



**Chesapeake Bay Program**  
**Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)**  
**Conference Call**  
Thursday, August 4, 2022  
10:00 AM to 12:00 PM  
**Calendar Page:** [Link](#)

### Summary of Actions and Decisions

**Decision:** The WTWG approved the [June Meeting Minutes](#), contingent upon edits (i.e., spelling error and sentence correction on page 2 and 3) (post-meeting note: edits were incorporated. New version [posted](#)).

**Action:** Each jurisdiction will be asked for feedback on the 2021 Progress process and approached via email.

**Decision:** The WTWG changed next month's meeting date to [Thursday, September 8<sup>th</sup>](#). Hilary Swartwood will update the WTWG's September calendar page and the email invite with the new meeting date (post-meeting note: the calendar page and email invite were updated on 08.16.2022).

**Action:** WTWG members should report harvest forest acres and construction acres to Jess Rigelman ([jrigelman@j7llc.org](mailto:jrigelman@j7llc.org)) by the end of this month, as well as any updated information on permitted vs non-permitted feed space units to Sucharith Ravi ([sravi@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:sravi@chesapeakebay.net)). Please copy Vanessa Van Note on submissions ([vannote.vanessa@epa.gov](mailto:vannote.vanessa@epa.gov)).

**Decision:** The WTWG approved of the updated NEIEN Appendix for 2022 Progress Submission.

**Action:** Vanessa, Cassie, and Leon will return to the AgWG with the issues/ideas brought up by the WTWG on the NEIEN Phase 6 draft Soil and Water Conservation Plan BMPs. Clare Sevcik, DE, will send WTWG leadership a summary of issues DE is having with individual SWCP practices.

### Meeting Minutes

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

- **Decision:** Approval of [June Meeting Minutes](#)– Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC
  - Scope and purpose discussion - Bill Keeling: change WV to VA.
  - Page 2 - Olivia Devereux comment - “a different criteria not just having a program”
    - Norm's comment - should be “push” instead of “pus”
- New DC WTWG Representatives, Welcome! – Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC
- PSC and WQGIT CAST Update – Vanessa Van Note, EPA- CBPO
  - PSC decision on CAST-21 is still pending. More discussion will occur late August or early September.
- 2021 Progress Released – Vanessa Van Note, EPA- CBPO
  - **Action:** Each jurisdiction will be asked for feedback on the 2021 Progress process and approach via email.
- [CAST Issue Tracker](#) on WTWG homepage
  - *Ted Tesler:* Maybe we should add a “date” column in the tracker.
- The DoD Chesapeake Bay Program released their [FY21 Annual Accomplishments report](#)

- Highlights DoD's collective accomplishments toward meeting the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement and EO13508 goals.
- **NEXT MEETING:** September 8th 10:00 - 12:00
  - **Decision:** The WTWG changed next month's meeting date to Thursday, September 8<sup>th</sup>. Hilary Swartwood will update the WTWG's September calendar page and the email invite with the new meeting date (post-meeting note: the calendar page and email invite were updated on 08.16.2022).

10:15 AM – **2022 Progress Submission Update** – Jess Rigelman, J7 Consulting LLC.

Jess Rigelman provided an update on the 2022 Progress submission, which includes the updated NEIEN Appendix. The WTWG was asked to approve the Appendix after the presentation.

**Discussion:**

*Bill Keeling:* Any changes to NRCS named practices?

*Jess Rigelman:* No.

*Cassie Davis:* Any specific format you would like for progress submissions?

*Jess Rigelman:* I will send the format to you.

*Greg Sandi (in chat):* When will the new IDDE BMPs be "released" v. draft?

*Olivia Devereux:* Those won't be released until CAST-21 is approved.

*Jess Rigelman:* You should still submit them; they will just be in draft form until CAST2021 is released.

*Olivia Devereux:* Can you remind us of which BMPs will be updated in CAST-21?

