

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
AUGUST 11, 2014 CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES

ACTION ITEMS & DECISIONS

ACTION: WQGIT members should contact jenvolk@udel.edu and power.lucinda@epa.gov if interested in nominating representatives for the proposed Toxics Workgroup.

DECISION: WQGIT members approved the Report on Non Cost-Shared and Resource Improvement Practice Definitions and Verification Visual Indicators Guidance Document.

WORKGROUP UPDATES

Land Use Workgroup

- The Land Use Workgroup met on 8/12 to discuss the details of the Phase 6.0 land use classification.
- LUWG will be presenting the proposed comprehensive list of land uses to the Modeling Workgroup in September and to the WQGIT in October 2014.
- The next conference call is scheduled for September 25th.

Agriculture Workgroup

- The Agriculture Workgroup finalized their verification guidance on August 8th.
- The AgWG approved the Resource Improvement Technical Review Panel's final report.
- The AgWG is in the process of finalizing the Phase 6.0 agricultural land uses.
- Their next meeting is on August 14th.

BMP Verification Committee

- The Committee held a conference call on 7/31. They worked through the series of comments submitted on the May 2014 draft of the BMP Verification Framework Document and agreed to changes to the document. The revised document and framework will be distributed to the Management Board on August 11th (or 12th).

Urban Stormwater Workgroup

- The USWG discussed the new Virginia Tech panel process and updates to the NDGI (Nutrient Discharges from Gray Infrastructure) expert panel report on 7/15.
- The USWG will not meet in August. Their next meeting/call is scheduled for September 23rd.

Watershed Technical Workgroup

- The WTWG held its call on 8/7. The workgroup discussed stream restoration, shoreline management, oyster aquaculture, riparian forest buffers, and resource improvement practices.
- Next call is scheduled for Thursday, 9/4.

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup

- The WWTWG held its call on 6/24, which included a briefing on the expert panel recommendations for nutrient discharges from grey infrastructure.
- The WWTWG will reconvene on September 9th.

Trading and Offsets Workgroup

- The next TOWG is scheduled for September 24th.

Forestry Workgroup:

- The FWG had a conference call on August 6th. During this call, members discussed management strategy development for riparian buffers and urban tree canopy.
- The next meeting will be in-person on September 3rd.

MINUTES

1. Welcome/Confirm Call Participants, Recent Workgroup Decisions and Updates

- Jenn Volk, Chair, welcomed everyone to the call and reviewed the workgroup updates.

2. Next Steps for WQGIT Outcomes in Watershed Agreement

- Jenn Volk: Following the signing of the Bay Watershed Agreement earlier this year, each of the goals and outcomes will fall to one of the GITs to be the lead. The 2017 & 2025 WIP outcomes and standards attainment outcome are under the WQGIT. The WQGIT Forestry and Land Use Workgroups will also be leads on some outcomes.
- Volk: The Management Board is discussing on Thursday who will be responsible for the toxics outcome, and it will likely be with the WQGIT as well. If the Management Board approves it, there will be a toxics workgroup formed under the WQGIT, with a separate coordinator and staffer to help support the workgroup.
 - Mark Dubin (UMD): The Agriculture Workgroup will have an interest in the toxics strategy.
 - Volk: Most workgroups will need to be in the loop on toxics, so there will be collaboration.
 - Greg Allen will be soliciting members for the toxics workgroup. If anyone is interested in helping with this group, contact Jenn and Lucinda.
- Lucinda Power will be developing executive summaries for the 2017 and 2025 WIP outcomes and the standards attainments outcome, as the WIPs and monitoring work plan under the Midpoint Assessment serve as the management strategies for those outcomes. The summaries will detail how the WIPs address each of the management strategy elements and the work underway for the Midpoint Assessment.
 - Dave Montali (WV): Support this idea. The WQGIT management strategy is essentially complete already.
 - Scott Phillips (USGS): The attainment outcome should be mentioned in the overall strategy. The work plan for the Midpoint Assessment under STAR would suffice as the management strategy for the attainment outcome.
 - Davis-Martin: Will the management strategies developed by the Forestry and Land Use Workgroups come to the goal team for review and approval?
 - Power: It will depend on which GIT has the oversight for the outcomes, as some will be led by other GITs, but they will coordinate with the lead workgroups.

ACTION: WQGIT members should contact jennvolk@udel.edu and power.lucinda@epa.gov if interested in nominating representatives for the proposed Toxics Workgroup.

