBPO modelers – to go next to the WQGIT for approval.

Introductions and Announcements – Ted Tesler, PA DEP

- **Decision:** The September 6th meeting minutes were approved.

Broiler Mortality Freezers – Chris Brosch, DDA

The interim BMP: Broiler Mortality Freezers was presented to the WTWG on Sept 6th, 2018. The WTWG expressed several concerns related to the interim BMP that have stalled its approval until those concerns have been satisfactorily addressed. The AgWG DE signatory members volunteered to return to the WTWG with responses to the concerns brought up in September.

Discussion:

- Bill Keeling: The original question was “What is the baseline? Burial and application or land filling?” The answer could not be provided to us. If the AgWG is saying the baseline for mortality is in the litter and land applied, then this is plenty conservative, if not overly so.
 - Chris Brosch: The AgWG has clearly defined the baseline as composting and land application. And this value contains the 50% conservation factor as well.
- Ted Tesler: Is the weight of mortality relative to litter in production very small comparatively?
 - Chris Brosch: Yes, the mass and volume of mortality is very small, and gets smaller when considering composting. Largely, P would be conserved in that process and N would be subject to volatilization during cleanouts and the storage process.
 - Ted Tesler: That process puts birds into a rendering plant? If using a freezer, is it defined in the technical process with assurance that it is a full capture?
 - Chris Brosch: Yes. It becomes a commodity, there is tracking of tons, the poultry mortality turns to fish food, and rendering plants are sticklers about how much mortality is going in.
 - Ted Tesler: Is the record keeping of these high?
 - Chris Brosch: For the transport of mortality, rendering plants pay commodity price which doesn’t currently offset the total cost. It’s then cost shared at a per ton rate. The tonnage gets reported to us, so farmers can reclaim that expense.
 - Ted Tesler: Who is really using this system? Is it a small or large group?

- Chris Brosch: The adopters of this practice are poultry growers working with any integrator. This practice better farmers way of life by not having to turn piles of mortality, a decrease in smell, etc.
 - Ted Tesler: I see that usefulness for hygiene.
 - Chris Brosch: Yes, and not having this in the model is holding us back from promoting these to the full potential.
- Jeff Sweeney: We would still need more documentation. I'm still unclear of some information that would be provided in a technical appendix. Is this broilers or layers? We need specifics, units, data needed for submission, more technical detail. Add some bullets to the end of this ppt. of more specifics on how to incorporate this in CAST.
 - Chris Brosch: I believe Matt Johnston, who put together the original proposal answers those questions. The broilers vs. layers question was not considered because I don't know of any layer operations that use freezers.
- Bill Keeling: Is there any use of this for turkeys? Or just chickens?
 - Chris Brosch: In this watershed it's adopted for broilers or roasters.
 - Mark Dubin: During a presentation Victor Clark made to the expert panel, he noted that they are in discussion with VA producers as well. As far as turkeys, the consideration would be weight of animals going into freezers with a larger sized bird. There may be some limitations.
- Ted Tesler: How would the relative nutrient value of mortality, included in the manure load, change if mortality was not a part of that? Are there studies that differentiate?
 - Chris Brosch: Mortality is such a small volume compared to that of the litter that it would virtually be unnoticeable. In average conditions, the concentration of P and N in mortality compared to litter is close. Removing the mortality would not drastically affect the litter concentration.
- Chris Brosch: The only thing that concerns us is the 50% reduction as the conservation factor.
 - Bill Keeling: It's probably overly conservative.
 - Chris Brosch: We're not asking to revise it, since that would set back the timeline for approval. At the very least, one of our three counties does benefit from this.
- Jess Rigelman: I believe I reviewed this technical appendix and we should be okay, I just need to confirm.
- Ted Tesler: Motioned to approve the interim BMP.
 - Bill Keeling: Seconded the motion.
- **Decision:** The WTWG approved the interim BMP: Broiler Mortality Freezers and will move on the WQGIT for approval.

2018 Progress Scenario – WTWG Members and Interested Parties

The workgroup will discuss issues with submissions of data for the 2018 Progress model assessment (due Dec. 3rd) including technical difficulties, data reviews, deadlines, etc.

Discussion:

- Ted Tesler: Which jurisdictions are you providing the federal NCRS data for?

