



Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Webex Meeting Chat Summary*
Thursday, September 3, 2020
10:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Calendar Page: [Link](#)

**Chat messages were edited to provide clarity and correct grammatical errors. Chats that were irrelevant to preserving the questions and discussion below were removed (ex. reminding people to mute phones, letting participants know of call interference, etc.). There may be overlap between the chat and the WTWG Meeting Minutes. Refer the WTWG September Meeting Minutes for more details and the Action and Decisions.*

WTWG WEBEX MEETING CHAT SUMMARY

from James Martin to everyone: 10:12 AM

Federal Planning Goals to what end? WIP III is done.

from Kevin Du Bois, DoD CBP to everyone: 10:13 AM

By calculation of FPGs, do you mean progress? FPGs have already been established. What about FPGs the federal agencies don't agree with?

from Matt English DC to everyone: 10:14 AM

Are the Federal Facilities in DC aware that Brown and Caldwell are available to assist with BMP data submission?

from James Martin to everyone: 10:14 AM

We assigned Federal planning goals for WIP III development. Developing new goals could undermine the state WIPs

from Olivia Devereux to everyone: 10:15 AM

The role of B&C has been discussed at the FFWG. Hopefully they have been attending the FWG meeting and learned of the resources and expectations.

from Matt English DC to everyone: 10:15 AM

Is there someone who we can put our federal facilities contacts in touch with at Brown and Caldwell?

from Ted Tesler to everyone: 10:16 AM

May relate to PA Fed Targets

from James Martin to everyone: 10:17 AM

Already done

from Kevin Du Bois, DoD CBP to everyone: 10:18 AM

That's exactly the point DoD has problems with FPGs that are unattainable or inequitable.

from Olivia Devereux to everyone: 10:21 AM

Federal Facility Support: Stephanie MacDurmon (smacdurmon@brwnncald.com), Stephanie Hanses (SHanses@brwnncald.com), Greg Allen (allen.greg@epa.gov)

from James Martin to everyone: 10:30 AM

you effectively reduce the % excess by including annual practices in the count. What % of non-annual practices are cut off?

from James Martin to everyone: 10:37 AM

the theory of over-reporting being the source of cutoff was valid pre-verification...now, in a world where BMPs have a credit duration and verification, over-reporting is not the problem

from Lisa Beatty to everyone: 10:44 AM

I think it would be wise for CBP to run the percentages for each jurisdiction without animal practices so they can view the overall picture of this issue.

from Ted Tesler to everyone: 10:58 AM

Sounds like two records

from Lisa Beatty to everyone: 11:02 AM

I understand you are showing percentages, but can you relate the terms to amounts of pounds lost of nitrogen, phosphorous and sediment due to cut off and back out?

from Jason Keppler MDA to everyone: 11:10 AM

Is there any upland benefit attributed to a natural forest buffer adjacent to cropland?

from James Martin to everyone: 11:12 AM

Good question Jason. My understanding is that we cannot currently count those

from Olivia Devereux to everyone: 11:15 AM

Jason, yes for forest buffer. No for forest buffer with livestock exclusion. The livestock exclusion buffer is only applied to pasture. There is no backout applied to the efficiency portion of load source change BMPs. If you are referring to an existing forest, then it is not a BMP, simply an existing land use.

from Jason Keppler MDA to everyone: 11:20 AM

Thanks Olivia. In theory wouldn't an existing forest function identically to a riparian forest buffer that has been "backed out?"

from Ted Tesler to everyone: 11:20 AM

Also animal systems?

from Olivia Devereux to everyone: 11:22 AM

Jason, that is more a question for the expert panel. Apparently, a designed wooded area functions differently. It may also be a difference in width. We are also measuring change. An existing forest is not a change.

from Jason Keppler MDA to everyone: 11:25 AM

but it could be a filter

from Alana Hartman to everyone: 11:27 AM

I appreciate the slides about backout, especially the definition and example stating the exact year that the aerial imagery starts over. Thank you!

from Alana Hartman to everyone: 11:34 AM

my final concern about the Sub Vs. Credited report is the column labeled "Total Amount Credited." I think it might need a little more clarification in the ReadMe tab, given what we learned today.

from Lisa Beatty to everyone: 11:43 AM

Is the WTWG going to lead the coordination of back out / cut off issue to the other WG? If so, are they going to other workgroups like agriculture, forestry etc.? If so, are they going to ***coordinate*** other workgroups like agriculture, forestry etc.?

from James Martin to everyone: 11:49 AM

Recommendations:

1. For tree planting land use change practices, backout baseline = date of imagery - 5 years.
2. Stop using ag census to change backout baseline. with regular updates to land cover, it is not needed.
3. Backout baseline should be re-evaluated annually with progress so that the credit duration loss is not double discounted
4. Cutoff practices at the LR seg should be rolled up and reapplied at the county scale.
5. County scale data should be distributed to the LRSeg proportionally to the available untreated acres

from Lisa Beatty to everyone: 11:56 AM

Can you please make sure all of my questions are answered? It is being repeated that there is no one to lead the issue of back out and cut off which as you can hear is a very important issue. This is not just a VA issue. Is CBO going to address the issue for cut off / back in the WTWG for CAST2021 for at least priority BMPs?

from Olivia Devereux to everyone: 11:56 AM

James: All BMP records are broken down to LRSeg and summed. An alternative would be to establish an order to geographic types.

from Matt English DC to everyone: 12:02 PM

Is there a way that if justification is provided that Cutoff procedures could be ignored for specific BMPs?

from Kevin Du Bois, DoD CBP to everyone: 12:08 PM

Nor for Ag BMPs, but we do that analysis, loss of pounds of TN, TP, TSS, for BMPs lost because of the lack of inspection and maintenance.