



**Chesapeake Bay Program  
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)  
Conference call**  
Thursday, May 5, 2016  
10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

**MINUTES**

Summary of Action and Decision Items

**ACTION:** Once the Trading and Offsets Workgroup and WQGIT leadership meet to discuss the path forward for the tracking trades in NEIEN, James, Teresa or Pat will report back to the WTWG on next steps.

**ACTION:** Matt will use the CTIC database to provide the percent breakdown of the acres in conservation tillage in spreadsheet format to the jurisdictions prior to the September 30<sup>th</sup> data submission deadline.

**ACTION:** CBP will rerun the NEIEN error reports in May and provide them to the states prior to the June data submission deadline.

**ACTION:** CBP will hold one on one calls with each jurisdiction prior to the June draft data submission deadline to discuss the NEIEN error reports and graphs of historic BMP data for each sector.

**DECISION:** The proposed NEIEN appendix changes will be incorporated for the July Beta 2 calibration of the Phase 6 Model.

Welcome and Introductions – Ted Tesler, Chair

Comments re: Proposed NEIEN Schema Changes for Trading - Pat Gleason, EPA

Maryland and Virginia walked through the comments they provided on the proposed NEIEN Schema changes for trading, and Pat Gleason (EPA), described EPA's perspective, given the comments received.

**Discussion:**

- Matt Johnston (Coordinator, UMD): Would other jurisdictions like to share their thoughts on the proposal?
  - Ben Sears (NYSDEC): We don't trade in New York currently, so we don't have any comments.
  - Marcia Fox (DE DNREC): We are also not trading or doing any offset programs in Delaware.
  - Alana Hartman (WV DEP): We have a couple of case by case trades, but nothing significant. We don't have any comments at this point.
  - Marty Hurd (DOEE): I mentioned that we are having a sector growth analysis done. A lot of time these workgroups meet separately. EPA and the Bay Program may not be on the same page, because we don't specifically report loads that are pounds removed by any particular implementation. The Model will do that conversion for us. It seems here we are being asked to report specific pound reductions for projects.
    - Johnston: It is a good point. I hear from some states that they are using other tools to calculate load reductions and they want to report those loads, but in D.C., you want to report the number of BMPs and flag them. That was the original intent, but we are hearing from other states that that bypasses some of their efforts.
  - Hurd: To clarify, any trade done in D.C. is because of a stormwater permit requirement to retain something onsite. It is not to offset growth, it is a permit requirement on a particular development.

- Johnston: Good point, but in that case, I wouldn't expect D.C. to flag those if NEIEN were asking to flag trades and offsets.
- Johnston: Pat, what would you like from this workgroup and the partnership in general moving forward?
  - Gleason: I think what is really important is the 2025 land use projection decision. Until we see that and have discussions and sector growth is impacted, I don't think we would be ready to talk about this for another 6 months.
- Johnston: Is there a need for you and Ted to follow-up with the WQGIT on this?
  - Gleason: I am supposed to have a discussion with James and Teresa on the role of the Trading and Offsets Workgroup, so it would be good to discuss whether a recommendation should come from the TOWG to the WQGIT.
- Bill Keeling (VA DEQ): Any change to the NEIEN process is potentially a big deal and very costly because of how we make changes to our data.
- Jason Keppler (MDA): Will there be recommendations or a task issued from the WQGIT down to the workgroups to look at this issue further?
  - Johnston: Until the conversation with James and Teresa happens, I don't know the next steps.

ACTION: Once the Trading and Offsets Workgroup and WQGIT leadership meet to discuss the path forward for the tracking trades in NEIEN, James, Teresa or Pat will report to the WTWG on next steps.

#### Preliminary Agricultural BMP Reports for the Phase 6 Model – Mark Dubin, UMD

Mark reviewed preliminary reports written by each Phase 6 agricultural BMP panel, and provided the group with a timeline for revisions. The purpose of the reports is to provide both the Modeling Team and states information relevant to the collection of historic BMPs for the Phase 6 calibration effort. The final reports will include much more detail, including specific efficiencies for each BMP.