*Jess Rigelman:* BMP updates for CAST 21:

- Impervious Disconnection BMP only available on impervious
- Ditch BMPs moved to release and updated in CAST as per the EP report
- Abandoned Mine Reclamation land use change is from mixed open to Forest
- Update the Wetland BMPs per the EP report
- Tree bmp backout moved back 15 years
- Tree bmp credit duration changed from 10 to 15 years
- Urban Stream Restoration Protocol 5 moved to release.

**Action:** WTWG members should report harvest forest acres and construction acres to Jess Rigelman ([jrigelman@j7llc.org](mailto:jrigelman@j7llc.org)) by the end of this month, as well as any updated information on permitted vs non-permitted feed space units to Sucharith Ravi ([sravi@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:sravi@chesapeakebay.net)). Please copy Vanessa Van Note on submissions ([vannote.vanessa@epa.gov](mailto:vannote.vanessa@epa.gov)).

**Decision:** The WTWG approved of the updated NEIEN Appendix for 2022 Progress Submission.

10:30 AM – **The Role of the Watershed Technical Workgroup in Phase 7 Development** - Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC

Cassandra Davis reviewed the discussions at the July Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG) and followed up on our discussion of the Scope and Purpose of the WTWG on whether any changes need to be made. We also discussed the role of the WTWG in Phase 7 development.

Questions for the WTWG Membership:

1. *What role did the WTWG play in Phase 6 development?*
2. *What role should the WTWG play in Phase 7 development?*

**Discussion:**

*Greg Sandi:* I thought we didn't have control over BMP definitions and efficiencies and only expert panels (EP) did that. Also, raising a concern about too much specificity in BMP reporting.

*Bill Keeling:* CAST isn't a model, it's a scenario tool. Can we change wording to reflect that? Also, I agree with Greg that adding all of this complexity in BMP reporting is one of the leading errors we have with the BMP warehouse.

*Cassie Davis:* It sounds like we need to be more involved as a WG in future expert panel reports. Might help solve data input issues.

*Greg Sandi:* Typically for the Expert Panel (EP) process, a member of WTWG is included. We should come up with background tenants of what we want our representative to be looking for during that process. Also, it would be helpful for EP to come to the WTWG at least once or twice before putting out the report so that they can get feedback from us.

*Bill Keeling:* when this was brought up last time (USWG and VA comments), we suggested that the chair and/or coordinator attend virtually. We also need more contact prior to them coming to us for endorsement.

*Dave Montali:* How would it work if the AMT decides to simplify BMP credits? Would the WTWG have to approve that?

*Cassie Davis:* I think BMP decisions will remain in the WTWG. The AMT would not make any of those decisions.

*Tom Butler:* Correct. We would talk about simplification of inputs but not BMPs themselves.

*Dave Montali:* there's issues with the way cover crops are set up and they need to be looked at. And if it's not the AMT, then some other group needs to dive into this.

*Tom Butler:* in terms of land use change, that is something being addressed in the AMT. If you are talking of simplifying those, it's fair game, but if it's a BMP, then that's different.

*Bill Keeling:* There's a disconnect between the model and how we account for loads. It greatly complicates the reporting efforts.

*Olivia Devereux:* I understand. That's why the WTWG role is so critical in Phase 7. The main tasks should include how we incorporate the recommendations from the EP panels and source sector WGs into our modeling tools. And maybe we come up with a process for reviewing what already has been incorporated.

*Jess Rigelman:* The EP should be able to do what they do with science and recommendations with data. But WTWG should definitely have a stronger say in the technical appendix. That is where it's translated into CAST.

*Greg Sandi:* It would be nice to have the WTWG looking at some of these inputs again (i.e., fertilizer sales data) and provide technical review and recommendations to help the CBP Modeling team understand the processes and input data.

*Olivia Devereux (in chat):* Please define scoping scenarios. I believe that you are referring to no action and E3.

*Cassie Davis:* I think that's correct. We can define that more specifically.

*Vanessa Van Note:* Cassie and I will be meeting with WQGIT leadership about these changes. And raise the concern that the WTWG is not part of the SRS process.

*Bill Keeling:* Will the new methodology for backout be implemented for 2022 Progress? Or is that dependent on the release of CAST-21?

