



Watershed Technical Workgroup

May 7, 2026
10:00AM-11:00AM

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

Purpose: This is the monthly meeting of the Watershed Technical Workgroup. Agenda topics include relevant announcements, an update on 2025 Progress communications outreach, and a follow-up to the future topics brainstorm at the April 2026 meeting.

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: The WTWG approved the April 2026 meeting minutes.

Action: The Clean Water Goal Team will have a hybrid meeting on June 22nd and 23rd, with in person participation at the MDE office in Baltimore, MD. If you would like to join the meeting but are not on the CWGT distribution list, please reach out to Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov) for the RSVP form.

Action: The CWGT will host an office hours session on May 12th to continue discussions on workgroup structure under the CWGT. WTWG members interested in attending can learn more [here](#).

Action: It is anticipated at this time that source sector workgroups will provide their E3 Scenario assumptions for review at the August CWGT meeting, and finalization will take place at the September CWGT meeting. The WTWG will continue to remain informed of the Progress of E3 Scenario development.

Action: Auston Smith, EPA, will be reaching out to schedule informal meetings to discuss the draft Progress Scenario. The meeting scheduling request will go to those who were also included on the earlier verification calls, though jurisdictions should feel free to send the meeting invitation to other colleagues as needed. Notes on QAPPs will be distributed within the next week.

Action: Please reach out to Sushanth Gupta, Christina Lyerly, Auston Smith, and Caroline Kleis with any additional feedback on the [key themes](#) used to summarize the April 2026 Mentimeter topic brainstorm activity. In particular, please note any topics you would like to prioritize from the [list](#) and/or any speakers you would like to see come to future WTWG meetings.

Meeting Minutes

I. Introductions & Announcements

Lead: Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG

Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG, walked the group through the following announcements:

- Approval of the April WTWG Meeting Minutes
 - The WTWG approved the April meeting minutes.
- Upcoming WQGIT/CWGT Hybrid Meeting

- The Clean Water Goal Team (CWGT) will have a hybrid meeting on June 22nd and 23rd, with in person participation at the MDE office in Baltimore, MD. This meeting is tentatively planned to have a split focus across the two days: Modeling and Nutrients (Day 1) and GT Operations and Management Strategy (Day 2). Meeting materials, including the agenda with a link to join virtually will be posted as soon as possible [here](#). If you would like to join the meeting but are not on the CWGT distribution list, please reach out to Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov) for the RSVP form.
- Auston Smith, EPA, also noted the upcoming CWGT office hours on May 12th to discuss the proposed workgroup structure under the CWGT. Auston noted that it has been proposed that the Federal Facilities Workgroup may sunset and dissolve its responsibilities into the work of the WTWG. Discussion will take place both on the office hours of the 12th and the May 18th CWGT meeting. If you'd like to join and share your opinions on this proposal, the agenda and link are posted [here](#).
- E3 Scenario
 - All the sector workgroups, this group, and the Clean Water Goal Team have had overviews on how the E3 and the No Action scenario are used to produce the controllable loads which, along with the finalization of the hydrologic and critical period, will help provide us with a model for reviewing in 2027. Auston noted that he is tentatively targeting an August CWGT review of the E3 input documents with the hope that by September at the CWGT, those assumptions can be finalized. Auston will continue to keep the WTWG up to date as inputs and adjustments are finalized by source sector workgroups, in advance of the September CWGT meeting.

Decisions:

1. The WTWG approved the April 2026 meeting minutes.

Actions:

1. The Clean Water Goal Team will have a hybrid meeting on June 22nd and 23rd, with in person participation at the MDE office in Baltimore, MD. If you would like to join the meeting but are not on the CWGT distribution list, please reach out to Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov) for the RSVP form.
2. The CWGT will host an office hours session on May 12th to continue discussions on workgroup structure under the CWGT. WTWG members interested in attending can learn more [here](#).
3. It is anticipated at this time that source sector workgroups will provide their E3 Scenario assumptions for review at the August CWGT meeting, and finalization will take place at the September CWGT meeting. The WTWG will continue to remain informed of the Progress of E3 Scenario development.

Discussion Notes:

Norm Goulet: What was [the Federal Facility Workgroup's] function? What was their overlap?

Auston Smith: At the Federal Facilities Workgroup, a lot of what we discuss are Federal Facility specific reporting updates and Progress messaging. For Phase 7, there was more work that the Workgroup was helping to handle. They had to help finalize the Federal Facility data layer and, after many months of analysis aided by Peter Claggett's group, dove into the possibility of being able to account for BMPs on different land uses than were already there. So, they had some pre Phase 7 prep work. Outside of that, a lot of the discussions are adjacent to BMP reporting and Progress topics. So, it has been proposed that if there's time on the WTWG agendas, there could be time allowed to absorb topics there. There is also an overlap of a lot of the jurisdictional

membership. So, these are some of the reasons why the migration had been suggested. I hope that gets at your question, and I am happy to dive in further as I can.

