



**Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Conference call
Thursday, October 2, 2014
10:00 AM- 12:00PM**

Meeting Minutes

Summary of Action and Decision Items:

ACTION: Jeff Sweeney and David Wood will draft the Gray Infrastructure technical appendix to present at the next WTWG meeting.

ACTION: Jenny Tribo will modify the Gray Infrastructure panel report to include the acknowledgement of the potential for double counting in Phase 5.3.2.

ACTION: David Wood will place Historical Data Cleanup on the next agenda for the next WTWG meeting.

Welcome and Introductions

- Ted Tesler (PADEP) convened the meeting and introduced David Wood (CRC, CBPO), the new WTWG staffer.
- David verified meeting participants.
- David asked that group members please review the latest version of the NEIEN Appendix and NEIEN Codes List posted on the meeting's [website](#). Please forward any comments on these documents to Matt Johnston (mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net).
- Olivia Devereux (Devereux Consulting): NRCS is going back to using umbrella practices (systems approach) to track BMPs, as opposed to looking at every single NRCS practice. We may need to rethink how we do our reporting as we move forward so that we don't do any double-counting.

Phase 5.3.2 Agricultural BMP Panel Updates

- Chris Brosch (Virginia Tech) discussed the process and timeline for the agricultural BMP panels to complete their work for 2014 Progress ([Attachment A](#)). This process was approved by the Water Quality GIT in September.
 - Chris: Three Agriculture BMP panels will be meeting in the several days after the Face-to-Face (Nutrient Management, Tillage, Cover Crop) in order to come up with final Phase 5 efficiencies so they can be used until 2017.

CAST priorities

- Olivia Devereux (Devereux Consulting) reviewed top CAST priorities ([Attachment D](#)).
- Olivia: BMP optimization based on cost was the number one priority. First step is providing a way for users to see cost and BMP reduction efficiencies in the same place. From there we will work into the actual optimization module.
 - Ted: What is the timeframe?
 - Olivia: We have quite some time because we must receive recommendations from the expert panels first.
 - Jeff: Is there anyone you know who is actually using the cost information?
- Olivia: Talbot county and another county in MD asked about it. Outside of that, there were a number of private consulting firms.

Land Use Loading Rates

- Olivia Devereux reviewed how the land use loading rates will be used in the Phase 6 Watershed Model calibration, sources of data used to inform the loading rates, synthesis process, and timeline for the project.
 - For more information, please see her [presentation](#).
 - Alana Hartman (WV DEP) asked for clarification on the concept of a "target".
 - Olivia: The land use calibration is the first step, the river calibration is the second step. We need to know the relative differences in the land uses so they can be applied across the

- land. We then alter the targets based on differences in particular segments.
- Bill Keeling (VA DEQ): Will we be eliminating the variability in the next phase for “same county, same land use, no-action” state? It would only be relative to dissimilar land uses?
 - Gary Shenk (CBP): If you have a variance in a “same county, same land use, no action state,” then there are differences in delivery which were calibrated based on differences in river transport and regional factors. That’s where we get those differences. The targets are independent of those considerations. The modeling workgroup is evaluating how we look at those regional factors to replace it with better knowledge about how the watershed works.
- Ted: Will HSPF continue to be the main backbone for the model? Are there segmentation changes?
 - Olivia: It is really the Bay Program’s Watershed Model. There are a lot more components being built on including sensitivity work, and PQUAL, so it is not really HSPF anymore.
 - Gary: We thought about changing segmentation in the watershed model, but it was determined to be too disruptive to BMP data. Sparrow however is much finer on load delivery within a land-river segment.
- Bill: A lot of the data sets we use in Sparrow still have issues with scale of inputs used to come up with relative differences.
 - Gary: we are not using their outputs directly, we are just using their estimates of the effective small order streams.
- Jeff Sweeney (EPA, CBPO): While source sector workgroups will be looking at their own absolute loading rates and relative differences in loading rates, I see a lot of utility of this group looking at the same things across all of the sectors. The task is reporting to the modeling subcommittee, but this group has the potential to look at all the source workgroups.
 - Alana: How would that process work?
 - Jeff: After the workgroup sees it, we would see it. Many of you are in the sector workgroups however, so if you catch a concern while you are on the workgroup, go ahead and address the problem concurrently.