*Jess Rigelman:* It is dependent on the release of CAST-21. Any data and method changes are only for CAST-21.

10:50 AM – **NEIEN Phase 6 (P6) Appendix/Soil and Water (S&W) conservation plan** - Leon Tillman, NRCS and Vanessa Van, EPA- CBPO

[May 2022 AgWG Decision:](#) *The AgWG endorsed the proposed changes to the Phase 6 NEIEN appendix for select NRCS practices identified as mapping to Soil and Water Conservation Plans in the Phase 5 NEIEN appendix. These BMPs would shift from "draft" to "release" status. Final approval of changes in the NEIEN appendix will occur in the Watershed Technical Workgroup.*

Leon Tillman presented on crediting NRCS agriculture BMPs through the decision outlined above.

For reference (May 2022 and February 2022):

1. May 2022 AgWG Meeting:  
[https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/agriculture\\_workgroup\\_conference\\_call\\_may\\_2022](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/agriculture_workgroup_conference_call_may_2022)
2. February 2022 AgWG Meeting:  
[https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/agriculture\\_workgroup\\_conference\\_call\\_february\\_2022](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/agriculture_workgroup_conference_call_february_2022)

#### **Discussion:**

*Vanessa Van Note:* The SWCP is a suite of practices in the CBP. Only one of these practices within the suite of SWCP can be credited to a single acre, which is why the original decision was made in 2015 by the WTWG.

*Jeff Sweeney:* WTWG had a year of discussion about this already and what the changes are. We did this to avoid double counting. How would that be avoided with this? If they are reporting individual components and the plans as a whole?

*Leon Tillman:* Would still have the same volume, but it would be a small subset getting credit because it only applies credit to a single practice on a specific acre.

*Ted Tesler (in chat):* These BMPs look to be more largely captured by reporting state Ag E&S Plans

*Jess Rigelman:* We have no idea if it's on the same acre of land. Ag practices are reported on a county scale, so there's no way to do that based on the information we get. It's up to the states or reporting entity to know that they're on the same acre.

*Vanessa Van Note (in chat):* Ok, would there be potential for more cutoff by releasing these practices while S&W con plans are still being reported?

*Jess Rigelman (in chat):* Yes, a lot more cutoff.

*Vanessa Van Note:* This would lead to a potential for more cutoff. Some practices on this list are being reported as other practices.

*Jeff Sweeney:* Right, there's a double counting aspect to it.

*Leon Tillman:* Jurisdictions have said there is some variability in how these practices are reported. There is interest in seeing what these reductions will yield concerning individual practices versus a plan.

*Cassie Davis:* if we were to release these from draft form, would the SWCP be retired? Or would we still be able to report those?

*Vanessa Van Note:* We have an EP report for SWCP practice. It wouldn't retire, which is why the issue of overlap comes in.

*Cassie Davis:* Could states choose? Either the SWCP or individual?

*Jeff Sweeney:* We would need to determine efficiencies for each of these individual practices.

*Vanessa Van Note (in chat):* I think my biggest concern is the efficiencies associated with these practices. An individual practice isn't going to accomplish what a combination of practices accomplishes. So, what efficiency do we assign them?

*Leon Tillman:* It would be the same reduction efficiency because they crosswalk.

*Jeff Sweeney:* But you can only report it as a composite.

*Cassie Davis:* so, would these need an expert panel? Because the SWCP was for conservation plan composite?

*Leon Tillman:* were the individual practices not evaluated as part of SWCP?

*Vanessa Van Note:* No. They were evaluated as a combination of practices.

*Leon Tillman:*

*Jeff Sweeney:* It would probably be one panel doing all of these individual practices, but yes.

*Vanessa Van Note:* Yes, I think we would need to base this on the Phase 6 process. Couldn't find anything in Phase 5 documentation of how they were handled.

*Jess Rigelman:* Individually reported and individually mapped to conservation plans. There were hundreds and hundreds of acres of cutoff in Phase 5, which is why this decision was made.

