



**Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Conference call**

Thursday, May 4, 2017

10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Calendar Page: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/24820/>

Meeting Summary

Actions & Decisions:

DECISION: The WTWG reached consensus to approve the proposed revision to the technical appendix of the Stream Restoration BMP panel report.

ACTION: WTWG members should review the spreadsheets over the next few weeks, and submit feedback to Matt Johnston on the proposed mappings.

ACTION: WTWG members should submit additional feedback on the draft guide mock-up to Jeremy Hanson (jchanson@vt.edu) by May 18th.

Revision to Stream Restoration Technical Appendix –Matt Johnston, UMD

Matt discussed an [amendment](#) to the original stream restoration technical appendix based upon the Phase 6 Model's use of sediment delivery factors.

- Alana Hartman: During the sediment webinar, I think someone raised a question about this at the end. If people watch that webinar in the future, it might be a good idea to include a note on the webinar to indicate that it's been addressed.
 - Matt Johnston: I'll roll that into the fatal flaw comment document as a question from the WTWG, and an answer being the revision to the technical appendix. That way we can track it.

DECISION: The WTWG reached consensus to approve the proposed revision to the technical appendix of the Stream Restoration BMP panel report.

Methods for Mapping Phase II WIP Input for Phase 6 Purposes – Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting

Olivia reviewed the comments received regarding the proposed methods for mapping Phase II WIP inputs to Phase 6. The workgroup will be asked to approve the methods.

- Comments were received from MD. Olivia asked if the group was comfortable mapping specific cover crop species to the version that does not have fall nutrients. No issues were raised; consensus was reached.
- Stormwater management BMPs: 5 of the BMPs are MD-specific, and the CBPO is waiting on recommended changes from MD for the crosswalk. (Recent Stormwater Management, Stormwater Management by Era 2002 to 2010 MD, Stormwater to the Maximum Extent Practicable (SW to the MEP), MS4 Permit-Required Stormwater Retrofit, Stormwater Management by Era 1985 to 2002 MD)

- Bill Keeling: You're trying to map a WIP II to Phase 6.
- Olivia Devereux: If you submitted BMPs for a Phase II WIP, it would have existed in the Phase 5 model. But with the Phase 6 model, those 5 BMPs don't exist, so we need to find other BMPs that do exist so we can represent your Phase II WIP in the new version of the model.
- Norm Goulet: Do we have a handle on the numbers for those BMPs?
- Olivia Devereux: They were fairly similar. The efficiencies are fairly similar to filtering practices.
- Greg Sandi: For MD, there could be significant stormwater acreages that would be falling out of the Phase 6 model.
- Norm Goulet: I'm concerned about double-counting with this.
 - Greg Sandi: Double counting shouldn't be a big issue; we've run the numbers to address that concern.
- Olivia Devereux: So it sounds like we're going to wait for MD to make a recommendation on these 5.
 - Group agreed.
- Nutrient Management:
 - Group agreed that efficiency nutrient management is Core NM.
 - Group agreed that decision agriculture is placement and timing NM + Core.
 - Group agreed that enhanced NM is all four Phase 6 practices (core, rate, timing, placement).
 - Group agreed that Efficiency NM Tier 2 is core, placement, and timing.
 - Group agreed that Tier 3 TN is core, rate, placement, and timing.
 - Some are specific to N or P and that specificity will be reflected in the mapping.
- Urban Tree Planting:
 - MD intended urban tree planting to move to forest planting, but tree planting was left as the default.
 - Matt Johnston: For the Phase 6 NEIEN effort, everything we had was mapped to urban tree planting (canopy). We approved that mapping, then added a new BMP so you could specifically report forest planting if you had it. Our assumption was that everything planted in the past without knowing anything about it is urban tree planting.
 - Bill Keeling: I thought the default for tree planting was to go to forest.
 - Matt Johnston: I can check meeting minutes, but we don't make a change to the NEIEN appendix without having it fully approved.
 - Bill Keeling: When the BMP was being approved, that's what was agreed to. Rebecca Hamner was on-board.
 - Greg Sandi: I think for reporting history, we did do that conversion. So wouldn't we want to do something similar for our WIPs?
 - Brittany Sturgis: I think we did mostly urban – we submitted by number of trees. DC also used this strategy.
 - Matt Johnston: Is there an opportunity for the states to review this conversion in CAST?
 - Olivia Devereux: Yes. In CAST, if you want to download Phase 5 scenarios, we can do these transformations for you and you can edit those for any scenario you want.
 - Olivia Devereux: DE and DC think this is more like tree planting, and MD and VA assume it's more like forest planting.

