

SUMMARY
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Teleconference
Tuesday, May 27th, 2014, 1:00PM-3:30PM
<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/21246>

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

DECISION: The April minutes were approved as submitted.

ACTION: WTWG members will review their jurisdiction's federal facilities data template by June 10th and send any comments to Matt Johnston (mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net).

ACTION: The WTWG will revisit the shoreline management BMP at its next meeting. CBPO staff will revise the technical appendix for Scenario Builder.

ACTION: Workgroup members should submit feedback or questions on the report or technical appendix to Bill Stack (bps@cw.org), Lew Linker (LLinker@chesapeakebay.net) and Matt Johnston (mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net).

Post-meeting note: Sadie Drescher accepted a new position and Bill Stack will handle the shoreline management panel on behalf of the CWP going forward.

DECISION: Urban filter strips expert panel recommendations were approved for submission to the WQGIT, noting the concern over clarification for verification in the report.

DECISION: NEIEN will be updated to enable multiple event status codes for individual BMP records.

DECISION: The WTWG approved the on-site wastewater treatment systems expert panel report and technical appendix for submission to the WQGIT.

MINUTES

Welcome, Introduction and Announcements

- Ted Tesler (PA DEP; WTWG Chair) convened the call, verified participants, and reviewed the [agenda](#).
- Tesler called for comments or edits to the April workgroup minutes ([Attachment A](#)). None were raised; the minutes were approved.
 - **DECISION:** The April minutes were approved as submitted.

Update to CAST/MAST/VAST/BayFAST

- Olivia Devereux (Devereux Consulting) explained that BayFAST (www.bayfast.org), was up and running and there will be training available since the tool is different than the others. It allows users to define an area and choose land uses for the defined area, and

then run a scenario. She noted that BMP cost estimates are being incorporated into CAST/MAST/VAST/BayFAST within the next couple weeks. Will be sending out emails to users with training schedules and announcements. Anyone can contact here with any questions or special needs for training.

- Olivia Devereux can be reached at olivia@devereuxconsulting.com
- Devereux: We will schedule a couple BayFAST trainings in mid-June and cost trainings in later June. Next the WTWG can discuss priorities for next round of changes to the tools.
- Alana Hartman (WV DEP) noted that some people have been using CAST to estimate their load reductions for NFWF proposals. This is an interesting application of the tool.
- Johnston explained that the federal facilities team appreciated the templates from the jurisdictions last year, and have asked for a quicker turnaround with the templates this year. Johnston asked the states to review the templates by June 10th for any edits, and CBPO staff will pass the updated templates on to the federal facilities team.
 - **ACTION:** WTWG members will review their jurisdiction's federal facilities data template by June 10th and send any comments to Matt Johnston (mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net).

Shoreline Management Expert Panel Recommendations

- Johnston noted that approval for the expert panel report and technical appendix would come later since the appendix was distributed recently.
- Sadie Drescher (CWP) described the panel's charge, membership, and recommendations. She explained the protocols for crediting the shoreline management practices and summarized the dissenting report from some of the panel members (Appendix L of the full report).
 - View the full report ([Attachment D](#)) for the detailed recommendations.
 - View the [presentation](#) for details.
 - View the technical appendix ([Attachment E](#))
- Lewis Linker (EPA, CBPO) explained that the load reductions from the proposed BMP are capped at 1/3 of the total sediment reductions for a state basin (e.g., Maryland western shore). However, the panel does not expect that to happen. Most of the shoreline in the region is privately owned.
- Johnston noted that the technical appendix ([Attachment E](#)) needed to be revised, based on how Linker and Drescher described the recommendations. He explained how the shoreline management BMP could be simulated in the Watershed Model. For tidal BMPs like shoreline management, there would be a land use with zero acres that would simulate a negative load equal to the reductions from the BMP. View [his slides](#) for illustrations of tidal BMPs. He asked for questions from the workgroup.
- Bill Keeling (VA DEQ) felt the negative load land use proposed for simulating the BMP in the Watershed Model may be problematic. He asked for clarification of the credit for protocol 4.
- Johnston noted the panel opted to give a one-time credit rather than less annual credit over the lifespan of the credit.
- There was concern and discussion among participants about protocol 4 as a one-time reduction.

- Drescher: The concerns are reasonable and it could be changed to make it more consistent with other cumulative practices, for accounting purposes.
- James Davis-Martin (VA DEQ): Concern about protocol 1, how do we account for all the historic implementation that may exist?
- Linker: Within the current watershed sediment transport model we have surveys that go up to 2008, so the management practices that are in place are already accounted for. So, only recent practices would be accounted for.
 - Davis-Martin: Would it be double-counting if we keep using those surveys? Or will we stop doing those surveys?
 - Lewis: Anything from 2008 on could be accounted for under this proposed BMP.
- Davis-Martin: Why the different bulk density factors for protocols 1 and 3?
 - Drescher: The vegetated area is different than the bank area for the calculations. Protocol 3 is for vegetative area. Protocol 1 is for prevented sediment. All four protocols can be applied cumulatively.
- Johnston: Davis-Martin brings up a good point that protocol 1 is site specific and there will be a specific calculation submitted to the CBP. Are the states comfortable with moving from default values to site-specific parameters or calculations?
 - Davis-Martin: Problem with that. One benefit of the model is as a planning tool. When the reductions are site specific it makes planning impossible.
 - Drescher: Do not want to speak for the Panel, but believe they would want to stick with the proposed approach and not recommend a default value.
 - Keeling noted the difference between planning, which is the “what if” scenario, and annual progress. Need to have a default value for a planning scenario, though we will need the specific information for the progress submission.
 - Linker: The essential information is the bank height and recession rate of the shoreline. Those two values are publically available and not much trouble to get. In a planning sense one could take the average bank height and recession rate for an area or a state to calculate a reduction for planning scenarios. There would be differences between states because the shoreline has different characteristics.
- Keeling: would need clarification about reporting the different protocols together or in various combinations.
- Johnston: Will need to make some substantive changes to the technical appendix. The protocols are additive, but will need to talk about it more before bringing it back to a vote. Still some unanswered questions.
- Sarah Lane (MD DNR) commented that Maryland is still uncomfortable with protocol 1. Also need additional information about the modeling and Scenario Builder aspects.
- Keeling expressed a concern that the negative loading land use seems like a communication nightmare.
 - Johnston: Yes, that was a difficult problem to fix. The load that is being reduced is in the sediment transport model, whereas the BMP is accounted for in the Watershed Model. It is a modeling trick and we would welcome other ideas.
- Drescher thanked the participants for all their feedback.
- **ACTION:** The WTWG will revisit the shoreline management BMP at its next meeting. CBPO staff will revise the technical appendix for Scenario Builder.

- **ACTION:** Workgroup members should submit feedback or questions on the report or technical appendix to Bill Stack (bps@cwpp.org), Lew Linker (LLinker@chesapeakebay.net) and Matt Johnston (mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net).
 - **Post-meeting note:** Sadie Drescher accepted a new position and Bill Stack will handle the shoreline management panel on behalf of the CWP going forward.

