

**SUMMARY**  
**Chesapeake Bay Program**  
**Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)**  
**May 6<sup>th</sup> 2013, 10:00AM – 12:00 PM**  
Conference Call  
<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19139/>

**ACTION ITEMS & DECISIONS**

**DECISION:** The April workgroup minutes were approved.

**ACTION:** Hurd will send these options to Karl Webber and Jen Gumer to get their feedback, and possibly convene a meeting in mid-May of the “NEIEN NPS-BMP” group to think through these issues. WTWG members are asked to ensure NPS BMP group members are available or informed.

**ACTION:** Hurd will send these options to Karl Webber and Jen Gumer to get their feedback, and possibly convene a meeting in mid-May of the “NEIEN NPS-BMP” group to think through these issues. WTWG members are asked to ensure NPS BMP group members are available or informed.

**MINUTES**

**Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements**

- Alana Hartman (WV DEP; WTWG Chair) welcomed participants and reviewed the day’s [agenda](#).
  - She reminded the workgroup that the July conference call will be July 8<sup>th</sup> instead of July 1<sup>st</sup>. The June meeting will be Monday, June 3<sup>rd</sup> at the Chesapeake Bay Program Office in Annapolis.
- Hartman asked for comments or corrections to the April WTWG minutes.
  - None were raised; the minutes were accepted as submitted.
- **DECISION:** The April workgroup minutes were approved.
- Matt Johnston reviewed updated detailed [2013 Progress Run Task Calendar](#)
  - He noted that jurisdictions can begin submitting their data at any point.

**Update to Stormwater Performance Standard Nutrient Efficiency Curves**

- Johnston explained the following WQGIT approval of the report, members of the expert panel elected to change the efficiency curves to polynomial curves as these curves fit the nutrient reduction data better than the original logarithmic curves.
  - See [slides 2-4 of the presentation](#) for illustrations of the old and revised curves.
- He asked for questions on the curves.
  - None were raised.

**Potential Changes to NEIEN Schema for Stormwater BMPS**

- Marty Hurd (TetraTech): We are currently in the open enrollment period for NEIEN schema changes. He noted that the partnership owns the non-point source BMP node and any state can propose modifications to the schema.
  - He explained that he reviewed notes and minutes from the previous year and compiled a list of [potential schema changes for the 2013 Progress Run](#).
- Johnston: explain how this differs from the land use groups that are currently used when the states report.
  - Hurd: These are elements that were proposed by WTWG members or the Urban Stormwater Workgroup (USWG) at some point. It would be good to get input from states' workers that were involved with creation of the schema. The idea is that the jurisdictions have different types of land cover that they want to report.
- Beverly Quinlan (VA DCR): unclear how this adds to the existing system, seems like a redundant feature.
  - Hurd response: It gets complicated if we pull this information out at the BMP component level. Some jurisdictions prefer to report land cover at the BMP level rather than at a component level. The workgroup can take time to look at available data before making any decision on this.
  - Johnston: The idea is to report the total storage or treatment volume for all the BMPs on the site and apply reductions from the curves, rather than reporting each individual practice.
  - Quinlan: Probably okay to add a land use at the BMP level, but if we allow multiple land uses, should probably all be the same for BMP components. The list of land uses should be the same. Don't know if acres treated counts as a land use.
  - Hurd: the BMP measures are free text and would be validated and processed in a particular way. Some of the jurisdictions have suggested relying less on the appendix to keep things simpler.
- Hurd discussed BMP Event Status (section 1.2). The idea would be to have more categories aside from just "implemented."
- Johnston asked Goulet if the three proposed categories could be reduced to two by assuming that inspected means the practice is maintained.
  - Norm Goulet (Northern Virginia Regional Commission; USWG Chair): maintenance may not occur even if there are inspections. May even need a fourth category for verified practices. Depending on results of the BMP Verification effort, there may be two different types of inspections: one for typical MS4 requirement, done every 3-5 years, and one slightly more rigorous inspection for BMP verification within two permit cycles.
- Quinlan inquired how the statuses and practices would be linked together from year to year.
  - Hurd response: The states would likely have to pull up that record with some identifier and then update it in the Bay Program database.
- Hurd discussed Codes list additions (section 1.3).
  - Hartman: These new codes may not be necessary if the person compiling data follows the flow charts we've reviewed at previous meetings.
    - Johnston pointed out these were proposed when we realized we need new BMP names in the system for these new BMPs, and this might be a better

way to keep things consistent, because you can still use the original BMP name, but qualify it with these “type” codes.

