

**Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Meeting Minutes**

Thursday, December 8, 2022

10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

[Meeting Materials](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: The WTWG approved the [October Meeting Minutes](#).

Action: Members are asked to review the [two proposals](#) and Modeling Workgroup [2018 recommendation](#) regarding the proposed BMP associated with the "Volkswagen Settlement" and offer input to Jeff Sweeney (sweeney.jeff@epa.gov). There will be further discussion at the January meeting and the WTWG plans to vote on this item following the discussion at a meeting in early 2023. The BMP recommendation will then be raised to the Water Quality GIT for additional approval.

Decision: The WTWG approved the [updated scope and purpose](#). This will be presented to the Water Quality GIT for additional approval at an upcoming meeting.

Meeting Minutes

10:00 AM – **Introductions and Announcements** – Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC/Chair (15 min).

- **Decision:** The WTWG approved the [October Meeting Minutes](#).
- Ag Mortality BMP Expert Panel Update – Jeremy Hanson, CRC
 - No updates.
- CAST-2021 Management Board Meeting Update – Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC
 - [MB Meeting](#) on Friday, December 16 from 10a - 12p to discuss CAST.
- Upcoming CAST Webinar - Helen Golimowski, Devereux Consulting
 - No webinar in Dec. Will continue in Jan 2023.
- Welcome, Ruth Cassilly, UMD, as new WTWG Coordinator! – Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC
- [CBP's Quick Reference Guide for BMPs: Second Edition](#) now live!
- [Data Dashboard 2020 Progress updates](#) – Ruth Cassilly, UMD-CBPO

10:15 AM – **Progress Update/Announcements** – Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting (15 min).

- [2022 Progress Data Analysis](#)
- [2022 Grant Guidance \(Attachment 7\)](#) - Data submissions and requirements
- [Protocols for Verification of Annual BMP Data Submissions](#)

Discussion

Alana Hartman (in chat): The "annual implementation" tab has submitted data, not credited data?

Jess Rigelman: Yes, it is only submitted data from NEIEN. It isn't processed through CAST.

Alana Hartman (in chat): Once you have another progress run, will you be able to see both?

Jess Rigelman: We are doing another progress run tomorrow that will be up on CAST for you to see, but it won't be added into Olivia's tool.

Clare Gooch (in chat): Are these data submitted for that year? or cumulative, like the CAST summary report? On the BMP submitted tabs.

Jess Rigelman (in chat): For the BMP submitted it would be cumulative.

Greg Sandi: Will we still have an immediate validation report like we get from NEIEN?

Olivia Devereux: The validation report will come from CAST.

Bill Keeling: Concerned about the grant guidance.

Olivia Devereux: It will be the following year so it might give you and your team some time.

Bill Keeling: It would be helpful to know if EPA allows or specifies this in the grant guidance.

Alana Hartman: I'm afraid that saying yes to this means more work for our IT department. Not sure what that means for us yet.

Olivia Devereux: You'd be submitting the same XML file, you'd just email it somewhere else.

Cassie Davis: When you upload to NEIEN and get an immediate response about the XML file. Having that quick "yes or no" saves a lot of time upfront. Would be helpful to have another XML validation check that we can run.

Bill Keeling: NEIEN transmission validation that is step A to get files submitted. Then there is the secondary validation that produces the NEIEN errors and status errors and CAST errors. It's a multistep process. Beneficial to have that immediate feedback.

Jess Rigelman: That would be part of the process.

Clare Gooch: I support this assuming that it addresses the concerns raised. Cutting out NEEIN would be helpful.

Alicia Ritzenthaler (in chat): I don't anticipate any concerns about directly submitting (skipping NEIEN). Especially if the xml formatting and all remain the same!

Alana Hartman: When we first started using NEIEN, the information lived in the national information exchange and that was important for some reason. Has CAST replaced that now?

Olivia Devereux: Turns out that the schema we use is not the same as the national node. We have a different system.

Jess Rigelman: We don't submit it up to the national node anymore.

