



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

Thursday, August 3, 2017

10:00 AM to 11:30 AM

**Call-in number:** 866.299.3188 **Code:** 267-5715

**Adobe Connect:** <http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/wtwg/>

**Calendar Page:**

[http://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/watershed\\_technical\\_workgroup\\_conference\\_call\\_august\\_2017](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/watershed_technical_workgroup_conference_call_august_2017)

**Agenda**

Summary of Actions and Decisions:

**Decision:** The WTWG recommended the following actions for functionality in Phase 6 BayFAST: using area of interest or planning area terms in lieu of parcel or facility; No inclusion of agency selection functionality for users; bounding user entries for agricultural data; and decreasing the number of land uses available to users. These recommendations will not be final until approved by the Federal Facilities Workgroup at their August meeting.

Introductions and Approval of June Minutes - Ted Tesler, PADEP

Announcements:

- CAST has been updated to reflect requested changes made by the WQGIT, and will be updated in the future. Messages are going out alerting users of updates. Scenarios should be re-run following updates.

*Discussion:*

- Jeremy Hanson's email address has a typo in the June minutes. June minutes should be corrected for accuracy to: [jchanson@vt.edu](mailto:jchanson@vt.edu)
- Johnston: WQGIT-requested changes to CAST that have been made. Emails will go out to account holders to remind users of updates. Scenarios have to be rerun after any updates to the website.

Getting to Recalibration in September

Matt discussed a number of updates relevant to the September 1 deadline for submitting new data.

*Discussion:*

- Jurisdictions should submit permitted construction and harvested forest acres for 1985 through 2016 by August 15 if they have not already done so.
  - Bill Keeling: I don't see numbers for VA changing. We're ok with those animal numbers you have.
- Jurisdictions should submit 2014-2016 BMP data by September 1, as well as any updated progress data for 1985-2013.

- Johnston: The actual request from the WQGIT is 2014-2016, but states are encouraged to resubmit all historical data. Please also review BMPs from the draft calibration using CAST or FTP. Stream exclusion in PA, DE NM might be errors.
- Olivia Devereux: If they did make a correction for a future year, you get all the NGOs asking why you stopped implementation when it's an error in the data and not a change in practice.
- Keeling: When you say over reported, you mean cut off?
- Johnston: Right, when you implement too much for any particular practice it kicks other BMPs off the model. You are reporting on data verification as well. We committed to making that change in the draft calibration.
- Johnston: Percent reductions can be submitted for BMPs, and is recommended for forest and erosion and sediment control. Percent can only be reported at one geography level. Percents and acres can't be reported together either. The plug-in that transfers NEIEN to Scenario Builder can't handle it.
- Tesler: On the harvested forest and construction, we will try and stick with what we have. Is there a problem with that?
- Johnston: Each state should let me know what they would like to use. It's up to the jurisdictions to decide.
- Norm Goulet: Can we talk about street sweeping? We have an issue that the expert panel didn't connect between 5.3.2 and phase 6. You are allowed to report pounds with the old methods up until 2017. For phase 6 it's miles only. Because phase 6 requires miles, any progress reported in previous models doesn't get credit.
  - Johnston: We will not be moving the old methods for 5 to phase 6. That has to be reported in NEIEN and we have to add that function back in for the history. We have to wait for the panel recommendation before we add that back to NEIEN, but it might be too late at this point.
  - Goulet: Could states just plug in the pounds to a spreadsheet that converts pounds to miles and then report that in NEIEN?
  - Keeling: I may not be able to modify VA's history in time to convert pounds to miles.
  - Brittany Sturgis: DE will have a hard time meeting this deadline, as we have lost our contractor. We may not be able to meet that September 1 deadline.
  - Johnston: That decision came from the WQGIT, and that's a deadline that the PSC approved. I would ask DE to raise that to the WQGIT and the PSC. In phase 5 there was panic if you miscalculated the history, in Phase 6 NEIEN is open to changing the history until phase 7.
- The Phase 6 Watershed Model currently allows grass and forest buffers without exclusion fencing on pasture. Yet most state and federal funding programs require exclusion fencing prior to planting buffers on pastures. WTWG will be asked if the Phase 6 Model may exclude non-exclusion fencing buffers on pasture.

## 2017 Progress

Matt described the timeline for 2017 Progress, and alerted the group to changing responsibilities within CBPO that pertain to future progress runs.

Discussion:

- Johnston: This is the first and last time that we will run progress in both phases of the model.
- Keeling: No till drill vs conventional drill on cover crops. Will that be resolved or result in changes to the appendix?
  - Johnston: That has not been resolved, and will have to be raised beyond this workgroup to fix.
- Keeling: My question is more for history than for progress. There are 103 stream buffer flavors that map to the same stream buffer BMP—how is that
- Keeling: I expect management in VA will request an extension on the Sept 1 deadline. We are moving buildings and there may be impacts on meeting our deadline.
- Johnston: Suchith and Jeff will be taking over NEIEN and general questions on 2017 progress, respectively. I will be moving into more WIP development work.
- Johnston: Phase 5 will die on March 31, 2018. No changes to phase 5 will be made after that date.
  - Devereux: CAST 5 and MAST will also expire on that date as well since they are based on the phase 5 model.
- Johnston: It will be tough this year since you are submitting to phase 5 and phase 6, so get started early.
- Ted Tesler: Matt, you want 2017 progress by December 1? It will be very hard to make that deadline.
- Keeling: We have developed a separate guidance for USDA BMPs at the state scale as well.

