

This meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes



Chesapeake Bay Program

**Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Meeting Minutes**

Thursday, September 2, 2021

10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Calendar Page: [Link](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Action: Hilary Swartwood will review the minutes and make sure that the action item to inform FFWG of what should be included in NEIEN is captured (post- meeting note: this was added into the minutes)

Action: Hilary Swartwood will send out the 2021 Progress Schedule post- WTWG meeting.

Action: WTWG will bring sewer connections as it relates to backout to the WWTWG to get their input.

Action: WTWG leadership will work with Lisa Beatty to address her questions related to QAPP's.

Agenda

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

- Approval of August Meeting Minutes – Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC
 - **Action:** Hilary Swartwood will review the minutes and make sure that the action item to inform FFWG of what should be included in NEIEN is captured.
 - **Bill Keeling:** I thought there was some discussion that Federal Facilities WG needs to know what to report in NEIEN. I didn't see that in the minutes, so I don't approve them until that is verified.
- WQGIT approved Land Use Change data as "best available data" for CAST 2021
- Status of 2020 Progress- Jeff Sweeney, EPA
 - 2020 Progress Scenario is not complete. There are still some issues remaining with BMP verification that are being dealt with, however there is no set date when it will be released.
- 2021 Progress Upcoming Due Dates – Vanessa Van Note, EPA
 - NEIEN is open for submissions now.
 - Vanessa reviewed upcoming due dates for 2021 Progress. The schedule will be sent out to the group.
 - **Cassie Davis:** when is the first NEIEN error report going to be available?
 - **Jess Rigelman:** it can be available at any time. Officially, the first time we will run it is on December 1st.
 - **Olivia Devereux:** we will run it every Friday, whether you need it or not. But if you want that feedback, reach out to Jess Rigelman. The calls that Vanessa mentioned would include technical staff from the Bay Program so that we can look up data and resolve any issues during the call.
 - **Action:** Hilary Swartwood will send out the 2021 Progress Schedule post- WTWG meeting.
- Update on At- large membership – Vanessa Van Note, EPA

This meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes

- *Currently doing a revote and will have more information at next meeting.*
- *Synopsis: there was a “Stop” on the continuum for the first round of voting. This was due to a perceived conflict of interest. Following the governance protocols, and recommendations from GIT6, the nominee was given a chance to rebuttal, and now the voting members are doing a revote. If there is still a hold or stop on the continuum, a meeting of the voting members will be held to discuss this issue and work towards consensus.*
- *Ag Modeling Needs for Phase 7 – Loretta Collins, UMD and Vanessa Van Note, EPA*
 - *Will keep WTWG updated on progress as we move forward with developing and working through Ag Modeling needs.*
 - *Bill Keeling: at the last modeling quarterly review, we discussed whether it would be more important to focus on shallow estuarine modeling.*
 - *Loretta Collins: I hear you; we aren’t going to reinvent the wheel. We are going to be looking at what was done in Phase 6 and checking to see what worked at what needs to be fixed, but we won’t be redoing the whole thing. This won’t be a full-scale redo of the model.*
 - *Bill Keeling: one of the major complaints is that the land use is cropland, it’s not a rotation of cropland. Just to put that on your radar.*
 - *Loretta Collins: if you have comments on this, please reach out to me.*
 - *Dave Montali: the GIT3 meeting in October is focusing on gathering priorities for Phase 7, and issues like this are what they are looking for at that meeting.*
- *CAST 2023 Hillandale Update – Vanessa Van Note, EPA*
 - *This has been taken to AgWG and they received it well. The group wanted to continue the conversation and I will continue to provide updates. It will be discussed at the October AgWG meeting.*
- *Other announcements*

10:30 AM – Retirement Date for Default Urban Stream Restoration – David Wood, CSN

David Wood will present the retirement date for the default urban stream restoration practices. He will also discuss the new climate resiliency resources.

Discussion for Default Urban Stream Restoration:

Bill Keeling: in terms of the data we report, planned implementation is not reportable to the DEQ database. I just need to know that if it falls in 2022 it is still reportable by 2022.

Dave Wood: that is correct, Bill.

James Martin: I typically use CAST as a planning tool. I still will be able to use the default rate in my scenarios, correct?

David Wood: It is totally fine to use the defaults as a planning option. We stripped them out of the memo because people weren’t using them as a planning tool anymore.

James Martin: all the practices being reverified will still get the default rate until they are reverified?

David Wood: that is correct.

Ted Tesler: confirming that Ag SR projects can still report default rate after June 30, 2022?

David Wood: barring any new decisions from the AgWG, that would be the case. This just applies to urban practices.

Loretta Collins: I will take the blame; we are still working on ag stream restoration.

This meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes

Discussion on Climate Change Informed IDF Curves:

Links to these resources is found in David's presentation posted on the [calendar page](#).

10:45 AM – **Progress Evaluation SOP** – Vanessa Van Note and Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Vanessa will review the SOP as it currently stands then lead a discussion. Feedback will be accepted until COB September 20th, 2021. We will discuss the comments received at our October WTWG meeting.