Norm Goulet: Thanks.

Auston Smith: Again, none of this is finalized. This is going to be discussed further. There are, rightfully so, some questions about how all of that would work. So, tune in for the office hours on the 12th if you are able to.

Bill Keeling (in chat): Would there be a federal entity that is responsible for federal reporting for facilities outside state control?

Auston Smith: Great question, Bill. In short, we don't know. That does not sound like a bad idea to me. There have been structural adjustment ideas thrown around. One of which is ensuring some representation through At-Large membership for Federal Facility representation. I think a lot of that will be discussed on the 12th and certainly at the 18th, the Clean Water Goal Team's next actual meeting.

II. 2025 Progress Communications Outreach

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA

Auston Smith, EPA, provided an update on communications surrounding the release of the 2025 Annual Progress scenario. Auston noted that he will be reaching out to schedule meetings with each jurisdiction. July is still the targeted month for the release of the Progress scenario, with the hope of tying the release to the release of the milestone evaluations.

Actions:

1. Auston Smith, EPA, will be reaching out to schedule informal meetings to discuss the draft Progress Scenario. The meeting scheduling request will go to those who were also included on the earlier verification calls, though jurisdictions should feel free to send the meeting invitation to other colleagues as needed. Notes on QAPPs will be distributed within the next week.

III. Follow-Up to April Meeting Topic Brainstorm

Lead: Caroline Kleis, CRC; Auston Smith, EPA

Caroline Kleis, CRC, provided the group with an overview of the key themes of topics received through the Mentimeter activity at the April 2026 WTWG meeting. The group was asked to prioritize these areas of interest and provide any remaining feedback on topics or speakers for future WTWG meetings.

Actions:

1. Please reach out to Sushanth Gupta, Christina Lyerly, Auston Smith, and Caroline Kleis with any additional feedback on the [key themes](#) used to summarize the April 2026 Mentimeter topic brainstorm activity. In particular, please note any topics you would like to prioritize from the [list](#) and/or any speakers you would like to see come to future WTWG meetings.

Discussion Notes:

Bill Keeling (in chat): Is review of p7 calibration data included in specific technical areas of interest?

Auston Smith: I think it can be. I think that this Workgroup would be well poised to help add a level of review to areas that the source sector workgroups of the Clean Water Goal Team will be helping to review. My understanding is that there is a structure that will need to come from the Clean Water Goal Team telling each workgroup to review certain sections of the model. So, I think that some of the calibration data for this group makes sense as a good topic. I know that

there have been discussions about some of the review of this data before the model year of review begins in 2027 as well.

Bill Keeling (in chat): Our group transcends all sectors so we are stuck with review of everything. Ergo make any suggested changes to the calibration data if any.

Auston Smith: Absolutely, Bill. We help with the review of everything to do with this model. So, I would say that your first comment is certainly a valid topic of concern. I know that the AMT has put forward a notice that they would like to be in the review of this prior to 2027 as well. So, as it makes sense, maybe complimenting that effort here would be good.

Kevin Du Bois (in chat): In our discussions with Caroline, I know we would like to see more bay-wide adoption of innovative BMPs for crediting in the model

Auston Smith: Absolutely, Kevin. As we can further develop that suite of available BMPs, absolutely. We will be trying to put that expert panel protocol to use.

Suzanne Trevena: I don't know if this is a question you guys would know off the top of your head. But, in the Clean Water Goal Team, there's a lot of discussion around doing a better job of balancing modeling and monitoring data. I don't know if that would come to this group or if it would happen in a different space. But, thinking about how we have good tools with METRIC and things like that, how do we bring that into conversations around using Progress? Is that something you guys would be covering here or does that maybe stay in the Clean Water Goal Team space? I am not really sure.

Kaylyn Gootman: I will be talking about this at the Clean Water Goal Team meeting this month, so please tune in if you weren't going to already. But, I think this conversation needs to happen at this workgroup level as well, and not just at the higher level of the Clean Water Goal Team. It is going to involve the monitoring folks. It is going to involve the Modeling Workgroup and the office Modeling Team. It's not just the world of Progress, too. So, I do hope this is a primer to please come ready to contribute to the start of discussion. It would be my preference to have the conversation at multiple levels. When I think Watershed Technical, I think a lot about expertise with the model and it's application, which is a critical piece.

Auston Smith: Thank you, Kaylyn, really well said. I think it would be a good topic for us to support on, along with some of the workgroups that Kaylyn highlighted, to showcase how monitoring data is already integrated and some of the improvements that the team is working on for Phase 7. Getting that in front of the leadership and the public in general, is a major focus. Maybe that falls under specific technical areas of interest, but it fits across a lot of the work.

