



**Chesapeake Bay Program**  
**Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
Thursday, October 7, 2021  
10:00 AM to 12:00 PM  
**Calendar Page:** [Link](#)

### Actions and Decisions

**Action:** Approval of September and August meeting minutes will be sought at the next WTWG meeting after incorporating requested revisions from PA.

**Action:** Lisa Beatty will send her questions from the September and August meeting minutes to the WTWG leadership for them to address.

**Action:** WTWG Leadership will work with new at- large members to set up an orientation (post- meeting note: WTWG leadership is developing orientation materials for the new at- large members. Once the at- large members review, WTWG leadership will see if they would still like to set up a time to meet).

**Action:** WTWG member are encourage to send questions and comments regarding Hillandale to Vanessa Van Note ([vannote.vanessa@epa.gov](mailto:vannote.vanessa@epa.gov)) **by Tues, October 12<sup>th</sup>**. These will then be brought forward to the AgWG during their October meeting.

**Action:** WTWG members should review the technical appendix from the Ag Mortality BMP report by end of next week (October 15<sup>th</sup>) and send any comments to Jeremy Hanson ([hansonj@chesapeake.org](mailto:hansonj@chesapeake.org)).

**Action:** Vanessa Van Note will work on incorporating all comments and edits received today and from previous meetings into Appendix V: Protocols for Verification of Annual BMP Data Submissions Discussion. Once this is complete, it will be reviewed at an upcoming WTWG meeting.

### Meeting Minutes

10:00 AM – **Introductions and Announcements** – Vanessa Van Note, EPA

- Approval of August and September Meeting Minutes – Vanessa Van Note, EPA
  - **Action:** *Approval of September and August meeting minutes will be sought at the next WTWG meeting after incorporating requested revisions from PA (August: clarification on Progress submissions / September: inclusion of Webex chat questions).*
    - *Lisa Beatty requested that PA's questions in the chat at 11:27am and 11:51 be added into the September minutes and an action item that those need to be addressed.*
    - *Lisa Beatty PA does not approve the August 2021 WTWG meeting minutes that were posted today 10/7/21 at 9am. I noticed that everything Jeff Sweeny said in August about progress was Not included in the August meeting minutes. I have several comments like 1/21 should not be called final..."the submission is not final until the verification review is received, responses provided, and issues resolved." We would appreciate you please go back and detail more transparency what Jeff said about the*

**THIS MEETING WAS RECORDED TO ENSURE THE ACCURACY OF THE MEETING MINUTES**

*flexibility of meetings like a 3rd and 4th meeting if necessary, with 2020 Progress OR can we please be sent the recording.*

