



Chesapeake Bay Program

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

**Call Summary**

Thursday, November 2, 2017

10:00 AM to 11:30 AM

**Call-in number:** 866.299.3188 **Code:** 267-5715

**Adobe Connect:** <http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/wtwg/>

**Calendar Page:**

[https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/watershed\\_technical\\_workgroup\\_conference\\_call\\_november\\_2017](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/watershed_technical_workgroup_conference_call_november_2017)

**Summary of Actions and Decisions:**

**ACTION:** Any WTWG members interested in serving on the Wetland Restoration, Enhancement and Creation Expert Panel should contact Jeremy Hanson at [jchanson@vt.edu](mailto:jchanson@vt.edu)

**ACTION:** Jeremy Hanson will update Appendix D of the Impervious Disconnection BMP expert panel report to include the units and unit names consistent with the expert panel report. This update will be renamed as a new version and the updated appendix will be posted on the Expert Panel report page on chesapeakebay.net.

**ACTION:** The draft August meeting minutes are available on today's [calendar page](#) and the August [calendar page](#). The workgroup will review and provide comments on the minutes by COB November 16, after which the minutes will be considered final.

**DECISION:** the WTWG approved using the number of buildings as the unit for NRCS roof runoff practices, with a default of 2 buildings per practice.

**ACTION:** The submission timeline for 2014 – 2017 progress in Phase 5.3.2 and Phase 6 will be updated to reflect changes in the Midpoint Assessment Schedule that were approved by the PSC October 3.

**Introductions and Approval of August Minutes** - Ted Tesler, PADEP or Jeff Sweeney, EPA

- Due to staff changes at the Bay Program Office, Matt Johnston has stepped down as coordinator for the WTWG. Jeff Sweeney (EPA CBPO) is the new coordinator for the WTWG. Matt will be focusing more on policy development and using the models for implementation plans
- Jeremy Hanson: For the technical report on impervious disconnection, I've updated the area units and unit names in part B of Appendix D.
  - Bill Keeling: is this the BMP that requires entering site area, impervious area, and runoff catchment in acre feet? We have an xml generation from our modeling tools
  - Hanson: The default we wanted to be simpler, so we are using the performance standards for retrofit curves. The default here is just the site area now, and the model will cover that.
  - Keeling: Can we have area treated as the measure or add another measure in addition to site area? We have an xml that is generated when we submit this in our modeling tools.

- Devereux: We are really just looking for the acres. We could just call this one acres, as long as it's consistent with the expert panel report.
- Sucharith Ravi: The default will be acres, and we will rename that? We need both measurement name and unit. If Bill wants to submit just acres, then we need a unit and name for that.
- Hanson: So what would that be?
- Devereux: We should do what's consistent with the report, either area or acres.
- Hanson: When we confirm, I will update the appendix and put that up on the website with a note that indicates what changes were made, and we will make it a new version.
- Hanson: We need a WTWG member to serve on the non-tidal wetland REC panel. Those categories are in the P6 model and this group would be evaluating what the reductions for those practices should be in the next 2 year milestone period. Materials are posed on the calendar page today. Please contact me if you are interested in serving as a WTWG representative. My contact info for anyone who wants to volunteer as WTWG rep: [jchanson@vt.edu](mailto:jchanson@vt.edu)
  - Sweeney: It would be good if we had a state representative on that panel. This is based on the other wetland creation BMPs, and now we are adding enhancement, restoration and creation onto that for nontidal wetlands. What is the difference between creation and restoration?
  - Hanson: Creation is creating a wetland where there wasn't one before, and restoration is bringing back a historical wetland on the site.
- Sweeney: What sector will these wetlands be applied on?
  - Hanson: We now have wetland land uses which are separate from ag and urban, so those will be applied to wetland land uses.
  - Sarah Diebel asked about the available land uses for the wetland REC BMP.
  - Sweeney: These BMPs are available now as urban land uses, if this is enhancement as a wetland it is now available on urban land uses. There are also wetland land uses now that are under the natural land use category.

