

Chesapeake Bay Program Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG) Meeting Minutes

Thursday, March 3, 2022 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Calendar Page: Link

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: WTWG approved the February meeting minutes.

Action: A discussion on the CBP grant guidance will be added to the April WTWG agenda.

Action: WTWG will continue to discuss the changes to the Animal Mortality Technical Appendix at their April meeting. Approval will be sought in May.

Action: WTWG jurisdictional members should send information on current federal BMP data to Stephanie MacDurmon (smacdurmon@brwncald.com). The Federal Facilities Workgroup will send an email with more information and the deadline to submit. They would like to come back to the WTWG to continue this discussion at a future meeting.

Decision: WTWG approved separating narrow forest buffers from forest buffers with them all being summarized in the BMP Summary Report. Jessica Rigelman will submit a request with the IT team for this change.

Action: WTWG leadership will work on developing a joint meeting to discuss backout with the Wetlands and Land Use Workgroups.

Meeting Minutes

10:00 AM – Introductions and Announcements – Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC

- Approval of February Meeting Minutes Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC
 - Decision: WTWG approved the February meeting minutes
- New Phase 7 Model Development webpage
- Recap from Feb 14 CAST21 Meeting Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC
- 2021 Progress Schedule Reminders Vanessa Van Note, EPA
- Looking Ahead: Results of an analysis of excess in the draft 2021 Progress BMP record looking for specific causes for each BMP and each state— Jeff Sweeney, EPA / Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC
- Other announcements
 - CAST Webinar on March 17th will discuss local engagement resources.
 - Comparison for C19 and C21 is now available. Link to model documentation: https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/Documentation/ModelDocumentation
 - WV let everyone know there are some new bullet points in the CBP's grant(s) guidance that covers CBIG, LIF, CBRAP, and could change the workload. Would like this to be an agenda item in the future to discuss if possible. VA supports this as an agenda topic. The grant guidance review is still open but need to confirm. EPA stated that they try their best to incorporate comments but ultimately, it's up to them. DE doesn't collect data from partners till October and they update

their QAPP during this process; it's hard to figure out how to work this new date (due in September) without undue pressure on our partners. DE wants to make sure they can submit new BMPs without a problem even though they don't get the new data till October. PA supports reporting once on February 1st with an "as built" for the progress data. Comments were due on February 25 for the grant guidance review.

Action: A discussion on the CBP grant guidance will be added to the April WTWG agenda.

10: 15 AM - Update on the Animal Mortality Technical Appendix - Jeremy Hanson, CRC (20 min.)

Jeremy Hanson will give an update on the technical appendix for the Animal Mortality BMP Expert Panel Report. Approval of the technical appendix will be sought in April.

Discussion:

Jeremy Hanson: current schedule is to seek approval from WTWG in April but can move to approve appendix at the May meeting.

Jennifer Walls: would delaying this another month affect anything related to this report in CAST? Jeremy Hanson: we missed the deadline for getting this into CAST 2021. It's more just about this group's workload in April and May.

Loretta Collins: I think it's a good idea to discuss in April and approval in May. Then people feel confident about deciding the following month.

Action: WTWG will continue to discuss the changes to the Ag Mortality Technical Appendix at their April meeting. Approval will be sought in May.

<u>10:35 AM</u> – **Federal Facilities Workgroup** – Greg Allen, EPA-CBPO and Stephanie MacDurmon, Brown & Caldwell (20 min.)

Federal Facilities Workgroup is looking for information about jurisdictional BMP data. They would like to figure out how much effort it would take to generate a list of federal BMP records, including state identifiers.

Discussion:

Greg Sandi (MD): we can provide any records that passed QA/QC. *42 min. into call*. Making unique ID conform to our standard description to maintain that level of being able to track that moving forward. MD tracks everything by federal, state etc. so it would be easy to pull that information out.

Clare Sevcik (DE): is it federal agencies or federal land?

Greg Allen: whether it has facilities on it or not is not of interest to us. If the land is owned by a federal agency, then we would like to know about it, but to our knowledge there are no federal lands in DE.

Ted Tesler (PA): we've worked with Stephanie in the past, it's been helpful to have her available. We can go probably get this information to you.

Greg Allen: we that in the amended WIP III from PA with rate of completeness.