- New WTWG At- Large Members – Vanessa Van Note, EPA
  - Jordan Baker, Norm Goulet, Jessica Rodriguez are new members.
  - *PA requested a briefing for new at- large members. Although this is typically reserved for the nominating party, if the new at- large members feel they need more information they can reach out to Cassie, Vanessa, and Hilary to set that up.*
  - **Action:** *WTWG Leadership will work with new at- large members to set up an orientation (post-meeting note: WTWG leadership is developing orientation materials for the new at- large members. Once the at- large members review, WTWG leadership will see if they would still like to set up a time to meet).*
- Upcoming WQGIT Meetings:
  - [Oct 12<sup>th</sup>](#): Monitoring Meeting
  - [October 25<sup>th</sup>](#) and [October 26<sup>th</sup>](#): Phase 7 Development and Application
- **Reminder:** Discussion on accommodating Hillandale layer population data will continue the October 21 AgWG call. Reach out to Vanessa Van Note ([vannote.vanessa@epa.gov](mailto:vannote.vanessa@epa.gov)) **by Tues, October 12<sup>th</sup>** with any questions or concerns you would like addressed on the Oct 21 AgWG call.
  - *Bill Keeling: this is just about Hillandale, there is nothing about things we may want to look at for Phase 7?*
  - *Loretta Collins: phase 7 is a separate issue, we will be discussing this and Hillandale, but as two separate issues. Let me know if you guys have anything for phase 7 too. CAST 2021 workplan is closed. There are some lingering issues from that workplan that we need to close out, whether that's in Phase 7 or CAST 2023. Hillandale speaks to larger issues regarding animal data and needs to be addressed.*
  - *James Martin: So, it could be talked about being patched into CAST 2023 but also more broadly related to Phase 7.*
- **Action:** WTWG member are encourage to send questions and comments regarding Hillandale to Vanessa Van Note ([vannote.vanessa@epa.gov](mailto:vannote.vanessa@epa.gov)) **by Tues, October 12<sup>th</sup>**. These will then be brought forward to the AgWG during their October meeting.
- CAST 2021 is on schedule – Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting
- 2020 Progress Update – Jeff Sweeney, EPA
  - *2020 Progress should be released soon.*
  - *Lisa Beatty what is the timeframe for that?*
  - *Jeff Sweeney: although I've heard this multiple times, it seems like it will be 2-3 weeks.*
- 2021 Progress Schedule Reminders – Vanessa Van Note, EPA
  - *Bill Keeling: VA won't get some of their data till November 1<sup>st</sup> which is late to meet the December 1<sup>st</sup> deadline. Something needs to happen where either this data is given to us earlier or EPA needs to acknowledge the tight turnaround.*
  - *Olivia Devereux: We have this elevated to the highest level at NRCS, and we do plan to get this data one month in advance of the deadline.*
  - *Bill Keeling: the one month ahead is not sufficient. They need start looking two months ahead.*
  - *Olivia Devereux: the problem going two months ahead is that the systems update in that first week of September and that update includes data from the progress period and update for the entire federal fiscal year. We can make the decision to do that but that is why we wait till the first week of September to request that information.*
  - *Bill Keeling: We've discussed this offline of the potential risks so let's move on.*

**THIS MEETING WAS RECORDED TO ENSURE THE ACCURACY OF THE MEETING MINUTES**

- *Vanessa Van Note*: Thanks Bill. Since we are behind schedule, I would like to move on to the Draft Technical Appendix and then if we have time, we can come back to the last two announcements.
- *Lisa Beatty*: I have a few other questions regarding progress. I have back in August Jeff saying that if there are issues after those two meeting that we will have additional meetings, is that correct?
- *Vanessa Van Note*: Yes, that is correct.
- *Lisa Beatty*: If 1/21 final call for submissions would not be final until the verification is received with those two meetings, responses provided, and the issue resolved between jurisdiction and CBP office.
- *Vanessa Van Note*: Jeff, I only have a February 7<sup>th</sup> submission/ finalization and not the January 21<sup>st</sup> in the grant guidance. Could you speak o
- *Lisa Beatty*: I wish you would've posted what was decided on so that we could look and make sure that that's what we were deciding on.
- *Vanessa Van Note*: There is nothing to be decided on regarding the grant guidance.
- *Lisa Beatty*: There were outstanding issues that were talked about and they were not incorporated into the document.
- *Vanessa Van Note*: those issues were regarding the QAPPs. We will have to speak about this after. The schedule that is in the grant guidance is what it is. The biggest change is the additional of virtual meetings. We can discuss this mor afterwards as we need to move on to the next agenda item to respect Jeremy's time.
- *Lisa Beatty*: Things that were detailed back in August are ringing true and haven't been addressed.
- *Vanessa Van Note*: If you could please send me what you are referencing, I will address it.
- *(From Chat) Lisa Beatty*:
- **Action**: Lisa Beatty will send her questions from the September and August meeting minutes to the WTWG leadership for them to address.
- NEIEN Error Reports can be run at any time – Jess Rigelman, J7 Inc.
  - *Did not have time to address this at this meeting.*
- Update on Septic Connections – Vanessa Van Note, EPA
  - *Did not have time to address this at this meeting.*
- Other announcements

**10:30 AM – Draft Technical Appendix from the Ag Mortality BMP Report – Vanessa Van Note, EPA and Jeremy Hanson, VT**

Vanessa and Jeremy will introduce the draft technical appendix from the Ag Mortality BMP report. WTWG are encouraged to begin reviewing this document. We will attempt to reach consensus at our November 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Discussion:**

*Bill Keeling*: I'm confused as to what it is I would be reporting.