*Jeff Sweeney:* All of these are being credited in the model. They just aren't being reported individually.

*Leon Tillman:* Yes, but there are more practices used beyond the soil loss aspect and goes beyond what is done for a compliance plan.

*Jeff Sweeney:* we would need the AgWG to endorse an expert panel with a reasoning.

*Clare Sevcik:* RECORDING. DE is requesting conversion tables because they lost individual practices due to this being in draft form.

*Leon Tillman:* The public also cannot see total planning acres; they are solely using the data provided through this aggregate data.

*Vanessa Van Note:* For PA and DE, we can work towards that. NY only tracks SWCP, not individual practices.

*Ted Tesler:* P relies on our Ag E&S plans as our amount of SWCP. We track these individual practices because we see value in tracking them and may be useful in developing a more complete history or if tracking additional benefits beyond soil.

*Alana Hartman:* WV doesn't report individual components because I think we know we don't get credit from them. We don't report the plans either because we stopped getting that info from the NRCS database.

*Vanessa Van Note:* DE and WV rely on NRCS reporting planned acres, so need to find a way they can continue reporting them.

*Cassie Davis:* maybe we can go to the AgWG and present with Leon what we've discussed today to see if they want to go through with an EP for some of these individual BMPs or a partnership approved process of moving forward.

*Jessica Rigelman (in chat):* This shows planned acres by state:

[https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/NRCS\\_RCA/reports/conservation-by-prog.html](https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/NRCS_RCA/reports/conservation-by-prog.html)

*Vanessa Van Note (in chat):* I think my biggest concern is the efficiency associated with these practices. An individual practice isn't going to accomplish what a combination of practices accomplishes. So, what efficiency do we assign them?

*Greg Sandi (in chat):* I think that we could address the double counting in our BMP Verification Protocols. Should a jurisdiction decide to report one way or another.

*Clare Sevcik (in chat):* I also want to point out that some of these BMPs cannot be translated into acres for the SWCP BMP. For example, hedgerow planting and diversions are in ft, others are in number of units. We cannot convert these two acres to submit under the SWCP

*Vanessa Van Note (in chat):* Jess/Olivia - Do we not have a conversion factor for what Clare mentioned above?

*Ted Tesler (in chat):* There will be fairly wide ranging efficiencies depending on the slopes and operational differences. Some have high performance brake systems (and need them) while others are just the DOT minimums, to keep the brake system analogy.

*Vanessa Van Note (in chat):* I ask because, for barnyard runoff controls (as an example), I have seen practices reported as feet (like roof runoff structure or diversion) be converted to acres for Barnyard Runoff Controls.

*Olivia Devereux (in chat):* The NEIEN appendix does have conversions for units. For example, hedgerow planting is generally assumed to be 2 feet wide. These are decisions that would need to be made for each BMP.

*Vanessa Van Note (in chat):* Decision Item from June 2015: "All of these BMPs mapped to Conservation Plan in CAST in Scenario Builder/Phase 5 Appendix. These BMPs were over-reported in the Phase 5 Model calibration as multiple BMPs treat the same acre of land. In reality these multiple BMPs are part of one holistic BMP: Soil and Water Quality Conservation Plans."

*Vanessa Van Note (in chat):* Olivia, do we have any guidance available to help Clare report these practices to S&W con plan? Is the 2 feet wide for hedgerows something she could use, or do we need to wait for some kind of expert panel?

*Olivia Devereux (in chat):* This is something that the AgWG and WTWG should evaluate. It is not a CBP staff decision and requires Partnership input.

11:20 AM – **Impact the AgWG Proposal would have on Future Data Reporting** – Vanessa Van Note, EPA - CBPO

Questions for state reps:

1. *How does your state track and report S&W Conservation Plans currently?*
2. *How would your current reporting change with the WTWG approval of the AgWG proposal?*

**Discussion:**

**Action:** Vanessa, Cassie, and Leon will return to the AgWG with the issues/ideas brought up by the WTWG on the NEIEN Phase 6 draft Soil and Water Conservation Plan BMPs. Clare Sevcik, DE, will send WTWG leadership a summary of issues DE is having with individual SWCP practices.