3. Modeling Workgroup Update

- Dave Montali (Modeling Workgroup Co-Chair): The Modeling Workgroup held their Quarterly Meeting from July 22-23, and discussed the Phase 6.0 prototype Watershed Model. We are preparing many of the major elements to allow multiple model representation of nutrients. At the next quarterly, we will have some key scenarios run from the Phase 5.3.2 model for comparison. At the Modeling Workgroup meeting there were presentations regarding phosphorus fate and transport; there is evidence that P buildup in the soil is leading to observed increases in phosphorus in the Bay. The workgroup discussed the need for a mechanism for representing P storage in soil in Phase 6.0. The next Modeling Workgroup conference call will be September 4; the next quarterly meeting will be held the week before the WQGIT face to face meeting.

- Davis-Martin: When we start comparing scenarios, our goal should not be that phase 6.0 should produce the same results as 5.3.2.

4. Watershed Technical Workgroup Updates

- Matt Johnston (Watershed Technical Workgroup Coordinator): The Watershed Technical Workgroup last week reviewed Shoreline Management, Stream Restoration, Forest Buffers and Oyster Aquaculture reports.
- The Watershed Technical Workgroup provided these clarifications and recommendations on the Stream Restoration report:
 - Clarify that the revised interim rate is in fact the approved default rate.
 - Recommend that the reduction cap for de-nitrification apply to nitrate and not to total nitrogen.
 - The recommendations for nutrients reduced by stabilizing bank sediments should be revisited prior to calibration of Phase 6.0. WTWG does not have science for attenuation of nutrients in streams. Other than de-nitrification, attenuation is not well understood, so there was no way to incorporate that in to the panel's recommendations. The panel did apply a conservative estimate; however, not a lot of evidence to change the panel report at this time.
- Shoreline erosion is modeled in the Estuarine Model; however, the BMP counting is in the Watershed Model. The revised report and appendix will discuss the modeling approach.
- The reports for Shoreline Management and Stream Restoration will be brought to the WQGIT in September.
- WTWG did not yet approve the forest buffer panel report. The AgWG did approve the use of narrow grass and forest buffers, and just a land use change with no upslope benefit. This will be a change in the appendix to be available for 2014 progress.
- STAC produced a report on oyster aquaculture and the WTWG created the technical appendix; however, the group recommended that the topic be addressed through the expert panel process.
 - Power: Habitat and Fisheries GITs are very interested in this BMP. The Oyster Recovery Partnership has offered to assist. We can contact them to request they develop a proposal. There was interest to broaden this report to include oyster restoration as well.
 - Russ Baxter (VA): Participated in this discussion earlier, ORP was planning to create a proposal. That may be already underway.
 - Davis-Martin: Also have clam aquaculture in VA. Recommend including these other aspects in our request to the ORP.
- Lucinda will get the oyster proposal out to the Fisheries, Habitat and Water Quality Goal Teams as soon as possible, planning to agree to an approach in September.

5. WQGIT October 2014 Meeting

- James Davis-Martin, Vice-Chair, updated members on the upcoming face to face meeting. The planning committee held a conference call to discuss the agenda topics and big picture goals for the October meeting. The agenda is now being developed.
 - The general direction for the meeting will be to begin with a big picture overview of the issues and necessary steps to get us to the 2017 goal. Many of these priorities are model refinements. We will also talk about the progress and schedule for each of the priorities. The goal of the meeting is to clarify those priorities and the steps needed to move them forward; the overall schedule; and the overlaps and intersections between the priorities.
- Liberty Mountain resort has availability on the dates we have selected; we are waiting on a proposal from them. We are also exploring alternative options in case our first choice does not work out.
- Davis-Martin: Are there any objections to the planning team finalizing the agenda?
 - Power: Recommend presenting the final agenda at the September WQGIT call.

- Rich Batiuk: Recommend that the planning group decide if any materials need to be shared several weeks in advance of the meeting, so that we can make this happen.

6. Resource Improvements

- Bob Ensor, Howard County Soil Conservation District, presented the [recommendations from the Resource Improvement \(RI\) practice Technical Review Panel](#) for the acceptance of 19 non-cost shared RI practices and their associated Visual Indicators. The Watershed Technical Workgroup approved these on August 7, 2014. The Agriculture Workgroup has recommended these practices be approved.
 - View Bob's slides [here](#).
- Volk: If and when another state comes forward with additional practices, what will be the process for adoption?
 - Ensor: If a jurisdiction comes up with additional RI practices, they may have to go through the same process we just went through with a technical panel under the AgWG.
 - Dubin: The AgWG would decide what needs to happen to an additional RI for approval.
- Johnston: If states submit RIs will they make changes to their QAP plans to explain how they're avoiding duplication?
 - Batiuk: Yes, recommend that the states include the appropriate documentation.
- Suzanne Trevena (EPA): How does this work to collect RIs? Is there a reporting mechanism in place?
 - Ensor: These practices will be discovered as a soil conservation district employee or technical service provider is on the farm.
 - Keppler: MDA will be introducing a training and certification program to identify and report these (currently through conservation tracker, which is the same system for BMPs, which takes care of the double counting issue).
 - Dubin: This was developed in parallel with the AgWG verification guidance, which address tracking and verification.
- Volk: Are there any objections or concerns to approving the report at this time?
 - There were no objections.

DECISION: WQGIT members approved the Report on Non Cost-Shared and Resource Improvement Practice Definitions and Verification Visual Indicators Guidance Document.

7. LUWG Land Use Classification Update

- Peter Claggett, Land Use Workgroup Coordinator, provided an update on the development of new [land use classifications](#) and the schedule for the Chesapeake Bay Program partnership review and approval of these land use classifications.
- LUWG has focused its attention on approving the urban and natural land use classifications by collecting local land use information. TetraTech has solicited additional data from localities.
- Sarah Diebel (DoD): For developed, is there a specific definition for developed? Is it part of an MS4 area? Or is there a ratio of impervious?
 - Claggett: We have line data on all roads and information on road type. All roads fall in to impervious. Many jurisdictions have impervious data, which would go in to the developed class. There will be a distinction between pervious and impervious on agriculture farmsteads.
- Sally Claggett (USFS): Have there been suggestions to lump some categories?
 - Peter Claggett: There may be jurisdictional differences in how important each of the categories are.
- Davis-Martin: How large can an area of pervious turf be before it becomes agriculture?

- Claggett: For tree canopy there will be an area threshold. Agriculture would be determined by ancillary information.
- Claggett: Agricultural land uses can be mapped using the Cropland Data Layer. The land uses may be collapsed following literature review if there is not information to support the finer categories.
- Teresa Koon (WV): Does the land use classification for riparian on agricultural land reduce the need for historical data cleanup on this BMP?
 - Johnston: It is worthwhile to clean up your record of riparian buffers. For the calibration of the model, we still want to know this information.
- Mark Dubin: Is there a limit on the buffer width that can be mapped?
 - Claggett: For coarse landsat satellite imagery, the buffer has to be at least 50ft. With high res can capture buffers as narrow as 10 ft.
- Dinorah Dalmasy (MDE): MDE's Land Use Workgroup representatives were concerned about the open space. Although the acreage may be small, what will the loading rate will be?
 - Claggett: We haven't determined the loading rates yet. It will be less than pervious turf and more than forest. Perhaps similar to unfertilized hay. It probably will not be a high loading land use.
 - Dinorah: Why are landfills lumped together with fallow agricultural land? Recommend an open space for natural separate from open space in developed. Then the loading rates will still be slightly more accurate.
 - Claggett: If there is a distinction in loading rates, they should be captured separately.
 - Dubin: The Census of Agriculture captures that abandoned agricultural land use; however, that doesn't mean it's out of production completely. We would not want to place it into a separate land use for that reason.
- Claggett: The barren land use will be for active mining areas, based on information from state agencies.
- John Rhoderick (MDA): Does rural include agriculture?
 - Claggett: Yes.
- Rhoderick: What about modified drainage?
 - Claggett: That's something we're going to have to explore how to address.
- Davis-Martin: Is this just representing the bank full width of the stream and those acres that are part of the stream, or this a broader corridor?
 - Claggett: Initially we will use the line work and characterize the sediment functions within individual stream reaches, then attribute those characteristics to upstream impervious surfaces.
 - Johnston: Have never had a good understanding of the length or acreage of streams for the model, or how much can be attributed to urban or agriculture.
- Diebel: Will the infrastructure associated with stormwater be included in stream corridor?
 - Claggett: CWP is looking at this.
- Claggett: A more detailed explanation will be shared with the WQGIT in October, to clarify the complex issues.
- Davis-Martin: Noted that we will be making final decisions on the land use classes during the October meeting. Recommend more information be provided in September.
- Dubin: Are farm ponds and reservoirs included in water land use?
 - Claggett: If we have the data, it will be included as surface water.
- Claggett: The LUWG will be presenting to the Modeling Workgroup and WQGIT in September. Expecting to make a final decision on the list of land uses at the October 2014 face to face meeting. In spring 2015 we will be developing draft land use data set with acreages. By October 1, 2015 we will have a final land use dataset. January 2016 - May 2016 will be the jurisdictional review period, and jurisdictions who have improved land use land cover at this time can submit it, as long as we know what data we will be receiving by October 2015.

