



Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Conference Call
Thursday, April 4, 2019
Calendar Page: [Link](#)
Call Summary

Summary of Actions and Decisions:

Action: Any partners interested in gaining deeper training on the Watershed Data Dashboard should contact Emily Trentacoste (trentacoste.emily@epa.gov) or Michelle Williams (williams.michelle@epa.gov) to schedule a training in the coming months.

Action: Approval of March 7 meeting minutes were postponed until May WTWG call.

Action: The Shoreline Management Expert Panel Recommendations and Technical Appendix will be reviewed to address any discrepancies in nutrient crediting calculations for Protocol 1. Any revisions will be shared with the WTWG at the May 7 WTWG conference call.

Action: Emily Trentacoste and CBPO staff will work on developing a feature in the Data Dashboard to visualize BMP domains and implementation progress compared to opportunities and measure against WIP goals.

Action: The WTWG will discuss updating fertilizer application data in the Phase 6 model updates at an upcoming conference call.

10:00 AM – Introductions and Announcements – Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO

Action: Approval of March 7 meeting minutes were postponed until May WTWG call.

Announcements:

- Request from James Davis-Martin to look into crediting nutrients for shoreline management practices. CBPO looking into the issue. Lew Linker, Jeff Sweeney, USWG representatives, and WTWG will look into it. If there are corrections to be made to Protocol 1 calculations.
 - Olivia and Jess clarified: That's a change to the BMP expert panel report and not a change to the modeling tools.
 - Daniel Proctor also offered to explain the issue. He was on the expert panel with Lew Linker. Protocol 1 TN and TP numbers were put on hold until further investigation could allow for those credits to be calculated. Those credits were added in in 2017/2018. In the process of the addition some of the calculations turned out to be inaccurate according to the intentions of the panel. The calculations were made based on an incorrect fraction of the sediment addressed. The result is about 1/3 of what the actual credit should be in VA and ½ what it should be in MD.

- Jeff Sweeney: We still need to dig into the issue of the sediment addressed in the panel report. Does this need to go back to the Urban Stormwater Workgroup (USWG)?
- Proctor: USWG is working on other priorities right now, but James Davis-Martin didn't want this to fall through the cracks.
- Sweeney: We do have a technical appendix that would need to be revised. We will bring this back to the WTWG and USWG at the next meetings.
- Bill Keeling asked whether Modeling Workgroup is looking at the issue rather than USWG.
- Jeremy Hanson: USWG was the original sponsor of the panel, but Modeling Workgroup helped with the actual technical details.
- Sweeney: We shouldn't need to reopen the panel. We just need to acknowledge that there was a miscalculation made and announce the corrected calculations when we have that available at the next meeting.

Action: The Shoreline Management Expert Panel Recommendations and Technical Appendix will be reviewed to address any discrepancies in nutrient crediting calculations for Protocol 1. Any revisions will be shared with the WTWG at the May 7 WTWG conference call.

- Jess Rigelman announced updates to CAST and NEIEN. Adding interim BMPs to CAST, updating the codes list, and no longer allowing submissions to the Phase 5 version of the node, and there is a 1.0 and 1.1 schema—1.0 will no longer be available and you will have to change to 1.1 in future submissions. This will not change your scenarios or data, it should just make submitting data easier in the future.
 - Jeff Sweeney: We are trying to stick to the stopping rule and not changing model data during the milestone period. We want to coordinate with your databases as best we can.
 - Jason Keppler asked about changes to mapping and cover crops in CAST.
 - Sweeney: I need to talk with you more offline, but that issue will be brought to the WTWG for more information at an upcoming call.

10:10 AM – **Watershed Data Dashboard** – Emily Trentacoste, EPA CPBO

Emily demonstrated the Watershed Data Dashboard tool. The data dashboard collects monitoring trends, modeling results, projections and explanations into one tool for use in guiding watershed planning and assisting in plan implementation. The Data Dashboard is available [here](#), and the link is available under WQGIT [Current Projects](#).

