



Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Conference call
Thursday, April 5, 2018
10:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Calendar Page: [Link](#)

Draft Call Summary

Summary of Actions and Decisions:

Decision: The WTWG approved the March 2018 meeting minutes.

Decision: The WTWG approved the Agricultural Stormwater EPEG recommendations and accompanying technical appendix. The EPEG recommendations and technical appendix will be reviewed by the WQGIT for approval at an upcoming WQGIT conference call.

Decision/Action: The WTWG approved the inclusion of VA-specific geographies in CAST. Olivia Devereux will follow up with VA representatives to include VA-specific geographies in CAST.

Action: The WTWG will determine a list of parking lot issues for technical consideration in CAST, which may involve multiple workgroups of the Bay Program Partnership.

Action: The WTWG will coordinate with the Land Use Workgroup and CBP Land Use team to ensure that all available land use spatial data is available to the WTWG membership. Individual WTWG members are also encouraged to contact the CBP Land Use team with requests for additional inclusion of land use data.

10:00 AM - Introductions and Announcements- Ted Tesler, PADEP or Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO

- Alisha Mulkey asked how buffer domains are handled in CAST.
 - Jeff Sweeney: We are discussing that today with the back-out topic at the end of the call. We'll discuss options for how that information can be used or not used.

Decision: The WTWG approved the March 2018 meeting minutes.

10:10 AM – Recommendations from the Agricultural Stormwater BMP Expert Panel
Establishment Group – Loretta Collins, UMD

Follow-up discussion on the recommendations of the Agricultural Stormwater Management EPEG for addressing crediting for post-construction agricultural stormwater BMPs, and draft technical appendix. The recommendations of the EPEG were approved by the AgWG at their February 15 meeting.

- Loretta Collins: We would like approval to bring this to the WQGIT for final approval.

- Bill Keeling: is this already in the NEIEN appendix A? If not, we need to add it to the appendix to be able to report this.
 - Sweeney: This will not get the full expert panel treatment, as this practice is very similar to the urban SW practices, so we used a lot of the same technical considerations.
 - Matt Johnston: Once the technical appendix is approved by this group and the WQGIT, we will take exactly what's in the technical appendix and include it in the NEIEN appendix.

Decision: The WTWG approved the Agricultural Stormwater EPEG recommendations and accompanying technical appendix. The EPEG recommendations and technical appendix will be reviewed by the WQGIT for approval at an upcoming WQGIT conference call.

10:40 AM – CAST updates that were made available April 2, 2018 – Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting

New CAST updates include the new Land Policy BMPs, updated base conditions, new wastewater datasets, and changes to the stream restoration BMP. Olivia will show CAST to walk through these items.

Discussion:

- Olivia covered new updates to CAST and noted that updates will change the loads in user scenarios. Those scenarios will have to be re-run.
- Alana Hartman: Our 2016 progress loads have increased by ½ million lbs N since the updates went in—what is the reason for changes to load in the progress loads?
 - Devereux: The progress was decided to be on Current Zoning (CZ) rather than Historic Trends (HT). That was decided to be consistent with the WIPs which are done on CZ for the years of your runs.
 - Sweeney: Have you dug into why those loads changed? The source of the change could be either updated wastewater or the land use.
 - Hartman: I have not looked into it, but I will investigate the wastewater vs land use change question.
 - Devereux: You can put those 2016 BMPs on HT to look at how your loads might change across land use scenarios.
- Keeling: I had thought that the WTWG is the decisional entity for CAST, but there are changes here that we did not decide on and don't really understand. Who is really making these decisions.
 - Johnston: If the WQGIT has decided on a policy like using CZ, we have to update CAST to accommodate the WQGIT decision.
 - Keeling: There are septic changes also coming in May?
 - Devereux: This group does not deal with data changes, This group deals with functionality in CAST.

