

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM

May 22, 2017 CONFERENCE CALL

Conference Call Phone Number: 866-299-3188 **Code:** 267-985-6222

The conference line plays music when **any** participant's phone is put on hold. If you need to take another call during the meeting, please hang up and call back in to prevent disruptions. Thank you!

Adobe Connect: <http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/waterqualitygit/>

Summary of Actions and Decisions

- **Decision:** The WQGIT approved the proposed amendment to the Stream Restoration BMP Expert Panel Report technical appendix.
- **Action:** The WQGIT did not reach consensus on a decision to extend credit for the MS4 Nutrient Discovery Program. This item will be brought before the Management Board, and the WQGIT will be notified of the Management Board's decision.
 - **UPDATE:** EPA withdrew its objection after further internal discussion. Therefore, the WQGIT has consensus to extend credit for the MS4 Nutrient Discovery Program.
- WQGIT members will review the mock-ups for the BMP quick reference guide and provide feedback via email to Jeremy Hanson (jchanson@vt.edu) by COB June 8.

Welcome/Confirm Call Participants/Workgroup Updates – James Davis-Martin, Chair

- Lucinda Power (EPA): We will have WIP assistance funds available in FY17, but there is a tight turnaround, so feedback will be done by email.
- Lindsey Gordon (CRC): AgWG members want to redistribute numbers for animal data.
 - Davis-Martin: We can also distribute within counties for animal data, correct?
 - Matt Johnston (UMD): Yes, right now the data template is for animals both within and outside of the watershed, but we can adapt it to distribute within counties.
- Lucinda updated the group on upcoming webinars on the Phase 6 modeling tools.
- Mary Gattis (ACB): The LGAC forum is on June 7th from 10-4pm in Annapolis to discuss future growth scenarios.
 - Lindsey: WQGIT is invited to participate. Space is limited but a conference line for remote participation will be available.
 - Mary: Recommend in-person attendance for the interactive group sessions. We really want to engage non-traditional partners.
 - James: Like who?
 - Mary: Folks who work on regional planning in the states at local or regional levels. People who are familiar with growth management planning and growth scenarios. Information about the forum is also posted on LGAC meeting calendar page.
- Jim George: What is the date when the WIP assistance funds will be available?
 - Lucinda: We don't have a specific date, but awards will be given mid-Aug. Very tight turnaround. It is a competitive process. I will get something out for jurisdictional

review by next week. The focus of this year's RFP will be on supporting local engagement efforts and local planning goal development.

Phosphorus Scenarios, Preliminary Briefing – Gary Shenk, USGS

Gary Shenk [briefed](#) the WQGIT on upcoming phosphorus decisions for the Phase 6 modeling tools. The WQGIT will be briefed in more detail at their June 12 WQGIT meeting, with a decision requested on phosphorus scenarios on June 12.

Discussion

- Johnston: AMS did not advise a technically defensible number of years. However, the Frank Coale study suggests that 25 years might be a good time frame to study in the Chesapeake region.
- Davis-Martin: But in order to achieve that, you need a constant management action over that period of time. And the longest any BMP lasts is maybe 10 years.
- Shenk: Both reasonable points. Whatever we decide on June 12, we will put that into CAST, and it's nothing that can't be changed as we finalize the modeling tools later in the summer/early fall.
- Tanya Spano (MWCOCG): Gary said that about specific soils, but we don't have the same soil throughout the watershed, so do we need all different values for each soil type?
- Shenk: Soil P depends on the balance between three factors: Soil type, runoff, and inputs. I don't think there's a scientific reason to have a different set of years for different regions, so we should probably keep it the same everywhere.
- Bill Angstadt (Angstadt Consulting): But none of this applies to P in urban systems, correct?
- Shenk: That's right. There's very limited research on P in urban systems, so we just kept what we had for Phase 5.3.2 since we don't have a lot of new or extensive research to do that.
- Davis-Martin: So we will come back to this next month on June 12 to give Gary a decision. He has a tight turnaround to get these values into CAST.
- Beth McGee (CBF): The state's nutrient management regulations regarding P are in play here, right? How do we get a sense how those regulations incorporate the reality of what you're presenting in their management applications?
- Shenk: I don't know how those regulations would work, and I don't know how you would connect those, but that's a good question. So if you followed state nutrient management regulations, when would you see the benefit of those recommendations?
- Johnston: It's an interesting question. This is all dependent on level of soil P to begin with, and the difference between inputs and uptake. So if inputs equaled uptake with crop scenario assumptions, that would zero out. A thought question: what if all the P is removed from the watershed, how long would it take for the watershed to draw down naturally? It appears here that that answer is 25 years for P to essentially be cut in half from 200 to 100.

