

MEETING SUMMARY
Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
October 1st, 2012, 10:00AM – 3:00 PM
Joe Macknis Memorial Conference Room
Annapolis, MD

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18737/>

ACTION ITEMS & DECISIONS

DECISION: The proposed changes were accepted for incorporation as optional NEIEN reporting elements, with the exception of 1(e) (“performance standard”) that will remain a free text element.

ACTION: Jurisdictions should send their feedback or any revisions for animal population projections to Jeff Sweeney (jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net) by Friday, October 5th.

ACTION: Comments on the draft grant guidance should be submitted to Jeff Sweeney (jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net) by October 15th.

DECISION: The Proposal for a NEIEN Open Enrollment Period was approved for submission to the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team.

ACTION: WTWG members with questions or suggestions about the Army Corps of Engineers’ BMP database projects can contact Rinker (jason.s.rinker@usace.army.mil) or Shuster (michael.j.schuster@usace.army.mil) directly.

SUMMARY

1. Welcome & Introduction

- Alana Hartman (WV DEP; WTWG Chair) called the meeting to order.
- Hartman asked for comments or changes to the [September 5th WTWG conference call minutes](#).
 - Bill Keeling (VA DCR) still needed to review them.
 - No other comments or objections were heard.

2. Prioritization of Midpoint Assessment Comments

- Katherine Antos (EPA, CBPO) discussed the goals of the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team’s (WQGIT) October 22nd-23rd meeting, midpoint assessment schedule, and the WTWG’s priorities. View her presentation [here](#).
 - Slides 4 and 5 list some of the questions that need to be answered during or after the WQGIT meeting.
 - Slide 10 explains the two parallel tracks: while conducting these actions such as revising the tools, we also have to continue putting in place 60% of our goals by 2017, be guided by our WIP and milestones, and be evaluated by the watershed model v. 5.3.2.

- Beth Horsey (MDA) [referring to slide 5] asked how the workgroups will decide how the priorities relate to the draft guiding principles, and how the principles will be communicated to the workgroup.
 - Antos acknowledged that the draft principles were still subject to change based on recent comments from the Management Board and others.
- Hartman noted the WTWG has been discussing the midpoint assessment since its [August 1st meeting](#), and she asked if the workgroup members felt the priorities ([Attachment 3](#)) had been sufficiently vetted to capture what the WTWG wanted.
 - Keeling suggested adding a phrase on an “analysis of the appropriate use” of the model (e.g., scale) to priority #1; he referenced Kenn Pattison’s 1999 tributary strategies memo about real-time use rather than 10-year annual averages to represent progress. Keeling will share more details on a revised memo at a later date. He also stated that if the goal is to produce a local tool that can be used at a county scale, then the model may not achieve that since it addresses regional scale questions.
 - Gary Shenk (EPA, CBPO) pointed out that there is an indicator based on monitoring data from each year, and that the indicator was produced as a result of a discussion about temporal averaging that occurred approximately 10 years ago.
 - Keeling expressed concern that the difference between the progress and actual loads isn’t communicated well enough. He explained the public often interprets the progress run as a reflection of that year’s actual loads, though it is based on a 10-year average rather than actual flow.
 - Matt Johnston (UMD) noted that the ChesapeakeStat staff is working with him and Jeff Sweeney to improve some of the communications issues, including a better way to communicate the temporal averaging pointed out by Keeling.
 - Greg Sandi (MDE) suggested adding “septics” to the list of local data elements that should be improved. This would be 3(e) in the document.
 - Ted Tesler (PA DEP) asked about Priority #2 and how difficult the lag-time issue would be.
 - Shenk noted that lag-time has been a known issue for a while, and it remains a complicated problem. If lag-time was incorporated into the calibration, it would have to be taken out to run scenarios.
 - Keeling and Norm Goulet (NVRC) felt the first priority needed clearer language to suggest the schedule for Phase III WIP development should account for changes in the model.
 - Goulet felt this lent itself to discussion of (1) the use of the model at the local scale, and (2) is the model for compliance or for planning?
 - Shenk noted the language may need to be changed and explained his interpretation that #3 and #4 go together: incorporate good local data when available; when not available, have good local assumptions.
 - Antos noted that the model was not originally developed for the purpose of local level engagement. She cautioned that a 64,000-sq. mi. watershed model will probably never make sense at a site-specific level, so the WQGIT should focus on

how it can reasonably improve the model and associated tools for phase III WIP outreach and engagement.