Discussion:

- Norm Goulet pointed out a small bug in the wastewater load graphs—Emily Trentacoste will take a look and correct the graphs.
- Jason asked if there is maps and graphs available for most recent CAST scenarios.
 - Emily Trentacoste: We don't have that yet, but recent progress scenarios and planning scenarios is something we'd like to display in the future.
- Jeff asked if there is modeling data in addition to monitoring.
 - Trentacoste: This is just the water quality monitoring information, we don't have

- modeled information, like from SPARROW.
 - Sweeney: There are a lot of situations here where comparisons between modeled and monitored information are not possible, but this monitoring information is more what general users are looking for. This is valuable for me and my team to address these general information requests very quickly, where before we had to go on CAST and run queries and download reports.
 - Sweeney: Also please note that EPA does review water quality and monitoring information in our evaluations of the WIPs. EPA also uses that monitoring information and program evaluations in the WIP reviews. The model is not the only piece of information that EPA draws on in evaluating watershed implementation plans.
- Trentacoste: We will plan to go around and do some trainings and webinars in coming months. Please contact me or Michelle Williams if you or your jurisdiction is interested in getting a more in-depth training on this dashboard.
- Jeremy Hanson: Here, the BMP progress is just the latest data. If we wanted to go deeper into the implementation history, we currently have to go back to CAST.
 - Trentacoste: We don't have that capability yet, but we have discussed adding implementation graphs over time.
 - Hanson: it would be very useful to be able to visualize just the key scenarios.
 - Sweeney: Most inquiries from the public are just current conditions snapshot. Questions of progress and trends need that data over time, but this hits that more general need to see what's happening now.
- Jason Keppler asked about percent implementation calculation
 - Trentacoste: Percent implementation takes into account the opportunity of that BMP vs the amount implemented. For instance, percent is the number of units out of the amount of available land.
 - Sweeney: When you look at summary BMPs, the report from CAST gives you more information about what the point of comparison is for the summary BMPs and percent implementation. We have discussed what the domain is for some of those BMPs in going from Phase 5 to Phase 6. However if there's no opportunity for BMP implementation we should display that clearly in the map.
- Keppler: Can you show the domain amounts on the dashboard also?
 - Trentacoste: We discussed that. For summary BMPs, the BMPs in the summary can have different domains, and we are discussing the best way to capture that and show the opportunity used and remaining for each county. In the meantime, we can provide the documentation up here to show what land use is being used to calculate the opportunities and percent implementation.
 - Sweeney: Other partners have also asked to see the numbers of implementation compared to the WIP goals. We will work out what can be done to make that visualization possible.

Action: Emily Trentacoste and CBPO staff will work on developing a feature in the Data Dashboard to visualize BMP domains and implementation progress compared to opportunities and measure against WIP goals.

Action: Any partners interested in gaining deeper training on the Watershed Data Dashboard should contact Emily Trentacoste (trentacoste.emily@epa.gov) or Michelle Williams (williams.michelle@epa.gov) to schedule a training in the coming months.

10:50 AM – Ongoing Discussion of Progress Scenarios, Verification and Model Schedule – Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO

Jeff updated the workgroup on the status of the 2018 Progress model scenario and BMP verification + the schedule for WIP3 and data needs for CAST for the next Milestone period. 2018 Progress—version 11 is the version that is considered final in CAST. Topics discussed included:

- Each state will receive a letter regarding verification from CBP Director Dana Aunkst.
- NEIEN is open now for 2019 progress, so states should be able to submit early and often through NEIEN. The ultimate goal is to perform one data pull at beginning of December, with QA/QC completed prior to December 2.
- Land policy BMPs will be added to CAST this week.
- Draft Phase III WIP documents (documents and input decks) are due April 12. The easiest way to share input decks is to share the CAST scenario with Jeff or Suchith. Between now and final August 9 deadline for Phase III WIPs, there will be a lot of one-on-one discussion between EPA and state agencies
- April 30: Deadline for new data from jurisdictions and source sector workgroups to be submitted for inclusion in next CAST updates. Includes panel reports, etc.

Discussion:

- Norm Goulet asked about deadlines for including fertilizer application data in urban sector.
 - Sweeney: I don't know where that stands now that Matt Johnston is gone but I will follow up on that. That's a priority for Urban Stormwater Workgroup and Ag workgroup.
- Sweeney: We should be able to share some preliminary data on the Phase III WIPs next month.

Action: The WTWG will discuss updating fertilizer application data in the Phase 6 model updates at an upcoming conference call.

11:30 AM – Adjourned

Call Participants:

Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO
Emily Dekar, USC
Wade Cope, PA DEP
Pat Walsh, PA DEP
Greg Sandi, MDE
Jason Keppler, MDA
Daniel Proctor, Stantec
Bill Keeling, VA DEQ
Alana Hartman, WV DEP
Chris Brosch, DDA
Emily Trentacoste, EPA CBPO
Megan Crunkleton, Contractor
Norm Goulet, NoVA Regional Commission
Jeremy Hanson, VT
Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting
Jess Rigelman, J7 LLC

Suchith Ravi, UMCES

Jason Bernagros, EPA

James Davis-Martin, VA DEQ