



Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, November 5, 2020
10:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Calendar Page: [Link](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: WTWG approved the October Meeting Minutes

Action: No decision was made on the Impervious Cover Removal Tracking and Reporting BMP at this time. David Wood and Norm Goulet will incorporate the feedback from today's meeting and bring this back to the WTWG at a future meeting.

Agenda

10:00 AM – **Introductions and Announcements** – Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC (10 min.)

- Approval of the October Minutes
 - **Decision:** WTWG approved the October Meeting Minutes
- CAST webinars, recorded and upcoming – Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting
 - Next webinar: December 10th at 12:00 PM on tips on QA/QCing annual data submitted by states for the BMP progress review
 - Final deadline for QA/QC data is December 1st
 - Final deadline for revisions to final progress submission is February 8th
- BMP Verification Ad-Hoc Action Team Update – Vanessa Van Note, EPA
 - Confirmed Elliot Kellner as Chair and Jason Keppler as Vice- chair
- AgWG 11/6/20 deadline for feedback on CAST21 and future model needs – Loretta Collins, UMD
 - Documents can be found on AgWG [October calendar page](#)
- Member and participant announcements
 - None

10:15 AM – **Impervious Cover Removal Tracking and Reporting** – David Wood, Chesapeake Stormwater Network

David will review the tracking and reporting needs of the USWG's Impervious Cover Removal BMP.

Decision Requested: WTWG approval of the tracking and reporting of the ICR BMP.

Discussion:

David Wood: We originally had fertilization for the new land use for consistency we took that addition out, so it aligns with historic practices and it aligns better with.

Sarah Lane: Could we add a sentence that explicitly says that there is not any maintenance required? Can we run this through?

Olivia Devereux: We did not run it backwards. It's not a land use change BMP it's an efficiency BMP. We do that for a land use change BMP (ex. Forest buffers) but we don't do that for efficiency BMP. Jess, is that something we could do with this one?

Jeff Sweeney: It seems like the 5-year duration is just when we get the land cover but after those five years there's no expectation you will go back to inspect it for the model.

Olivia Devereux: I think the inspection date is different than the back- out date.

Jeff Sweeney: since we are using an efficiency, there wouldn't be any back- out.

Bill Keeling: Applying an efficiency on impervious does not account for the hydrologic impact. What would be the pervious area which has some assumptions on pervious area?

David Wood: it would be applied to the impervious load.

Bill Keeling: even the land could be turned into turf and fertilized maintained as a yard?

David Wood: Correct, but the efficiency is based on the change on an assumed impervious rate and the assumed turf rate. That was accounted for in the derivation of those efficiencies.

Olivia Devereux: it sounds like your main concern is the change in flow.

Bill Keeling: I am saying that in modeling terms that was the reason it was considered a land use change. BMPs in the old models, can change the hydrology. I don't see where that is accounted for in the efficiency.

Olivia Devereux: I don't think it matters in CAST, it would only matter in the calibration of a new model and there isn't a hydrologic simulation.

Jeff Sweeney: How does this work in the real world?

Olivia Devereux: let's go back to the pictures because we can address Kevin Du Bois' question about gravel.

Kevin Du Bois: Does the original land use have to be a building or paved? Can you convert compacted gravel surfaces or soils?

David Wood: It came up in the first place because folks didn't know they could report this as a BMP. Basically, they go into these small areas (dead streets etc.) and break up the gravel/ compacted soil and plant turf and possibly tree plantings. This is mostly looking at vacant lots. The idea is that the original land use would be one of the land use BMPs in the model. We don't have a BMP yet, although it's been discussed for consideration in the future. But right now, there isn't a BMP for a straightforward amended soil lot. You can claim credit for the run on, but not for the land use change.

Jeff Sweeney: It's been approved by USWG and if the WTWG approves it would go to the WQGIT. If the GIT approves then this would go into CAST 2021?

Olivia Devereux: Yes

Jeff Sweeney: Anything historically reported would get this BMP in CAST 2021?

Olivia Devereux: No, we don't change the history, people would just use it moving forward.

Jeff Sweeney: Anything that was impervious reduction now is impervious removal and would get this BMP?

Jess Rigelman: That is what would happen in CAST 2021.

Bill Keeling: I am confirming that there are no changes that we need to do in NEIEN?

Jess Rigelman: Yes

Norm Goulet: The intent was to not make any changes in NEIEN.