- Horsey agreed the model was never intended as a measurement or an engagement tool, but as a planning tool; she observed it was now used as a measurement tool.
 - Goulet commented it was now also used as a compliance tool; he pointed to recent (sub-county level) Phase II MS4 permits that were based on data from the Watershed Model. He agreed with Antos that the model was never intended for that purpose, but it was happening anyway.
 - Keeling reiterated his comment about the appropriate scale for using the model, and suggested that permit writers need to be aware of the scale issues.
- Hartman noted her discussions with Goulet about local planning tools, and suggested that this is an issue the WTWG can work on over the next 6-12 months, by hearing examples of local implementation planning and benefitting from those shared exchanges.
- Johnston asked if Hartman should point out at the WQGIT's October meeting that the WTWG will analyze available tools in the watershed and advise the WQGIT over coming months.
 - Hartman suggested the WTWG should express that as part of its role, with the caveat that it may not be able to assess the tools in the time allotted and will seek guidance from the GIT as appropriate.
- Hartman asked for comments on priority #5.
 - Keeling pointed to issues when sediment and phosphorous do not display similar outputs, which raises questions given the link between the pollutants.
 - Shenk noted that the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) has a group working on phosphorous dynamics. Specific suggestions are sought.
 - Goulet explained that local governments have interest in the different in-stream sediment loads and sediments loads coming off the land.
 - Shenk acknowledged this is a very complicated question without good data; the expired Sediment Workgroup was unable to make any substantive progress on the issue. Olivia summarized the current modeling philosophy is that sediment came off the land at some point.
 - Keeling observed that the estuarine model displays that resuspension of sediment is a larger impediment to water clarity than the sediment loads running off the land.
- Hartman thanked everyone for their specific input that she and Matt will use to refine the WTWG's priorities in preparation for the WQGIT meeting on October 22nd and 23rd.

ACTION: Hartman will present the WTWG's priorities at the Oct. 22-23 WQGIT meeting, using Attachment 3 and adding "3E: septics"

3. 2012 Progress Updates

- Jeff Sweeney's (EPA, CBPO) presentation can be viewed at the following URL:
http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18737/sweeney_wtwg_100112.pdf
 - Sweeney began by reviewing the 2012 Progress Run Schedule [slides 2 & 3]
 - Jurisdictions had until October 5th to provide comments on the 2012 Progress pre-BMP land uses, animals and septic numbers, and submit any changes to AFO/CAFO breakouts and septs.
 - Initial data submission starts on October 16th and lasts until the end of the year (12/31); he encouraged the states to start submitting available data early to allow for QA/QC.
 - He discussed some recommendations and examples from VA DCR [slide 9]
 - He pointed out that the basic rule about whether a change to the data can occur or not depends if it violates the calibration (1985-2005) or not.
 - For DCR's example of hogs in Virginia Beach, the hogs were included in the calibration.
 - Keeling pointed out that the detailed data he provided documented that the animals do not reside in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed portion of VA Beach, but when CBP distributed the animals across the county they were thereby included in the calibration.
 - Shenk commented that the change in loads, not the absolute load, is the main focus; he acknowledged efforts such as the new Land Use workgroup to get better local details when available.
 - Goulet noted that Shenk was correct, but pointed out that there are many instances of these errors.
 - Keeling questioned the value of expending effort to collect detailed data if it is not applied with the same detail.
 - Sweeney explained that the detailed data will be valuable for the next version of the model, so it is important to start building the database now. E.g. provide the acres of TRP (degraded pasture landuse) that you believe exists, in time for next model calibration, unless this landuse is deleted in the next version of the model.
 - Sweeney mentioned that comments on the draft grant guidance [slides 12-16] are due by October 15th.