Update on STAC Legacy Sediment Workshop—Dr. Andy Miller (UMBC)

Dr. Andy Miller, STAC workshop chair, [briefed](#) the WQGIT on the recently held STAC workshop regarding legacy sediments. Included was an overview of the schedule for releasing the workshop report.

Discussion

- Marel King: On behalf of CBC, Anne and I really appreciated the discussion. We found it very valuable, so thank you.

Revision to Stream Restoration Manual Technical Appendix—Matt Johnston (UMD)

Matt [notified](#) the WQGIT of the amendment to the original Stream Restoration BMP Expert Panel's technical appendix based upon the Phase 6 Watershed Model's use of sediment delivery factors. The WTWG approved this amendment during their conference call on May 4.

Discussion:

- Johnston: We reduced the TSS value by linear feet per year. That gets automatically calculated in CAST now, so we reverted back to the original recommendation, and we got rid of the sediment delivery factor based on the recommendation from the BMP panel.
- Davis-Martin: What about nutrient reductions?
- Johnston: We don't have nutrient reductions available for stream restoration currently in Phase 6.
- Tom Schueler (CSN): We're working on that for shoreline management, and the USWG has had a lot of questions from implementers about how to apply the protocols. David Wood and I have been working on an FAQ document for that.

Decision: The WQGIT approved the proposed amendment to the Stream Restoration BMP Expert Panel Report technical appendix.

MS4 Nutrient Discovery Program Extension—Norm Goulet (USWG Chair) and Tom Schueler (USWG Coordinator)

Norm and Tom [presented](#) an USWG recommendation to extend the credit for the MS4 Nutrient Discovery Program by another 3-4 years. The Nutrient Discharges from Gray Infrastructure Expert Panel report, approved in November 2014, included a phase out of the Advanced Nutrient Discovery Program Credit at the end of 2017. The WQGIT will be asked to approve the USWG recommendation.

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: Why did we put a lifespan on this credit in the first place, and why would we put another expiration date on that?
- David Wood (CSN): The panel recommended that if communities can meet these above and beyond requirements, they could get this credit. It was originally set to end at the end of Phase 5 and with Phase 6, we expected communities to start reporting individual credits, but we need to push that back a few years.

- Chris Day (EPA): These are illegal discharges, and were never nutrients that were allocated to these MS4s. The same concern I had before applies now, that it seems like no existing MS4 has tried to take advantage of this, so I don't see the point of extending this credit.
- Davis-Martin: So it appears that we have not reached a consensus on this.
- Norm Goulet (USWG): Chris has a problem with the whole concept of the BMP. This BMP has already been approved by the WQGIT. We're not changing any credits; we're just pushing back the timeline. Chris's concerns were noted in the initial establishment of this BMP, so I don't think we should roll back the clock on this practice.
- James Davis-Martin: Chris, is there a compromise position we can strike or is this a non-starter?
 - Chris Day: The MS4s have had several years to develop their discharge requirement. I request that if you want to continue this you should put it to another vote.
- Jim George (MDE): It seems that there's a distinction between modeling what's happening in real life and crediting it to a permitted entity, correct? We may want to have the model reflect this change but not assign it to a particular permit. Is that correct?
- Norm Goulet (USWG): This is strictly with the TMDL.
- Mary Gattis (LGAC): It's an ever-degrading, ever evolving issue. Chris' point is understandable from a regulatory perspective. But the reality is much more complex, and if we don't incentivize this it won't get done. Local governments only will go after this with the carrot of getting credits. This provides the incentive to get these really important issues done. We maybe just haven't put enough advertising of this tool out there.
- Johnston: The model does not assume compliance of any plan. In my mind, this follows that logic of getting credit for compliance.
- Gattis: I'm wondering how this particular tool stacks up against others for local jurisdictions?
- Davis-Martin: We will look for a consensus of the WQGIT. Do we have consensus to extend this advance program credit to 2020?
 - Anne Carkhuff: EPA has an objection.
 - James Davis-Martin: We will document this as having approval of all voting members except EPA, and bring this issue before the Management Board for a decision.

