



Watershed Technical Workgroup Meeting

August 6, 2026
10:00 AM-11:45 AM

[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, a discussion on voting membership and workgroup processes, an initial discussion on federal planning target needs, an overview of brief edits to the UNM Technical Appendix, a discussion on the NEIEN Appendix, and a brief update on CAST and Phase 7 Review Products User Research.

Summary of Actions & Decisions

Decision: The WTWG approved the [July 2026 meeting minutes](#).

Action: Please reach out to Auston Smith (Smith.Auston@epa.gov) with any concerns or requested amendments to the [2026 Progress Schedule](#).

Action: The WTWG will discuss updates to the Expert Panel Protocol as well as provide their recommendations for Model update frequency at upcoming WTWG meetings in 2026.

Action: WTWG members and federal agency representatives will be asked to vote via email to determine whether or not three at-large WTWG membership spots should be reserved for federal agency members. Following the vote, a call for nominations will be distributed for open positions, and additional outreach to potential nominees will take place as needed.

Action: The WTWG will revisit the topic of standing up a Federal Planning Targets Action Team as additional decisions take place across the Partnership and Clean Water Goal Team.

Action: Auston Smith, EPA, will seek clarity on the timeline for the Phase 7 Model being the Model of Record, as opposed to Phase 6 which is being utilized now.

Action: The WTWG approved the [Annual Progress Reporting Appendix](#) (previously referred to as the “NEIEN” Appendix).

Action: Please reach out to Jess Rigelman (jrigelman@j7llc.com) if you would like to run validation reports for Test CAST.

Action: Q4/A4 and Q12/A12 of the Technical Appendix for Urban Nutrient Management will be updated to include the construction land use. The updated version is accessible [here](#).

Action: Please reach out to Alex Gunnerson, Koniag (Agunnerson@chesapeakebay.net) with any additional feedback as it relates to the user research that was conducted on CAST and the Phase 7 Review Products.

Meeting Minutes

I. Introductions & Announcements

Lead: Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG & Auston Smith, EPA

Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG and Auston Smith, EPA, walked the group through the following announcements:

- Approval of the [July WTWG Meeting Minutes](#)
 - The WTWG approved the July 2026 meeting minutes.
- Reminder: The CBP NEIEN node will be decommissioned on **August 31, 2026**. All Progress BMP submissions will be made via CAST.
 - Jess Rigelman, J7 Consulting LLC/CBPO Contractor, reminded the group that the CBP NEIEN node will be decommissioned on August 31, 2026. The test mode has already been decommissioned, but the production node will go down at the end of the month.
- 2025 Progress Release
 - Auston Smith, EPA, noted that they are awaiting final approval and insights from jurisdictions before the press release is finalized and released. As such, it was noted that the press release may take place either later today (August 6th), early Friday morning, or on Monday.
- 2026 Progress Schedule
 - Auston Smith, EPA, noted that the schedule for the upcoming Progress year has been posted to the [BMP verification page](#). Auston made the group aware of one change, noting that the initial verification meetings with jurisdictions and the EPA CBPO have been moved to the second week in December, one week later than the previous year. This will allow for additional data submission time and time for the CBPO to develop tailored agendas for jurisdictional meetings. Otherwise, key dates remain the same as in previous years: initial QAPP submissions (September 1st), BMP submissions (December 1st), finalized land use data sets (November 1st), Federal Agency data reporting (October 1st). It is hopeful that the 2026 Progress Scenario will be released in May of next year.
- CWGT RENPS Management Strategy Development
 - Auston Smith, EPA, noted ongoing efforts related to the development of the Clean Water Goal Team Reducing Excess Nitrogen, Phosphorous, and Sediment management strategy. In particular, Auston informed the group that a draft of the management strategy will be available at the August Clean Water Goal Team meeting. WTWG members interested in the development of the Management Strategy should consider attending upcoming Clean Water Goal Team meetings.
- Updates to the Expert Panel Protocol and Model Review Frequency
 - Auston Smith, EPA, noted that the group will discuss early stages of Expert Panel protocol updates at the September WTWG meeting. The WTWG will be asked to engage in the review of these updates/revisions following the September meeting.
 - Relatedly, the WTWG will also be asked to evaluate the necessary frequency of updates to the Model. While this will ultimately be a Clean Water Goal Team decision, the WTWG will be asked to provide their feedback as it relates to reporting, BMPs, BMP history, etc., to help inform the Model update timeline.

Decisions:

1. The WTWG approved the [July 2026 meeting minutes](#).

Actions:

1. Please reach out to Auston Smith (Smith.Auston@epa.gov) with any concerns or requested amendments to the [2026 Progress Schedule](#).
2. The WTWG will discuss updates to the Expert Panel Protocol as well as provide their recommendations for Model update frequency at upcoming WTWG meetings in 2026.

Discussion Notes:

2025 Progress Release

Christina Lyerly: I have a quick clarifying question. Is this the press release of Progress and the milestones?

Auston Smith: No, just the 2025 Progress. Milestones and the 2025 Assessment- EPA's overarching look at what we've done and where we need to go from here- that will be next week. It will have a separate press release as well.

Christina Lyerly: Ok, thanks.

Auston Smith: Yeah, good question. Again, shout out to Jess, Megan, and others on that team for being ready whenever we say.

RENPS Management Strategy

Petra Baldwin (in chat): An initial draft of the CWGT management strategy will be shared at the [August 24th CWGT meeting](#).

Other

Kevin Du Bois (in chat): Sorry for joining late. I would like to suggest that the following meeting topic be added to future meeting topics: Correcting data submission records, removing duplicate records, fixing NEIN upload errors, etc. for an accurate assessment of Partnership progress

Federal Facilities Agenda Items

II. Voting Membership Structure & Workgroup Processes

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA

Auston Smith, EPA, kicked off collaboration between the members of the WTWG and previous Federal Facilities Workgroup. Auston provided a brief introduction to both groups before discussing workgroup processes, future meetings, and next steps. In particular, Auston explained expectations for WTWG voting members and provided options for voting membership structure before opening a decision up to the group regarding how to fill the voting membership. After group discussion, it was determined that decision positions would be collected via email. WTWG members and federal agencies will be asked to provide their stances over email, so that at-large nominations can be received in advance of the September WTWG meeting.

Actions:

1. WTWG members and federal agency representatives will be asked to vote via email to determine whether or not three at-large WTWG membership spots should be reserved for federal agency members. Following the vote, a call for nominations will be distributed for open positions, and additional outreach to potential nominees will take place as needed.

Discussion Notes:

Kevin Du Bois: I don't think I see Katie Brownson on the call, right?

Auston Smith: She is on vacation, you are right.

Kevin Du Bois: I think my concern is making sure there is sufficient representation from federal landowning agencies. I know the Forest Service is the largest federal landowner within the watershed. I think we are number two. We're the largest owner of developed land, but I think that's an important consideration. Not just federal agencies, but federal agencies that own land that are then subject to BMP reporting and all that comes with that, like the federal planning goals. So maybe that's another consideration that we reserve positions not just to federal agencies but to the federal landowning agencies that are the ones who would be most affected by policy decisions, management strategies, and that sort of thing. I would hate to hold three seats and then only have two interested people. But, I also think it's important to make sure that, again, there's consideration given to some of these federal land-owning agencies that own more land and are responsible for maintaining that land, more than the land in some jurisdictions.

Norm Goulet (in chat): I'll nominate Katie in absentia.

Auston Smith: Thanks, Kevin. Any other thoughts there? Norm, I will have to follow up with Katie there, but I recognize that comment. Thanks. Are there other federal agencies on the call that know one way or another which way they might be leaning?

Josh Glace: If we reserve three spots for federal agencies, would it be then the intent that they could fill the other three at-large spots as well, or then you want to reserve those for a more eclectic group for at-large members to have a broader representation?

Auston Smith: Yeah, good question. So, I would have thought that Kevin would be, as a DOW member, one of those three spots, and we would try and reserve those other spots for outside entities not in the Federal family.

Josh Glace: Thank you for that clarification.

Auston Smith: Yeah, good question. So, Army Corps of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife, National Park Service, many others do participate. So, maybe we'll need to send out some targeted emails here.

Scott Heidel: I think this is really interesting, and I absolutely want to have great coverage. My only concern is that we've just gone through a very significant change with the structure and had all this training on the governance and management framework (how decisions are made and things like that). This seems like something that might be outside of the boundaries at this point that have just been explained to everybody. So, I'm not saying that I'm opposed to it. I just want to be careful about something like this because it does seem like it goes against the training that we all just had to take.

Auston Smith: I'll just ask for some clarification. Was the training saying that we cannot specify at-large membership as being of a particular flavor, so to speak? Or was there another consideration?

Scott Heidel: Yeah, I think it's saying that you can't designate certain people as such. You have to keep it open, and it has to be voted on, and things like that.

Auston Smith: To clarify, Kevin is a current at-large member, and he has self-nominated for the upcoming cycle. But, absolutely, everyone will need to be voted upon and agreed upon before being put into a hypothetical federal agency spot or additional at-large spot. So, I certainly wasn't trying to beat around the voting bush of that. I hope that that clarified concern but, Scott, was there an additional angle that I maybe need to reach out to the Clean Water Goal Team on for clarification?

Scott Heidel: I think an email wouldn't be bad just to make sure. It just does seem to be outside of the guidance. Maybe it's totally fine, but it might be a good idea to check, because it could alter the balance of power with this. Thanks.

Kevin Du Bois: I would agree with Scott about the balance of power, but I think in the opposite way. The Watershed Technical Workgroup has been bastardized by wrapping the federal facility work group into it. What I've seen in other Goal teams and Workgroups is that jurisdictions flood the market with nominees for positions for at-large seats. Then it goes into a popularity contest for who should get a voting position. Then there's the very real potential that federal agencies would not have any representation. So, I agree and support a diverse membership to represent the broad spectrum of partners within the partnership. But in some ways, I think sending it to a popular vote is the wrong way. This is my personal opinion, because then, as I said, that sets the stage for the diversity of voices not to be represented. I'll just speak for my agency. Again, with over 400,000 acres managed throughout the Watershed, the Department of War manages more land and is responsible for the management of more land than some jurisdictions, but they have an automatic vote. So, if we got into a situation where the federal family has no representation in a Workgroup, I think that would be the wrong path forward for the partnership. So, just giving you my perspective.

Auston Smith: Thank you. Before I go to Christina, I'll just add the EPA is one of the signatories, and we do try and ensure that they're trying to represent the best interests of the federal family. But I recognize your point, Kevin.

Kevin Du Bois: But, what if the EPA disagrees with any particular federal agency and any federal agency has a different perspective from the consensus of all other federal agencies? Again, there are federal land-owning agencies and there are non-federal land-owning agencies. So, there's the potential that non-federal landowning agencies are making policy that they don't have to submit to, but the landowning agencies do. So, it's really a different standard for landowning agencies and non-landowning agencies. I don't know why that distinction was never made when the Partnership was established, but it's, in my opinion, a real omission that the interests of landowning federal agencies could be overwhelmed by non-landowning federal agencies that don't have to subject themselves to their decisions.

Mark Dubin (in chat): Perhaps an alternative option for at-large positions would be to have a targeted representations versus designating individual agencies. The AgWG previously implemented a similar process for targeting agricultural production groups versus identifying individuals or corporations/NGO's. Thanks!

Christina Lyerly: Maryland would support the option to keep the nominations open to all. This would be based on ensuring that membership is not overly prescriptive and is more inclusive, as well as to increase the probability that all 15 member positions can be filled. If we go that route, it would be important to proactively engage the federal family to inform decision making. But at the same time, it would be up to the federal facilities to ensure that they're putting forth nominations for these positions and, through that process, make that case that it is important for them to be on the Workgroup.

Norm Goulet: The Urban Stormwater Workgroup faced a similar issue when we had to change ours. Originally, we had local government participants as a separate block within the participant list. When we changed to the 15 member structure, what we ended up doing was two of the states historically have never supplied names for those local government members, so we ended up including in our write up that we would go ahead and reserve two of those spots for the states. In the event that the states did not put forth any nominations, those positions would just shift to a completely open at large position. So, I think we could primarily do the same thing here. Three of the blocks would be theoretically set aside for the federal members. In the event that there was no

participation or nominations from the federal members, then it could revert to just a straight open position.

Auston Smith: I think that that would certainly be the way we would be leaning if we were to choose option one. If we choose to have three at-large positions reserved for federal agencies and then only two federal agencies are interested, absolutely. We're not just going to get rid of an at-large position. Totally agree with you there.

Josh Glace: I just have a follow up question for Norm. I do like that method of thinking. Would those positions then only have one year terms so that if a federal agency didn't nominate anybody for 2026, but they want somebody in 2027, they could do that, or would that still follow the at-large term for two years? So, would that change or if the federal facility or agency doesn't nominate somebody they will have to wait two years to potentially nominate someone else?

Norm Goulet: Yeah, honestly, that was never brought up, but I would think that we would have to maintain the existing duration and, whoever the entity was that didn't initially submit any names would have to wait until it's the term is over. But that's just my personal opinion.

Auston Smith: I'd agree with that. I don't think that we'd be able to cut anyone out early to make room for a federal agency that speaks up a year or two down the line.

Josh Glace: Ok, thanks.

Auston Smith: I don't think that would necessarily be fair.

Josh Glace: I appreciate the clarification. I just wanted to ask the question while we're discussing.

Kevin Du Bois (in chat): Are At-Large seats afforded an alternate?

Norm Goulet (in chat): Yes.

Auston Smith: Absolutely, and thanks, Norm, for your thoughts on that, too. Are there any other questions or considerations here? So I know we have this as a decision, but we don't want to have this as a decision for an agenda next month when Federal agencies might be less represented than they are already right now. So, we would like to try and ensure that all Federal agencies and current Watershed Technical Workgroup voting members are able to vote on this in the next two weeks via email. It doesn't seem like we're very close to wanting to put up a vote at this moment. I believe Katie is back from vacation, maybe the 16th or 17th. So, we can ensure that we get her thoughts as well. We can try and do some outreach to Federal agencies that are that maybe are not here today and get their confirmation of understanding of what's happening here. That's kind of how I'm seeing next steps going. We seem to be lacking some Federal representation. I'm hearing a split in opinions as well. So, I think we will move to email voting over the next two weeks, and we'll be doing outreach to get your vote.

Christina Lyerly: I just have a clarifying question. Is the voting block both the Watershed Technical Workgroup membership and the Federal Facilities Workgroup membership?

Auston Smith: So yes, I think it's exactly as you said. The Watershed Technical Workgroup's membership, jurisdictionally, those nine, almost exactly fit the Federal Facilities Workgroup membership for the jurisdictions. So, we'd be looking for those voting members, along with the federal agencies from the Federal Facilities Workgroup to provide a formal vote there. Did that answer your question?

Christina Lyerly: It did. Thanks.

Auston Smith: So, I believe it is 21 total entities that we'll be reaching out to here.

Kevin Du Bois (in chat): Total acreage by Federal Agency from CAST

US Forest Service	1,425,682
DoD	319,844
NPS	307,863
US Fish and Wildlife Service	87,563
USACE	60,338
Other	16,661
Agricultural Research Service	4,618
Smithsonian Institute	3,410
GSA	2,567
NASA	1,963

Auston Smith: It is a portion of the watershed, certainly, that should not be overlooked, Kevin. I agree. Unless others had any other final thoughts on this, you will see an email from us requesting your vote on whether at-large positions should be reserved for federal agencies or if we'd rather keep it open to all and the EPA represents the federal family and their signatory vote.

Kevin Du Bois: I think you should put Norm's stipulation in when you send it out that if there's no interest in all three, then the remaining ones would revert just to an open election.

Auston Smith: Thank you, Kevin. Absolutely agree that that's a caveat we should add in there.

Norm Goulet (in chat): Agree Kevin.

III. Initial Discussion on Federal Planning Targets Needs

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA

Given the integration of the Federal Facilities Workgroup functions into the WTWG, Auston Smith, EPA, discussed the process for establishing federal planning targets and the need for a potential Federal Planning Targets Action Team. Auston also provided the group with context from the last time that federal planning targets were developed, before opening the discussion up to the group.

Actions:

1. The WTWG will revisit the topic of standing up a Federal Planning Targets Action Team as additional decisions take place across the Partnership and Clean Water Goal Team.
2. Auston Smith, EPA, will seek clarity on the timeline for the Phase 7 Model being the Model of Record, as opposed to Phase 6 which is being utilized now.

Discussion Notes:

Auston Smith: I am not familiar with the program BayFAST. Kevin, can I call upon you to speak to that program and how it was used in the past?

Kevin Du Bois: No, because I wasn't around when that happened. But, I will cut to the chase. I think there is great value in standing up an Action Team because I know that, over the history of my tenure at the DoW. There were federal planning goals established that were not fair and equitable. Again, I wasn't around when they were developed, but when Pennsylvania developed their federal planning target for the Department of War, the load was greater than the E3 scenario. So, I don't know what their methodology was or how they calculated it, but there was absolutely no way in heaven that we could have met that FPG. So, we met with Pennsylvania. They were great. They recognized that that couldn't be done. So, we reverted to the EPA default method, and we all agreed that we would adhere to that, and that was a success. In Virginia, the FPG was established

using all the land use sectors. The federal agencies are only responsible for the developed and natural land use sectors. So again, we said, hey, we have an FPG in Virginia, but it's not fair and equitable and it doesn't reflect what we're responsible for, and that was never resolved. So, I think there's a great need for the Action Team so that we're all on the same page in terms of what's the proper methodology to establish federal planning target to make sure they're fair and equitable, that they're using the right load source groups, and all that stuff. I think the sooner we start that conversation, the better.

Olivia Martin: I just wanted to say that that tool was used before we added the specific instructions onto the CAST page. While I no longer work on CAST, I know that they're still there because I was looking at them just the other day. So, it does have ways to do this site specific. In fact, an entire manual was developed that was on the page and should still be there. I know I've shared that with Kevin and done a training for his contractors on how to do that. For the federal planning targets, I did work with Jeff Sweeney on that. There were states who had ways of doing it. It is the state's prerogative legally to determine how to do the allocations among the sectors or among other ways of doing allocations within the states. Some states decided to give the federal agencies targets and some states decided not to. I don't know what people want to do now, but at the time, for the states who chose not to do that, Jeff Sweeney and I worked together, and we developed these methods for federal facilities targets. I don't think there's any reason it has to be done the same way, but it could be. It doesn't have to be done the same way across the watershed. Again, it's a state decision, and the directions were on the CAST website a few weeks ago when I was looking for something.

Kevin Du Bois (in chat): That's true Olivia, but the FPGs are supposed to be developed in partnership with the federal agency and with their agreement on the target. Is there a document somewhere that identifies each of the federal agency, jurisdiction-specific 2025 federal planning targets? If not, that would probably be a good place to start!

Olivia Martin (in chat): The documentation is on CAST under the Federal Facilities page: <https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/Home/TMDLTracking#fedAgencySection>

Auston Smith: I appreciate that very much, and I'm glad we won't necessarily need to rely on BayFAST, which I'm entirely unfamiliar with. Thank you. That's really helpful. Are there any other thoughts on whether or not the Watershed Technical Workgroup has bandwidth to do this, or if an action team should be planned to be stood up by this group?

Norm Goulet: It seems to me that, for the most part, it's going to be the same folks that are right here. Do we really need to stand up another group? Can't we just handle this internally within our own agendas and meeting schedule? The last thing I need is another meeting that I'm going to need to attend.

Christina Lyerly: To Norm's point, one question I would have is the workload capacity for the Watershed Technical Workgroup to fit this on their schedule. That's just a question that I put out there. My gut reaction is being supportive of an Action Team. Auston, you answered my question on there being coordination with the jurisdictions. So, it sounds like the jurisdictions are actually on the Action Team.

Auston Smith: I can't envision this Action Team functioning well without jurisdictional representation. Maybe this can be a topic that we can bring back next month or in a couple of months. It's not immediately time pressing, but it came from the June Clean Water Goal Team. It was suggested there that Federal planning targets could be among one of the first Action Teams that would be stood up for good reason. So, I just wanted to bring it to this group immediately. I appreciate everyone's thoughts there.

Kevin Du Bois: I think getting the Federal planning goals established is a crucial step. I think, for Phase IV WIP development, once the jurisdictions know what the targets are for Federal agencies, I would think that that would support their efforts in WIP development. So, I see it as a precursor to WIP development.

Auston Smith: So, my understanding was that 2028 to 2029 up to 2030 was WIP development as the planning targets in 2028 were ironed out. So, I didn't know if the Federal planning targets would want to run parallel to all of the partnerships other target discussions, or if we wanted to kind of begin to have it in our minds that it will be stood up hypothetically, 1/4 before- six months before to just make sure the action team is actually ready to go. I was just kind of building in wiggle room on each side. Are there other thoughts there? We have time on the agenda. If there are other thoughts on this discussion, happy to keep having them here. Otherwise, we'll include these thoughts in our minutes, and we can continue the discussion in September/October.

Dylan Burgevin (in chat): Would we want to form the action team before or after the Phase 7 model is released?

Dylan Burgevin: Is it premature to start setting these goals and targets until the Phase 7 Model is released? What is the timing with all of that?

Auston Smith: It would be beforehand. So, the Phase 7 Model would not be released until 2030 after planning targets are determined, after WIPs are created to theoretically reach those planning targets, and then everyone agrees on all of that. Phase 7 would be reviewed as well, and adjustments would be made, and the partnership will agree on them. Once all that's done, I think it's about 2030 is the golden year for a release.

Norm Goulet: Auston, not for the Model. The Model is going to be finalized with all the review in 2028.

Auston Smith: But, it would not be used. Is that right? It would not be the model of record until 2030. Am I off base there?

Norm Goulet: I'm not sure. I really don't know what use we would need of the Model beyond setting allocations.

Auston Smith: Yeah, so we'd use the Model after it was reviewed in 2027. In 2028, we'd use it to help develop targets.

Olivia Martin: I want to start with a couple of questions. I've not been following everything that happens at the Bay program, but has EPA issued its guidance for the WIP IV?

Auston Smith: No, we're working with jurisdictions to tee up that process immediately following planning targets.

Olivia Martin: Then EPA may say it needs to be at a local scale like each MS4 or each county. They may recommend that there be a lumping of sectors or not. EPA. EPA could do anything, and I don't know if EPA is going to ask there to be separate targets for federal agencies, or they might require that or not. Until that guidance or expectations are issued, I don't know how the states would have a plan for how they're going to do their local goals or sub-state goals. I'm a little confused about how the decision can be made before those two things happen.

Norm Goulet: Olivia, we haven't even had the discussion yet if there is even going to be a WIP IV. That's just everybody's assumption.

Olivia Martin: That should have been my first question. I did make that assumption. You're right, Norm. So, that's the three decisions that I think would have to be made before you could actually come up with a methodology for this. I hate to throw a wrench in your planning, Auston.

Auston Smith: No, that's ok. I think the decisions on how the WIP will need to be structured will likely be issued by the EPA, but it'll be partnership-led. I think we won't want to issue anything that we wouldn't have run by a lot of the partners. But my understanding would be, yes, the Model is reviewed next year. It's theoretically done 2028, but then we use it while still continuing to use Phase 6 for Progress. We use Phase 7 to create the targets, and then we use those targets to help create WIPs with the EPA WIP guidance. Then in 2030, the Phase 7 Model with its adjusted targets and all of our WIPs, everything outlined, would then be the model of record. Until then, I think we're on Phase 6. Dylan, it's clear you've asked a great question.

Norm Goulet: Auston, it is a bit of a rabbit hole. Olivia's right in terms of the allocations. We haven't even discussed what WIP 4 is going to be. We haven't even discussed yet what tiered

implementation is, and that is supposed to be the center point of whatever is developed for Phase 7. So, there is a bit of a rabbit hole here.

Kevin Du Bois (in chat): Perhaps a first step is to agree upon the methodology for calculating the FPG. In MD, the FPG for DoW is basically compliance with MS4 permits (since all installations have MS4s). From someone that knows the ins and outs, could we get a presentation on the pros and cons of using the default method vs. other methods?

Norm Goulet (in chat): Kevin, did VA do the same?

Kevin Du Bois (in chat): Did VA do the same what?

Kevin Du Bois: I'm just wondering if we could maybe just work on the methodology without actually hitting the go button to get the number. If we can all just agree on the methodology so that that's ready to go when Phase 7 can be used to develop the actual target, maybe that's the way to go.

Auston Smith: I agree that it shouldn't necessarily be needed to have all the targets and certainly WIP considerations done up front, ahead of this methodology. From frankly a layman's perspective, I would think that this methodology could be ironed out and then that could be used alongside everyone else's knowledge and insight on what you think targets should be. You already have the understanding of what the Federal Facilities piece would be in your back pocket as you go through the rest of that conversation. I can't see that methodology running up against anything in the planning targets portion that would mean we have to redo that effort, but maybe that's naive. Other thoughts there? This has been really helpful. I have a few questions for the Clean Water Goal Team. Until someone tells me differently, I'm pretty sure, Dylan, that Phase 7, the model that we'll be reviewing, will not be the model of record that we're producing progress scenarios on until 2030 progress, maybe 2031, depending on how that lines up.

Kevin Du Bois (in chat): 2027 – year of testing Phase 7 model; 2028 – Phase 7 approved, but Phase 6 used for evaluation of progress; 2030 – adjusted FPGs calculated using Phase 7 and Phase 7 becomes the model of record for progress evaluation.

Watershed Technical Agenda Items

IV. Annual Progress Reporting Appendix Draft Overview

Lead: Jess Rigelman, J7 LLC/CBPO

Jess Rigelman, J7 LLC/CBPO provided the group with an overview of the updated [draft annual progress reporting appendix](#), noting changes received since the July WTWG meeting. Jess also noted that, given that NEIEN is going away, this Appendix will now be referred to as the Annual Progress Reporting Appendix. Time was made for participants to discuss any changes and provide additional feedback before the group voted on the approval of the Appendix.