ACTION: Jurisdictions should send their feedback or any revisions for AFO/CAFO breakouts and septic numbers to Jeff Sweeney (jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net) and Matt Johnston (mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net) by Friday, October 5th.

ACTION: Comments on the draft grant guidance should be submitted to Jeff Sweeney (jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net) by October 15th.

- Megan Thyng's (EPA, CBPO) presentation can be viewed at:
http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18737/baytas_overview_for_watershed_technical_group_meeting_10-01-12.pdf
 - Thyng described the Chesapeake Bay TMDL Tracking & Accounting System (BayTAS), its current tracking capabilities, and planned capabilities [slides 2-9].
 - ChesSTAT is the public-facing version of BayTAS
 - She demonstrated some of the updates under development.
 - Anyone interested in obtaining a BayTAS user account should contact Megan at (thyng.megan@epa.gov).
- Marty Hurd (Tetra Tech)
 - The document used for Hurd's agenda item can be viewed at:
http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18737/hurd_psbmp_wtwg_schema_mod_decision_request.pdf
 - Hurd recalled the proposed schema modifications he introduced during the September WTWG call [[view his 9/5/2012 presentation](#); see slide 8], but began by discussing additions to the NPS-BMP Codes list [see page 3 of Hurd's 10-01-2012 document].
 - A jurisdiction had responded with a couple different approaches (schema modifications vs. appendix modifications).
 - Keeling pointed out that 1(e) – Performance Standard – could easily be confused with the new urban stormwater BMP with the same name.
 - Hurd proposed to strike out 1(e) and leave it as a free text option for the jurisdictions' 2012 Progress to avoid confusion. A phrase other than “performance standard” should be considered, to avoid confusion later when the new “Performance Standard” BMP is incorporated into NEIEN.
 - Hartman asked for objections; none were heard.
 - Keeling asked for clarification that all the proposed changes were optional and would remain optional.
 - Hurd confirmed they were optional.
 - Hartman thought it would be up to the workgroups to determine whether they remain optional or not in the future.
 - Hurd explained that the changes are being made to allow jurisdictions to get the full credit they deserve, instead of lower credit for default assumptions.
 - Hartman noted that Hurd conducted a meeting of NEIEN contacts via telephone since the Sept. 5 meeting, and that these proposed schema elements were discussed with that group, as well.
 - Hartman asked for agreement to proceed with the proposed (optional) changes, excluding 1(e).
 - No objections were heard.

DECISION: The proposed changes were accepted for incorporation as optional NEIEN reporting elements, with the exception of 1(e) (“performance standard”) that will remain a free text element.

- Olivia Devereux (Devereux Environmental Consulting) quickly updated the WTWG on the USGS data gathering project discussed in previous meetings.
 - Devereux has received all FSA data and sample NRCS data; the full NRCS data would be requested later that month following the close of the fiscal year.
 - Devereux will be documenting the methods for use in jurisdictions' BMP data QAPPs.
 - She noted that the BMP Verification Committee determined at its [9/12 meeting](#) that the FSA or NRCS – not the state agency responsible for reporting the data into NEIEN – would be responsible for verifying the BMPs.

4. Proposal for a NEIEN Open Enrollment Period

- Hartman introduced the proposal and mentioned it had been discussed at the two previous WTWG meetings. The October 1st version of the proposal (Attachment 4) is available at: http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18737/attachment_4_draft_neien_open_enrollment_protocol_09282012.pdf
- Johnston explained that changes were made to provide the static rules desired by Keeling (VA DCR) and allow for incorporation of new BMPs or new information about existing BMPs as requested by Sandi (MDE).
- No additional comments or revisions were brought up in discussion, so Hartman took a vote from the jurisdictions.
 - Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Delaware: yes
 - New York and District of Columbia: not present

DECISION: The Proposal for a NEIEN Open Enrollment Period was approved for submission to the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team.