#### BayFAST Development for Phase 6 --Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting

Decisions requested about functionality of the new BayFAST including use of agencies and flexibility of agricultural source data.

#### *Discussion:*

- Goulet: The problem with using parcels, is that a lot of these users are local, and they think of property parcels and not watersheds.
- Devereux: Is AOI a common abbreviation for area of interest?
  - Keeling: I would stay away from a term that might have a different definition or a different usage at the local scale.
- Devereux: Do we need agency classifications in BayFAST? IF we did have them, you would have to specify that in the tool.
- Greg: I don't think that would affect what we're doing in MD.
- Sarah Diebel: One of the issues we discussed at the Federal Facilities Workgroup is that smaller agencies that might not have a lot of acreage or don't have MS4 permits—those would benefit from using BayFAST and from being able to select the agency in the scenario.
- Devereux: Would a federal agency be doing scenarios for more than one agency at a time? We had thought that each agency would be running a scenario for their own agency, one at a time, and not a mix. If they are doing it only for one agency at a time, then they could designate that in the title or in the notes.
- Diebel: If we're not using it as part of a mechanism to support future planning, it may not be necessary.

- Devereux: the next item is on default conditions. BayFAST shows the ESRI satellite imagery with labels. The issue is that now that you have feeding space and the ability to edit animal numbers, which allows users to input numbers for each that don't match. How much of an issue is this in the tool?
- Tesler: Where is the feeding space coming from?
  - Johnston: Feeding space is connected to square feet per animal count. If you gave users the option, they could zero out 1, which could make the results illogical.
  - Tesler: So if you have animals then you have to have feeding space, right?
  - Devereux: We could keep them tied and have the user edit one or the other. In the tool right now, the user can edit both and they're not tied.
  - Tesler: How does that relate to Chesapeake Commons land use?
    - Johnston: The 1 m resolution goes to Peter Claggett and he develops acres of natural, ag and impervious developed—that's agricultural construction—roads, buildings, feed lots, etc. When we calculated acres of feeding space, we take it out of developed classes.
    - Keeling: But grazing pastures aren't part of that right.
      - Johnston: There is a default for every animal type.
      - Keeling: We have very low confinement for beef in VA, if you're not in confinement how do you tie a grazing animal to a feeding space? For calculating animal numbers, if no one has given you information, you just take them out of NAS right? So would you have animals that don't exist then?
      - Johnston: The acres themselves are small, and the important thing is the load. Where beef's not confined, the load is very low compared to areas where beef is confined.
- Keeling: How were animal numbers calculated in BayFAST? Did states provide that data and you calculated feeding spaces through NAS?
  - Johnston: Every state provided confinement information and data on time in pasture/access area for each animal type.
  - Keeling: If nobody provided information for distributing numbers out of NAS, then could you have animals represented that don't exist?
  - Devereux: Maybe, but that's outside of this discussion. I am concerned with changing the default to keep it so that the end result makes sense to users. Is what we have enough or should we constrain it?
    - Diebel: We need constraints on there. Other nonprofits using the tool on ag properties for non ag practices are skewing the numbers that we see when they report practices.
    - Devereux: Ok, thanks. I'll have to come back to you all with what the constraints should be, but I do need that yes/no guidance on whether we should introduce constraints or not.
    - Keeling: On my email, I told you I am supportive of constraining illogical situations. Like Sarah just mentioned, many users may have a poor understanding of ag, and they may not have the knowledge to use the more complicated tools. Simple is better here.
- Diebel: I know we don't have federal land uses for ag in phase 6, but if we were to give out ag leases on federal land, we'd want to be able to predict what practices on that land would give load reductions. Not having ag on federal land might be a limitation for us.

- Devereux: I didn't realize that was an interest for federal facilities, but we can certainly do that.
- Devereux: The next issue is the land uses for ag land, we have 10 possible crop types. One option is to limit them for users, or just have all the land uses available to users.
- Johnston: I don't have a vote, but I would suggest 3 because that's my general recommendation to states to break out nutrient management practices—crop, hay, pasture.
- Greg: The research center in Beltsville is MD's only facility that might be affected by this-- that has a lot of ag land use, and we'd have to confer with them what they'd want.
- Sarah Diebel invited Olivia to brief the FFWG on this issue at their August 8 meeting.
- Tesler: I concur with Matt's suggestion but I would defer to FFWG.
- Devereux: We are asking for decisions but none will be final until the FFWG meeting next week.

**Decision:** The WTWG recommended the following actions for functionality in Phase 6 BayFAST: using area of interest or planning area terms in lieu of parcel or facility; No inclusion of agency selection functionality for users; bounding user entries for agricultural data; and decreasing the number of land uses available to users. These recommendations will not be final until approved by the Federal Facilities Workgroup at their August meeting.

### Adjourned

### Call Participants:

Ted Tesler (PA DEP), Chair  
 Matt Johnston (UMD), Coordinator  
 Michelle Williams (CRC), Staffer  
 Lauren Townley, NYS DEC  
 Alana Hartman, WV DEP  
 Greg Sandi, MDE  
 Hampton Roads Planning Commission representatives  
 Bill Keeling, VA DEQ  
 Jeremy Hanson, VT  
 Loretta Collins, AgWG coordinator  
 Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting  
 Brittany Sturgis, DNREC  
 Jason Keppler, MDA  
 Emily Dekar, USC  
 Adam Wright, DOD  
 Sarah Diebel, DOD  
 Norm Goulet, USWG