



Watershed Technical Workgroup Meeting Minutes

June 4th, 2026
10:00-11:15 AM

[Visit the meeting webpage for meeting materials and additional information.](#)

Purpose: This was the monthly meeting of the Watershed Technical Workgroup. Agenda topics included relevant announcements, a brief update on the 2025 Annual Progress release, an update on the CWGT Structure and Management Strategy Development, and an overview of progress towards the development of the E3 scenarios.

Summary of Actions & Decisions

Decision: The WTWG approved the May 2026 meeting minutes.

Action: CBP NEIEN node will be decommissioned on August 31, 2026. All Progress BMP submissions should be made via CAST thereafter.

Action: EPA CBPO is working towards the release of the Progress Scenario, Milestone Evaluations, and 2025 Assessment. The WTWG will continue to remain informed of the timeline and next steps associated with these releases, and additional communications will take place in advance of the releases.

Action: EPA CBPO will be reaching out to schedule meetings in July to continue discussions related to Progress communications and pros and cons to additional ways to promote or discuss Progress.

Action: WTWG staff and leadership will continue to inform the WTWG on next steps related to Management Strategy development and Federal Facilities Workgroup. Members with particular interest in these topics are encouraged to attend the Federal Facilities Workgroup meeting (June 9th) to discuss the role of the FFWG in the CWGT structure and the Clean Water Goal Team Hybrid Meeting (June 22-23rd) to discuss management strategies, among other relevant topics.

Action: The WTWG will continue to be made aware of the E3 Scenario development for respective sectors. Those with interest in sector-specific E3 scenario development are encouraged to attend related meetings at the Agriculture, Forestry, Urban Stormwater, and Wastewater Treatment Workgroups. It is anticipated that the scenarios will be presented to the Clean Water Goal Team in August for discussion and for approval in September.

Action: Jess Rigelman, J7 LCC/CBPO Contractor, will follow up with David Wood, CSN, to confirm how to report regenerative stormwater conveyance for Progress.

Post Meeting Note: David Wood, CSN, confirmed the following: Dry Channel RSC are RR practices. Wet channel RSC are stream restoration practices and may be credited as Protocol 1 or 5, but not both. In limited cases, a dry channel RSC installed in ephemeral stream channels is credited as both an RR practice and stream restoration practice (Protocol 5). Protocol 4 reductions are subtracted from the pollutant load generated from the upland urban catchment it is treating, whereas the Protocol 5 reductions are subtracted from the urban stream bank load where the erosion is prevented. For documentation, you can refer to the Unified Guide: <https://chesapeakestormwater.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Unified->

[Document Clean 1.12.24 updated-links.pdf](#) Section 3.3.2 is most relevant to how the protocols interact with each other. Section 2.2.4 discusses dry channel RSC specifically.

Meeting Minutes

I. Introductions & Announcements

Lead: Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG

Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG, open the meeting, and the WTWG walked through the following announcements:

- Approval of the May 2026 WTWG Meeting Minutes
 - The WTWG approved the May 2026 meeting minutes.
- Reminder: Decommissioning of Open Node
 - Jess Rigelman, J7 Consulting LLC/CBPO Contractor, reminded the group that the CBP NEIEN node will be decommissioned on **August 31, 2026**. All Progress BMP submissions will be made via CAST.

Decisions:

1. The WTWG approved the May 2026 meeting minutes.

Actions:

1. CBP NEIEN node will be decommissioned on August 31, 2026. All Progress BMP submissions should be made via CAST thereafter.

Discussion Notes:

[Bill Keeling \(in chat\)](#): I have a future progress reporting NEIEN appendix question on regenerative stormwater conveyance reporting. If we have time after the agenda.

[Auston Smith](#): Thanks, Bill. We will have time to discuss your question after the agenda.

II. Update on the Release of the 2025 Annual Progress Scenario

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA

Auston Smith, EPA, provided a brief update on the release of 2025 Annual Progress and related communications, discussions, and coordination in advance of the release, anticipated late summer. In particular, Auston noted that draft progress discussions are underway. Auston also noted that a minor update did need to be made to the 2025 Progress scenario, but it should now be considered final. A reminder was made to the group that there are three products the EPA CBPO is working through the release of: Progress Scenario Release, Milestone Evaluations, and 2025 Assessment. The 2025 Assessment will be an overarching look at what has been done over the last 15 years and provide a look at where we are going. The Assessment is anticipated for release in early August, following the Progress Scenario's release. Additional communications will take place ahead of the release of these items. It is also anticipated that meetings will be set up in July to talk through pros and cons of various communication products and factors related to Progress.

Actions:

1. EPA CBPO is working towards the release of the Progress Scenario, Milestone Evaluations, and 2025 Assessment. The WTWG will continue to remain informed of the timeline and next

- steps associated with these releases, and additional communications will take place in advance of the releases.
2. EPA CBPO will be reaching out to schedule meetings in July to continue discussions related to Progress communications and pros and cons to additional ways to promote or discuss Progress.