#### **Conservation Tillage:**

- Johnston: By May 19<sup>th</sup> these preliminary reports will be edited and we will know exactly what will go into NEIEN for the July calibration and final calibration.
- Keeling: Have the panels delivered preliminary efficiency values?
  - Johnston: If they decide on efficiency values by May 19<sup>th</sup> we can calibrate them in. The practices will be in NEIEN for you to report them though.
  - Dubin: I think it is doubtful that the efficiencies will be ready for prime time by May 19<sup>th</sup>.

#### **Nutrient Management:**

- Johnston: For the WTWG to report historic acres, do you expect the Nutrient Management panel will have a list of historic acres for states to use and put into the calibration by May 19<sup>th</sup>?
  - Dubin: Yes. Each panel is being asked to address historic implementation acres. Regardless of what the recommendations are though, it is still up to states to report actual acres to NEIEN.
    - Keeling: Panels would give states acres of practices?
      - Dubin: The panels will be recommending a process for incorporating and managing historical data.
- Keeling: The tiers will go away, or there will be a crosswalk? We went through a lot of effort to map acres to the tiers.
  - Dubin: Tentatively, yes, the tiers are going away. However, I wouldn't do anything until we get a partnership decision. I would say tier 1 is close to the core nutrient management recommendations.
- Keeling: I think panel and partnership should weigh in on a crosswalk.
  - Hartman: I agree.

- Keppler: Will compliance rates be considered in the recommendations?
  - Dubin: Yes, the panel will be utilizing historic data to the best of their abilities for how to represent compliance in a process. They are recommending using 2015 Progress data as the last point in the trend, and in that sense it would be representative.

#### **Cover crops:**

- Dubin: This panel is a little delayed, and it will be a struggle to get recommendations by May 19<sup>th</sup>. There is more flexibility for change in this preliminary report.

#### **Manure Incorporation/Injection:**

- Johnston: This BMP already has a place in NEIEN and you can report it, so please do so.
- Keeling: it is currently draft right? And once approved it would go to release?
  - Johnston: Correct.
- Keeling: How does this relate to the Manure Treatment Technology (MTT) panel recommendations if the panel changes the nutrient concentration?
  - Dubin: The MTT panel handles what happens at the facility. Once manure leaves there and goes to the field for application, this BMP comes into play.
  - Johnston: From a modeling perspective, the current idea is that MTT changes the amount of manure nutrients available to land application. Right now MII is a percent reduction to runoff.
- Keeling: But there is no current crosswalk correct?
  - Dubin: By the time the MII report comes out, we will be done with the MTT report and this group would need to address how the BMPs would get stacked. We are changing the total nutrient availability for application and this group will have that in the forefront of their decision making process.
- Johnston: Based on what we have on May 19<sup>th</sup>, we will pass along any changes to the NEIEN appendix for your review and approval.

#### **Discussion:**

- Tesler: I wasn't aware that the panels would be evaluating how to address historic data. It is difficult for them to have all the information on that.
  - Dubin: Historic data is something the panels were asked to address, particularly from the modeling team. It ultimately comes down to the jurisdictions to make the numbers work and put them in place.
- Keeling: Nutrient Management and Conservation Tillage both have the potential to rework significant amounts of what we reported. On the Conservation Tillage front, Matt provided a spreadsheet of the breakdown, but it was only the total percent of acres with Conservation Tillage. It would be on you to look back at CTIC data to do additional breakdown or provide us the data so we can do that.
  - Johnston: That is all available online by county in the percentages the panel are talking about. There is a link in the Tillage preliminary report to the CTIC database.
    - Keeling: We have gotten pdfs from each county and I needed to hand pull the data out.
    - Johnston: That is what we did here to get to those spreadsheets.

**ACTION:** Matt will use the CTIC database to provide the percent breakdown of the acres in conservation tillage in spreadsheet format to the jurisdictions prior to the September 30<sup>th</sup> data submission deadline.

- Dubin: We are hoping to have a preliminary Animal Waste Storage Systems preliminary report by May 19<sup>th</sup> as well.
  - Keeling: I would add that to the reports that need a crosswalk, in addition to conservation tillage, nutrient management and manure treatment technology.

