



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

Thursday, March 1, 2018
10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Call-in number: 202-991-0477 **Code:** 283-2221#

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

Calendar Page: [Link](#)

Agenda

Summary of Actions and Decisions:

ACTION: Data, results and documentation for the riparian buffer domains will be distributed to the WTWG for review through March. The WTWG will revisit the riparian buffer domains at the April WTWG call for approval to incorporate buffer domain calculations into BMP summary reports in CAST.

DECISION: The February 2018 WTWG meeting minutes were approved.

ACTION: The WTWG will review the Agricultural Stormwater EPEG (Expert Panel Establishment Group) recommendations through March 2018 (available on the March WTWG calendar [page](#)) and send comments and feedback to Loretta Collins (lcollins@chesapeakebay.net), and copy Jeff Sweeney (jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net), Tom Schueler (watershedguy@hotmail.com) and Michelle Williams (williams.michelle@epa.gov). The WTWG will be asked to approve the EPEG recommendations at the April 5 WTWG call.

10:00 AM - Introductions and Announcements- Ted Tesler, PADEP or Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO

Decision Requested: Approval of February 2018 meeting minutes.

DECISION: The February 2018 WTWG meeting minutes were approved.

10:10 AM – Incorporating Domains for Buffer BMPs into CAST – Matt Johnston, EPA CBPO

Matt will brief the WTWG on an alternative proposal to include domains for buffer BMPs in CAST. No maximum domains or caps would be placed upon scenarios or progress runs in CAST. Theoretically, acres for a plan or progress run could exceed the available domain. Instead, the domain would be incorporated in the percentage calculation for the Summary BMPs worksheet, just as a reference point. This will allow all partners the opportunity to compare acres of buffers in a scenario with our best estimate of available land without restricting reporting or planning.

Decision Requested: WTWG approval to incorporate domains for buffer BMPs into CAST.

- Ted Tesler: Is this 100 foot buffers we are looking at?
 - Matt Johnston: Yes, 30 meter buffers is about equal to 100 feet. You should see that the bufferable area in this domain is really large.
- Ted Tesler asked about the hay lands in the domain.
 - Johnston: That is in pasture. But the analysis we have has difficulty differentiating the herbaceous domains, and there is more certainty with the forest buffer domain than the herbaceous buffer domain.

- Tesler: I'm concerned about characterizing the herbaceous domains.
- Bill Keeling: I don't know if the totals are right. This analysis did not make a distinction between agricultural and non-agricultural land uses. I thought we used the ag census to get that information.
 - Johnston: This is limited, but it's the best information we've ever had. This uses the 1 meter resolution land cover data with our Partnership-approved land use analysis.
- Ted Tesler requested a write up of the methods used in the buffer domain analysis.
 - Lindsey Gordon: I have a write up that goes with the presentation I gave at last month's [meeting](#) that I can share with you. We can post that to this meeting's calendar [page](#). The data that I used does not change the LU data or change data that the Partnership approved, I just derived these calculations from it.
 - Johnston: All these acres are areas that are bufferable after 2013. If you have practices that went in before that, those acres are no longer considered available.
- Chris Brosch: I support the concept of including these domains. When we approach 100% coverage in our WIP, will this mean that CAST will start to cut off our practices? We also have concerns about the WOTUS (Waters of the US) rule and buffers around ephemeral streams. Do those show up in Lindsey's analysis?
 - Johnston: CAST would not cut off those additional acres over 100%. This would just be a percent that shows up in your summary BMPs report. Percentages would just be used in evaluation of WIPs and other milestones, but it wouldn't cut BMPs off in CAST.
 - Keeling: Does this affect reasonable assurance in the WIP, if we have 200% of a BMP in the summary report? I'm concerned about the rules around WIP evaluation changing to our disadvantage. This is beyond the WTWG's scope.
 - Johnston: You want to discuss with EPA for coverages that are more than 100%. I don't see a case where you would exceed that 1 million acres of bufferable area, but we can have that discussion with EPA.
 - Keeling: Our WIP II already exceeds that bufferable area. We will have to then work around that.
 - Johnston: There is no change in the rule, but that is a conversation you would need to have with EPA. There are a lot of other considerations that also go into doing this planning, so this would add to the considerations you make to build a realistic WIP.
- Keeling: I cannot live with this recommendation right now. I don't feel confident in the data that was used for the implications I think it will have. I want to do more review of the data and the methodology write up.
- Ted Tesler: Do we have a provision for what happens to buffers outside the domain?
 - Matt: There is no cut-off in the model. This is simply a calculation that would show your percent domain coverage in the summary report. IT does not affect your implementation or loads in CAST.
 - Jeff Sweeney: With BMPs, we typically look at how acres and implementation levels change through time – with respect to where they need to be in 2025 according to the state's WIP. This percent implementation is just for informational purposes, and we've had questions before of what percent implementation we had of BMPs. We wanted to know of all the available crop land and riparian land, what has been implemented and what can you still do. This is purely to help you look at that question.