- Keeling: We were given planning targets to evaluate, and we are supposed to use CAST to do that. My concern is that CAST keeps changing, and I have to keep going back to re-evaluate my scenarios.
 - Devereux: What you have now are draft targets and they won't be final until May, so you still have time to re-evaluate. We do understand that data keeps changing and we are trying to make the transition smoother.
 - Johnston: We understand that frustration. These changes are coming from the WQGIT and PSC decisions—and we can't change those decisions. Concerns that you have, you should be taking these to your WQGIT representatives and let them know how these decisions are affecting your work in CAST.
 - Keeling: We do need a lock-down and we need a stable CAST to work on our planning.
 - Devereux: There was a decision to only allow changes to CAST on milestone years from the 2015 Face to Face meeting, and we are doing our best to keep changes to that decision.
 - Johnston: We have told our representatives that the May update to CAST will be the last one until 2019. We don't like this instability either.
 - Devereux: We also have local planners that are using CAST that are concerned with the amount of changes to the service.
- Olivia discussed the land policy BMPs—these are the conservation plus scenarios (growth management, agricultural conservation, and forest conservation options). Note that land policy BMPs are available only as planning BMPs. These are available for both CZ and HT.
- Olivia showed the state summary spreadsheet. County summary is also available for those interested.
- Devereux: Peter Claggett is working on more options for land policy BMPs that are state specific for policies that the states have asked for. He is discussing with state representatives to work out those BMPs.
- Jeff Sweeney asked where more detailed descriptions are available.
 - Olivia: Those are available in the CAST documentation page under Edit Scenarios -> policy BMPs
- Johnston: These BMPs are a first cut. There is not a single policy out there that has that parameter specified in their policy, so as this evolves that parameter can change for your state.

10:50 AM – Including Virginia-specific geographies in CAST – Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting, and Bill Keeling, VA DEQ

VA has requested that Planning District Commissions and Soil Conservation Districts be included as available geographies in CAST. The WTWG will discuss implications of this inclusion in CAST.

Decision Requested: WTWG approval of a method for including the VA-specific geographies in CAST.

Discussion:

- Keeling: We'd like to have our staff be able to operate CAST themselves, and these geographies would help our planning effort.
- Devereux: This option would be available for building scenarios (input) and will be available for downloading reports.
 - Sweeney: That includes other geographies like HUCs, etc?
 - Devereux: The HUCs might cover more than one state, and so if you have a scenario that covers a trans-state HUC
- Johnston: I would suggest nesting the options into categories so that you choose a general category and then you can get sub-options under that category to choose from.
- Jason Keppler asked about dividing the options between power users and lite users.
 - Devereux: Including all those simplifications would be essentially a different tool, which we have not discussed yet as an option to create.
- Devereux: MD users use the HUCs most often.
- Sweeney: How many conservation districts are there?
 - Keppler: The conservation districts are by county in MD. But the other states have their own definitions.
 - Devereux suggested that the counties and cities be available as options to go together which would essentially make up a conservation district.
 - Keeling: Those districts don't exactly match up with the cities and counties. The conservation districts will be more ag focused and we will have urban scenarios that we would have for the PDCs. That's what we are envisioning for planning purposes. I think we would need the districts and the PDCs.
 - Devereux: Some counties have PDCs that are not 1:1. Those are assigned to just one PDC by James Davis-Martin some time ago, so I want to note that piece of the method.
- Sweeney: How to simplify this for users—is there an option to save a report format for users to come back to?
 - Devereux: No, there are just the options for selecting a report—type, geography, and scenario(s) that you want to see options for. You can only save formats for Bay TAS, not CAST.
- Keeling: Is there a way to see what input deck files I have already uploaded to scenarios. I'd like to see which input decks were included in running specific scenarios so that I can make sure what I've uploaded is correct.

Decision/Action: The WTWG approved the inclusion of VA-specific geographies in CAST. Olivia Devereux will follow up with VA representatives to include VA-specific geographies in CAST.

11:05 AM – Review of Schedules for Phase 5.3.2 and Phase 6 Scenarios – Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Jeff will go over updates to evaluations of mid-point progress (Phase 5.3.2) as well as Phase 6 scenarios.