Action: The WQGIT did not reach consensus on a decision to extend the MS4 Nutrient Discovery Program. This item will be brought before the Management Board, and the WQGIT will be notified of the Management Board's decision.

- **UPDATE:** EPA withdrew its objection after further internal discussion. Therefore, the WQGIT has consensus to extend credit for the MS4 Nutrient Discovery Program.

Olivia presented the new calibration inputs for the draft final phase 6 model, available on the [Midpoint Assessment website](#) until June 1. These tools will be available on the new [CAST website](#) after June 1.

Discussion:

- McGee: On the comparison tool, is that SPARROW data or Watershed Model outputs?
 - Devereux: This is Watershed Model scenario data. It's the same data that will be in CAST; it's just visualized as a map here.
- Davis-Martin: Will you also be able to create a basin or state summary of loads per acre? That way you can account for differences in size, etc.
 - Devereux: You can select any geographic scale, and you can get the result in either a graph or a tabular format.
- Davis-Martin: We will make sure we have links to all of these pages posted to the meeting calendar page for today?
 - Devereux: Lindsey has pasted them to the chat box, and they will be posted in the minutes (See above in topic description).
 - Gordon: Michelle and I will find a good place to post these links, and we will send these out in an email, but note that some of these are still draft links.
 - Devereux: CAST beta is available now, and Phase 6 CAST will be up June 15. BayFAST will be ready in December 2017.
- Davis-Martin: Will existing CAST log-on credentials and scenarios be patched over?
 - Devereux: We need to follow Federal guidelines for information security, so those will not patch over. We also have really big changes in scenarios that will not allow scenarios to patch over either. However, there are tools available to crosswalk Phase 5 to Phase 6 BMPs either automatically or manually.
- Ted Tesler (PA DEP): Will the Phase 5 environment still be up?
 - Devereux: Phase 5 will be up until there is a final approved Phase 6 model.
- Shenk: We will have that up for whatever milestone periods Phase 5 will be used for, correct?
- Devereux: Correct, but you will not be able to input new scenarios after a certain period of time. We will have annual scenarios and Phase 2 WIPs that will be crosswalked, and a couple scenarios.
 - Shenk: Those scenarios are no action and E3, I believe.
 - Johnston: The AgWG is still working on their E3 scenarios.
 - Devereux: No problem getting them into CAST, we just have to come to a decision about that.

BMP Quick Reference Guide—Jeremy Hanson (VT)

Jeremy [presented](#) an updated outline and mock-up for WQGIT input on the template and the process.

Discussion:

- Sarah Diebel (DOD): I think the bottom-line information for the BMPs is really good to provide as a quick reference. We tried to pick a couple BMPs that we wanted our implementers to know about and provided fact sheets on those. Based on the comments we got back, we want to get the most important aspects reflected in those quick reference guides.
- Jim George: My question would be where you're getting the information to include in these guides?
 - Hanson: I used the CAST and MAST definitions and I went back to the panel reports. if needed. I preferred the latter and would confirm in CAST.
- Hanson: And we will include NRCS practice codes for the agriculture BMPs.
- It was noted that older reports may have information that's out of date, so those will have to be updated, which could be time-consuming. However, newer reports should have up-to-date information that can be directly pulled into the reference guide.
- Hanson: Would people prefer a table or is just the text ok for these pages? I can save space if I nix the table. I'll give you time to think about that, and feel free to email me if you have any ideas about what the next steps should be. Let's make this deadline June 8 and after that I'll start incorporating feedback and putting something together with the communications team. A special request: If there are resources online that would be useful for these reference guides, let me know.
- Gattis: We want to make sure that we don't have duplicates, since we're working on similar stuff with co-benefits. Do we want to include co-benefits on this guide?
 - Hanson: That's an interesting question, but I don't want to get too bogged down in this or get too far into the weeds.
- McGee: Maybe at minimum, this could link to the TetraTech report on co-benefits.

Action: WQGIT members will review the mock-ups for the BMP quick reference guide and provide feedback via email to Jeremy Hanson (jchanson@vt.edu) by COB June 8.

Scenario Builder Output Review—Standing item for any issues that need to be resolved.

Discussion:

- Johnston: We do not have any decisions this month, but we have a few things coming down the pipe for a future discussion: We have animal data discussed earlier, translating Phase 5 stream exclusion practices correctly into Phase 6, and we're looking at nutrient uptake for pasture and hay. We also have a document posted on the meeting page that's a draft of AMS and AgWG comments, used as a model.
 - Gordon: The Projects and Resources tab under the [AgWG web page](#) has a link to that draft document and it will be regularly updated with comments as they come in.
- Davis-Martin: Will there be different documents with decisions from different workgroups or will it all be compiled in one document?

- Shenk: There's a difference between an email question or a comment. A comment is something that you think should be changed, and questions need to be answered and may or may not become comments. James, is that correct?
 - Davis-Martin: The questions I have just need to be resolved, and maybe they make more sense with some explanation. For instance, in the data visualization, nutrient loads differ across the states by an order of magnitude.
 - Goulet: The nutrient work from USWG shows changes because it's broken up by nutrient load and by year. It was very surprising, but it's not wrong.
 - Davis-Martin: So that is an appropriate place to test the assumption. These are all things I'd like explained or reviewed.
- Shenk: The only things I'm tracking as comments are items from a jurisdiction that are clearly marked as a comment.
- Angstadt: One other interesting piece is that the number one definition of a fatal flaw is a Partnership decision that the outcome is inconsistent with. Lindsey is compiling a list of decisions that the AgWG has made so we can measure the fatal flaw against those.
 - Gordon: I am having the AgWG leadership review that, and it will be posted on the AgWG web page. I am also working with other WQGIT workgroups to get similar documents up.

Adjourned

Call Participants:

James Davis-Martin, Chair (VA DEQ)
 Lucinda Power, Coordinator (EPA)
 Michelle Williams, Staffer (CRC)
 Lindsey Gordon, Staffer (CRC)
 Jim George, MDE
 KC Filipino, HRPDC
 Lisa Oschenshirt, VAMWA
 Mukhtar Ibrahim, MWCOG
 Kristin Wolf, VA DQ
 Dave Montali, WV DEP
 Marel King, CBC
 Anne Carkhuff, EPA
 Jenn Volk, EPA
 Beth McGee, CBF
 Bill Angstadt, Angstadt Consulting
 Sarah Diebel, DOD
 Mary Gattis, LGAC
 Ag: Mark Dubin,
 Karl Berger, Land Use Workgroup
 Norm Goulet, Urban Stormwater Workgroup
 Matt Johnston (UMD), Watershed Technical Workgroup

Jeremy Hanson, VT
Gary Shenk, USGS
Chris Day, EPA R3
George Onyullo, DOEE
Andy Miller, UMBC
Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting
Susan Trevena, EPA
Tanya Spano, MWCOG
Ted Tesler, PA DEP
Chris Brosch, DDA
Sara Latessa, NYSDEC
Joan Smedinghoff, CRC