- Keeling: We are talking about implementation in CAST, which was developed for the WIP III. This doesn't help us do that. I'm not in support of this being implemented in CAST.
- Matt: Have we posted the acres by county on the WTWG page?
 - Lindsey: We can calculate buffer domains by county, and the domains by land-river segment and agency are available on today's calendar page.
- Discussion of mixed open as a potential land use for buffer implementation.
 - Jess Rigelman: We can include mixed open, but that doesn't have any impact on buffers since it's an upland land use.
 - Lindsey Gordon: I have mixed open data that I can provide, but as Jess says that is an upland land use that does not affect riparian bufferable areas.
 - Olivia Devereux: Open space isn't part of riparian bufferable area.
 - Johnston: We can provide the entire table that has all the land uses for your review, but please note that only certain land uses are available for riparian buffers, so those upland land uses can't be buffered in CAST already.
- Bill Keeling asked about error rates for stream networks in the NHD dataset and stream networks in imagery.
 - Lindsey Gordon: I used a synthetic streams layer with imagery. The streams layer from the Chesapeake Conservancy uses a mix of imagery with a model derived from LIDAR data. It's more accurate in the CBP's opinion than the NHD layer. That's in the documentation for the Phase 6 land use that's available online.
- Jason Keppler: We have an additional issue with forest that is already in that buffer domain.
 - Lindsey Gordon: I considered that in my analysis methods. As an example, In DE there are X acres of crop or X acres of forest in the buffer zone. Any forest that was visible in the imagery was picked up and cut out in my analysis.
 - Jess Rigelman: If you see a drop off in BMPs, it's more likely due to an expiration date of the BMPs. This isn't used to calibrate or evaluate BMPs in the model.
- Ted Tesler: We'd like to be able to see that domain layer for PA, especially the streams layer.

ACTION: Data, results and documentation for the riparian buffer domains will be distributed to the WTWG for review through March. The WTWG will revisit the riparian buffer domains at the April WTWG call for approval to incorporate buffer domain calculations into BMP summary reports in CAST.

10:50 AM – Recommendations from the Agricultural Stormwater BMP Expert Panel Establishment Group – Loretta Collins, UMD

Loretta will brief the WTWG on the recommendations of the Agricultural Stormwater Management EPEG for addressing crediting for post-construction agricultural stormwater BMPs. The recommendations of the EPEG were approved by the AgWG at their February 15 meeting.

- Bill Keeling asked about the definition of agricultural stormwater.
 - Tom Schueler: This is what the EPEG has developed.
 - Keeling: There has been a legal ruling in VA about agricultural stormwater.