- Matt Johnston: Would MD and VA feel comfortable if this was caveated that you both felt this should be forest planting?
- Bill Keeling: But VA and MD's areas supersede that of DC and DE. And tree planting - canopy wasn't a BMP in the WIP IIs.
- Matt Johnston: I'd prefer to record these differences for now, and discuss with CBPO staff. Then we can circle back with an approach via email.
- Wetland Restoration:
 - Suggested to default to wetland restoration in headwaters.
 - Group supported this proposal.
- Load Source Group Relationships:
 - Request for additional time to review the proposed changes.
 - Matt Johnston: If a state already reported PU, then they're ok right?
 - Olivia Devereux: If they reported on PUH or PUL, our suggestion was to put it on regulated or non-regulated. MD instead would prefer to have it all lumped together and do a different load source group.
 - Greg Sandi: Is there any downside to lumping?
 - Olivia Devereux: You do lose specificity this way, but you would not lose credit due to running out of acres.

ACTION: WTWG members should review the spreadsheets over the next few weeks, and submit feedback to Matt Johnston on the proposed mappings.

BMP Informative Document for General Audience— Matt Johnston (UMD) and Jeremy Hanson (VT)

Matt and Jeremy presented a [first pass](#) at a BMP [guidance document](#) intended for general audiences, including possible sections and headers for workgroup review and discussion. Members are invited to provide feedback on the document and the project in general.

- Matt Johnston: A lot of people have attempted to do this before, but one issue we run into is maintenance. Do you have any ideas on how to address that?
 - Jeremy Hanson: Each BMP would have a uniquely editable document that could be updated easily by either a staffer or coordinator. I wouldn't anticipate that being too much work, since it would be a fill-in-the-blank type of update.
- Adam Wright expressed support, noting that it would be useful for planning in DoD.
- Brittany Sturgis asked how the group would be asked to review the documents. She suggested potentially reviewing them in batches, grouped by sector.
- Matt Johnston: I think you have the workgroup set-up already, and would recommend that's the way to go about this. You could update the WTWG on the ones you've gotten done this month, but let them know that the workgroups will be reviewing them.
- Olivia Devereux suggested potentially breaking out agricultural BMPs further by manure and non-manure BMPs.
- Matt Johnston: It might be best to keep these as word documents in case MD wants to add information on how they specifically track their BMPs. This would be for their own purposes, not for our website.
- Norm Goulet: I would rank these from heavy-hitters to the least implemented BMPs, and prioritize those big BMPs first. Then in terms of the urban BMPs, I would coordinate with

Tom and try to use the FAQs or summaries that he's put together so that we don't have a duplication of documents.

ACTION: WTWG members should submit additional feedback on the draft guide mock-up to Jeremy Hanson (jchanson@vt.edu) by May 18th.

Phase 6 Fatal Flaw Review and Outlook for the WTWG—Matt Johnston, UMD

Matt discussed tasks assigned to the workgroup by the Water Quality GIT for fatal flaw review beginning in June.

- Matt Johnston: The Ag Modeling Subcommittee is already collecting comments on the inputs hosted on the Inputs Visualization Tool:
<https://mpa.chesapeakebay.net/Phase6DataVisualization.html>

Participants:

Matt Johnston	UMD
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Greg Sandi	MDE
Jason Keppler	MDA
Emily Dekar	USC
Alana Hartman	WV DEP
Lori Brown	DNREC
Brittany Sturgis	DNREC
Tyler Monteith	DNREC
Clint Gill	DDA
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Bill Keeling	VA DCR
Ruth Izraeli	EPA
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Marian Norris	NPS
Adam Wright	DoD
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Sarah Lane	UMCES
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting