

**SUMMARY**  
**Chesapeake Bay Program**  
**Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)**  
**June 3<sup>rd</sup> 2013, 10:00AM – 12:30 PM**  
Conference Call  
[www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19140/](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19140/)

**ACTION ITEMS & DECISIONS**

**DECISION:** The May workgroup minutes were approved.

**ACTION:** CBPO staff will find out if historical cleanup methods indeed belong in Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP).

**ACTION:** CBPO staff to provide jurisdictions with tables of annual implementation.

**ACTION:** Johnston will bring the CSO/BMP issue to the WWTWG and the Urban Stormwater Workgroup for their recommendation to the WTWG.

**ACTION:** Johnston will present these recommendations to the USWG on June 18<sup>th</sup> and report back to the WTWG in July.

**MINUTES**

**Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements**

- Alana Hartman (WV DEP; WTWG Chair) welcomed participants and reviewed the day's [agenda](#).
  - She reminded the workgroup that the July conference call will be July 8<sup>th</sup> instead of July 1<sup>st</sup>. The June meeting will be Monday, June 3<sup>rd</sup> at the Chesapeake Bay Program Office in Annapolis.
- Hartman explained she would be stepping down after a year as the workgroup Chair. She
  - Matt Johnston (UMD, CBPO) explained that Ted Tesler (PA DEP) had been nominated
    - Tesler noted he would be willing to serve as the Chair if the workgroup votes to accept his nomination.
  - Hartman noted that additional nominations would be accepted via email through June 21<sup>st</sup>.
- Johnston explained the Agriculture Workgroup's (AgWG's) concerns with agricultural forecasting. A new method would be double-exponential smoothing, which would better account for long term and short term trends. The AgWG approved the new forecasting method, which will be used going forward. Forecasts will be shared with the jurisdictions in early September for the 2013 Progress Run.
- Elizabeth Horsey (Maryland Dept. of Agriculture): there's been a discussion about this approach and how it will be applied to broilers.

- Johnston: The approach will be used across all animals and crops, but there's a discussion between the AgWG and CBPO modeling team to potentially use production numbers for broilers to adjust projections accordingly. It will be up to the states to provide the production numbers to make adjustments.
- Jeff Sweeney (EPA, CBPO) noted that states can start providing the data now. We need trends, going back to 2005 at least, from a citeable, publicly available source, at the finest scale available (County scale). If the newest numbers are not currently available, we could still use the available data from previous years now, and just add the
- Bill Keeling (VA DCR): How to deal with Disclosure D issue for animal numbers?
  - Sweeney: We still need to figure that out.
- Keeling: Had previously provided finer than county scale since Virginia had gone through remote sensing effort. Concerned that the animals might get placed in areas where they are not actually located, as happened before.
  - Johnston: We're looking at trends, so we wouldn't be replacing absolute numbers.
- Tesler: concerned that the jurisdictions may choose or develop different methods for accounting for animal numbers. Just something to keep in mind.
- Olivia Devereux (Devereux Environmental Consulting) noted that she and Jess Rigelman (J7 LLC) are improving some of the agriculture load estimations in CAST/MAST/VAST. The next improvement will be adding cost estimates into the tools. Will be planning some in-person and webinar training sessions later this year. Thought it may be useful to split the trainings into urban and agriculture for the training webinars. Always available to come do in-person training when requested.
- Jennifer Volk (University of Delaware): may depend on the jurisdiction and who's interested in the training.
- Johnston explained that August 13<sup>th</sup> is available, and asked if that date was acceptable.
  - No objections were raised.
  - Keeling: unsure of schedule at this point, won't know until after first day at DEQ which is June 25<sup>th</sup>.
  - Hartman: in the interest of planning, we'll tentatively plan on August 13<sup>th</sup>. This may need to be a face-to-face meeting since September will be restricted to a conference call due to a WQGIT call that same afternoon.
- Johnston: new contract is in place with Tetra Tech, so they will be available to provide NEIEN assistance throughout the progress submission.
- Hartman asked for comments or corrections to the May WTWG minutes ([Attachment A](#)).
  - None were raised; the minutes were accepted as submitted.
- **DECISION:** The May workgroup minutes were approved.

### **BMP History Cleanup Update from Jurisdictions**

- Hartman described the spreadsheet West Virginia will use to track their history cleanup procedures: BMP names down first column, then problems with the history data, methods to solve those problems, agency working on it, and "comments" which includes time frame/priority. Following tabs will each include an individual BMP's input deck with corrected history numbers.

- Hartman asked how others will clean up Conservation Plans numbers.
  - Horsey said Maryland is satisfied with CBP's numbers for Conservation Plans because they had cleaned up that history previously when the Conservation Tracker database came into use. Each of the districts went back through records at that time.
  - Keeling understands that revisions to existing Conservation Plans may show up in Virginia's system as new plans, which would be problematic.
- Hartman asked if we can come up with a rule of thumb for discounting the old numbers, is that acceptable, because it would be better than leaving the inaccurately large numbers in there.
  - Sweeney said yes, but document it in the QAPP. Sweeney's reasoning is that any/all BMP data the states submit need to be covered by a QAPP.
  - **ACTION:** CBPO staff will find out if historical cleanup methods indeed belong in Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP).
- Hartman pointed out since there was no TRP landuse in the past, that breakout will have to be determined for historically reported buffers and fencing.
  - Johnston: the AgWG is leaning towards removing TRP for the next version of the Watershed Model.
- Keeling: Currently scenario builder treats exclusion, and either buffer grass or forest as mutually exclusive and needs to be corrected to bring it into compliance with the pasture panel report. You cannot have a forest and grass buffer on the same acre so they are mutually exclusive. What you have now in Scenario Builder is either fencing, or a buffer, but not both. In the real world you cannot have a buffer without fencing out the livestock. This does not need to wait until the Phase 6 Model to be corrected, but can be done now before the next progress run reporting.
  - Matt Johnston will raise this issue with the AgWG and Mark Dubin (UMD; AgWG Coordinator)
- Keeling: Virginia data is pretty cleaned-up, but the urban data is up in the air and will probably take most of the time.
- Tesler: Older information is aggregated, so can be difficult to tease out. Will start with priority areas and go from there.
- Hartman: back to Conservation Plans: could they be cut off because of Nutrient Management Plans on the same acres?
  - Johnston: No, they are "stackable." See CAST documentation for explanation of which BMPs are stackable.
  - Hartman: we can talk more about CAST and conservation plans down the road.
- Horsey: Eventually the sediment aspects of Cons. Plans should be revisited. There are many components that were disregarded in the past that could be effective in sediment reduction.
- Johnston: Have encouraged the AgWG to compare Scenario Builder BMPs with NRCS codes. May find other BMPs
- Jennifer Volk (University of Delaware): Marcia Fox (DE DNREC) was unavailable for today's call. We are more focused on urban side in Delaware. Have hired a couple seasonal employees to go through documents and databases this summer, e.g. sewer connections, dates things were built, water control structures, plus historic nutrient management plan data and timber harvest.

- Hartman: WV Conservation Agency hired an intern last summer to collect agriculture BMP history data from field offices; let me know if Delaware wants to know more about that.
- Hartman and Johnston reviewed some questions on the historical data clean-up raised by Greg Sandi (MDE) via email:
  - Now that processes will be identified, will verification of these historical BMPs be needed?
    - Hartman noted this was previously discussed to some degree and that verification for historical data would be less rigorous than new practices going forward.
    - Johnston encouraged jurisdictions to utilize the draft verification protocols during their clean-up process.
  - What exactly is the cutoff timeframe you are looking for? 2006? 2010? 1985?
  - What level of spatial detail are you looking for? Lat/Long? County? City?
    - Johnston: if it is possible to get detailed data on stormwater practices, this is the time to get that data into NEIEN, since we will start to see retrofits. Lat-long would be useful.
  - Would any of the information required be different than what is in the current NEIEN submission?
- Keeling: Has the calibration period been determined for the next Model?
  - Johnston: No, that has not been determined yet.
- Johnston: There will likely be new land use model and new projection methods, etc., so we don't know what may be cut off in 2017.
  - Keeling cautioned that finer scale data has more tendency for cutoff, as a general rule.
- Hartman: As we get new BMPs, we may see the NEIEN fields change.
- Steve Gladding (NYS DEC): For 1985-2005, only agricultural practices were submitted from New York. Upper Susquehanna Coalition (USC) reviewed all the paperwork for these historical agriculture BMPs in the conservation districts. Beyond that, not much else that can be done to verify the historical data.
  - Aaron Ristow (USC): We also worked with NRCS state conservationists along with the conservation districts, so double-counting was accounted for.
- **ACTION:** CBPO staff to provide jurisdictions with tables of annual implementation.

#### **BMP History Cleanup Process CBPO would use if no other information is provided**

- Sweeney described the potential clean up process that CBPO staff would take if a jurisdiction does not do the clean up itself
  - View his [presentation](#) for more details
- Questions
- Volk: would be useful to take the recommendations into a separate document to share with the jurisdictions.
- Still discussing how this could be best sent through NEIEN, will report back
- Hartman: keep on future agendas, perhaps quarterly

#### **Stormwater BMP Expert Panel updates**

- Sally Claggett (U.S. Forest Service, CBPO): urban tree canopy now being called “expanded tree cover.” This is one of two forestry BMPs currently under review, and should be wrapping up soon. Expect it to be an efficiency credit. We are keeping it in mind that urban forests may become a separate land use down the road.
- Keeling encouraged all the panels to document that they have addressed all the required elements in the BMP review protocol.
- Sadie Drescher (Center for Watershed Protection): The shoreline erosion control panel has been meeting every month since January. Finished literature review. Dividing into smaller groups to work through some of the issues before July meeting.
  - Hartman recalled an issue was raised about the size of the river and the relation between shoreline erosion control and stream restoration.
    - Drescher: We’re working on that issue right now.
  - Keeling: shoreline is defined in estuarine model, which is where the BMP will likely be credited.
- Neely Law (CWP): urban filter strips/stream buffer upgrade panel started in February and held fourth meeting at end of May. This is a new practice to be defined. Have finished the first round of the literature review. There are limited studies inside the watershed itself.
  - Keeling: they might filter the runoff, but they do not necessarily capture it like other practices.
- Jeremy Hanson (Chesapeake Research Consortium, CBPO): Illicit Discharge Detection & Elimination (IDDE) expert panel has not met for a few months. The Chesapeake Stormwater Network has been working with CWP staff on a crediting protocol during that time.
- Hanson explained the Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) panel has finished its literature review and is drafting its report. Expect the report to go to the workgroups later this summer or early fall. There is limited literature on nutrients and ESC practices, but the panel is finding high fertilization rates associated with stabilization on construction sites. The panel still has to define the efficiency removal rates, but they may only be able to recommend low, or no, efficiency for nutrients based on available information.

### **Applying BMPs to CSOs**

- Johnston explained there were 64 CSO communities in the Model, though about a dozen have separated their sewers and are no longer CSO areas. The loads from CSO are assigned to “wastewater,” so they are not affected by Scenario Builder. Pervious area in a non-CSO area, when a BMP is applied, gets a reduction. In a CSO that BMP would still be reported but won’t result in a nonpoint source load reduction. You can report your BMP in the “urban” landuse group, which doesn’t include CSO. If you use “urban with CSS,” then it includes CSO. View the [slides](#)
- Keeling: in effect, getting cut off of BMPs in urban areas that are applied to CSO land uses. Asking that the landuse not be default to CSO-containing group.
- Johnston: The implementation is still counted and displayed in BMP progress charts, but the reductions are not modeled as non-point source reductions by the modeling tools. They are instead understood to reduce CSO loads to wastewater treatment plants.
- Sweeney: Perhaps the recommendation would be to reduce the estimated CSO load due to BMPs.

- Keeling: will need wastewater workgroup to look at this.
- **ACTION:** Bring this issue to the WWTWG and the Urban Stormwater Workgroup for their recommendation to the WTWG.

### **Stormwater Performance Standards and Retrofits in Scenario Builder**

- Johnston recalled some of the issues and recommendations following the previous month's discussion.
- Issue 1 recommendation
  - Keeling pointed out that degraded BMPs receive one year of degraded credit before they receive full credit for the restoration retrofit.
- Issue 2 recommendation: all urban BMPs will have default life span of 10 years beginning in 2013 Progress. Beginning in 2023 Progress, BMPs will be removed if an inspection/verification/maintenance date has not been entered. Caveat: the verification of practices is still being discussed by USWG and Verification Committee, so the 10-year default will work.
  - Goulet: it may need to be a practice-specific default.
  - Johnston: For now, may need the one default and can expand it as the other panels suggest different lifespans.
  - Goulet: We are talking about verification lifespans that consider whether the facility is functioning as originally intended. This is different than engineered lifespans for these facilities.
- Keeling noted he had to leave and explained that Virginia would vote "abstain"
- Crediting procedure
  - Goulet: concern about giving land use priority over the site specific practice information.
- Hartman wasn't ready to call a vote on these issues because we just learned in Johnston email on Thursday there would be a vote. Does not know what stormwater WG colleagues think.
- WTWG discussed whether these issues should have been discussed in USWG first, or the way it was actually done, which was WTWG first. This has become a systemic question within Bay Program workgroups, so must be addressed soon. Reasons were given for both sides; the issues were tabled.
- **ACTION:** Johnston will present these recommendations to the USWG on June 18<sup>th</sup> and report back to the WTWG in July.

### **Potential agenda items for July**

- Hartman summarized some of the potential agenda items for the next month or so.
  - Goulet suggested bringing the SB changes for Urban Nutrient Management and Urban Stream Restoration to the Urban Stormwater Workgroup before the WTWG.
  - Chris Brosch (Virginia Tech, VA DCR): offered to give a brief update on the Ag Nutrient Management panel during next call.
- Hartman adjourned the call, thanking participants for their time and input.

**Adjourned 12:30 PM**



## Conference Call Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Alana Hartman (Chair)	WV DEP
Matt Johnston (Coord.)	UMD, CBPO
Jeremy Hanson (Staff)	CRC, CBPO
Chris Brosch	Virginia Tech/ VA DCR
Sally Claggett	USFS
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting
Sadie Drescher	Center for Watershed Protection, CBPO
Steve Gladding	NYS DEC
Norm Goulet	Northern VA Regional Commission
Beth Horsey	MDA
Bill Keeling	VA DCR
Sarah Lane	UMD/MD DNR
Neely Law	Center for Watershed Protection, CBPO
Robin Pellicano	MDE
Jess Rigelman	J7 LLC
Aaron Ristow	Upper Susquehanna Coalition
Greg Sandi	MDE
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO
Sally Szydlowski	Water Stewardship
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Jenn Volk	U. of Delaware
Dana York	Green Earth Connection, LLC