- Schueler: In VA and WV, ag stormwater is not included in other stormwater, so this would not apply to VA and WV. This would apply to PA, DE, and MD and NY. Those are also the areas of increasing animal production, so those are areas that could be targeted for reductions in the next few years. That legal consideration is outlined in the report that we have produced.
- The last slide on the ppt is from a request on the load differences between stormwater in agricultural vs urban sectors. This is a calculation from Loads available in CAST. Feeding space, while there is less area, there is higher load associated with feeding space in ag over urban. This BMP would allow states to go after some additional reductions.
- Norm Goulet: Would this efficiency increase due to the higher loads? I'm worried about oversaturation of the BMPs.
 - Schueler: When concentrations are very high, the BMPs work more efficiently, and you tend to get diminishing returns with treating lower-loading land uses.
- Chris Brosch: This is a heavy hitter BMP for DE. Some of our storage structures are already eliminating 90% of the load from these feeding spaces. Where do these presented loads fall in the treatment train?
 - Schueler: This could be treated by elements of SW BMPs in sequence
 - Brosch: We already have reductions in loads from practices already on the feeding spaces. We want to make sure that those BMPs are already incorporated in this analysis.
 - Sweeney: Your storage would affect the load on the production area, and this would treat the that load after your storage BMPs.
- Goulet: Ag-developed land is included in the whole bin of developed land, so this isn't another land use separate from developed?
 - Devereux: the land use for the BMP is feeding space even though GIS imagery could classify this area as urban (pervious or impervious).
 - Tesler: Is there an overlap on these land uses?
 - Devereux: You report the BMP as either in agriculture or urban settings, not both. Within agriculture, you report what you are doing for barnyard runoff control AND ag stormwater management. For instance, the gutters are under barnyard runoff control.
- Alisha Mulkey: So this is a treatment train concept?
 - Devereux: right.
- Jeff: These are different BMPs that are tracked differently.
- Keeling: I'm confused about the 10-year duration and inspection every 5 years. Does the BMP expire with no inspection every 5 or 10 years?
 - Loretta Collins: There is concern about the maintenance of these BMPs, which is why we set the inspection duration for 5 years.
 - Rigelman: What is enforced in NEIEN and CAST is 10 years.
 - Sweeney: But, you get another 10 years after every inspection.
 - Ted Tesler: So the 5 year inspection to maintain credit could be left off the recommendation.
- Collins: You can make a decision on it today if you want, but we can also give another month for review.
- Ted Tesler suggested review through March and approval at April's WTWG call.
 - Sweeney: Send comments to Loretta and copy Tom, Michelle, and myself. on those emails.

ACTION: The WTWG will review the EPEG recommendations through March 2018 (available on the March 2018 calendar [page](#)) and send comments and feedback to Loretta Collins (lcollins@chesapeakebay.net), and copy Jeff Sweeney (jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net), Tom Schueler (watershedguy@hotmail.com) and Michelle Williams (williams.michelle@epa.gov). The WTWG will be asked to approve the EPEG recommendations at the April 5 WTWG call.

11:20 AM – Review of Schedules for Phase 5.3.2 and Phase 6 Scenarios – Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Jeff reviewed schedules with the WTWG for evaluations of mid-point progress (Phase 5.3.2) as well as Phase 6 scenarios.

- Brittany Sturgis: DE has not been receiving these reports, so we would like to be notified.
 - Sweeney: Suchith Ravi should be sending you this information, and I will confirm with him.
- Alana Hartman: Is the write-up something that EPA generates and then we can make comments?
 - Sweeney: Yes. We have been doing these every year since the TMDL was published.
- Sarah Diebel: for federal agencies in Phase 5.3.2, most of that has been on the programmatic vs numeric side. Will there be any numeric assessment for the fed agency progress?
 - Sweeney: I don't think we have any plans to look at numeric progress, but you have some tools available to you to look at that using the data that you have provided to us and that you use for tracking.
 - Sarah Diebel suggested a discussion at the FFWG meeting.
 - Sweeney: I would contact Greg Allen also, as he has some information available for federal facilities.
- Sweeney: The new versions of progress for Phase 6 are available to the jurisdictions by March 12, using the new data that was submitted as of today.
 - Rigelman: That will be publicly available in CAST as well.
 - Sweeney: This will be Version 9 for 2014-2016, for 2017 it's Version 3. The old version will be available to a special progress group, and the new version will be available through CAST publicly.
- Hartman: This has been a difficult year for us. We are having some issues with updating our database, so we thank you for your patience as we iron out those issues.
- Sweeney: This will be the last version done in Phase 5, and we hope that using Phase 6 exclusively will simplify things.

11:50 AM – Wrap-up

12:00 PM – Adjourned

Participants:

Ted Tesler, PA DEP

Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO
Michelle Williams, CRC
Alisha Mulkey, MDA
Jason Keppler, MDA
Brittany Sturgis, DNREC
Chris Brosch, DNREC
Lori Brown, DNREC
Bill Keeling, VA DEQ
Jess Rigelman, J7 LLC
Norm Goulet, No VA Regional Commission
Danny Kaufman, CRC
Loretta Collins, UMD/AgWG coordinator
Lindsey Gordon, CRC
Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting
David Wood, CSN
Matt Johnston, UMD
Alana Hartman, WV DEP
Tom Schueler, CSN
Sarah Diebel, DOD