**THIS MEETING WAS RECORDED TO ENSURE THE ACCURACY OF THE MEETING MINUTES**

*Jeremy Hanson:* Here is an example: I know DE does have the weight of birds from freezer units, and plans to use that in their reporting. That is one option. I don't know if other jurisdictions do this, or if they only know the number of systems. Weight and animal units was the most logical.

*Bill Keeling:* I don't know what information I have, and it's a bad time to be looking because we are swamped, but I will try.

*Jeremy Hanson:* I know that it is varied.

*Bill Keeling:* I just don't know what is being tracked.

*Jeremy Hanson:* I know it's a lot, but anything you can find out would be appreciated.

*James Martin:* thinking about the timing and workload issues because of progress: ultimately this goes from here to WQGIT and then sits and waits for CAST 2023. Do we need to push from now till November?

*Jeremy Hanson:* if we could come up for a compromise that would be ideal. My hesitancy is having Doug and the panelists waiting in the wings when they already spent more time on this than originally planned. The report itself isn't really going to change, it's just the technical appendix that may be changed.

*James Martin:* Protocol for expert panels is being edited, essentially to disconnect those two pieces- the technical appendix and the report- and it may be worth postponing that decision. I don't know what the clear path forward is, but I just wanted to mention it.

*Loretta Collins:* the reason Jeremy is here before is because it went through the AgWG last month. The reason he is here with the technical appendix is because the AgWG was hesitant to approve the report without the technical appendix, especially if we lose that expertise once the report is final. To address one of Bill's comments on potentially having a default, I think the purpose of the report was to separate out each of those mortalities because each has a different efficiency.

*Bill Keeling:* but if there is not any data available, how do we deal with that information? I just need to know what to do. The point of having the two linked is because we didn't want to have something that wouldn't be reportable in the model.

*Jeremy Hanson:* to know what can be used and reported, we do need to hear from members of this group.

*Loretta Collins:* I think one of the main drivers was to account for freezers on the eastern shore and that may have been part of it.

*Jen Walls:* regarding the freezers and the use of that practice as part of rendering, we do have significant number of freezers and we are able to report it easier. This is a process we've been looking for and needing.

*Loretta Collins:* as the AgWG coordinator, I guess I need to understand, is if asking for approval of the report is a reasonable thing to do.

*Norma Goulet:* Based on what we've done in the USWG is that I rarely take a report to them for approval until the whole thing is pretty much final. Having Jeremy bring it to us now is good, but it's your preference whether you want to ask for approval. Usually, the questions get asked are related to the technical appendix. I also want to back up Bills comment. I don't see me being able to devote time to this for a while.

*Jeremy Hanson:* I make the case that we want to respect the panel's time, that's part of the reason.

**Action:** WTWG members should review the technical appendix from the Ag Mortality BMP report by end of next week (October 15<sup>th</sup>).

**11:00 AM – Appendix V: Protocols for Verification of Annual BMP Data Submissions Discussion-** Vanessa Van Note, EPA

## THIS MEETING WAS RECORDED TO ENSURE THE ACCURACY OF THE MEETING MINUTES

Proposed changes to Appendix V were submitted during the comment period between the September and October meetings to address an action item that arose in March 2020 from Issue II of the Management Board charge. During the October meeting, the proposed changes will be reviewed and discussed by the WTWG. Additional feedback during this meeting will be recorded. Between the October and November meeting, EPA and Bay Program staff will review the proposed changes for incorporation into Appendix V. At the November meeting, EPA will notify the group of which changes will be incorporated into Appendix V for the 2021 Progress Evaluation.

### Discussion

*Vanessa Van Note took notes directly in the document (this document is a summary of the comments/edits received). Once these edits are incorporated into Appendix V, the document will be reviewed again at an upcoming WTWG meeting.*

### General Comments

*Lisa Beatty:* When was this sent for us to review this?

*Vanessa Van Note:* we sent this after the September meeting and we accepted comments after the August meeting as well.