10:30 AM – Pennsylvania WIP and the Volkswagen (VW) Settlement BMP – Jeff Sweeney, EPA (45 min).

Jeff Sweeney gave an overview of a proposed BMP associated with the "Volkswagen Settlement" and the [recommendation](#) from the Modeling Workgroup on applying credit for reductions in atmospheric nitrogen emissions and deposition. He presented two proposals for the WTWG to consider prior to discussion by the group. The WTWG will be asked to make a consensus-based decision regarding the options presented at a future meeting.

Discussion

Cassie Davis (in chat): "Auto Settlement BMP?"

Norm Goulet: Two questions on the bigger picture: 1) How will we attribute any changes specifically just to the settlements, as opposed to investment in technologies that are identical but not related to the settlement? 2) Why is the state getting all of the credit if the locality is accelerating the implementation of technology beyond just this settlement?

Greg Sandi: In MD, we've been tracking this by county in MD. Not sure how we expand it outside the VW settlement. Trying to figure out potential reductions in the private sector as well.

Norm Goulet: When a locality is investing its own money into these zero emission vehicles, it seems like the locality should be getting the credit instead of the state or EPA.

Greg Sandi: We talked with our MS4 permitting staff. That's probably where we'd assign the credit in MD.

Norm Goulet: We don't include air in our MS4 permit. Also, this should go beyond MS4. It should be any jurisdiction.

Jeff Sweeney: PA mitigation plan says they are targeting areas where this would have the most benefit on air quality. In this case we're giving the credit to the state because they are getting the money, but

the benefits are widespread. It's not "real world", but you could distribute these deposition and load benefits to each land use in each segment or regions doing most of the work. The state would need to provide that information though. Modelers are trying to incorporate clean air act considerations into our future air modeling.

Dave Montali: When PA proposes 55 mill lbs, what due diligence goes into making sure that proposal is over and above the clean air act (CAA)?

Jeff Sweeney: First need to dig into the 2030 scenario. There are specifics in there about what exactly changes in deposition in the 2025 scenarios, and then compare that to this additional work solely from the VW mitigation.

Dave Montali: We first need to determine that the lbs reduction is over and above CAA though. Once you get that answer, then a task force should sit down and determine the answers to the questions raised and those protocols should apply across the board, beyond just this settlement. Maybe we could call the BMP "nitrogen reductions over and above the Clean Air Act" - EPA will get credit for CAA nitrogen reductions, and then everyone else should get credit on everything over and above the CAA. Also, is this Phase 6 or Phase 7?

Olivia Devereux: Ideally, Phase 6 so PA can finalize their Phase III WIP.

Dave Montali: Okay, just wondering because I think the deposition numbers will change for Phase 7.

Jeff Sweeney: Right. We want to make sure it's credited for PA's final amended WIP. In Phase 7 we will have more scenarios from CMAQ (air quality model) so we could look at previous future scenarios for atmospheric deposition and compare that to each states' mitigation plan for VW or otherwise. We used to have an air subcommittee that worked on these issues.

Cassie Davis: I think I'm leaning towards Proposal 1 because it might be confusing to explain if we don't have shoreline why it would be a negative value due to air emissions.

Olivia Devereux: Process-wise, what happens next?

Jeff Sweeney: WTWG chooses a recommendation and then it goes to the WQGIT for additional approval.

Lisa Beatty (in chat): I was wondering if we could have an internal discussion with just PA before giving an answer. Scott is not on this call.

Cassie Davis: Can you explain the document posted on the page?

Jeff Sweeney: The Modeling WG developed that in 2018. Lew Linker did a lot of the leg work, but it involved all of the modelers.

Cassie Davis: Would that be used as the basis for this BMP or would we have to develop a separate document similar to an expert panel report?

Jeff Sweeney: We feel as if this document is sufficient. The load reductions are small compared to the emission reductions.

Cassie Davis: This would be our first atmospheric BMP. Moving forward, if a state had climate change reduction goals and they wanted to account for what was achieved, would we rerun this process or should we develop a process now to count for these atmospheric BMPs?