- Dave Montali noted that there are two Modeling Workgroup opportunities to present, one call in September and one face to face meeting before the October WQGIT face to face meeting.

8. Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee Land Use Update

- Mark Dubin, Agriculture Workgroup Coordinator and Matt Johnston, Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee Coordinator, discussed the new agriculture-specific land use classifications currently under review by the Agriculture Workgroup.
- Matt: The agricultural land uses may have to be simplified once the literature review to develop loading rates is complete. AMS developed the land uses based on crop specific land uses. This is because the management actions are fundamentally different based on crops.
- Mark noted that some BMPs do not have an appropriate land use to apply them to (such as ag stormwater controls), and this list helps create some of those land uses.
- Davis-Martin: Missing elements based on the current land uses including nursery, trampled riparian pasture, and hay without nutrients.
 - Johnston: Hay without nutrients will be represented in some form such as fallow or idle.
 - Nursery is proposed under the specialty land use. If states want a specific nursery land use they should recommend this to the AgWG soon.
 - VA: Note that there are TMDL allocations for nursery.
 - There is no answer yet for trampled riparian; if this is not included there will need to be a mechanism to place for pasture BMPs. The AMS is not currently recommending a trampled riparian land use, although they may discuss this further.
- Jenn thanked everyone for their work on the land uses.

9. Process for Allocating Resources to BMP Expert Panels

- Lucinda Power, WQGIT Coordinator, discussed the resources available to assist the BMP Expert Panels and how those resources are allocated across the WQGIT Workgroups. Questions have been raised about how this process works
 - Workgroups set the priorities. Once their BMP priority lists are established, the coordinators meet to figure out how to allocate the resources to all the panels in the queue.
 - Power: We try to keep the resources equitable. Certainly welcome any suggestions to refine the process, particularly if anyone has an alternative approach.
 - There were no comments.
- Jenn Volk thanked Jeremy Hanson for his contributions as staffer for the WQGIT over the past two years. He has accepted a position with Virginia Tech, where he will be coordinating BMP expert panels and will continue to work with the WQGIT and the workgroups in this new role.

Adjourned

Next WQGIT Conference Call:

September 8, 2014

1:30 P.M. – 3:30 P.M.

Participants

Jennifer Volk (Chair)	U Delaware
James Davis-Martin (Vice-Chair)	VADEQ
Lucinda Power (Coordinator)	EPA/CBPO
George Onyullo	DDOE
John Schneider	DNREC

Jennifer Tribo	Hampton Roads PDC
Bruce Michael	MD DNR
Jason Keppler	MDA
John Rhoderick	MDA
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Ben Sears	NYS DEC
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Russ Baxter	VA
Eric Aschenbach	VDH
Alana Hartman	WV DEP
Teresa Koon	WV DEP
Dave Montali	WV DEP
Matt Monroe	WVDA
Marel King	CBC
Ann Carkhuff	EPA Region III
Jennifer Sincock	EPA Region III
Suzanne Trevena	EPA Region III
Sarah Diebel	US DoD
Sheryle Quinn	US DoN
David Koran	USACE
Jeremy Hanson	CRC
Emma Giese	CRC
Lewis Linker	EPA/CBPO
Mark Dubin	UMD
Matt Johnston	UMD
Sally Claggett	USFS/CBPO
Scott Phillips	USGS
Dana York	Green Earth Connection
Ross Mandel	ICPRB
Mukhtar Ibrahim	MWCOG
Neely Law	CWP
Kristen Saacke Blunk	Headwaters LLC
Bill Stack	CWP
Lisa Ochsenhirt	V(M)AMWA