III. Clean Water Goal Team Management Strategy and Structure Update

Lead: Caroline Kleis, CRC and Auston Smith, EPA

Caroline Kleis, CRC, provided an overview of the WTWG's role in the anticipated CWGT structure, as a result of decisions following the May CWGT meeting. Particular emphasis was made on the ongoing discussions related to the functions of the Federal Facilities Workgroup and whether or not those functions should be integrated into the WTWG. Auston and Caroline also made the group aware of the ongoing effort to update management strategies for the new outcomes and the initial thoughts shared by the WTWG leadership related to challenges, priority tasks, management approaches, and other considerations for the RENPS Management Strategy. Auston provided the group with a high level summary of these initial responses, which were largely generated using the Mentimeter results that were discussed in greater detail in May.

Actions:

1. WTWG staff and leadership will continue to inform the WTWG on next steps related to Management Strategy development and Federal Facilities Workgroup. Members with particular interest in these topics are encouraged to attend the Federal Facilities Workgroup meeting (June 9th) to discuss the role of the FFWG in the CWGT structure and the Clean Water Goal Team Hybrid Meeting (June 22-23rd) to discuss management strategies, among other relevant topics.

Discussion Notes:

Dave Montali: Are the technical workgroups excluded from that worksheet? I may have missed something, but I don't think so. I am not sure that, as the chair of the Modeling Workgroup, I got that worksheet.

Caroline Kleis: I don't believe that the Modeling Workgroup was asked to do that at this time. I think the ask was really to the source sector workgroups and Watershed Technical Workgroup for the RENPS outcome.

Norm Goulet: I was going to say to Dave, Dave's is easy! It is to finish Phase 7.

Dave Montali: We can talk that level or detail off the top of our heads about what we are going to be doing for the next two years.

IV. Update on the Development of E3 Scenarios

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA

The WTWG heard updates on respective workgroups' progress towards developing a draft E3 Scenario for their sectors. Auston reminded the group of the anticipated timeline, noting the August delivery of the E3 Scenarios to the CWGT for a decision in September, including on the Base Year. In particular, Auston noted ongoing discussions needed between Forestry, Urban Stormwater, and Ag Workgroup on certain assumptions requiring collaborative meetings. Auston encouraged participation at the source sector workgroups over the next two months, given the ongoing E3 discussions that will likely take place.

Actions:

1. The WTWG will continue to be made aware of the E3 Scenario development for respective sectors. Those with interest in sector-specific E3 scenario development are encouraged to attend related meetings at the Agriculture, Forestry, Urban Stormwater, and Wastewater Treatment Workgroups. It is anticipated that the scenarios will be presented to the Clean Water Goal Team in August for discussion and for approval in September.

Discussion Notes:

Norm Goulet: We are working with the Forestry Workgroup on a couple of the E3s. Just as a hypothetical, let's say there is a disagreement between the two workgroups. Is the CWGT going to become the arbitrator of this?

Auston Smith: That's my understanding, yes. If there is a sincere disagreement that hypothetically two workgroups cannot solve, I think that part of the August presentations, which they can create collaboratively, would speak to that disagreement and there would hopefully have a discussion around it in August. Then the Clean Water Goal Team, informed by those two workgroups, would need to make a decision in September.

Norm Goulet: Ok, I don't think we are going to get to that point. There has just been a lot of back and forth between the Forestry Workgroup and the [Urban Stormwater Workgroup]. They're tending to be a little bit more conservative, and I think they are a little too unrealistic. But, I don't know. Nothing I am willing to lay on a sword for.

Bill Keeling (in chat): Norm expect the AgWG to have similar issues with the FWG proposals.

Auston Smith: It's a good consideration. I have been working with you all to try and make it clear that this E3 Scenario is really kind of "pie in the sky" and not based in reality, but kind of based on the idea that if people are still here, what is the most possible that could be done, not thinking about money, staffing, or other constraints. Really what the land use is is maybe the only major constraint. I know a number of workgroups are talking about land use change constraints, to that point. So, I know multiple workgroups kind of have that to be ironed out in the next couple of months. Bill, I just wanted to speak to your comment I see in the chat. Is that largely to do with the Forestry Workgroup's Forest Harvesting practice proposal? Could you speak to that a little bit?

Bill Keeling: I think if you are talking about the current differences between the Forestry Workgroup buffer width and the AgWG buffer width and things like that, yeah, there's a departure in thinking.

Auston Smith: That is helpful. I know that is certainly on Eric and Katie's radar as a point of discussion. What width of buffer should be in the E3 Scenario? So, thanks for that flag. That is certainly on our radar as being something workgroups need to collaborate on.

Bill Keeling: When we did the Bay TMDL, we were at 2010 No Action, and we had a 2010 Planning Horizon. For WIP 3, that was turned to 2025 I believe. I am not quite sure how that relates to whether E3 should be based on a future land use or some current one.

Auston Smith: Good question. My understanding is that the E3, No Action, and a lot of the other scenarios that will be produced later in the Fall are on current land use. So, it is ensuring that the model, as it is, is functioning as we thought. The major scenario that needs to be on a future land use, possibly 2040, would be the WIP scenarios. Jess, is that general understanding correct?