Decisions:

1. The WTWG approved the [Annual Progress Reporting Appendix](#) (previously referred to as the “NEIEN” Appendix).
2. Please reach out to Jess Rigelman (jrigelman@j7llc.com) if you would like to run validation reports for Test CAST.

Discussion Notes:

Arianna Johns (in chat): Bill is out due to a death in his family. These are some questions he wanted on the record. He would like some explanation about the 1000 year credit duration for wetlands practices. As well as an explanation for the Urban NM with and without soil tests as well

as the 1 and 3 year versions. I let him know I thought it was passed for 2025 but he doesn't recall that so would like some information.

Kevin Du Bois (in chat): UNM fertilization BMPs were approved

David Wood (in chat): Hi Arianna, the UNM with and without soil test were originally approved with 3 and 1 year durations, respectively. Bill requested that a version of the "With Soil Test" BMP also be added to the appendix with a 1 year credit duration to better align with how VA reports the UNM plans, so that was added by the WTWG.

Jess Rigelman: So, wetlands doesn't have a credit duration. That was just something we put in there. Obviously, we're not going to expire within 1000 years from now. Technically, that should be put null. I guess I need to put in a ticket with the IT team if that is confusing to people, but that was our way of basically saying it doesn't expire.

Emily Dekar (in chat): Those names would need to be changed within the QAPP's correct?

Auston Smith: I'm also seeing a question from Emily. "Those names would need to be changed within the QOPS, correct?" Yes, that would be extremely helpful for us. Absolutely, they reflect the current appendix.

Dylan Burgevin (in chat): Jess, can you run validation reports for Test CAST at this point or do we need to wait until Progress 25 is submitted?

Jess Rigelman: Dylan, yes, I can run them. Please send me an email whenever you want something done, and I will do that.

Auston Smith: Thank you, Jess. So, we're kind of up in the air with our voting membership. Generally, I know that Federal Facilities work closely with jurisdictions to ensure that the annual progress reporting appendix is all in line with how you report to each other. So, do we want to handle this like the minutes? Are there any maybe outstanding thoughts here? I'm not sensing much angst over a potential approval here. Hearing nothing, this is approved. I think we can just move forward with that, Jess.

Mark Dubin (in chat): Where is a copy of the new appendix available? Thanks!

Petra Baldwin (in chat): <https://www.chesapeakebay.net/files/documents/P6-Annual-Progress-Appendix-20260722.xlsx>

V. Minor Edits to the Technical Appendix for UNM

Lead: David Wood, CSN

David Wood, CSN, informed the group of a few minor edits that will be made to the Technical Appendix for Urban Nutrient Management for added clarity. These include two instances of the "construction" land use. The edits are in red below:

Q4. What does a jurisdiction need to report to receive credit for UNM Plans?

A4. BMP Name: UNM w/ Soil Test, UNM without Soil Test, Non-Fertilized Turf Acres:
number of acres of qualifying UNM plans or pledges within geographic reporting unit
Location: Approved NEIEN geographies: Latitude/Longitude of approximate centerpoint
of acres; County, Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC12, HUC10, HUC8, HUC6, HUC4), State
Date of Implementation: Date the plan was written, pledge was signed, etc.
Land Use: Eligible land uses include Turfgrass, Tree Canopy Over Turfgrass, Solar
Pervious, **Construction** (MS4, CSS, and Non-Regulated)

Q12. How are the eligible land uses simulated in P7 to ensure the Non-fertilized turfgrass BMP represents a change in management compared to the Pre-BMP condition?

A12. Every acre of the eligible land use categories for the UNM BMPs (turfgrass, tree canopy over turfgrass, **construction**, and solar pervious) is assumed to receive fertilizer. The updated non-farm fertilizer application methodology takes the state-wide fertilizer nutrient mass and divides it by the state-wide turfgrass acres, plus solar pervious acres and construction acres, to determine the non-farm fertilizer application rate for each state.

Actions:

1. Q4/A4 and Q12/A12 of the Technical Appendix for Urban Nutrient Management will be updated to include the construction land use. The updated version is accessible [here](#).

Discussion Notes:

No questions, comments, or concerns noted from the group.

VI. CAST and Phase 7 Review Products User Research

Lead: Alex Gunnerson, Koniag

Alex Gunnerson, Koniag, provided a brief overview of major findings and recommendations developed from the user research conducted this spring on CAST and Phase 7 Review Products. The group discussed actionable items resulting from this research.

Actions:

1. Please reach out to Alex Gunnerson, Koniag (Agunnerson@chesapeakebay.net) with any additional feedback as it relates to the user research that was conducted on CAST and the Phase 7 Review Products.

Discussion Notes:

Kevin Du Bois (in chat): Alex, were any of those interviewees in federal agencies?

Alex Gunnerson: Yes, some of the scientists were. I will go back to the persona slide. In the sense of the scientist category, yes, but that was it. So, mostly like USGS folks in terms of the Federal Agencies.

Kevin Du Bois (in chat): So, no federal land-owning agencies that submit through CAST?

Alex Gunnerson: Kevin, to answer your question on that, no, we did not have any Federal landowning agencies that submit data through CAST. But if you have other comments or feedback on these topics, we still welcome your input. This is not in any way an end-all, be-all exhaustive conversation. This is a recognition that we need to continually engage with folks to get their input, especially in the more experimental ones like spatial CAST and BMP optimization. Of course, we will welcome comments on the other parts as well, like the Phase 7 review products and the Phase 7 CAST website. So, Kevin, feel free to send me an email with any questions or comments you have, and I'd be happy to follow up with you.

VII. (Announcement) Nutrient Credit Trading in Virginia

Lead: Kevin Du Bois, DoW

Kevin Du Bois, DoW, made the group aware of the following announcement:

“Navy Region Mid-Atlantic signed an Inter-Governmental Support Agreement with the Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD) on June 26, 2026. The agreement will enable the Commander Navy Region Mid-Atlantic to purchase nutrient reduction credits from HRSD to support Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit compliance at

Naval Station Norfolk, Joint Base Little Creek Fort/Story, Naval Air Station Oceana, Naval Support Activity Hampton Roads, and Naval Support Activity Portsmouth. “

Discussion Notes:

Kevin Du Bois: For the last year or so, we've put out there that we wanted to work with jurisdictions to make sure that the templates that we report our BMP progress in are updated to allow us to report the purchase of nutrient credits. I know there was some initial reluctance because people weren't sure if it was going to happen or not. But it's happening. So, we're probably going to be purchasing nutrient credits maybe by the end of this month, if not very soon, for military installations/Navy installations in the Hampton Roads area. I would expect that once word gets out that the opportunity to purchase nutrient credits to meet either TMDL or MS4 permit requirements is available, that other services are going to jump on the bandwagon. My intent always was to make sure that we can accurately report those and get credit in the model. So, it's not going to be coming up in this year's data call response, but it is absolutely going to come in next year's data call response. So, I just want to make sure that the jurisdiction templates are amended to allow for that absolutely by next year.

Auston Smith: Thanks, Kevin, and thanks for keeping me up to date on the emails around that as well.

Norm Goulet (in chat): There goes the price of credits.

VIII. Wrap-Up

Lead: Petra Baldwin, CRC

IX. Adjourn

Next Meeting: September 3, 2026, from 10:00AM-12:00PM

Attendees:

Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG
Christina Lyerly, MDE
Auston Smith, EPA
Petra Baldwin, CRC
Cass Klingaman, NYSDEC
Olivia Martin, Devereux Consulting
Joseph Schell, DNREC
Karl Wilson, USDA
Tyler Trostle, PA DEP
Scott Heidel, PA DEP
Emily Dekar, USC
Andrew Leight, MDA
Jess Rigelman, J7 LLC/CBPO
Contractor
Matt Kofroth, LCCD
Ashley Hullinger, PA DEP
Norm Goulet, NVRC
Dylan Burgevin, MDE
Alicia Ritzenthaler, DOEE
Chris Blizzard, USACE

Mark Dubin, VT Cooperative Extension
Eugenia Hart, Tetra Tech
Lori Brown, DNREC
Megan Beever, CBC
Kelly Gable, EPA
John Lancaster, PA DEP
Clint Gill, DDA
Arianna Johns, VA DEQ
David Wood, CSN
Rachel Owrutsky, DNREC
Wajeeh Khan, USACE
Megan Thyng, EPA
Karen Zhang, OPEM
Alex Gunnerson, Koniag
Samantha Cotten, DNREC
Eric Hughes, EPA
Josh Glace, Larson Design Group
Kevin Du Bois, DoW
Tom Butler, EPA
Bo Williams, EPA

Cassie Davis, NYSDEC
Sabine Miller, DOEE
Lindsey David, USDA ARS
Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA