**MILESTONE WORKGROUP CONFERENCE CALL**

**February 6, 2013 1-3 pm**

**Conference Call Phone Number:** 866-299-3188, code 215-814-5422

<https://epa.connectsolutions.com/mwg/>

**AGENDA**

**Welcome/Confirm Call Participants**

* Thank you to all jurisdictions for your 2012-2013 milestone progress submissions.
* Anticipate that the information in the programmatic milestone progress may be discussed on a future quarterly call with the EPA and jurisdiction senior manager if there is a question/concern with progress in a particular milestone or sector.

**Decision on developing/evaluating milestones**

Milestone Evaluation Questions to the Jurisdictions:

2013 Milestones

* + What background conditions should CBP use to measure progress towards 2013 milestones in 2013?
		- Place 2013 Progress BMPs on 2010 background conditions.
			* All jurisdictions agreed to use 2010 background conditions to evaluate the 2012-2013 milestones.
		- Place 2013 Progress BMPs on 2013 background conditions.

2015 and 2017 Milestones Planning

* + What background conditions should jurisdictions use to set milestones at the beginning of these milestone periods (in 2013 and 2015 respectively)? - WV abstained
		- Use 2013 projected background conditions to set 2015 Milestone goals. (Similarly, use 2015 conditions to set 2017 goals.)
			* PA supported this option for 2015 and 2017
			* DC supported this option for 2017
		- Use 2015 projected background conditions to set 2015 Milestone goals. (Similarly, use 2017 conditions to set 2017 goals.)
			* This option was supported by MD, VA, DE, NY
			* DC supported this option for 2015
			* Majority rule supported this option for the development and assessment of milestones.
		- Use 2010 projected background conditions to set 2015 Milestone goals. (Similarly, use 2010 conditions to set 2017 goals.)

2015 and 2017 Milestones Assessment

* + What background conditions should that CBP use to measure progress towards the 2015 Milestones and 2017 Milestones? – WV abstained
		- Place 2015 BMPs on 2013 background conditions. (Similarly, place 2017 BMPs on 2015 background conditions.)
			* PA supported this option for 2015 and 2017
			* DC supported this option for 2017
		- Place 2015 BMPs on 2015 background conditions. (Similarly, place 2017 BMPs on 2017 background conditions.)
			* This option was supported by MD, VA, DE, NY
			* DC supported this option for 2015
			* Majority rule supported this option for the development and assessment of milestones.
		- Place 2015 BMPs on 2010 background conditions. (Similarly, place 2017 BMPs on 2010 background conditions.)

**Additional Discussion on milestone development and evaluation**

* Agreement across all jurisdictions that milestones should be developed and evaluated on the same background conditions
* WV abstained from voting due to continued concerns with the land use projections.
* Jurisdictions suggested that we keep the issues related to land use projection process separate from the decision on evaluating milestones. The land use projection process can be discussed in sector specific workgroups or with the overall WQGIT.
* PA preferred to use the starting year’s projection for 2015 and 2017 because with each year a projection is made it is further from the actual data the calculation is based upon.
* MD – want to see if milestones are met as a result of management actions. Progress run information will give the whole message of how growth impacted the efforts from management actions.

**Open Discussion of additional topics**

* **How the 60% target for 2017 will be evaluated.**
	+ Previous EPA communications have stated that model version 5.3.2 will be used to evaluate the 60% goal.
	+ EPA may evaluate the 60% goal in any newer versions of the model for informational purposes.
	+ Discussions involved which background condition would be used to evaluate the 60% goal by 2017 goal.
	+ PA raised concerns with the use of constant delivery factors to evaluate the 60% goal for 2017. Katherine will raise to the WQGIT chairs for a future agenda item.
* **Reporting progress of the programmatic milestones**
	+ Are jurisdictions OK with the current reporting process?
	+ Should we revisit the use of BayTAS for programmatic milestone reporting again? (Discussed in August 2011)
		- Jurisdictions are happy with the current process
		- There is no interest in using BayTAS at this time to track programmatic milestones
* **Reporting format of milestones for the 2013 EC meeting**
	+ Is the format from the 2012 EC meeting acceptable? Do we need to revise how milestone progress is presented?
		- Topic for a future call. Jurisdictions will look over and see if have concerns with using the same format. Fact sheets will only highlight a few BMPs or programmatic milestones. Links will be provided to the full list of updates in the document.
	+ <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/documents/ecbrief/18163/chesbay_2012-13_milestones_fact_sheets.pdf>
	+ This format would only highlight a few key highlights both in implementation and of the programmatic milestones. A full list of progress on milestones will be available on Chesapeake Stat or another website location.
* **Federal Facility Factsheets**
	+ Interest was expressed to see a federal milestone fact sheet for the annual EC meetings in addition to jurisdiction milestone fact sheets.
	+ EPA is working internally to correct this issue in hopes to provide fact sheets in future years. At this time EPA does not anticipate having a federal milestone fact sheet for the 2013 EC meeting.
* **Phase 3 WIPs**
	+ Do not let decisions made at this time specific to milestones influence the Phase 3 WIP development. Because jurisdictions are developing milestones on projected base conditions does not mean that jurisdictions support developing the Phase 3 WIP on a 2025 projection. This decision will be made separate from the milestone decisions.

**Future Milestone Workgroup Discussion Topics**

1. Timing of milestone submissions and potential impacts
	1. Milestones would be final 9 months after the start date of July 1. One suggestion was to change the start date.
	2. How do we avoid gaps in milestone coverage?
	3. Can timing be changed for submissions to offset the December 1 progress reporting date?
2. Wastewater issue – wet year vs. dry year and how that impacts whether a jurisdiction has met their goal for the year
	1. PA ok if MD has an additional indicator for WW if this is not an issue for all states
3. Ask EC to reconsider whether there is a need for interim evaluations of milestone progress. Can we report the milestone goal and milestone results at the end of the milestone period?
4. How should the interim evaluation of 2-year milestones be performed? What base conditions should be used for those evaluations? Current year vs. the base condition used to develop milestone?
5. What information and layout should be used for the milestone fact sheets for the 2013 EC meeting?
	1. The current year’s progress run information will be posted on ChesapeakeStat.
6. How to message the results of the 2012-2013 milestones given that many jurisdictions were meeting their 2013 milestone targets in 2011. Part of the issue was related to the use of design flow levels in wastewater milestone projections. Consider possibility of evaluating milestone progress outside of wastewater influence.

**Summarize follow up actions**

* Talk to wastewater workgroup to schedule a joint wastewater/milestones workgroup call to discuss the wastewater issue.
* Check with Peter Claggett on when updated projected background conditions will be available for 2015 for jurisdictions to develop their 2014-2015 MS.
* Katherine has raised the Constant Delivery Factor topic to the WQGIT chairs as a future agenda item.