# CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010 Conference Call

# SUMMARY OF DECISIONS, ACTIONS, AND ISSUES

**ACTION:** WQGIT members should submit feedback on the proposed air standards.

**ACTION**: CBP will distribute the portions of the Goal, Indicators, Milestone, and Strategies that the Management Board is looking for approval on for the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team by Tuesday, January 12<sup>th</sup>.

**ACTION**: CBP will consider behavior of delivery factors in phase 5.3.

**ACTION**: State representatives are asked to continue to provide the WQGIT with updates on Watershed Implementation Plan development.

**ACTION**: States should nominate representative to assist EPA in selection of local WIP pilot projects.

**ACTION**: EPA will provide instructions to states on amount, contacts, and process for state to follow for contractual services within a week.

# **MINUTES**

# Update on Primary and Secondary Air Standards Proposal – Lewis Linker

- Friday announcement that air standard would be reduced to 0.06 or 0.07 ppm
- EPA will be taking comments on primary standards for 60 days
- CBP considering how this would assist achieving water quality standards
- Secondary standards are also being considered
- Not linear reduction between ozone reduction and NO<sub>X</sub>

**ACTION:** WO GIT members should submit feedback on the proposed air standards.

# <u>Review/Approval of Work group Comments on Executive Order Section 203 Strategy</u> – Dave Hansen

- <u>Attachment A1</u> is only comment received directly about WQGIT Goals, Indicators, Milestones and Strategies. Will be sent to Sediment Workgroup for incorporation
- Seeking WQGIT approval for listed indicators and desired results, through more may be included in the future
- Pg. 3, table 2, indicators listed under "Water Quality Index": dissolved oxygen, water clarity, chlorophyll a, chemical contaminants
- This document addresses entire scope of WQGIT, not just the TMDL, for which nutrients and sediments are the focus. Chemical contaminants will be more of a focus in the future.
- Pat Buckley, PA DEP, noted that the current Bay Barometer includes indicator for chemical contaminants limited to Bay tidal waters and supports continuing to focus on tidal waters.
- Rich Eskin, MDE, found the indicators were generally good, but if the goal is to delist the Bay he suggested an indicator directly related to delisting process, i.e. trend in percentage nonattainment in each WQ segment. Also, sustainable fish and shellfish population is more directly related to harvest pressure than water quality. Suggest adjusting the table to clarify.

- Ron Entringer, NY DEC, would like more watershed-specific information for the "Healthy Watershed" indicators.
- Not presenting specific milestones to Management Board. Percentages will be filled in once states develop their milestones
- Milestones will not be set until states lay out Watershed Implementation Plans and Milestones planning specific reductions by source sector
- Pat Buckley, PA DEP, clarified that PA is committed to meeting nutrient and sediment reduction two-year milestones; but we will not be setting milestones by source sectors and characterizing them by source sector is contrary to adaptive management. PA does not approve of tracking chemical contaminants in non-tidal waters. Should have a set of indicators on each of the segments of the Bay and various parameters in those segments to measure partial successes and trends where we begin to succeed in those segments.
- Bruce Michael, MDE, suggested that N, P and S concentrations be included as an indicator. **ACTION**: CBP will distribute the portions of the Goal, Indicators, Milestone, and Strategies that the Management Board is looking for approval on for the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team by Tuesday, January 12<sup>th</sup>.

# <u>Update on from Jurisdictions on Watershed Implementation Planning Process</u> – NY, PA, MD, VA, WV, DE, DC representatives

### PA:

- Want EPA contractual services with TetraTech
- Like to have stakeholder work group to work with TetraTech and DEP
- Need assistance to break down BMP information to county level

#### MD:

- Have schedule for allocation process, allocating to county level at least for discussion purposes is difficult process
- Leads on eight WIP elements have been identified, work on work plans next week
- Allocation analysis under way to answer "what-if" questions at variety of geographic scales
- Need support for allocation process

# VA:

- Agency staff consulting with 5-7 source sector experts to project feasible reductions
- For wastewater, will start with general permit that already exists
- Secretary of Natural Resources formed advisory group with EPA-provided facilitator including many stakeholders. Will present target BMP coverage areas in February
- Staff will complete input deck for preliminary Watershed Implementation Plan WV:
- Completed detailed evaluation of point sources in past few months. Can get big reduction in P through traditional point sources, but not N
- Need contractual assistance for consistency with approved WV TMDLs, etc.
- Could use modelers' assistance to understand delivery factors, particularly the increase in P delivery with nutrient reductions, etc.

**ACTION**: CBP will consider behavior of delivery factors in phase 5.3.

- Large questions like delivery factors need to be addressed as soon as possible for allocation and outreach process.
- Jeff Sweeney, UMD/CBP, noted that problems with 5.2 scenario stem from anomalous state data, which went out for comment in Spring/Summer of last year, not Scenario Builder or the

model. Data must be finalized this week. Chemical fertilizer application rates are too high in most states.

#### DE:

- Recently held first implementation group meeting
- Developed seven workgroups for source sectors, state lands, land use changes, etc.
- Priority is immediate local involvement
- DE interested in trading between N and P, doing better with P

### DC:

- Began developing load allocation options, will distribute to major stakeholders, using Tributary Strategies as the basis
- Focus on Blue Plains major source of nutrients
- Need loads form 5.3 model runs and contractor support

#### NY

- Upper Susquehanna Commission has Watershed Implementation Plan with credible milestones
- Need EPA support

**ACTION**: State representatives are asked to continue to provide the WQGIT with updates on Watershed Implementation Plan development.