ACTION: Any WTWG members interested in serving on the Wetland Restoration, Enhancement and Creation Expert Panel should contact Jeremy Hanson at [jchanson@vt.edu](mailto:jchanson@vt.edu)

ACTION: Jeremy Hanson will update Appendix D of the Impervious Disconnection BMP expert panel report to include the units and unit names consistent with the expert panel report. This update will be renamed as a new version and the updated appendix will be posted on the Expert Panel report page on [chesapeakebay.net](http://chesapeakebay.net).

ACTION: The draft August meeting minutes are available on today's [calendar page](#) and the August [calendar page](#). The workgroup will review and provide comments on the minutes by COB November 16, after which the minutes will be considered final.

#### Update on Agriculture EPEGs—Loretta Collins, AgWG Coordinator

Loretta Collins updated the WTWG on the status of two expert panel establishment groups in the agriculture sector: stormwater on agricultural land uses, and nursery capture and reuse.

- Diebel: Nursery capture and reuse is what exactly?
  - Collins: Mainly irrigation.
- Devereux: what about barnyard runoff controls?
  - Sweeney: at the moment, loafing lot management and barnyard controls are both in the model, so this expert panel needs to be really clear about what practices apply to which category.
  - Jason Keppler: Barnyard runoff is diverting water away. This would be treating stormwater that's running over the land.
  - Devereux: ag developed is any land that's been developed. So you might want to talk to Matt and Peter about how those land uses were mapped.
  - Sweeney: what about a post-construction poultry house, for example. Is that now reported as urban stormwater management?
  - Keppler: We are currently not reporting that, but we hope that we can report that through the livestock reduction land use. We are currently not capturing the stormwater that comes off the poultry houses. That is treated through a stormwater retention pond, so we want this BMP to capture what's being treated coming off that land use.
- Sweeney: mortality composting has been a creditable BMP for a long time in the model.
  - Collins: We are reviewing that to include other practices like freezers, gasification and landfill disposal in that BMP.

#### NRCS and FSA Data Updates—Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting

Olivia Devereux, on behalf of USGS, reviewed the data provided to the states, uses of the data, and changes from previous years.

- Ravi: Why are forest buffers not included here?
- Devereux: We consider that bad data because it included practices like cutting down trees and replanting them, and we don't consider that a WQ improvement. So we consider a lot of it bad data and we are working to clean it up. NRCS has its own land uses, and we make sure to update all our rules to reflect their annual updates.
- Sweeney: The linear feet has to be "number" so how do we submit that?
- Devereux: It has to be linear feet, since the unit is "number."
- Sweeney: Since it's not recorded in units?
- Barry Frantz: What often happens is that we fund roof gutters. What is the intent when we look at this practice? Does it matter if we are putting gutters on more than one building?
  - Devereux: I would say that we want to evaluate that per building. But if there is an average number on a farm we could use that.
  - Alisha: We are using numbers for our data, not linear feet or animal units. There is potential to have a system on multiple buildings, so you could have it for multiple buildings but not in the 100,000s.
  - Devereux: I just need to know what to set it to that's a more realistic number.
  - Keppler: 1-5 is a typical number of buildings.
  - Sweeney: So we can default to 2 as a conservative estimate for this practice.