12:00 PM – **Meeting Adjourned**

**Next Meeting: September 8, 2022, from 10:00 to 12:00 PM**

<b>Common Abbreviations/Acronyms</b>	
AgWG- Agriculture Workgroup	BMPVAHAT- BMP Verification Ad Hoc Action Team
BMP- Best Management Practice	CBP- Chesapeake Bay Program
CAST- Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool (user interface for the CBP Watershed Model)	goals)
CBPO- Chesapeake Bay Program Office (houses EPA and myriad contractors and grantees working towards CBP	CRC- Chesapeake Research Consortium
CBW- Chesapeake Bay Watershed	DOEE- [DC] Department of Energy and Environment
DNREC- [DE] Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control	EPA- [United States] Environmental Protection Agency
DoD- [United States] Department of Defense	FFWG- Federal Facilities Workgroup
FWG- Forestry Workgroup	MB- Management Board
LUWG- Land Use Workgroup	NFWF- National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
NEIEN- National Environmental Information Exchange Network	PA DEP- Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
NYSDEC- New York State Department of Environmental Conservation	PSU- Pennsylvania State University
PSC- Principal Staff Committee	UMCES- University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science
STAC- Scientific & Technical Advisory Committee	USDA-ARS- United States Department of Agriculture- Agricultural Research Service
UMD- University of Maryland	States Department of Agriculture-Natural Resources Conservation Service
USDA-NASS- United States Department of Agriculture-National Agricultural Statistics Service USDA-NRCS- United	VA DEQ- Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
USWG- Urban Stormwater Workgroup	WTWG- Watershed Technical Workgroup
WQGIT- Water Quality Goal Implementation Team	
WV DEP- West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection	

**Participants**

Cassie Davis, NYSDEC  
 Vanessa Van Note, EPA  
 Jackie Pickford, CRC  
 Amy Goldfischer, CRC  
 Jenn Wells, DE  
 Clare Sevcik, DE

Holly Walker, DE  
 Bill Keeling, VA  
 Arianna Johns, VA  
 Greg Sandi, MD  
 Emily Dekar, NY  
 Ted Tesler, PA DEP  
 Jordan Baker,



Jeff Sweeney, EPA  
Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting  
Jess Rigelman, J7  
Leon Tillman, NRCS  
Jess Rodriguez, DoD  
Helen Golimowski, Devereux Consulting

Alana Hartman, WVDEP  
Dave Montali, Tetra Tech WV  
Karl Blankenship, Bay Journal  
Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA  
Ruth Cassilly, UMD CBPO

## **Meeting Chat**

*from Hilary Swartwood to everyone: 10:02 AM*

Today's meeting materials are posted here:

[https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/watershed technical workgroup wtwg conference call august 2022](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/watershed_technical_workgroup_wtwg_conference_call_august_2022)

*from Walker, Holly DNREC to everyone: 10:02 AM*

Also, Holly Walker from Delaware, but my audio doesn't work

*from Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA to everyone: 10:04 AM*

Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA

*from Helen Golimowski to everyone: 10:04 AM*

Helen Golimowski, Devereux Consulting

*from Karl Blankenship to everyone: 10:04 AM*

Karl Blankenship, Bay Journal

*from Ruth Cassilly to everyone: 10:10 AM*

Ruth Cassilly, UMD CBPO

*from Vanessa Van Note to everyone: 10:12 AM*

Sorry that we didn't get that into the agenda, Olivia. Thank you for remembering!