Ted Tesler: I know DoD works great, and we are willing to work with Stephanie to get that information.

Stephanie: I know a couple jurisdictions maintain two separate databases. We are aware that there may be some difficulties in how those databases communicate. We are just looking for a poll of what you have now and not expecting you to fix any errors that might exist.

John Maleri (DOEE): I need to confirm with the database team but don't think it will be a huge lift.

Alana Hartman (WV DEP): we don't have a lot of records, but I am worried about finding them. We've had difficulties in the past. In the future if we successfully flag them as BMPs on federal land then CAST could give you this information.

Stephanie MacDurmon: yes, that is correct.

Greg Allen: we will work on getting a memo together with some details and instructions and include a turnaround time we can get that to the data leads and jurisdictions. To keep the Brown and Caldwell tasks on schedule we would like to have this sooner than later. Does a month feel necessary or 3 weeks?

Bill Keeling (VA): I would first request that federal agencies have access their own data.

Stephanie MacDurmon: theoretically that is true, we have not had a focused discussion with the Feds (at least with our contacts) and not sure if they would have those warehouse permissions. It may be a larger lift depending on the number people we would have to coordinate with. I know the warehouse would give us all the MS4 permits and any additional BMPs. Our request in VA would be in the warehouse and have that federal label.

Greg Allen: I appreciate that because we don't want to ask for something we can't get ourselves. And we can keep talking with you about the best way to do it.

Bill Keeling: the BMPs with the biggest issues are federal agencies reporting ag BMPs or septic BMPs.

Greg Allen: This is one of the top issues we are trying to work on this.

Jessica Rigelman: although this can be a problem, we are hoping that states are reporting these in NEIEN. The assumption is that ag and septic land was assigned nonfederal so they should get credit for those BMPs so those should still be reported, and you can track them with a state unique identifier.

Action: WTWG jurisdictional members should send information on current federal BMP data to Stephanie MacDurmon (smacdurmon@brwncald.com). The Federal Facilities Workgroup will send an email with more information and the deadline to submit. They would like to come back to the WTWG to continue this discussion at a future meeting.

<u>10:55 AM</u> – Forestry Workgroup Request – Katie Brownson, USFS (15 min.)

The Forestry Workgroup requests that narrow forest buffers be separated from regular forest buffers in the BMP Summary Report. Katie Brownson will provide additional information and answer questions.

Discussion:

Cassie Davis: other BMPs in the summary report are summed up so we could maybe have them summarized but split out in the report.

Clare Sevcik: when we look at forest buffers in our WIP we look at them as whole, so that could be an issue, but Cassie's suggestion makes a lot of sense, and we understand your rationale.

Jessica Rigelman: there is no process, if you want it, we can submit a request with the web team. I don't have their schedule in front of me so I am not sure how long it would take but it's not a difficult change.

Katie Brownson: their efficiency won't change it's just how they are reported in the BMP Summary report.

Bill Keeling: narrow forest buffers or grass buffers?

Katie Brownson: I only care about narrow forest buffers.

Jordan Baker: I would support with breaking out the narrow forest buffers and forests buffers with a summary report. I also support that for grass buffers as well.

Cassie Davis: is anyone opposed to this proposal?

Decision: WTWG approved separating narrow forest buffers from forest buffers with them all being summarized in the BMP Summary Report. Jessica Rigelman will submit a request with the IT team for this change.

11:10 AM - Backout as it relates to Wetlands - Vanessa Van Note, EPA- CBPO (50 min.)

Vanessa will provide a background on how wetlands base conditions are developed for CAST. A discussion on backout will follow.

Discussion:

Alana Hartman: since many of the elements are static backout doesn't make sense for wetlands.

Vanessa Van Note: that's how I understand it. Does anyone feel the way we designate wetland land uses is sufficient for backout until it becomes static?

Bill Keeling: From my understanding the NWI is not sufficient or of good enough quality to be doing this around. Ted Tesler: PA agrees with Bill. IF we could show our gains and losses from mitigation banking, we would be much more ahead. We are missing an opportunity with this. We are not tracking the wetland in the natural sector when we could be because we have this blanket exception for this data. I am not a fan of backing out wetlands based on the information we have presently.

Cassie Davis: the land use team can see when wetlands are lost but not when they are gained?