Discussion:

- Sweeney: We need to finish this evaluation by the June 2 PSC meeting. The EC meeting is still uncertain but they want to have that near the middle of this year—early summer.
- Alisha Mulkey: How many versions do you have now for 2017? Are there 7 or 8 versions available?
 - Devereux: There is not a version 8 in CAST, only version 7.
 - Johnston: BayTAS is for Phase 5.3.2—that might be a version 8 but the Phase 6 scenarios are up to version 7 in CAST.
 - Sweeney: We will make sure that version 8 is available in Bay TAS for 5.3.2.

11:30 AM – BMP Back-out and Credit Durations – VA DEQ, UMD, EPA

We will discuss questions about how BMP back-out and the credit duration of BMPs in the modeling tools affect BMP “credit”.

- Johnston: The buffer domain data has been shared with the WTWG and will be available on a data portal that is publicly available. We are looking at this summer, possibly July for release of that data portal. The buffer domains are not in CAST in any way.
 - Mulkey: So what of that data is being used?
 - Johnston: The domains in CAST right now are the same as they have been, that the only cut off for converting cropland to forest buffer, for instance, is the amount of total cropland available in your county or watershed, regardless of whether it is riparian or not.
- Keeling: Regarding the methods used to calculate the amount of BMPs to be backed out, how is this done and how do we ensure the result is accurate? I am concerned with the process overall. The other issue is how we are crediting buffers.
- Matt gave an overview of back-out procedures for BMPs submitted prior to 2012. If a landuse-change BMP is reported for a period before the year of land cover imagery, the change has been accommodated and “credit” is given through BMP reports of acres implemented. In the case of riparian forest buffers, CAST backs out the acres so that double counting does not occur. The tool calculates the upland benefit of those acres for “credit”. Only the submitted acres can be backed out—you shouldn’t have back-out greater than what you’ve submitted. The exceedance is an issue with CAST and we will fix that for the next release.
- Note: Submitted acres of a BMP can diminish in credit over time, if BMPs are not inspected or inspections are not reported for maintenance/inspection to renew credit.
- Jason Keppler asked about upland benefits.
 - Sweeney: Everything that you submit before 2012 gets an upland benefit related to the acres submitted for the land use change. That benefit continues past 2012.
 - Keeling: the land use change is the benefit of a buffer BMP, not the loading efficiency.

- Devereux: The spatially explicit data is not the same as what you've got in CAST, but that is available on the land use viewer.
- Keeling: Can you look at counties' buffer domains? Can that be viewed and downloaded?
 - Devereux: That data is available on the Land Use viewer, you can't see BMPs but you can see what is forest and what's not.
 - Johnston: We can make that request to the Land Use team to make sure that you have access to all that spatial data you need, and we are encouraging the states to let us know any other information they'd like to include in the land use data we have.
- Keeling: I also want to note that there are areas that look forested, but they are not actually performing like a buffer even if they look like that from imagery.
 - Sweeney: Forest is considered the best land use (lowest loading land use).

Action: The WTWG will coordinate with the Land Use Workgroup and CBP Land Use team to ensure that all available land use spatial data is available to the WTWG membership. Individual WTWG members are also encouraged to contact the CBP Land Use team with requests for additional inclusion of land use data.

Action: The WTWG will determine a list of parking lot issues for technical consideration in CAST, which may involve multiple workgroups of the Bay Program Partnership.

Call Participants:

Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO
 Michelle Williams, CRC
 Matt Johnston, UMD
 Loretta Collins, UMD
 Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting
 Jeremy Hanson, VT
 Chris Yearick, USC
 Bill Keeling, VA DEQ
 Alanna Hartman, WV DEP
 Brittany Sturgis, DNREC
 Clint Gill, DNREC
 Luke Cole, DOEE
 Jason Keppler, MDA
 Alisha Mulkey, MDA
 Greg Sandi, MDE
 Tom Schueler, CSN/USWG Coordinator
 KC Filipino, HRPDC
 Chad Thompson, WV DEP
 Norm Goulet, NoVA Regional Commission/USWG Chair