- Would like to revisit in June.
- **ACTION:** Hurd will send these options to Karl Webber and Jen Gumer to get their feedback, and possibly convene a meeting in mid-May of the “NEIEN NPS-BMP” group to think through these issues. WTWG members are asked to ensure NPS BMP group members are available or informed.
- Greg Sandi (MDE): would like to bring back the issue of the test node. Would not like to do this on the production node.
  - Hurd noted that the test node is under consideration.
- Ted Tesler (PA DEP): The inspection element should not get too detailed. Need to be aware that there is often a lot of data aggregation.
- Johnston reviewed some issues with scenario builder [[slides 5-10](#)]
- Issue 1
  - Goulet: Third bullet on recommendations slide does not fly. The historical record and universe of land uses is often sketchy. If the BMP was not included in the historical record, the jurisdiction should still be able to receive credit for the retrofit.
    - Johnston said he thought of that problem, but felt it could work because it would be kicked back to the jurisdiction as an error, and the jurisdiction could report it as a new retrofit and get credit.
- Issue 2
  - Tesler doesn’t see how PA would have the manpower to comply with this.
    - Johnston recalled that the intention was for this to be done within two permit cycles. As long as this info gets passed along to the state by MS4s, and the state passes it along to NEIEN, it would be accomplished.
  - Ted: but the concern still remains for non-MS4s.
    - Goulet: The USWG is aware of this and realizes that PA will probably request changes to this proposed procedure. A lot of this is still up in the air.
- Issue 3
  - Hartman: Jurisdictions have said on previous discussions that this is problematic because pre-2000 we didn’t know we had to report such details, but yet it will all be removed if we can’t find the details. This is probably worse for jurisdictions other than WV, where the building boom happened earlier than WV’s.
  - No other comments raised.

### **Ag BMP Expert Panel updates**

- Wade Thomason (Virginia Tech) provided an update on the status of the conservation tillage expert panel and the panel’s draft recommendations.
  - For details, view his [presentation](#)
  - In response to question from Sally Claggett (US Forest Service) about treatment trains, Thomason noted that understanding stacked BMPs is especially important for conservation tillage. The Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG) requested the panel to consider these interactions.

- Jack Meisinger (USDA ARS) updated the workgroup on the status of the cover crops expert panel.
  - The panel has 18 members. Panelists were asked to nominate species of cover crops; 23 species were identified. Will condense down to a more manageable size and lump some of the species together. The additional species still need to be approved by the panel.
    - Additional species are in blue text on page 2 of Meisinger's [handout](#).
  - Hurd offered to review the jurisdictions' rejected cover crops submissions and share the results with the panel, so they are aware of all the species the jurisdictions are trying to report.
  - In response to a question, Meisinger noted that vetch would be under legumes. Legumes appear to be pretty poor at nitrogen recycling and will likely have a reduction efficiency in the single digit range.
  - Meisinger noted this is just for version 5.3.2 of the Watershed Model. The panel has an opportunity to make larger recommendations for the phase 6 model.
  - Tesler asked if the recommendations are based on geographic regions.
    - Meisinger: For this version of the model, only split between coastal plain and uplands. Will be more specific for phase 6 and divide between the approximately 13 physiographic regions in the watershed.
  - Johnston: what is the panel doing with commodity cover crops in this version and the next version of the model?
    - Sweeney: the jurisdictions currently report commodity cover crops, so there is probably an expectation for the panel to make recommendations on the issue.
- Mark Dubin (UMD, CBPO; AgWG Coordinator) provided an overview of the AgWG's expert panels and an update on the Nutrient Management expert panel.
  - View his [presentation](#) for details
  - Nutrient management panel plans to provide recommendations on the phase 5.3.2 WSM by the end of the summer. Recommendations for the phase 6 model will follow.

### **Potential agenda items for June**

- Hartman thanked the presenters and described some potential topics for the June meeting.
  - Update from jurisdictions on historic BMP cleanup
  - BMPs on CSO lands discussion
  - Updates from urban BMP panels
- Hartman asked members for suggested additional topics.
  - Tesler asked about the status of the BMP Verification Committee. Not sure if anything has been finalized at this point.
    - Johnston: nothing has been finalized at this point. The WTWG has been tasked by the Committee to head up the historical data cleanup effort.
    - Goulet: the Verification Review Panel has a meeting scheduled in late August. In September, the Verification Committee will meet to hear the Panel's recommendations.
  - Devereux suggested adding a MAST/CAST/VAST update to the June agenda. Planning to have another training, will schedule one in the next couple weeks.

- Hartman thanked participants for their time and adjourned the call.

**Adjourned 12:00 PM**

### Conference Call Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Alana Hartman, Chair	WV DEP
Matt Johnston, Coord.	UMD, CBPO
Jeremy Hanson, Staff	CRC, CBPO
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Bryan Bloch	DE DNREC
Chris Brosch	Virginia Tech/ VA DCR
Sally Claggett	USFS
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting
Danielle Dills	NACD
Mark Dubin	UMD, CBPO
Barry Evans	Penn State
Marcia Fox	DE DNREC
Steve Gladding	NYS DEC
Norm Goulet	Northern VA Regional Commission
Marty Hurd	Tetra Tech
Sarah Lane	UMD/MD DNR
Neely Law	Center for Watershed Protection, CBPO
Jack Meisinger	USDA-ARS
Beverly Quinlan	VA DCR
Jess Rigelman	J7 LLC
Greg Sandi	MDE
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO
Sally Szydlowski	Water Stewardship
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Wade Thomason	Virginia Tech
Jenn Volk	U. of Delaware