*from Jackie Pickford, CRC (she/her) to everyone: 10:12 AM*

WTWG homepage: [https://www.chesapeakebay.net/who/group/watershed technical workgroup](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/who/group/watershed_technical_workgroup)

Under "Projects and Resources"

*from Jessica Rodriguez, DoD CBP to everyone: 10:16 AM*

The DoD Chesapeake Bay Program has released our FY21 Annual Accomplishments report. It highlights DoD's collective accomplishments toward meeting 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement and EO13508 goals. The report can be found here: [https://www.denix.osd.mil/chesapeake/dod-cbp-quarterly-journals/reports/dod-chesapeake-bay-program-fy2021-annual-progress-report/DIGITAL\\_FY21%20Annual%20Progress%20Report\\_SINGLE%20PAGES.pdf](https://www.denix.osd.mil/chesapeake/dod-cbp-quarterly-journals/reports/dod-chesapeake-bay-program-fy2021-annual-progress-report/DIGITAL_FY21%20Annual%20Progress%20Report_SINGLE%20PAGES.pdf)

*from Gregorio Sandi to everyone: 10:18 AM*

When will the new IDDE BMPs be "Released" v. draft?

*from Olivia Devereux to everyone: 10:18 AM*

See CAST Data Update Frequency for the state-reported data for the 2022 progress, due August 31.

<https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/Home/TMDLTracking#progressReportingSection>

*from VVANNOTE to everyone: 10:23 AM*

Welcome!!

*from Alana Hartman, WVDEP she, her to everyone: 10:23 AM*

Dave Montali joined by phone at the start of the meeting.

*from Alana Hartman, WVDEP she, her to everyone: 10:23 AM*

I am joining now, a bit late. I apologize. Alana Hartman, WV DEP.

*from Tom Butler to everyone: 10:26 AM*

thanks for letting everyone know about the AMT!

*from VVANNOTE to everyone: 10:28 AM*

[https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel\\_files/24820/phase 6 approval process modeling wg edits 4-6-17.pdf](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/24820/phase_6_approval_process_modeling_wg_edits_4-6-17.pdf)

^Resource for the Approval Process during Phase 6.

*from Jessica Rigelman to everyone: 10:34 AM*

BMP updates for CAST 21:

- Impervious Disconnection BMP only available on impervious
- Ditch BMPs moved to release and updated in CAST as per the EP report
- Abandon Mine Reclamation land use change is from mixed open to Forest
- Update the Wetland BMPs per the EP report
- Tree bmp backout moved back 15 years
- Tree bmp credit duration changed from 10 to 15 years
- Urban Stream Restoration Protocol 5 moved to release

*from Gregorio Sandi to everyone: 10:34 AM*

Thanks Jess...

*from VVANNOTE to everyone: 10:45 AM*

Great point, Jess.

*from Olivia Devereux to everyone: 10:47 AM*

Please define scoping scenarios. I believe that you are referring to no action and E3.

*from VVANNOTE to everyone: 10:53 AM*

Watershed Technical Workgroup (for Phase 6):

- Read watershed model documentation Chapter 1 for an overview of the work.
- Review Chapter 6 on BMPs.
- Review Chapter 3 on nutrient inputs.
- Review sensitivity analyses generated for other workgroups as detailed below.

Use this link: [https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel\\_files/24820/phase\\_6\\_approval\\_process\\_modeling\\_wg\\_edits\\_4-6-17.pdf](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/24820/phase_6_approval_process_modeling_wg_edits_4-6-17.pdf). We want to make sure whatever role we have in Phase 7 blends well with the AMT and the modeling workgroup responsibilities. I really hope this group can be one that brings jurisdiction and nongovernmental reporting leads voices forward in the process.

*from Jackie Pickford, CRC (she/her) to everyone: 11:08 AM*

Q&A document: [https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel\\_files/44096/nrcs-neien\\_proposal\\_q\\_and\\_a\\_may\\_2022\\_updated.pdf](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/44096/nrcs-neien_proposal_q_and_a_may_2022_updated.pdf)

*from Vanessa Van Note to everyone: 11:15 AM*

Olivia and Jess let's say we release these BMPs. If a hedgerow planting and a soil and water conservation plan are reported to the same land use acre/area, would only one of the practices be credited (I know the BMP distribution is more complicated than this in the model itself)?

*from Jessica Rigelman to everyone: 11:18 AM*

No, they are all treated independently. We have no idea if they are on the same acre.