Gray Infrastructure BMP Panel Discussion

- Jenny Tribo (Hampton Roads Sanitation District) presented the Gray Infrastructure Expert Panel’s recommendations as conditionally approved by the Urban Stormwater Workgroup in September.
 - For more information, please see Jenny’s [presentation](#), the panel’s [full report](#), and the panel’s “response to comments” [memo](#).
 - Bill: The report we are seeing is basically the original report. Is it clear what sections are coming to the workgroup for approval?
 - Jenny: We are asking for the full report to be approved, but we will only be giving program credit until the new model is out.
 - Bill: Are you proposing this for dry weather pervious and wet weather impervious, or across the available urban land uses in the regulated category?
 - Jenny: This BMP only applies to pervious developed land.
 - Bill: There are land uses that may not have enough lbs to offer. We may need a cap on the credit.
 - Jeff: The credit is just a percent of whatever the load is.
 - Ted: What did the workgroup say regarding the sampling? What if it is not reported or not done?
 - Jenny: That is the emphasis behind the program credit. For individual credits, you will need to report the sampling and follow-up activities. Program credit is a more holistic approach, using the procedures outlines in Table 7 of the report. If you wanted to report a specific individual credit, it would only be available in phase six, and you would need to show your monitoring and follow up sampling.
 - Bill: What is the order of the crediting? Does this credit come after the other BMPs have been credited?
 - Gary: This is a very small BMP, we would need to implement it as a multiplicative BMP along with everything else. We couldn’t put it first.
 - Jeff: Yes, you can treat it like a treatment train where this BMP goes at the end.
 - Jeff: The next step here is the technical appendix. Do we need to cover all phases, or should we just address Phase 5.3.2 now, then add on an additional appendix for Phase 6 later?
 - Bill: It would be best to just address Phase 5.3.2 now. We don’t know what the explicit load for gray infrastructure is going to look like yet.
- **ACTION:** Jeff and David will draft the technical appendix to present at the next meeting.
 - Jeff: When we developed the TMDL, we decided to have a load from permitted CAFO’s even though there is supposed to be no discharge. Why is the wet weather SSO load different from that?
 - Jenny: The panel agreed that they are similar in that the loads are clearly present,

- regardless of whether or not they are legal. However, there were policy concerns, and so in order to move the rest of the report forward, we pulled SSO's from the report.
 - Bill: There is potential double counting in this model. I would ask the panel to consider modifying their response in order to acknowledge that.
 - Gary: If they say double counting it is understood but considered minimal, I think that would be a fine response.
- **ACTION:** Jenny will modify the report to acknowledge the potential for double counting in Phase 5.3.2.
 - Marty Hurd (DDOE): DC is developing bacteria TMDLs, and discovering nutrient discharges is one way of helping us do that. We are interested in seeing how this moves forward.

Historical BMP Data Cleanup

- Jeff Sweeney (EPA, CBPO) reviewed the process used in the past to create input decks for calibration, and reviewed the timeline for the Phase 6 historical BMP cleanup effort.
 - For more information, please see Jeff's [presentation](#).
 - Jeff: I strongly encourage everyone to read pages 20, 38, and 46 of the BMP verification document for references to historic BMP data cleanup.
 - Bill: Does the verification document require everything going through NEIEN?
 - Jeff: Yes.
 - Bill: As you go back in time, there is data lacking that is needed for NEIEN, and the data quality is lower. My recommendation is that only NEIEN information would be carried forth for progress runs, and that the rest be used for calibration.
 - Jeff: It is understood that the quality of old data is not as good, but that information is still valuable for calibration.
 - Bill: And we're not going to be linearly interpreting between NAS years?
 - Jeff: It is your data, and you can do that. The CBP is taking your data as-is. We no longer have the resources to take ownership of the data here, so it is now the responsibility of the agencies and localities.
 - Olivia: We can provide agriculture NRCS and FSA data going back as far as 2006. The pre-2006 data is not necessarily inaccurate, but NRCS can't say it *is* accurate either. Hopefully your own records are ok, and there are other data sources you can use.
 - James Davis-Martin (VA DEQ): Is there some hybrid approach you could take? The first 15 years we do implicit BMPs, the last 15 years we do with explicit BMPs.
 - Jeff: The problem is that the industry is going to want to receive credit in the model for those 15 years.
 - Bill: I don't know what in the NEIEN deck is pulled forward for progress. I just control what I input into NEIEN. I don't want to have the headache of verifying very old practices.
 - James: we are looking for more and more refinements of data, but when you look through the history, it is not that defined.
 - Jeremy Hanson (VT, CBPO): Can you have a distinction in NEIEN for what is going into progress versus what is in the historical record?
- **ACTION:** David will place Historical Data Cleanup on the next agenda for the next WTWG meeting.

Next Meeting – Ted Tesler, PADEP

The meeting was adjourned

Meeting Attendance

Member Name		Affiliation
Ted	Tesler	PA DEP
David	Wood	CRC
Jeff	Sweeney	EPA, CBP
Olivia	Devereux	Devereux Consulting
Alana	Hartman	WV DEP
Neely	Law	CWP
Steve	Gladding	NY DEP

Bill	Keeling	VA DEQ
James	Davis-Martin	VA DEQ
Marty	Hurd	DDOE
Jenn	Volk	University of Delaware
Gary	Shenk	USGS, CBP
Jeremy	Hanson	VT, CBPO
Greg	Sandi	MDE
Jason	Keppler	MDA
Sarah	Lane	UMD, MD DNR