James Martin: When you looked at CAST data to develop the efficiency, I assume that if you liked at it at different scales -did you look at that variability? I like the approach of using a memo in the place of what we use to use the panel for, but I want to make sure we are using the same amount of scientific rigor that an expert panel.

Jess Rigelman: We looked at state by state, but I am not sure at what scale, we did it a long time ago, so we'd need to go back and look at this again.

Matt English: Should we add a reminder ?

David Wood: Making sure the practice name aligns with cast so there are no changes, the efficiency is applied to impervious surfaces and you stack with the conservation landscaping. The recommendation was that they are mutually exclusive.

Olivia Devereux: That was the confusion to begin with.

James Martin: It seems to me that any of those practices that make improvements to a turf condition should be. Maybe it's a nuance of the model vs. the real world.

David Wood: The other option here- and Norm I will check with you- We could always have the conservation landscaping only apply to turf land use.

Jess Rigelman: It's applied to impervious and there was one for run on and one for run off. You submit the acres treated for conservation landscaping not the acres.

Norm Goulet: I think we may need to go back and look at conservation landscaping. I don't know if we are making an issue of something that may not be prevalent.

David Wood: There is not a huge time crunch on this, so if there is an issue that needs to be resolved, we have some time. If you would like us to look at conservation landscaping and come back at the next meeting, we can.

Norm Goulet: David, let's do that.

Jeff Sweeney: Let's potentially meet on this for our December meeting.

Action: No decision was made on the Impervious Cover Removal Tracking and Reporting BMP. David Wood and Norm Goulet will incorporate the feedback from today's meeting and bring this back to the WTWG at a future meeting.

10:30 AM – **CAST 2021 Workplan Items** – Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Each item on the CAST21 work plan will be reviewed from the status to actions needed. This includes where we are with investigations of back-out and cut-off procedures from the October meeting.

Discussion:

Loretta Collins: Were you on the last AgWG call, Dave? I was trying to figure out if the stuff on Peter's side is encapsulating the total acres and would that mitigate some of the issue you are having?

Dave Montali: Possibly. It was added to crop and decision makers said that something was wrong.

Loretta Collins: Within the confines of the CBP and what Peter Claggett is doing alleviate some of the issues WV is having?

Dave Montali: It's possible, I am just not in a position to say right now.

Loretta Collins: We definitely need help from the states because CBP cannot do it all. For your specific issue, I would recommend working with Peter directly.

Jeff Sweeney: There were presentations on these topics at the LUWG and AgWG, on slide 8 of my presentation there are links to them.

11:15 AM – **Schedule for TMDL-Related Scenarios** – Olivia Devereaux, Devereaux Consulting and Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Olivia will cover annual and biennial data needs for CAST with emphasis on gaps in data reporting. Jeff and Olivia will provide an update on the 2020 Progress scenario submissions and the schedule.

Discussion:

Alana Hartman: Gary Shenk is going to help us with our Soil P and once we figure this out, we will get back to you.

Jeff Sweeney: the same goes for NY, they also would like to report Soil P.

Cassie Davis: we are working with Cornell and Dairy 1 to get that data.

James Martin: I was wondering if we accept the reality that no one is going to be able to provide all of these things every year/ 2 years. Is there a way to prioritize the biggest hitters? I know these might be different depending the state and what data they have submitted.

Olivia Devereux: I think it depends on the landscape of each state. I would prioritize anything related to animals as manure is a big issue throughout the watershed. The land use is definitely a priority but that seems to be updated frequently by our land use team.

Jeff Sweeney: Again, we are running NEIEN every Friday as we receive new data. Whatever you can do now will help us make sure we get quality data.

12:00 AM – **Meeting Adjourn**

Next Meeting: December 3, 2020 from 10:00- 12:00 PM

Call Participants

Hilary Swartwood, CRC

Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC

Matt English, DOEE

Sarah Lane, MDE

Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA

Emily Dekar, USC

Ted Tesler, PA DEP

Bill Keeling, VA DEQ

Arianna Johns, VA DEQ

Dave Montali, Tetra Tech WV

Lisa Beatty, PA DEP

Vanessa Van Note, EPA

David Wood, CSN

Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting

Pat Thompson, Energy Works

Jason Keppler, MDA

Jeremy Hanson, VT

Jessica Rigelman, J7

Jessica Rodriguez, DoD

Kevin Du Boise, DoD

Alana Hartman, WV DEP

Loretta Collins, UMD

James Martin, VA DEQ
Rebecca Hanmer, FWG
Ruth Cassilly, UMD
Mark Dubin, UMD