



**Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Conference call**
Thursday, February 4, 2016
10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

MINUTES

Summary of Action and Decision Items:

ACTION: All comments on the Street Sweeping and Storm Drain Cleaning BMP panel report are due by COB, February 19. Any comments received that contradict the panel's scientific recommendations for crediting this practice within the modeling tools must be accompanied with alternative proposals. The WTWG will be asked to approve the report at its March 3rd conference call, and if consensus cannot be reached, the report will be elevated to the WQGIT for decision.

ACTION: The Technical Appendix will be revised to add a question and answer describing how to cap the reductions from street sweeping and storm drain cleaning practices based on a percentage of the available load. Bill Keeling will provide suggested language by February 19th.

ACTION: At an upcoming WTWG meeting, a presentation will be given about the current back-out procedure for land use change BMPs and possible options for amending that procedure Phase 6. Matt will check with the Land Use Workgroup to find out what data they plan to receive, and how often they expect to receive it.

ACTION: Matt will work with the CTIC data and try to turn it around to the jurisdictions prior to March 31st.

Welcome and Introductions – Ted Tesler, Chair

Nominations for WTWG Chair and membership confirmation – Ted Tesler, Chair

In December, the WTWG was asked to submit nominations for a new chair. No formal nominations were received but there were several parties interested. The WTWG hopes to have a new Chair by the next meeting.

Street Sweeping and Storm Drain Cleaning BMP Panel Report – Tom Schueler, CSN

Tom described the review process to-date for the Street Sweeping and Storm Drain Cleaning Expert Panel Report and technical appendix, and asked the WTWG to review the documents prior to the March 3rd conference call. All comments were requested by COB, February 19. Any comments received that contradict the panel's scientific recommendations for crediting this practice within the modeling tools must be accompanied with alternative proposals. The WTWG will be asked to approve the report at its March 3rd conference call, and if consensus cannot be reached, the report will be elevated to the WQGIT for decision.

ACTION: All comments on the Street Sweeping and Storm Drain Cleaning BMP panel report are due by COB, February 19. Any comments received that contradict the panel's scientific recommendations for crediting this practice within the modeling tools must be accompanied with alternative proposals. The WTWG will be asked to approve the report at its March 3rd conference call, and if consensus cannot be reached, the report will be elevated to the WQGIT for decision.

Discussion:

- Matt Johnston (UMD, CBPO): We are making an exception here by extending the comment period. We will try to avoid this in the future, but it gives us an opportunity to put our comments on paper with alternative language. As a reminder, the WQGIT made a decision at their December meeting that any BMP panel that is approved after milestones are submitted, will not be factored in until the next round of milestones. This BMP and all others that come in will not really have a place in the Phase 5.3.2 Model, so when we talk about changes, we are talking about changes down the road.
 - Bill Keeling (VA DEQ): Is that also true for Annual Progress going forward?
 - Johnston: Yes, that's correct.
 - Keeling: Aren't we locking down the NEIEN appendix after a certain date?
 - Johnston: Yes. We can make rules in the appendix that would allow us to accept a practice without getting an error, but we won't be crediting it differently in the Phase 5.3.2 Model.
- Keeling: When I was reading the report, the panel said there should be a representative coordinate pair or a HUC12 reported for the practice but the technical appendix lists all available NEIEN geographies. Which should it be?
 - Johnston: We have had this in other panel reports. The panel would like the more specific information, such as lat/long or HUC12, but we have to have contingencies for going back in the history. So we have always said all available NEIEN geographies in the technical appendix, but that the coordinates or HUC12 are preferred.
- Keeling: I think the WTWG should consider the recommendations if they think that reporting at a larger scale is not scientifically defensible. Also, like other BMPs where a mass load is an explicit calculation and is applied to an implicit source, we ought to put a cap on the reduction based upon the available load.
 - Johnston: I will ask David to add a question and answer to the appendix to describe that exact process.
- Keeling: I thought it was capped at some percent of the available load.
 - Johnston: In general the rule is that the load can't go below 0, but some other specific BMPs may have had a percent rule.
- Keeling: I would recommend a cap of some percent of the load.
 - Johnston: Can you put that in writing? I think it is a good suggestion as a new rule for Phase 6.
 - Keeling: Yes, I will provide that language by the 19th.

ACTION: The Technical Appendix will be revised to add a question and answer describing how to cap the reductions from street sweeping and storm drain cleaning practices based on a percentage of the available load. Bill Keeling will provide suggested language by February 19th.

- Greg Busch (MDE): Maryland has requested the WTWG review one of the points we raised. We had questions about how modeled loads from WinSLAMM model will mesh with the Watershed Model. When we start measuring reductions at the stormwater outfall based on WinSLAMM, and those get applied in the Watershed Model as edge of stream reductions, we are missing out on any reductions that would occur in-between. I think our concern is that there is no hydrologic benefit.
 - Johnston: The modeling team has looked over Maryland's comments and they don't have an opinion one way or the other. We don't do this reduction for any other urban BMPs, so this would be a unique change. More thought should go into what Phase 6 looks like from edge of field to edge of stream in order to come up with a response.
 - Busch: I think that's a discussion we would like to have.
- Keeling: For the WinSLAMM model, there were 960 scenarios run, but 624 were ignored because they produced no difference. Were the efficiencies based on the remaining scenarios?