Jeff Sweeney: It would be good to have a process. We do have other benefits from emission reductions for ammonia (like lagoon covers and manure treatment technology) so that's similar, but those tend to be local. This is different in that it's a massive amount of mitigation associated with the funding received. Definitely would recommend changing the name of the BMP.

Action: Members are asked to review the [two proposals](#) and Modeling Workgroup [2018 recommendation](#) regarding the proposed BMP associated with the "Volkswagen Settlement" and offer input to Jeff Sweeney (sweeney.jeff@epa.gov). There will be further discussion at the January meeting and the WTWG plans to vote on this item following the discussion at a meeting in early 2023. The BMP recommendation will then be raised to the Water Quality GIT for additional approval.

During the [May](#), [June](#), and [August](#) meetings, members provided feedback on updating the WTWG scope and purpose to better reflect the groups' role in Phase 7 model development. The feedback was consolidated into a draft scope and purpose for the WTWG to review and approve. Once approved, the updated scope and purpose will be presented to the WQGIT for additional confirmation.

Decision: The WTWG approved the [updated scope and purpose](#). This will be presented to the Water Quality GIT for additional approval at an upcoming meeting.

12:00 PM – Meeting adjourned.

Next Meeting

Thursday, January 5, 2023 from 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM.

Participants

Jackie Pickford, CRC
Cassie Davis, NYSDEC
Ruth Cassilly, UMD/CBPO
Jeff Sweeney, EPA/CBPO
Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting, Inc.
Alana Hartman, WVDEP
Samuel Camfield, WVDEP
Emily Dekar, USC
Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA
Clare Gooch, DNREC
Holly Walker, DNREC
Greg Sandi
Norm Goulet, NVRC
Alicia Ritzenthaler, DC
Bill Keeling (Call-in-User 2)

Mark Dubin, CBPO/UME
Dave Montali, WV Tetra Tech
Arianna Johns, VA DEQ
Chris Brosch, DDA
Clint Gill, DE
Eugenia Hart, Tetra Tech
Helen Golimowski, Devereux Consulting
Jenn Walls, DNREC
Jess Rigelman, J7 LLC
Katie Dyer
KC Filippino, HRPDC
Lisa Beatty, PADEP
Lori Brown, DNREC
Tom Butler, EPA

Acronym List

AgWG- Agriculture Workgroup	BMPVAHAT- BMP Verification Ad Hoc Action Team
BMP- Best Management Practice	CBP- Chesapeake Bay Program
CAST- Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool (user interface for the CBP Watershed Model)	CRC- Chesapeake Research Consortium
CBPO- Chesapeake Bay Program Office (houses EPA and myriad contractors and grantees working towards CBP)	DOEE- [DC] Department of Energy and Environment
CBW- Chesapeake Bay Watershed	EPA- [United States] Environmental Protection Agency
DNREC- [DE] Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control	FFWG- Federal Facilities Workgroup
DoD- [United States] Department of Defense	MB- Management Board
FWG- Forestry Workgroup	NFWF- National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
LUWG- Land Use Workgroup	PA DEP- Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
NEIEN- National Environmental Information Exchange Network	PSU- Pennsylvania State University
NYSDEC- New York State Department of Environmental Conservation	UMCES- University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science
PSC- Principal Staff Committee	USDA-ARS- United States Department of Agriculture- Agricultural Research Service

STAC- Scientific & Technical Advisory Committee	States Department of Agriculture-Natural Resources Conservation Service
UMD- University of Maryland	VA DEQ- Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
USDA-NASS- United States Department of Agriculture- National Agricultural Statistics Service USDA-NRCS- United	WTWG- Watershed Technical Workgroup
USWG- Urban Stormwater Workgroup	WV DEP- West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection
WQGIT- Water Quality Goal Implementation Team	WWG – Wetlands Workgroup
CAA - Clean Air Act	VW – Volkswagen
CMAQ – Community Multiscale Air Quality Model	