Vanessa Van Note: that is my understanding. They can only track the loss to change to impervious cover.

Cassie Davis: it sounds like it would be helpful to have KC Filippino or Peter Claggett present on this and decide from there. Would there be interest in having a meeting specific to wetlands with the Wetlands, Land Use, and Watershed Technical WG?

Norm Goulet: Am I wrong in that the mitigation wetlands are tied up in the bigger issue that historically we can't count practices that are being performed as a result of mitigation?

Ted Tesler: it is. Apparently, we are not supposed to count wetland mitigation because there is no net loss, but there are gains and there is the data of where they were and where they are now. It could be more helpful. There is an understanding that we don't report those but it's not a documented. A communal meeting between the three workgroups would be helpful.

Norm Goulet: I am thinking there might be other players into this discussion.

Cassie Davis: I agree, and I don't think we can look at backout without discussing the whole issue.

Action: WTWG leadership will work on developing a joint meeting to discuss backout with the Wetlands and Land Use Workgroups.

12:00 PM – Meeting Adjourn

Webex Chat Summary:

from Helen Golimowski to everyone: 10:09 AM

https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/Documentation/ModelDocumentation

CAST Webinar March 17th at noon on Local Engagement Resources

from Ted Tesler to everyone: 10:18 AM

Support reporting once on February 1st with an "as built" for the progress data

from Alana Hartman, WVDEP to everyone: 10:21 AM

@Greg, I was referring to the Chesapeake Bay grant(s) guidance that covers CBIG and LIF and CBRAP. Especially

the attachment that deals with data.

from Cassie Davis, NYS DEC to everyone: 10:23 AM

Comments were due on February 25 for the Grant Guidance Review

from Sarah Lane she/her to everyone: 10:29 AM

Oh, mortality composting, the issue that just won't die. :) sorry, couldn't help myself

from Jessica Rodriguez - DoD Chesapeake Bay Program to everyone: 10:41 AM

In addition to the BMP data dump would you be asking jurisdictions to identify any known gaps or missing data they are aware of? For instance, we know some BMPs don't get appropriately assigned to federal agencies.

from John Maleri to everyone: 10:43 AM

Having some mic issues - but for DC we are similar to Greg/MD - we can provide what we submit for BMPs for our federal lands. I'd want to confirm my thinking with our database team but I don't think it would be a huge lift.

from Jessica Rodriguez - DoD Chesapeake Bay Program to everyone: 10:48 AM

What was your potential timeline for getting this data? from Alana Hartman, WVDEP to everyone: 10:49 AM

3 weeks sounds ok

from Bill Keeling to everyone: 10:56 AM

Sorry I am swamped will need more than 3 weeks. from Alana Hartman, WVDEP to everyone: 11:00 AM

I'd be OK with this change in the BMP summary report. Makes sense.

from Ted Tesler to everyone: 11:03 AM

Like Cassie's showing the components solution

from Bill Keeling to everyone: 11:03 AM

Is this just narrow forest buffers or all narrow buffers including grass?

from Sevcik, Clare F DNREC to everyone: 11:04 AM

Well if one BMP is being split, doesn't it make sense to do the same for all compiled BMPs in the summary report?

Next Meeting: April 7, 2022 from 10:00 to 12:00 PM

Call Participants

Hilary Swartwood, CRC

Alana Hartman, WV DEP

Dave Montali, Tetra Tech (WV)

Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC

Norm Goulet, NOVA

Karl Blankenship, Bay Journal

Arianna Johns, VA DEQ

Leon Tillman, NRCS

Clare Sevcik, DNREC

John Maleri, DOEE

Lisa Beatty, NYSDEC

Greg Allen, EPA

Greg Sandi, MDE

Jess Rigelman, J7 Inc.

Helen Golimowski, Devereux Consulting

Nicole Christ, MDE

Ted Tesler, PA DEP

Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Loretta Collins, UMD

Jeremy Hanson, CRC

Bill Keeling, VA DEQ

Victor Clark, DE Farm Freezers

Sophia Waterman, CRC

Jennifer Walls, DNREC

Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA

Jordan Baker, HRG

Katie Brownson, USFS

Stephanie MacDurmon, Brown & Caldwell

Jessica Rodriguez, DoD

Ruth Cassilly, UMD

Sarah Lane, MDNR

Clint Gill, DDA