Dylan Burgevin (in chat): For reporting and verification if we could "clean up" the NEIEN appendix that would be helpful.

Auston Smith: Thank you, Dylan. If there are specific adjustments already on your radar, if you could send us an email and we will absolutely work over the summer to ensure that that is tailored for 2026 Progress as best we can. If you want to put that right in front of us, we can ensure that some adjustment can be made.

Dylan Burgevin (in chat): Will do thanks!

The topic of conversation shifted to adjustments needed to the Tree Canopy over Impervious and Compacted Pervious loading rate ratios for Phase 7. Additional details on this topic were presented by David Wood, CSN, at the May 18th Clean Water Goal Team Meeting. View the related slides from David Wood [here](#).

Norm Goulet: Jess, could you give us an update as to where we stand with the loading rate discussion over the last couple of days? Peter has made the recommendation that they all be recalculated. I haven't heard anything from the Bay Program committing to that recalculation.

Jessica Rigelman: I sent Peter the data he needed this morning. He has spoken with Auston and Jeremy about it, and he was 10 minutes on the CWGT agenda on the 18th to discuss it. As far as my understanding of loading rates go, they are in general part of the calibration and will be re-

calculated. I think the larger discussion is the change to the tree canopy over impervious loading rate ratio. I will let Auston speak more to that, but I think loading rates, in general, are a part of the new land use and the new calibration and will get recalculated. We just need to figure out what the loading rate ratio is or any adjustments to those ratios due to it. But, it is being worked on, and you should get an answer on the 18th. Peter will follow-up sooner.

Auston Smith: We are going to try and shoehorn this topic in to the CWGT meeting on the 18th. It is a necessary model update, so we are not trying to have a discussion and come back for a decision. This is a necessary item that has to be done. But, there are some specifications still that need to be ironed out for the Tree Canopy Over Impervious (TCI), as Jess mentioned.

Norm Goulet: The TCI seemed to be the least of our issues. This was a major oversight.

Jess Rigelman: I am not sure it was a major oversight. I just don't think the work was done yet because to calculate the loading rates, we needed final land uses to get into the calibration. So, yes, I think the communication of it was a major oversight. I think we were going to address it, we just hadn't yet because we hadn't gotten that far between myself, Gopal, and Joseph. So, yes, I get what you are saying, Norm, and it will be addressed. I think the plan all along was for it to be addressed. It just wasn't communicated properly. Does that alleviate your concern?

Norm Goulet: Yeah. The tenor I was getting from Peter's email was there was a reluctance to talk about the ag side of the equation. Looking at the numbers he cranked out, it seemed very appropriate that all of the land uses were going to have to be recalculated.

Jess Rigelman: Yes. The ag ones are handled a little bit differently. So, he is correct that it is a minor if at all a difference, but they are going to be discussed in this. If there is something that needs to be adjusted, we will have to make the necessary adjustments. Agreed.

Norm Goulet: Ok, great. I appreciate it guys.

Auston Smith: Jess, for my own education, is the effect on ag less because of a reliance on the ag census?

Jess Rigelman: It's mainly because they are kind of a separate category and have their loading rates determined by ratios amongst crop and pasture. So, yes, we need to look at crop and pasture acres. But, the relative loading rates amongst all the 16 agricultural land uses are not developed by the process/calibration. It is just the cropland and pasture that is adjusted.

Auston Smith: Thank you. Norm, we've got this topic in front of CWGT leadership and will ensure that this is discussed on the 18th. We will inform the sector workgroups of that finalized work in some manner as needed.

Norm Goulet: Thank you, guys.

Bill Keeling (in chat): With the changes agreed to at various workgroups there will be by definition changes from what was used for p6 calibration.

Sushanth Gupta: These slides are posted, and we would really value your guys' feedback. So, feel free to email Auston, Caroline, Christina, and I if you have any thoughts on the team's next steps and the questions that were brought up by Auston.

IV. Wrap-Up

Lead: Caroline Kleis, CRC

V. Adjourn

Next Meeting: June 4th, 2026, from 10:00AM-12:00PM

Attendees:

Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG
Christina Lyerly, MDE
Auston Smith, EPA
Caroline Kleis, CRC

Bill Keeling, VA DEQ
Christina Lyerly, MDE
Arianna Johns, VA DEQ
Cass Klingaman, NYSDEC

Joseph Schell, DNREC
Megan Thyng, EPA
Norm Goulet, NVRC
Dylan Burgevin, MDE
Josh Glace, Larson Design Group
Eugenia Hart, Tetra Tech
Lori Brown, DNREC

Alicia Ritzenthaler, DOEE
Kaylyn Gootman, EPA
Jess Rigelman, J7 Consulting/ CBPO
Clint Gill, DDA
Rachel Owrutsky, DNREC
Kevin Du Bois, DoW
Suzanne Trevena, EPA