- Olivia Devereux: The data is provided to all, and it's up to them if and how they use it. Some jurisdictions use it directly, some use it for QA/QC purposes.
 - Bill Keeling: I take what Olivia gives me, and enter it as provided.
 - Ted Tesler: We do the same thing.
 - Brittany Sturgis: We use Olivia's data as well.
 - Emily Dekar: NY is different. We have our own database and don't use the NRCS practices to avoid double counting. Conservation districts report directly, and if they're not involved with NRCS or FSA, they aren't getting captured at this point.
- Ted Tesler: I ask that question because there's discussion about the 1619 continuing. I'm wondering how we can work with limitations to keep moving forward.
 - Olivia Devereux: USGS has a 1619 agreement through 2020 and will most likely get that renewed in 2020. That is not at risk of going away. USGS has committed to and will continue to do the work.
- Bill Keeling: I have concerns about base conditions. EPA is sticking to Aug 31st deadline, when EPA decided to cancel the August workgroup meeting where we would have discussed this. I didn't get data in until September, and I hope we won't get a default baseline in future model runs due to that.
 - Jeff Sweeney: Most people missed that August deadline. It won't be included in the version you see on Monday, but I'm sure it will be applied in the January runs. After this, there will be a schedule for the next 2-3 years. The grant guidance document (attachment 6) does have all of this information for deadlines as well.
 - Bill Keeling: I have heard comments about attachment 6 and many are confused about what can or cannot be updated. Until that's clear, we can leave that alone.
- Brittany Sturgis: Can you please remind us about the deadlines in July and have an august meeting to reiterate?
 - Jeff Sweeney: We will do a notice in July, but the email list is quite long to send reminders.
 - Bill Keeling: The august meeting is the one that must be guaranteed every year to lock down the schema. We can't cancel meetings without the chair knowing why. I also sent an email with a question, I'm confused why I got an error.
 - Jess Rigelman: If the error message says "scenario builder Irseg not available" we had an issue with the plug in with no match. This next error report by Monday will have those fixed and defaulted to the closest. You will get credit, but not at Irseg, just at the next smallest level. It has been addressed but let me know if it's still an error.
- Jeff Sweeney: Jan 31st is the absolute last run for progress. Giving us a week to run results. I was disappointed with states and agencies meeting Dec 3rd deadline. For wastewater we only have 2 jurisdictions with reasonable data.
 - Ted Tesler: Is that due to the app rollout?
 - Jeff Sweeney: It varies by state, but for some cases there was no data submitted.
- Greg Sandi: We spent the entire year working on our data when this app was pushed on us at the last minute in November.
 - Jeff Sweeney: Over 2 years ago, it was in there that the app would be coming.
 - Greg Sandi: Rolling out a tool at the last second and expecting us to submit through that is not what I'd hope.
 - Jeff Sweeney: I sat in on many meetings with jurisdictions together or one on one about how to use the app and how to submit.
 - Greg Sandi: November was a surprise.

- Bill Keeling: Given that I'm the one that supplies the data, it's not good that I don't get direct emails.
 - Jeff Sweeney: I guess grant guidance goes to superiors and does not get filtered down as it should.

DC Combined Sewer System – Jonathan Champion, DC DOEE

Jonathan proposed a change to the assignment of DC's combined sewer system area in the model between federal and non-federal land.

Discussion:

- Jeff Sweeney: This means CSS is being assigned to segments that are considered non-federal. This would include BMPs in the district. It does not impact calibration or the critical period, just a different name segment in D.C.
- Ted Tesler: I'm not entirely sure what the change is. It's an allocation?
 - Jess Rigelman: When you separate it, it changes the CSS land to its Ms4 counterpart where the Ms4 has loads. Whereas CSO has 0, because its applied to CSS. The load increases in fed area if you change to Ms4 instead of CSS. I checked that based on current connections, they do have enough non-fed to do this.
- Bill Keeling: Is that a standard rule that any CSS disconnect now creates Ms4 even if jurisdiction is not an ms4? How does the model create Ms4 acres where they don't exist in reality?
 - Jess Rigelman: It's taking CSS roads and changing to Ms4 roads. There has never been a specification of Ms4 vs. non-regulated roads. That was in phase 5 and was carried over to phase 6.
 - Bill Keeling: I don't have an issue with D.C., but now in other states the CSS will change to Ms4 even though there is no permit?
 - Jess Rigelman: In the model, they're not GIS overlays. It could be a check, but that would be another model change that we would need to address separately.
 - Jeff Sweeney: There could be a segment where there is no Ms4 and then we create one where there is not a real permit, and this creates confusion.
 - Jess Rigelman: They load the same, but for permitting people it is a big deal.
- Ted Tesler: I don't have a problem with this request, but can we roll in Bill's concern?
 - Jeff Sweeney: That's hard, because it's a case by case thing outside of D.C. given its size.
 - Bill Keeling: I don't mind making a separate proposal, because it's creating issues with permitting people and causing issues.
- Jeff Sweeney: In April, we can make changes to the model if it doesn't violate calibration or the critical period. Looking across all bay watershed of where this is/ isn't applicable.
- **Decision:** The WTWG approved the recommendation based on input from DOEE and CBPO modelers – to go next to the WQGIT for approval.

Data Input Schedule – Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO

Jeff went over documentation of data input deadlines and guidance using Phase 6 – which was presented at the WQGIT's November meeting, including comments received to-date. The write-up details data input deadlines for Phase III WIP planning and development, 2018-2019 milestones, and

2020-2021 milestones, as well as the types of data that may and may not be changed during these time frames.

Discussion

- Jeff Sweeney: There are three outstanding comments from VA that we are addressing now.

Meeting Participants:

Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Jeff Sweeney	EPA CBPO
Allie Wagner	CRC
Jessica Rigelman	J7 LLC
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Brittany Sturgis	DNREC
Alana Hartman	WV DEP
Bill Keeling	VA DEQ
Lori Brown	DNREC
Loretta Collins	UMD
Sarah Lane	? MD
Mark Dubin	UMD
Chris Brosch	DDA
Clint Gill	DDA
Emily Dekar	USC
Jason Keppler	MDA
Jonathan Champion	DOD
Greg Sandi	MDE