- No objections from the workgroup.
- Devereux: There are other examples where this occurs, and we have to do a bit of a squeeze to account for these practices.
- Alana: We would prefer to just be able to import what we get from you into our database.
- Ravi: If all these are for one BMP, it would be easier for the states to submit all the components together.
  - Devereux: We can't tell if this was part of a component BMP if the farmer doesn't submit all the components. We could come up with a rule but there will be a lot of exceptions.
  - Keppler: How often is this issue coming up? It is difficult to come up with a rule that fits all the circumstances.
- Devereux: I can't tell how often based on the data I have. I can tell within one contract but I can't tell overall. That question would need a different kind of data request to answer.
- Keppler: If these practices are not supplemental practices, then they should be discounted in some way. How is fencing handled through NRCS? Is there any consideration for those numbers?
  - Olivia: States that are wholly depending on the USGS data are in a different situation than MD. We don't know with this tracking whether fencing is adjacent to a stream or not.
- Sweeney: How are the states tracking fencing to tell if it's adjacent to a buffer or not?
  - Keeling: VA doesn't have a reason to report fencing since we can't tell if it's exclusion or paddock fencing, and we are erring on the side of caution and just not reporting it.
  - Olivia: You have to have the animal units, length and width. You could also report in acres and there is an implied width. NRCS doesn't count that, however. We don't have that information. NY had a method to work that out using GIS a while back but I don't know if that is still in use.
- Alana Hartman: Will you be able to provide similar data for the next few years beyond the scope of the agreement?
  - Frantz: That goes to 2020 for the NRCS contract.
- Hartman: The BMP name relationships—where is this file available? ([calendar page](#))
- Sweeney: We could survey the states to see how they are using the FSA and NRCS data and see what they are doing and how they are reporting it. Maybe one state can assist another in assessing what kind of data submission is needed for model use.

DECISION: the WTWG approved using the number of buildings as the unit for NRCS roof runoff practices, with a default of 2 buildings per practice.

Transforming BMP Data from Root Sources through NEIEN— Sucharith Ravi (UMCES, CBP Nonpoint Source Data Manager) and Bill Keeling (VA DEQ)

Bill and Sucharith led a discussion among participants about transformations of BMP data from root sources through NEIEN, specifically 1) keeping a lock down on changes to the data element table, the Codes list, and Appendix A, and 2) keeping alignment of data rules between NEIEN and Scenario Builder.

- Sweeney: We are in a difficult transition as we switch between WSM phases. After 2017 progress (run on both models), then reporting will be only for Phase 6.
- Bill Keeling: The issue with VA is that our first Phase 6 history was based on a Phase 5 appendix, and we are transitioning the Phase 5 appendix to Phase 6. In our Phase 6 appendix we have the land uses and codes for scenario builder, but that doesn't match the codes for the watershed model. The LU codes as they evolved have been used in our modeling, but some of the Phase 5 LU and defaults are still there in our system. If the codes list is not kept up to date with all the other elements, then we will get conflicts with what is used in the Phase 6 model. VA is asking for that internal consistency to be part of the overall effort.
- Sucharith: Some of the LU codes in Phase 6 are not included in the codes list, and we are trying to keep that updated and transition to a spreadsheet rather than a Word doc. I will be sending that sheet out to the workgroup for review once I finish going through it. The CAST error report you get is also very important, if those LU reports are not fixed there, then CAST won't give you any credit. So that is what's most important—if CAST doesn't see that then it can't be processed.
  - Keeling: For disturbed harvested forest, we were told to use the Phase 5 LU codes since there is no code for that in Phase 6.
  - Olivia: In those cases, you should report the LU as null and it will default to the correct LU to give you credit.
- Sucharith: do you already have a mapping for harvest forest/disturbed forest? Can you map that BMP to the new code?
  - Keeling: Not till we develop our new warehouse next year. We will have to remap this to fix those errors. One way to fix that issue is to include a new code for those land uses in Phase 6.
  - Ravi: There are NEIEN-specific codes that the states use, and we add some new LUs there for LUs like disturbed forest, but I don't know how that will work for CAST.
  - Keeling: For now, can we just use a null default code in that column to report? For some BMPs there will be a land use we report. We are also having some issues with cover crops and issues with mapping to the proper land use. For NM and other BMPs I will be using the right land uses.
  - Ravi: That would work.
- Sweeney: Other states are going through similar issues. If you have issues, please work directly with Sucharith to make sure that it's working. We are changing tables and appendices on the fly right now, and we are trying to do what we can to make it work now and also come up with a long term solution.

#### Schedule for Scenario Data and Evaluations —Jeff Sweeney, WTWG coordinator

Jeff reviewed the timeline for submitting progress and planning data (and for evaluations of progress and planning) for the following scenarios 1) Phase 5 2017 Progress, 2) Phase 6 2014 Progress, 2015 Progress, 2016 Progress, and 2017 Progress, and 3) Phase 6 draft WIPs.