- Schueler: The primary recommendation is the table in the executive summary that shows 11 practices that had non-zero removal rate. Each of those 11 practices were the result of taking the midpoint reduction of each scenario that fit that practice definition. The model showed 2/3 of scenarios had no water quality benefits whatsoever, and those practices were not given unique practice names.
- Keeling: We are trying to get the reporting entity to do the verification.
 - Schueler: Pennsylvania had a similar concern. It is important to emphasize that while there is a panel recommendation on verification, there is language in the report on how those recommendations are not binding.
 - Johnston: I don't think that is part of the WTWG discussion process. We should restrict our review to the Scenario Builder appendix.
- Jeff Sweeney (EPA, CBPO): Is Virginia's reporting system robust enough to adapt to these different practice categories?
 - Keeling: We are always retroactive to EPA. The localities are operating based off of previous reports, and so there is always a lag. I can't say our system can adapt to going from one BMP with mass loading to 11 with all of these different reporting requirements. I don't see that happening any time soon.
- Sweeney: Will you be adding these to your reporting system? Even as a default?
 - Keeling: I still see us submitting one street sweeping practice using the mass loading approach for the foreseeable future.
- Johnston: If necessary, if there are substantive comments submitted between now and February 19th, we can schedule a 2 hour call before March 3rd to review those comments. We will play that by ear.
- Tesler: How do we determine whether the practice should be reported on the roads land use or tree canopy over roads land use?
 - Johnston: There is a default land use group in Phase 6, and for this BMP it would be all the road land uses. If you had more detailed information, you could submit that to NEIEN, but there would be a default to proportion it out in every segment.
 - Keeling: Does it get the same efficiency on both types of land uses?
 - Schueler: The panel argued extensively on that issue and while there was some research, they stopped short of making that recommendation because they did not feel it was adequately supported.
- Tesler: Is the dry weight fraction done in Scenario Builder, or is that calculation done on the front end?
 - Johnston: We can set it up in Scenario Builder to have a default fraction, but also give states the option to report nutrients.

Member Participation on BMP Expert Panels – Matt Johnston, UMD

Matt reviewed the list of WTWG representatives on active BMP expert panels and described a process for gathering feedback from panel deliberations.

Discussion:

- Johnston: This is just a reminder of our role as participants on the BMP panels as WTWG representatives. With tight timelines, it would be effective to have updates from WTWG representatives as panel deliberations are beginning to mold recommendations. We want to make sure the workgroup is aware of progress.
- Robin Pellicano (MDE): Would it make sense for the WTWG representative to work with Matt to draft the technical appendix?
 - Johnston: Those panels haven't gotten to that point yet, but as these panels finish up, we will definitely be relying on those representatives to assist with that process.

- Tesler: Each jurisdiction has their own data system and issues, and to the extent that we can become aware of upcoming data processing needs, the better. I think this is really helpful. While we have 1 representative as an actual advisor to the panel, the larger group will need to weigh in.
- Jeremy Hanson (VT, CBPO): Based on my experience with the panels, it is the last 1 or 2 months when the report is developed enough to bring anything to the WTWG. I would caution that, as we make these updates a regular occurrence, the WTWG reps work with the panel chair and coordinator on what information is ready to bring forward.
- Pellicano: Do the reps ever have the opportunity to really talk with the panel about what a jurisdiction could provide with data? How much can a rep push to say we don't have certain data?
 - Johnston: I think that is exactly the role of the WTWG rep, and hopefully they are accomplishing that.
 - Sweeney: I agree, but I also think that the panels are supposed to define the best science with the hope that in a few years, jurisdictions will be able to collect an improved level of data. I also think the role is about how the panels are planning to credit a BMP in Scenario Builder, and whether it is feasible.
 - Norm Goulet (NVRC): I think that happens quite frequently. The panelists generally don't have a huge understanding of the Model or Scenario Builder, and WTWG reps often have to reign them in a little.

BMP Backout Procedure – Matt Johnston, UMD

Matt Johnston (UMD, CBPO) reviewed the land use change BMP back-out concept being used for both Phase 5.3.2 and Phase 6 BMPs for scenarios on forecasted land conditions.