5. Army Corps of Engineers Stormwater Tracking Tool

- Jason Rinker and Mike Schuster (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) described and demonstrated the stormwater BMP tracking databases they have developed for some of their civil and federal partners. Their presentation is available at http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18737/attachment_5_rinker_usace_stormwater_bmp_database.pdf
 - The database is Access and desktop based, but they are looking at online options.
 - The Corps is working to integrate a BMP cost estimator into the database.
 - Slide 13 summarizes the key points from their presentation.
 - Keeling suggested that the Army Corps should speak with the jurisdictions' staff that is responsible for reporting BMPs to the Chesapeake Bay Program, namely Karl Huber and Bev Quinlan in Virginia.
 - Sweeney expressed concern that the Corps' tool compares a facility's loads to a "TMDL allocation" when the allocations were made at a statewide scale.
 - Hartman suggested using the term "target" rather than "allocation" to compare loads at that finer scale.
 - Hartman reiterated the importance of having tools to bridge the gap between the model and local partners; discussions of tools like the Corps' databases are important to help bridge this gap.

- Goulet suggested that the WTWG should spend time over the next couple meetings to discuss how some of these local tools could serve as the “missing link.”
- Goulet mentioned that the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments was sponsoring a modeling workshop for local partners on Thursday, October 4th. He encouraged Shuster, Rinker, and interested WTWG members to attend.
 - Karl Berger (Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments) agreed to send the workshop agenda and registration information to Jeremy Hanson for distribution to the WTWG.

ACTION: WTWG members with questions or suggestions about the Army Corps of Engineers’ BMP database projects can contact Rinker (jason.s.rinker@usace.army.mil) or Shuster (michael.j.schuster@usace.army.mil) directly.

6. Updates from the BMP Expert Panels

- Mark Dubin (UMD; Coordinator, Agriculture workgroup) described the current status of the four ongoing agriculture BMP expert panels, which were identified by the Agriculture workgroup as the top priorities:
 - *Cover crops* – The panel includes some returning experts from the previous cover crops panel from five years ago. They are considering ways to add new cover crops, while streamlining the reporting process. Timeline depends on when the panelists are ready to share their recommendations.
 - *Nutrient management systems* – The panel has completed a background report that includes an interesting comparison of the states’ nutrient management programs. A graduate student is comparing Bay model functions’ alignment with field-scale agronomics. Fertilizer sale data is being considered. Enhanced Nutrient Management and Precision/Decision Agriculture are part of this panel’s charge. Panel is still working on recommendations.
 - *Conservation tillage (CT) systems* – Right now CT is a stackable BMP; there is interest in splitting it out. The panel is nearly done with a background report being done with Tetra Tech. Bill Keeling represents WTWG on this panel.
 - *Poultry litter management* – Dubin felt hopeful this panel will draft its recommendations by end of 2012. They are currently reviewing data from the Bay states (excluding New York, who opted out from the panel), focusing on (a) changes in manure nutrient content over time and (b) volume for different types of poultry.
 - Keeling asked who serves on the panel from Virginia.
 - Dubin responded Tim Sexton (VA DCR) and Bobby Long (VA DCR), as well as Jim Pease (Virginia Tech).
 - Devereux noted that the Kellogg/NRCS animal manure data is being updated this year.
 - *Manure technologies (e.g., manure to energy)* is in the pipeline for a panel in the near future once a current panel concludes.
- Tom Schueler (Chesapeake Stormwater Network; Coordinator, Urban Stormwater workgroup) described the status for the six urban stormwater BMP panels:

- *Performance standards* – The panel’s report is being revised based on comments following the September 10th WQGIT call; the WQGIT would revisit the report on October 9th.
 - *Retrofits* – same status as performance standards.
 - **Post-meeting note:** The WQGIT approved the performance standards and retrofits BMPs on October 9th, 2012.
 - *Stream restoration* – The panel is refining the first draft of its report. Schueler felt hopeful the recommendations could be ready by the end of the year.
 - Keeling suggested that Schueler share the panel’s recommendations with the WTWG the same time they are provided to the stormwater workgroup.
 - Schueler will coordinate with the AgWG and habitat workgroups as appropriate, given overlaps with agriculture, habitat, and other non-urban stormwater considerations.
 - *Urban nutrient/fertilizer management* – The panel is nearing the second draft of its report, and plans to coordinate with the agriculture nutrient management panel.
 - *Illicit Discharge Detection & Elimination (IDDE)* – This BMP was requested by the Urban Stormwater workgroup (USWG). Following lively discussions the Panel determined with EPA that Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs) are within the scope of the panel’s charge.
 - Keeling asked if the IDDE panel included straight pipes from single-family homes to streams.
 - Schueler indicated this type of illicit connection was being considered, along with several others.
 - *Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC)* – This BMP was requested by West Virginia. The panel has met twice and is reviewing the literature. They will start writing the report over the next couple months.
 - *Street sweeping/bulk sediment removal* – there have been requests to reconvene this expert panel; the USWG plans to reform the panel in early 2013.
- Floating wetlands* – Following a July 25th, 2012 research workshop, the USWG plans to form a panel for this BMP in early 2013. Also as a result of this workshop, the USWG recommended that the WTWG convene a panel for algal turf scrubbers.

7. Wrap-up

- Johnston and Hartman recapped the decisions and actions from the day and thanked everyone for their participation.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Next Meeting:

Monday, November 5th at 10:00AM – conference call

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18855/>

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Email</u>
Alana Hartman, Chair	WV DEP	alana.c.hartman@wv.gov
Matt Johnston, Coordinator	UMD	mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net
Jeremy Hanson, Staff	CRC	jhanson@chesapeakebay.net
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO	jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net
Katherine Antos	EPA, CBPO	Antos.Katherine@epamail.epa.gov
Jess Rigelman	J7 LLC	jrigelman@j7llc.com
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting	olivia@devereuxconsulting.com
Norm Goulet	NVRC	ngoulet@novaregion.org
Gary Shenk	EPA	gshenk@chesapeakebay.net
Greg Sandi	MDE	gsandi@mde.state.md.us
Beth Horsey	MDA	elizabeth.horsey@maryland.gov
Sarah Lane	MD DNR/UMD	sweammert@dnr.state.md.us
Ted Tesler	PA DEP	thtesler@state.pa.us
Sucharich Ravi	UMCES	sravi@chesapeakebay.net
Mark Dubin	UMD	mdubin@chesapeakebay.net
Peter Claggett	USGS	pclaggett@chesapeakebay.net
Via teleconference		
Karl Berger	MWCOG	kberger@mwkog.org
Bryan Bloch	DE DNREC	bryan.bloch@state.de.us
Pat Buckley	PA DEP	pbuckley@state.pa.us
Barry Evans	Penn State	bme1@psu.edu
Naomi Detenbeck	EPA-ORD	detenbeck.naomi@epamail.epa.gov
Marty Hurd	Tetra Tech	martin.hurd@tetrattech.com
Bill Keeling	VA DCR	william.keeling@dc.virginia.gov
Sheryle Quinn	U.S. Dept. of the Navy	sheryle.quinn@navy.mil
Robin Pellicano	MDE	rpellicano@mde.state.md.us
Jason Rinker	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	jason.s.rinker@usace.army.mil
Tom Schueler	Chesapeake Stormwater Network	watershedguy@hotmail.com
Mike Schuster	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	michael.j.schuster@usace.army.mil
Megan Thyng	EPA, CBPO	thyng.megan@epa.gov
Jenn Volk	U. of Delaware	jennvolk@udel.edu
Dana York	Green Earth Connection LLC	dyork818@yahoo.com
Sally Claggett	USDA Forest Service	sclaggett@fs.fed.us