Discussion:

Bill Keeling and James Martin: Recommend a language change for over/ under reporting.

Chris Brosch: I'd recommend significant change to this language. It's the same verbiage used on CAFO permitting. It's not as confusing.

James Martin: I don't recall as I read through the report to VA any differentiation between these two methods (first assessment, second assessment)?

Jeff Sweeney: we focus more on the second one because every state can change their information. This was recommended by VA when this was introduced in 2019.

Ted Tesler: We are going to submit our comments in a written format. I had an aside on the due date to update the QAPP document. Can a revised QAPP be submitted up to the January 1st deadline.

Jeff Sweeney: while we are making revisions, you have the entire 2-month period to revise your QAPP. You have through February 7th to finish that up.

Matt English: will there be a way for the states to see the output from the "second assessment"? Is that option available in CAST to state leads?

Jeff Sweeney: Yes, we can provide that information to you. This is the kind of stuff we would show during these December conversations.

James Martin: I think it would be appropriate to share it with all jurisdictions or make it available to the state leads in CAST.

James Martin: I think the presentation implied a significant focus on using progress to evaluate year to year changes. I use progress to assess progress towards an end point. It seems to me that for 2020, progress towards an end point shifted to evaluate year to year changes.

Jeff Sweeney: the analysis we've been doing haven't changed that much since the early 2000s.

Olivia Devereux: We are really trying to make sure that the data states submitted is correct. It's really to work through data quality issues to make sure the states submitted what they intended. A lot of what Vanessa is presenting is making sure the data submitted is what was intended. I think that is why it's an analysis of year to year as opposed to assessing towards the TMDL.

Jeff Sweeney: we are emphasizing more than what we need is a change product. It's like what we we are doing with the land use change product or Hillandale. Instead, it's an actual change to the model through time.

Additional Questions / Comments from the Chat:

Lisa Beatty: From the previous presentation the QAPP was given 1 slide with a link to the QAPP. Is there going to be a more in depth presentation about the current QAPP so EPA can give clearer expectations? Is there going to be a template / form across jurisdictions to have clear expectations? so all jurisdictions are on the same page with EPA's Expectations for the QAPP for December 1st 2021? Is there plans to update the QAPP? If so, what is

This meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes

the timeline? Is this something that can be an agenda item at the next WTWG

Lisa Beatty: Jeff, since EPA is the reviewing entity, it is up to them to make clear expectations when EPA is reviewing all jurisdictions QAPP that is directly linked to accepting yearly progress. The link between QAPP and accepting yearly progress was NOT addressed in the presentation. Because all jurisdictions QAPP's vary extensively it is evident that all jurisdictions are not clear of EPA expectations.

Action: WTWG leadership will work with Lisa Beatty to address her questions related to QAPP's.

11:00 AM – Backout as it relates to Septic Connections and Low Vegetation – Vanessa Van Note, EPA, and Peter Claggett, USGS

Vanessa Van Note and Peter Claggett will provide information on backout as it relates to septic connections and low vegetation and answer questions.

Discussion:

Vanessa Van Note: are we constraining septic connections to only areas that are mapped.

Peter Claggett: I can't answer that, but it would make sense. Olivia and Jess would need to answer that. Some counties over generalize their sewer service areas but in terms of avoiding double counting that's the whole purpose of back out. Restricting back out to such connections would require knowing those connections and I am not sure that is the case.

Bill Keeling: If you are outside the service area, connecting to it outside the area is not financially feasible. So, if you live in that area, you are probably connected.

Peter Claggett: You could have connections with inclusion of septic, but on the periphery of that area there could be connections, but it would be outside of the mapped area. It's only those in the sewer service area that would be double counted.

Jess Rigelman: Obviously we don't have polygons in CAST, Peter gives us a file with this information. If you report a connection, those systems are removed, and the septic load goes down. I guess we are assuming in CAST that they are connected. They are based on the sewer service area but on a general land segment scale.

James Martin: the back out process would remove all septic connections reported prior to 2017.

Jess Rigelman: yes 2017 progress would be run to determine how many septics existed and then those would be backed out.

James Martin: If there was a septic connection reported from Northern VA, a septic connection in VA beach would be backed out?

Jess Rigelman: if it was reported in Loudin County then it's backed out for that county.

Peter Claggett: we have not been tracking the vintage of the sewer service areas. We ask for updates, provide data, and have people review them; we are assuming that the sewer service areas are up to date. There are still some places where we know there is sewer based on 2010 census, but we haven't received any information. I think that is an issue: we don't know the vintage of the SSA's, we don't know if they are specific or generalized. In the tetra tech report, it didn't have them as polygons, they were stick diagrams and we had to develop a training to show them how to make them into polygons. For CAST 2021, for those that provided data, I don't know if they didn't critique the data or didn't provide any. Reporting BMPS, sewer connections etc. and the land- river segment scale, but we don't know if they are inclusions or peripheries. The inclusions would be double counted, the peripheries would not be.

This meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes

Karl Berger: Has there been a pilot run / attempt to ground truth the data by going into a jurisdiction where the sewer data has expanded and compare that to the number of sewer connections reported?

Peter Claggett: We have not done that. The last detailed modeling of sewer connections etc. was based on the census and that only happens every ten years. That is our best baseline. Moving forwards in time we look at development and housing change inside and outside the sewer connection. For CAST 2023 we will have the 2020 census at the block level.

Norm Goulet: That's not true, it's not a census question anymore and that's part of the problem.

Peter Claggett: I am not referring to that, I am referring to the number of estimate of houses within an area. And overlaying that with the sewer information can help us estimate sewer changes.

Norm Goulet: there have also been significant changes to septic where entire subdivisions are on one or two septic instead of it being single households.

Jess Rigelman: In CAST, states can report large septic that treat residential areas, and we use that monitored data from that neighborhood.

Karl Berger: another issue is that you can't track commercial septic, right?

Jess Rigelman: That is also in CAST. These are reported through the WWTWG. There is a mechanism for it if we could get people to report newer data.

Norm Goulet: I think the problem is exactly that: the tracking and reporting.

Jess Rigelman: we are relying on our wastewater contacts, but we could reach out to different people if you guys have names.

Vanessa Van Note: where should we take this / what should our next steps be?

Bill Keeling: The assumption that everything in the service area is already hooked up is where I am having an issue.

Dave Montali: for WV, I think we spend way too much because the load effect is miniscule. Is there a way to assess / compare backed out to not backing out to see what the load is and if it's not that much maybe there is a better way to set it up for the model?

Jess Rigelman: I can do that analysis.

Norm Goulet: I agree that from a Bay wide standpoint the load is not significant, but if you zoom in to the locality it is a big deal. We should look at it from a couple different levels.

Peter Claggett: Bay wide in VA we are underestimating septic by 200,000, which leads me to believe that the underestimate is partly because of inclusions (grandfathered into sewer service area), or multi-unit homes that might be on sewer but are more likely on septic. Because we are underestimating septic it makes me less concerned about double counting.

Cassandra Davis: Has this been brought to the WWTWG recently?

Peter Claggett: not in a while.

Vanessa Van Note: Is that a good next step?

Cassandra Davis: I think it would be a good idea to present this to them.

Norm Goulet: I think with Phase 7 coming, we need to have a push to get as much updated data as possible.

Bill Keeling: I think we need to be clear on what it means to be connected. If I am a service guy and I hear how many people are connected to my line- is that new connections to the line or is that x number of septic systems connected to that line.

Cassandra Davis: so that would be a big ask to have each jurisdiction request this information from each individual plant.

Peter Claggett: yeah, and then there is still a problem where they may over generalize just to provide something. There may need to be some sort of validation to ensure that the data we are getting is useful.

This meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes

Karl Berger: There used to be a goal for the smart growth in MD to have as much of it as possible be on sewer, but most states don't report.

Peter Claggett: MD did that for the WIPs and they do have a statewide sewer service area map, but I don't know how frequently they update that. And even if we do get information, it excludes roads and so we need to add those back. It may come in through the BMPs, but it doesn't come into my shop. Tetra Tech sent out a letter to the major and minor wastewater treatment plants and asked for sewer service map in GIS format. They also provided instructions on how to make the map. They received a 60% return.

Dave Montali: For WV it wasn't a tetra tech product, but from WV itself.

Peter Claggett: if we want to update this for phase 7, then people need to look at what we already have and determine whether they have any better data, and if they do then they can provide better data. There needs to be a lot of QA/QC going on for this.

Lisa Beatty: Is this going to the WWTWG?

Cassandra Davis: Yes, we can make that an action.

Vanessa Van Note: How often are those plans updated?

Ted Tesler: they are 5- 10-year masterplan documents.

Action: WWTWG will bring sewer connections as it relates to backout to the WWTWG to get their input.

12:00 PM – **Meeting Adjourn**

Next Meeting: October 7, 2021, from 10:00 to 12:00 PM

Call Participants

Hilary Swartwood, CRC

Cassie Davis, NYSDEC

Vanessa Van Note, EPA

Bill Keeling, VA DEQ

Clare Sevcik, DNREC

Emily Dekar, USC

Jessica Rigelman, J7

Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Karl Berger, MWCOG

Karl Blankenship, Bay Journal

Kristen Wolf, PA DEP

Lisa Beatty, PA DEP

Loretta Collins, UMD

Norm Goulet, NRVA

Ruth Cassilly, UMD

Matt English, DOEE

Sarah Lane, MDNR

Arianna Johns, VA DEQ

Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA

David Wood, CSN

Mollee Dworkin, DNREC

This meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes

Ted Tesler, PA DEP

Lori Brown, DNREC

Dave Montali, Tetra Tech (WV)

Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting

Clint Gill, DDA

Alana Hartman, WV DEP

Jessica Rodriguez, DoD

Sucharith Ravi, UMCES

Chris Brosch, DDA

Pat Thompson, Energy Works

Peter Claggett, USGS

Greg Sandi, MDE

Kevin Du Bois, DoD