Discussion:

- Johnston: Land use change BMPs, such as forest buffers, actually take agriculture land out of production and places them into forest. The assumption in Phase 5, and in Phase 6 as of now, is that once the ag census or satellite data is brought forward, those capture any land use changes. So while a state still received credit in summary BMP reports for a land use change BMP, the actual land use change in the Model will not occur because it will be in the new ag census or satellite land use data. The possible tweak is that we don't know how often the land uses will be updated in Phase 6 so we have to wait for the Land Use Workgroup to tell us how often they will be confident in a new land use projection.
- Keeling: You are claiming your imagery is capturing current progress. When the imagery resolution is 30 meter, you are probably missing a lot of 35ft buffers. Also, we are always using imagery that is several years old. Reducing BMP acreage in a Progress year after that is not valid in my opinion. There is enough error in 30m resolution imagery that the procedure, as currently done, seems convoluted. If high resolution imagery is different, we are still talking about 2011-2013 imagery, so that shouldn't impact 2015 Progress. That back-out should be done at the front end, so that when we apply BMPs to the no action land use, we get credit for what is available.
- Sweeney: The other side of the issue is that when you report buffers, for instance, you get credit immediately, even though it will take years to actually get those benefits. Can you provide a few slides at the next meeting on your proposal? We have a few ideas as well.
 - Keeling: I don't have time to do that. I am just saying that if you look at 30m imagery, the buffer is missed. I think using 30m that way is not appropriate.
- Johnston: This is the first conversation because we haven't talked to the LUWG on how often we will get high resolution land cover data.
- Sweeney: I think everyone deserves a tutorial on back-out as well. I think we should come back and explain what we are talking about as simply as we can.
- Keeling: There is no plan in Virginia to redevelop a high resolution land use layer. It will just inform the 2013 layer. There is no guarantee that we will get funding to update that.

ACTION: At an upcoming WTWG meeting, a presentation will be given about the current back-out procedure for land use change BMPs and possible options for amending that procedure Phase 6. Matt will check with the Land Use Workgroup to find out what data they plan to receive, and how often they expect to receive it.

Phase 6 and Phase 5 2015 Progress Status and Questions – Group

Jeff Sweeney (EPA, CBPO) and Matt Johnston (UMD, CBPO) provided a status update and all members were encouraged to bring forward questions and comments about Phase 6 modeling as well as the 2015 Progress modeling assessment.

- No questions or comments were raised.

2016/2017 Milestone Inputs – Group

Jeff Sweeney provided an overview, and all members were encouraged to bring forward questions and comments about the milestone modeling assessment.

Discussion:

- Pellicano: Final milestones are due April 22nd?
 - Sweeney: Yes. You would have opportunities to revise them, but it depends on the degree of the revisions.
 - Pellicano: I know Greg has made some changes to 2015 Progress, and my original milestones didn't reflect those changes. That would be an example of the type of change I would make.
 - Sweeney: If you can finish it up in the next week, EPA could accommodate that right away because they don't begin their review for another week or so.
- Keeling: On nutrient management adjustments, Virginia is having a large amount of nutrient management being cut off. Why would we adjust nutrient management acres further if a large amount of what we reported is being cut off anyways?
 - Sweeney: I did notice that, but right now we are not saying we are adjusting anyone's acres. We don't know yet.
- Keeling: Didn't the forecast methodology change?
 - Sweeney: No, we are still using double exponential smoothing. It changed from 2 years ago because in 2014 we brought in the Ag census data and a few new urban datasets. Moving forward, all new data is frozen during a milestone period, so no new info will come in until 2017.
- Tesler: Will there be a migration period where we can enter Phase 6 BMPs within Phase 5 Progress as we get closer?
 - Johnston: I think it is BMP-specific. For example, if states would like it to be easier to submit 2016 Progress for street sweeping in the 11 new practice categories, Scenario Builder could track them and they would just map to the current Phase 5 credit. I can't say yes or no on those yet, but each jurisdiction should send me a list of those questions and we could talk through them.
- Alana Hartman (WV DEP): The next deadline for data submission seems important to us in West Virginia because it will enable us to see the impacts of the different tweaks to the Model through 2016. It would let us know that any changes we see are because of Model adaptations rather than changes to our inputs.
- Keeling: Please footnote that Virginia did not report any NRCS data. Unless something changes, we do not plan to.
- Sweeney: I want to bring your attention to an email to the WQGIT yesterday to help with these data cleanup efforts. There is money again being given out this year through the WIP assistance funds that can either be spent on historic data cleanup, verification protocols, or education and

outreach protocols targeted to local partners. You need to respond with some sort of proposal for one of these uses by February 22nd.

Announcements

ACTION: Matt will work with the CTIC data and try to turn it around to the jurisdictions prior to March 31st.

- Goulet: I am presenting to the WQGIT on the status of the Urban Nutrient Management credit on February 22nd.
- Hartman: For those revising your verification program plans, you can ask Rich Batiuk for more recent examples of states who did a really good job on certain BMPs and he can provide those. We found that very helpful.
- Tesler: Please remember to submit any more nominations for WTWG Chair.

Adjourned

List of Call Participants

Member Name	Affiliation
Ted Tesler (Chair)	PA DEP
Matt Johnston (Coordinator)	UMD, CBPO
David Wood (Staff)	CRC
Tom Schueler	CSN
Olivia Devereux	DEC
Marty Hurd	DOEE
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Jenny Tribo	HRPDC
Sarah Lane	MD DNR
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Greg Busch	MDE
Greg Sandi	MDE
Robin Pellicano	MDE
Marian Norris	NPS
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Bill Keeling	VA DEQ
Jeremy Hanson	VT, CBPO
Alana Hartman	WV DEP