Urban Filter Strips Expert Panel Recommendations

- Neely Law (CWP) summarized the urban filter strips expert panel's charge, membership, and recommendations.
 - View the [presentation](#) for details
 - View the report ([Attachment B](#)) to view the full recommendations.
- Law asked for comments or questions from the participants on the panel's recommendations.
 - None were raised
- Johnston reviewed the technical appendix ([Attachment C](#)) for incorporating urban filter strips into Scenario Builder.
 - Davis-Martin: Is lat-long required for credit or can we aggregate up as needed.
 - Johnston: The panel suggested lat-long for verification purposes, but can add in other NEIEN geographic scales if the WTWG prefers.
- Keeling: Other than UNM, no other BMP upstream of a filter strip can be reported? What about downstream?
 - Johnston: Yes, you can have practices downstream such as forest buffers.
- Joe Kelly (PA DEP): Pennsylvania rules and guidelines promote these practices in a series of BMPs.
 - Johnston noted that a while back the USWG determined that the predominant practice that is treating the given acres should be the one reported. The panel felt these filter strips are typically installed as a single practice for roads.
 - Law: These filter strips are usually a relatively small practice treating small drainage areas. Large subdivisions with many practices will probably not have these filter strips as the predominant practice.
- Kelly thanked Law for the effort in addressing Pennsylvania's comments. He asked for an update on the status of the verification requirements for MS4s.
 - Law: There is additional clarification in the urban stormwater BMP verification guidance. It provides options that could be used.
 - Norm Goulet (Northern Virginia Regional Commission; Chair, USWG): The BMP verification framework is going through the CBP Advisory Committees and GITs this summer. Stricken from expert panel report to make it consistent with most recent version of the verification guidance. The final PSC-approved version will set the options or expectations. The USWG outlined four options for non-MS4 areas that they can follow for verification. It will be up to the states to determine what approach they ultimately take.
- Tesler called for objections to submitting the report and appendix for WQGIT consideration.
 - Kelly: only objection is final clarification on the verification issue.
 - No other objections were raised.

- **DECISION:** Urban filter strips expert panel recommendations were approved for submission to the WQGIT, noting the concern over clarification for verification in the report.

Potential changes to NEIEN Event Status Codes

- Marty Hurd (DDOE) reviewed the memo regarding NEIEN schema updates ([Attachment E](#)) with participants. View Attachment F for more details.
- Johnston explained that the discussion is preliminary, given the PSC still has to sign off on the full verification framework later in the year.
- Keeling: If we are going to start listing inspections, will we need to link other information to that? For example, passed inspection or failed inspection.
 - Hurd: Great point. Have not thought about best way to address that, but probably some comment field. Mainly thought about the maintenance aspects at this point.
 - Goulet felt that pass/fail distinction would need to be incorporated.
 - Davis-Martin: Once we capture that information in NEIEN, the next step is determining which practices are creditable based on that data.
- Johnston: This first step is just to allow NEIEN to accept two dates for a single BMP, to account for maintenance. He asked for any objections or concerns to the proposed NEIEN schema change.
- Keeling: Optional, not required?
 - Johnston: Correct.
- Davis-Martin: To clarify, this will not be used for 2014 Progress.
 - It would not impact 2014 Progress at all. This is just a stepping stone for incorporating verification down the road.
- Keeling: no concern as long as it is not mandatory since we will be submitting aggregated data.
- Johnston noted the participants' agreement to move forward to make this change in the schema.
- **DECISION:** NEIEN will be updated to enable multiple event status codes for individual BMP records.

On-site Wastewater Treatment Systems Technical Appendix

- Johnston noted the time. He agreed to send a follow-up email to seek workgroup approval for the OWTS panel recommendations and the technical appendix ([Attachment G](#)) via email by June 10th. He explained if a WTWG member does not reply to the request, assumption will be that they approve the report for submission to the WQGIT.
 - **Post-meeting note:** No objections to the report or technical appendix were raised over email.
 - **DECISION:** The WTWG approved the on-site wastewater treatment systems expert panel report and technical appendix for submission to the WQGIT.

Adjourned

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Ted Tesler (Chair)	PA DEP
Matt Johnston (Coord.)	UMD, CBPO
Jeremy Hanson (Staff)	CRC, CBPO
Eric Aschenbach	VDH
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Environmental Consulting
Sadie Drescher	CWP
Marcia Fox	DE DNREC
Steve Gladding	NYS DEC
Norm Goulet	Northern VA Regional Commission
Alana Hartman	WV DEP
Marty Hurd	DDOE
LJ Ingram	CHART-LLC.net
Bill Keeling	VA DEQ
Jason Keppler	MDA
Joe Kelly	PA DEP
Sarah Lane	UMD, MD DNR
Neely Law	CWP
Lew Linker	EPA, CBPO
Rachel Melvin	MDA
Greg Sandi	MDE