*from Ted Tesler to everyone: 11:18 AM*

These BMPs look to be more largely captured by reporting state Ag E&S Plans

*from Vanessa Van Note to everyone: 11:19 AM*

Ok, would there be potential for more cutoff by releasing these practices while S&W con plans are still being reported?

*from Olivia Devereux to everyone: 11:19 AM*

Yes

*from Vanessa Van Note to everyone: 11:19 AM*

Good point, Ted.

*from Jessica Rigelman to everyone: 11:19 AM*

Yes, a lot more cutoff

*from Vanessa Van Note to everyone: 11:24 AM*

I think my biggest concern is the efficacy associated with these practices. An individual practice isn't going to accomplish what a combination of practices accomplishes. So, what efficiency do we assign them?

*from Gregorio Sandi to everyone: 11:24 AM*



I think that we could address the double counting in our BMP Verification Protocols. Should a jurisdiction decide to report one way or another.

*from Vanessa Van Note to everyone: 11:25 AM*

Right ^

*from Clare Sevcik DNREC to everyone: 11:25 AM*

I also want to point out that some of these BMPs cannot be translated into acres for the SWCP BMP. For example, hedgerow planting and diversions are in ft, others are in number of units. We cannot convert these to acres to submit under the SWCP

*from Vanessa Van Note to everyone: 11:26 AM*

Jess/Olivia, do we not have a conversion factor for what Clare mentioned above?

*from Ted Tesler to everyone: 11:27 AM*

There will be fairly wide ranging efficiencies depending on the slopes and operational differences. Some have high performance brake systems (and need them) while others are just the DOT minimums, to keep the brake system analogy.

*from Vanessa Van Note to everyone: 11:27 AM*

I ask because, for barnyard runoff controls (as an example), I have seen practices reported as feet (like roof runoff structure or diversion) be converted to acres for Barnyard Runoff Controls.

*from Olivia Devereux to everyone: 11:30 AM*

The NEIEN appendix does have conversions for units. For example, hedgerow planting is generally assumed to be 2 feet wide. These are decisions that would need to be made for each BMP.

*from Vanessa Van Note to everyone: 11:32 AM*

Decision Item from June 2015:

*from Vanessa Van Note to everyone: 11:32 AM*

All of these BMPs mapped to Conservation Plan in CAST in Scenario Builder/Phase 5 Appendix.

These BMPs were over-reported in the Phase 5 Model calibration as multiple BMPs treat the same acre of land.

In reality these multiple BMPs are part of one holistic BMP: Soil and Water Quality Conservation Plans.

*from Vanessa Van Note to everyone: 11:33 AM*

Olivia, do we have any guidance available to help Clare report these practices to S&W con plan? Is the 2 feet wide for hedgerows something she could use, or do we need to wait for some kind of expert panel?

*from Olivia Devereux to everyone: 11:35 AM*

This is something that the AgWG and WTWG should evaluate. It is not a CBP staff decision and requires Partnership input.

*from Vanessa Van Note to everyone: 11:36 AM*

Just surprised we haven't had those discussions. But agree with what you are saying.

*from Jessica Rigelman to everyone: 11:41 AM*

This shows planned acres: [https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/NRCS\\_RCA/reports/conservation-by-prog.html](https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/NRCS_RCA/reports/conservation-by-prog.html)

*from Olivia Devereux to everyone: 11:49 AM*

The tool allows you to click on a tab for resource concern and you can select water quality by state and year

*from Leon Tillman to everyone: 11:54 AM*

I am having audio problems. I lost everyone after Vanessa mentioned taking it back to the AgWG.

*from Jessica Rodriguez, DoD CBP to everyone: 11:55 AM*

8 SEP works for me.

*from Alicia Ritzenthaler to everyone: 11:55 AM*

Sept 8 works fine for DC

*from Gregorio Sandi to everyone: 11:55 AM*

Maybe, that's a MB meeting

*from Vanessa Van Note to everyone: 11:55 AM*

Sorry Leon! Just saw this. We will work with you on how to approach the AgWG discussion.

*from Ted Tesler to everyone: 11:56 AM*

The 8th is better, off the QAPP Deadline