- Chris Brosch (DDA): The Agriculture Ditch Panel, invited members and is getting ready to schedule their open stakeholder session. We will post that information on the CBP website when it is available.
  - Tesler: Is the panel looking at headwater diversions or roadside ditches?
    - Brosch: The panel is looking at all agricultural drainage ditches in the Bay watershed. The panel will do its best to identify any crossover with roadside ditches and hand that off to the Urban Stormwater Workgroup for when they have the resources available to tackle another panel.

#### Review of April Historic Data Cleanup Effort - Matt Johnston, UMD

Matt provided a summary of the historic data received to date by sector and state, and outlined a process for improving the data for the July calibration.

#### **Discussion:**

- Johnston: Is it possible to have revised draft data for BMPs in NEIEN by June 17<sup>th</sup> instead of June 30<sup>th</sup>? Modelers are concerned that waiting until June 30<sup>th</sup> could cause a delay because of the holiday. Final deadline is still September 30<sup>th</sup>.
  - No comments were raised.
- Brosch: I am looking at the slides and struggling to see what the graphs are saying for Delaware because the y-axis is so large.
  - Johnston: The purpose is to show what is going on across all states. I hope everyone looks at BMP summary data and NEIEN error reports posted after the April calibration.
- Keeling: We have already resubmitted since then, so I would need to you to rerun the error reports.
  - Johnston: We can do that in May so you know where you stand heading into June.
- Fox: Can you share the graphs by state?
  - Johnston: Before each call, I will do a similar thing for each state so you can see where you stand. For those that have resubmitted, we will rerun the error reports and the numbers will change.

ACTION: CBP will rerun the NEIEN error reports in May and provide them to the states prior to the June data submission deadline.

ACTION: CBP will hold one on one calls with each jurisdiction prior to the June draft data submission deadline to discuss the NEIEN error reports, and graphs of historic BMP data for each sector.

#### NEIEN Appendix Changes for Historic Data Cleanup Effort - Matt Johnston, UMD

Matt will provide a list of changes proposed to allow the states to more easily submit historic data for the cleanup effort, and review a list of land use

#### **Discussion:**

- Keeling: For manure transport, I thought we were going to have litter in Phase 6, not as-excreted. Wouldn't the default be to the default nutrient content in litter?
  - Johnston: That is a good point. For broilers that will work out well because the moisture content is 25%. For others, the moisture content is still based on as-excreted values because we didn't have information to do that in the Poultry Litter Subcommittee report.
- Keeling: What if we just have data for poultry litter?
  - Johnston: As of now, Scenario Builder will divvy it up proportionally.
- Hartman: For composter facilities, I think the definition still says it has to be poultry.

- Johnston: We have a change coming in July based on MSU data on nutrient content for dead animals so that you will be able to report composter facilities on any type of animal.
- Tesler: Can we drop verification on tree planting if it will get incorporated into the imagery?
  - Fox: That was how I included it in Delaware's verification plan.
    - Tesler: I like that concept.
- Tesler: Are there any other comments or concerns with incorporating the proposed NEIEN appendix changes?
  - No other comments were raised

DECISION: The proposed NEIEN appendix changes will be incorporated for the July Beta 2 calibration of the Phase 6 Model.

#### Updates from BMP Panel Members – All

- Jeremy Hanson (VT): The Manure Treatment Technology panel comment period has closed. Comments were received from a variety of stakeholders and we are in the process of organizing and responding to those comments. The Urban Tree Canopy panel report was just released on Tuesday for public comment by June 9<sup>th</sup>. They will hold a webinar on May 20<sup>th</sup> at 10:00am to discuss their recommendations.

#### Adjourned

#### **List of Call Participants**

<b>Member Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Ted Tesler (Chair)	PA DEP
Matt Johnston (Coordinator)	UMD, CBPO
David Wood (Staff)	CRC
Olivia Devereux	DEC
Chris Brosch	DDA
Marcia Fox	DE DNREC
Marty Hurd	DOEE
Pat Gleason	EPA
Sarah Lane	MD DNR
Jason Keppler	MDA
Greg Sandi	MDE
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Ben Sears	NYSDEC
Bill Keeling	VA DEQ
Mark Dubin	UMD
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Alana Hartman	WV DEP