- Keeling: In the past we had input decks for the milestones. How is that working for this upcoming milestones reporting?

- Sweeney: Not everything is finalized yet until the Milestones workgroup meets—but we are going to recommend that numerical data not be required to submit for 2019 milestones. For Phase 5, the schedule stays the same. For Phase 6, December 1 is the extended deadline to submit progress on Phase 6 and 2014-2017 data. There is a lot going on, and the proposal is to not require numeric milestones for 2019, and we are checking on whether we can do that with EPA, but we realize that there is an incredible amount of work the states are being asked to do.
- Sarah Diebel: What I just heard is that federal agencies have to submit programmatic and numeric milestones by November 1. Because of the lack of planning targets, the jurisdictions will not have to provide numeric CAST scenarios for 2018-19?
  - Sweeney: Yes, but that is not final. And we encourage every jurisdiction to still do that if they can. Federal Facilities is likely also wants to do this with the workgroup.
  - Diebel: There's an inconsistency there. The information that DOD or any federal agency provides is usually included with the states' data. I don't know why that's being uncoupled right now since we also don't have federal targets or final Phase 6.
  - Sweeney: Milestones are not progress, so states don't have to submit that through CAST.
- Sweeney: There are also always exceptions for DC and VA, those deadlines are extended to January 31. Everyone else is due December 1.
- Alisha Mulkey: What is the sequence for progress runs if we can't make the deadlines for December 1.
  - Sweeney: The only reason we need the current progress scenarios in Phase 6 is because the WQGIT has requested it. They want to know where their jurisdiction is right now to give an assessment of what is current. Personally, I don't see any problem with needing more time for 2017 progress in Phase 6.
  - Mulkey: It's not easy to do Phase 5 and Phase 6 together due to the changes in NEIEN rules. So down to the wire, we should prioritize Phase 5 first?
  - Sweeney: Correct. I think if you cannot submit all the progress, the Phase 5 data is more important right now. 2017 on Phase 6 should be able to wait a bit—the grant allows that.
- Keeling: My agency is moving in early December. I don't know if we have requested an extension, but I don't know how that will affect our ability to meet these deadlines. We have done a webinar and I just found an error in one county's reporting—so I will be correcting that and their numbers will change quite a bit.
- Sweeney: For Phase 6, the rules are different in that you can provide new data using the tools, and we will be taking new data every two years. The Modeling Team is developing rules on how this can work without violating calibration with new inputs every two years. There will be a lockdown during that two-year period, but hopefully it will improve the data somewhat.
- Keeling: We will need Phase 5 and Phase 6 reports for fixes.
  - Sweeney: We will be able to put out reports to you on that. Please keep us updated on where you are with data submission. If you can only do Phase 5 that's ok, but we encourage you to
- Hanson: The last four dates on the last slide is the old schedule on the ppt. The PSC version for

October 3 has changes to the schedule for 2018-2019 time frame.

- Alana: What about base conditions—can you use the new septic conditions for the counties?
  - Sweeney: We'd have to ask Peter Claggett on the septic data. I know he works with MD on septic, so he might also be able to work with WV on getting those base conditions in.
  - Ravi: Let me know if you have any updates to other land uses as well.

ACTION: The submission timeline for 2014 – 2017 progress in Phase 5.3.2 and Phase 6 will be updated to reflect changes in the Midpoint Assessment Schedule that were approved by the PSC October 3.

### Adjourned

#### Call Participants:

Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO  
Michelle Williams, CRC  
Jeremy Hanson, VT  
Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting  
Loretta Collins, UMD  
Jason Keppler, MDA  
Alisha Mulkey, MDA  
Bill Keeling, VA DEQ  
Brittany Sturgis, DNREC  
Sucharith Ravi, UMCES  
Emily Dekar, USC  
Alana Hartman, WV DEP  
Greg Sandi, MDE  
Sarah Diebel, DOD  
Jeni Keisman, ITAT coordinator  
Mike McMahon, MDE  
Norm Goulet, NoVA Regional Commission/USWG chair