Jess Rigelman: Yes. I think that the understanding is that some of the decisions that will need to be made about planning targets, which takes into effect E3, No Action, and all Forest, should be done on the Land Use that isn't going to change. We only have the land use through 2022, and Peter and team is going to produce a projected land use up to 2040 in the October/November/December timeframe. When they get the new updated land use for an updated version of CAST, those things change. The thought is you should pick a land use year that is going to be static throughout the lifetime of Phase 7. So, the latest that is going to be is 2022.

Bill Keeling: I see a disconnect between what we are using to set targets and allocations and then what we are using for planning.

Auston Smith: I can't really disagree with you there. Why the planning effort and the targets aren't on the same land use is because of that major point that Jess just put. Otherwise, it would make sense for it to be on a future land use. If it is on a future land use, assumptions would change each time there is a new model, and that is a communications headache across the partnership. So, that will be something that I think the Clean Water Goal Team would really have to put in front of the Management Board and the PSC.

Bill Keeling: Ok.

V. Additional Topic of Discussion Requested- Reporting of Regenerative Stormwater Conveyance

Bill Keeling, VA DEQ, requested an additional agenda item to discuss reporting of regenerative stormwater conveyance.

Actions:

1. Jess Rigelman, J7 LCC/CBPO Contractor, will follow up with David Wood, CSN, to confirm how to report regenerative stormwater conveyance for Progress.
 - a. Post Meeting Note: David Wood, CSN, confirmed the following: Dry Channel RSC are RR practices. Wet channel RSC are stream restoration practices and may be credited as Protocol 1 or 5, but not both. In limited cases, a dry channel RSC installed in ephemeral stream channels is credited as both an RR practice and stream restoration practice (Protocol 5). Protocol 4 reductions are subtracted from the pollutant load generated from the upland urban catchment it is treating, whereas the Protocol 5 reductions are subtracted from the urban stream bank load where the erosion is prevented. For documentation, you can refer to the Unified Guide: https://chesapeakestormwater.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Unified-Documents/Clean_1.12.24_updated-links.pdf Section 3.3.2 is most relevant to how the protocols interact with each other. Section 2.2.4 discusses dry channel RSC specifically.

Discussion Notes:

Bill Keeling: I have a locality that is asking about how to report regenerative Stormwater conveyance. They are saying it is eligible using different protocols, and they've given me the Expert Panel report and it's various iterations. If I am reading it right, it should be reported as stream restoration protocols. There is a wet and a dry regenerative channel listed in the report and there are different protocols being eligible. So, it just seems like it would be confusing to report a regenerative stormwater system as stream restoration when it may or may not be. I believe they would like to report it as what is installed to reduce confusion. Currently, regenerative stormwater conveyance is listed as NA status or not available, and it only has one measurement. In essence, it gets mapped to stream restoration but we add to the Appendix wet and dry, regenerative stormwater, and the various protocols that are allowed to be reported so we can accept the reporting. I am a little confused as to what to collect and/or what to send you guys, so I just want to get it straight if that is eligible.

Jess Rigelman: I got a question through the CAST contact desk. I am guessing it is the same locale. I went through my notes from the beginning of Phase 6 and found that we had said it should be reported as a Stormwater performance standard. I don't know if it is RR or ST. I have never heard of it being reported as stream restoration. I can double check with David Wood on that to get you what he would say. But, it would either be RR or ST or one of the stream restoration protocols. It certainly could, but I don't think it would be listed as regenerative

stormwater conveyance. It would just be the urban with protocols 1-5. I can't give you a clear answer. Let me speak with David Wood and get back to you on that.

Bill Keeling: Part of the issue is one of the conveyances can report either Protocol 1 or Protocol 5, but not both. So, it is not exactly clear. The Appendix is normally written for the state and what we got to report, but this was written more for the locality or reporting to the state. So, I am not clear on how to do it. It is different things to set up in our template if it is going to be stormwater treatment or runoff reduction and what has to be collected/reported versus protocols. There are different, so I just want to be clear.

Jess Rigelman: I understand. I don't know enough about it to actually give you a clear answer, but I will follow up and get back to you.

VI. Wrap-Up

Lead: Caroline Kleis, CRC

VII. Adjourn

Next Meeting: July 2nd, from 10:00AM-12:00PM

Attendees:

Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG
Christina Lysterly, MDE
Auston Smith, EPA
Caroline Kleis, CRC
Emily Dekar, USC
Bill Keeling, VA DEQ
Dave Montali, Tetra Tech
Arianna Johns, VA DEQ
Clint Gill, DDA
Matt Kofroth, LCCD
Michael LaSala, LandStudies
Jess Rigelman, J7 LLC/ CBPO Contractor
Josh Glace, Larson Design Group
Norm Goulet, NVRC
Eugenia Hart, Tetra Tech
Ashley Hullinger, PA DEP
Alicia Ritzenthaler, DOEE
Olivia Martin, Devereux Consulting