<u>Resources for Watershed Implementation Planning Process</u> – Katherine Antos, Bryan Seipp, Jake Romig, Amy Handen, Wink Hastings

- In recognition of TMDL, Executive Order, etc. the Chesapeake Bay Program budget increased \$15 million more than requested, with most being passed to states
- \$11.2 million is Regulatory and Accountability Program grants going to states in addition to current grants
  - Draft guidance for state review being released this week, will be finalized by early February
  - Same guidance for signatory and non-signatory grants, but signatory states will receive non-competitively. RFP for non-signatories will come out in early February
  - Distribution will likely be based on base amount of funding for each jurisdiction and an additional amount by formula based on necessary load reduction, same as that used for allocation method
  - States will be receiving at least double their current funding (WV would likely be receiving at least \$500,000)
- EPA will provide greater specificity on expectation for each WIP plan in November and December letter
- \$700,000 to provide state and local partners with existing contract vehicles, more rapid assistance
  - \$400,000 for states
  - \$300,000 for local pilots
  - TetraTech and facilitation contracts
  - EPA will hold the contract, states must go through EPA to request services
  - Will share nomination forms with states for local pilot programs, asking states to partner with EPA in nominating and selection projects rather than publicizing
  - State can exchange grant dollars for additional contractual services
  - Grants go through December 2011
  - States are encouraged to select pilots that will assist in both Phase I and II WIPs

- Lead organization for local pilot applies for local pilot
- Generalized templates useful in many areas would be helpful for local pilots
- EPA representative assigned to each state in addition to source sector leads to assist in plan development and review
- Provide consistency in plan review
- Will provide additional information

**ACTION**: States should nominate representative to assist EPA in selection of local WIP pilot projects.

**ACTION**: EPA will provide instructions to states on amount, contacts, and process for state to follow for contractual services within a week.

follow for contractual services with a week.

# Circuit Rider – Jake Romig, Bryan Siepp

# York County

- Workshops publicized to all municipalities in the county, will be followed by landowner workshops
- Considering having TMDL workgroup at county level
  - Not sure how to form relationship with state. Pat Buckley offered to be the state contact for this effort
  - May be regional opportunity, could cross state lines

# Center for Watershed Protection

- Working with local governments on request for service
- Providing different levels of service: sustained commitment vs. wider service
- Pat Buckley, PA DEP, noted that at the state level we are just beginning developing a basin wide implementation plan. County level not due until end of 2011; state staff will not be able to support pilot projects.

# CNEMO – Amy Handen

- Assistance more applicable in Phase II for stakeholder engagement, education, etc. assistance
- Have resources to share, i.e. list of watershed organization
- Working in Chesapeake Bay watershed and MD and VA coastal bays

# Rivers, Trails and Conservation Program – Wink Hastings

- · Assist with conservation and watershed plans with land trusts and local governments
- Green infrastructure planning for local municipalities

# **PARTICIPANTS**

Katherine Antos, Coordinator EPA CBPO		antos.katherine@epa.gov
Karl Blankenship	Bay Journal	bayjournal@earthlink.net
Pat Buckley	PA DEP	pbuckley@state.pa.us
Monir Chowdhury	DDOE	monir.chowdhury@dc.gov
Lee Currey	MDE	lcurrey@ mde.state.md.us
Chris Day	EPA R3	day.christopher@epa.gov
Ron Entringer	NY DEC	raentrin@gw.dec.state.ny.us
Rich Eskin	MDE	reskin@ mde.state.md.us
Patricia Gleason	EPA R3	gleason.patricia@epa.gov
Norm Goulet	NVRC	ngoulet@novaregion.org
Amy Handen	NPS/CBPO	ahanden@chesapeakebay.net
Rebecca Hanmer	Retired/FWG Chair	rwhanmer@yahoo.com
Dave Hansen, Chair	U. of Delaware	djhansen@ udel.edu

Wink Hastings NPS/CBPO whastings@chesapeakebay.net

Carlton Haywood chaywood@icprb.org **ICPRB** Dave Heicher dheicher@srbc.net **SRBC** 

imkennedy@deq.virginia.gov John Kennedy VA DEO teresa.m.koon@wv.gov Teresa Koon WV DEP Koroncai.robert@epa.gov Bob Koroncai, Chair EPA R3 Marya Levelev **MDE** mlevelev@ mde.state.md.us Lewis Linker EPA/CBPO linker.lewis@epa.gov

Charles Martin chmartin@deq.virginia.gov VA DEQ

bmcgee@cbf.org Beth McGee **CBF** 

Bruce Michael MD DNR bmichael@dnr.state.md.us WV DEP mmonroe@ag.state.wv.us Matt Monroe david.a.montali@wv.gov Dave Montali WV DEP Andrew Parker TetraTech andrew.parker@tetratech.com Reggie Parrish EPA/CBPO parrish.reginald@epa.gov Kenn Pattison kpattison@state.pa.us PA DEP

russ.perkinson@dcr.virginia.gov Russ Perkinson VA DCR aepollock@deg.virginia.gov Alan Pollock VA DEO **ACB** iromig@acb-online.org Jake Romig Kelly Shenk shenk.kelly@epa.gov EPA/CBPO

mohsin siddique@dcwasa.com Mohsin Siddique DC WASA

**CWP** Bryan Siepp bts@cwp.org

Jennifer Sincock EPA R3 sincock.jennifer@epa.gov Rachel Streusand CRC/CBP rstreusa@chesapeakebay.net Jennifer Volk jennifer.volk@state.de.us DE DNREC

swalker@wri.org Sara Walker WRI

Jeff Wren

Bob Yowell PA DEP ryowell@state.pa.us