*Lisa Beatty:* What original document you are looking at? Is this a document that we are comparing to the comments we sent?

*Vanessa Van Note:* This just goes section by section and only addresses what the proposed changes are. This document outlines the proposed changes for each section for us to look at today. We made sure that each comment was addressed, which includes PA's comments as well.

*James Martin:* you haven't really told us what you are changing just what you are clarifying.

*Lisa Beatty :* I am confused because these edits aren't in the original document it's hard to see what the changes are. Because it's not in the original document I am having to look back at the original to see where those changes would be.

*Vanessa Van Note:* I apologize if this isn't clear, that wasn't my intent.

*Olivia Devereux:* Hilary posted the link to the original document in the chat.

*Loretta Collins:* I think the way Vanessa set this up makes sense because the document is voluminous and this way of doing it makes sense for the meeting. The point here was to highlight that out of this large document here are the things we are responding to and here is what we are addressing.

*Lisa Beatty:* We were given this 2 hours before the meeting how are we supposed to address comments?

*Loretta Collins:* there is going to be time afterwards to provide comments.

*James Martin:* this is a summary of comments received then?

*Lisa Beatty:* thank you James, for clarifying what this document really is. I am not the only one that was confused.

*James Martin:* so, you will be drafting changes to the core document for the group to review and that will be our chance to see how the comments have been addressed.

### Proposed Changes to Analyses A-D

*Bill Keeling:* The issue what was being called a rate of implementation was really the combined new records those records still in lifespan and those that were inspected. The rate of implementation is the change in a BMP from one year to the next. The collection of everything is the percent of everything recorded that is available to

**THIS MEETING WAS RECORDED TO ENSURE THE ACCURACY OF THE MEETING MINUTES**

be simulated. We were given an analysis that said we had an increase in things and saw a significant incline and was confused what EPA was calling rate of implementation. We should look at year to year difference for BMPs.

*Olivia Devereux:* We can do both and that isn't a problem

*Bill Keeling:* the concept of basically what percent of your total throughout history is still active and may not have anything to do with the previous year.

*James Martin:* that issue is further comment because it is conceivable that in 2022 you will report 2021 NRCS data for the first time. The confusion comes where each progress year is separate and distinct from the previous year as opposed to a continuation of the last year. I don't disagree with having an additional analysis but we need to know what set of data it will be compared against.

**Action:** Vanessa Van Note will work on incorporating all comments and edits received today and from previous meetings into Appendix V: Protocols for Verification of Annual BMP Data Submissions Discussion. Once this is complete, it will be reviewed at an upcoming WTWG meeting.

**11:30 AM – Low Vegetation as it Relates to Backout** – Vanessa Van Note, EPA

Vanessa Van Note will lead a discussion on low vegetation as it relates to backout.

**Discussion**

*Did not have time to address this during today's call. Will bring this back at a future WTWG meeting.*

**12:00 PM – Meeting Adjourn**

***Next Meeting: November 4, 2021 from 10:00 to 12:00 PM (cancelled)***

**Call Participants**

Vanessa Van Note, EPA

Hilary Swartwood, CRC

Bill Keeling, VA DEQ

Arianna Johns, VA DEQ

Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA

Ben Coverdale, DNREC

Suchith Ravi, UMCES

Jason Keppler, MDA

Clare Sevcik, DNREC

Dave Montali, Tetra Tech (WV)

Emily Dekar, USC

Lisa Beatty, PA DEP

Kate Breshaw, PA DEP

Greg Sandi, MDE

Molly Dworkin, DNREC

Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Jordan Baker, HRG

Norm Goulet, NOVA

**THIS MEETING WAS RECORDED TO ENSURE THE ACCURACY OF THE MEETING MINUTES**

Jessica Rodriguez, DoD

Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting

Jess Rigelman, J7

Mark Nardi, USGS

Jeremy Hanson, CRC

Ruth Cassilly, UMD

Alana Hartman, WV DEP

Loretta Collins, UMD

Jen Walls, DNREC

Norm Goulet, NOVA