

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
September 14, 2015 CONFERENCE CALL
Minutes

Summary of Action and Decision Items

ACTION: WQGIT members should submit at-large member nominations to Lucinda by COB September 14.

DECISION: WQGIT approved the Phase 5.3.2 Nutrient Management Expert Panel's recommendations for the Tier 2 and Tier 3 nitrogen efficiencies.

ACTION: WQGIT will forward the Phase 5.3.2 Nutrient Management Expert Panel's recommendations for the Tier 2 phosphorus efficiency to the Management Board for a decision during their September 30 meeting, as the WQGIT could not reach consensus on this recommendation.

ACTION: WQGIT charged the Agriculture Workgroup to develop a clear charge to the subcommittee which will be responsible for working with the six states to: a) develop a cross walk between the states' nutrient management programs and the adopted Phase 5.3.2 nutrient management tier definitions; and b) identify the information associated with states programs, including compliance rates, to be used in reporting acres of nutrient management implementation by the appropriate tiers referenced above. The Agriculture Workgroup will address and discuss the subcommittee's charge during their September 17-18 meeting and report its recommended charge back to the WQGIT for review and approval.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the inclusion of the two proposed wetlands land uses in the Phase 6 Watershed Model. The WQGIT also agreed to ask the Management Board to urge EPA and FWS to work to update the National Wetlands Inventory database prior to September 2016.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the proposed charge and membership for the Oyster BMP expert panel.

Welcome/Confirm Call Participants/Workgroup Updates – Jenn Volk, Chair

- Volk: The final WQGIT Governance Protocol is [posted](#) on today's meeting page. Nominations for at-large members are due by COB today (September 14), and we will elect those members during the September 28 WQGIT meeting.

ACTION: WQGIT members should submit at-large member nominations to Lucinda by COB September 14.

Phase 5.3.2 Nutrient Management Tier II and III Panel – Chris Brosch, VT

Chris provided a [briefing](#) on the Phase 5.3.2 Nutrient Management expert panel report. WQGIT members were asked to approve the [Panel recommendations](#).

Discussion:

- Jenn Volk outlined the [proposed path forward](#) for the Phase 5.3.2 Nutrient Management expert panel recommendations that was agreed upon by the Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG).
- Andy Zemba (PA DEP): We have already been asked to update our QAPPs to address BMP verification, and I don't know why we are going down the path of identifying the compliance rates or other information associated with state programs, as proposed.
 - Volk: Good point, but I think we want to look at nutrient management first, and get that information laid out. We know some of that information will be in your verification plans. Some supporting documents have already been pulled into the panel report, and Kristen and John (AgWG Co-Chairs) provided this language and the AgWG is comfortable with this approach.
 - John Rhoderick (AgWG Co-Chair): That's correct. Part of the larger charge of the proposed subgroup will be to gather information on the topic of compliance with nutrient management plans, but how it will play out from that point, and how the information will be used will be determined by the AgWG.
- Zemba: I just think the collection of that information should be done through the BMP verification process.
 - Rhoderick: The verification process is at different levels in different states, so we wanted to collect the information and see what everyone was doing and where they stood.
 - Ben Sears (NYSDEC): I agree with Andy, we are already putting a ton of effort towards BMP verification. This will be a problem for us.
 - Rhoderick: We are only recording your current process at this time. We are not rewriting any procedures.
- Sears: What is meant when the proposal refers to compliance?
 - Rhoderick: When Chris went over the definitions of each nutrient management tier, they each talk about plan implementation. Compliance refers to how each state confirms plan implementation.
 - James Davis-Martin (VA DEQ, WQGIT Vice-Chair): That is what BMP verification is for. It is a very different term than compliance.
- Sears: So how will that information be used?
 - Rhoderick: That will be discussed by the AgWG.
- Jill Witkowski-Heaps (CCW): One concern Choose Clean Water had was that there has been research done on compliance with nutrient management plans. It has been documented that many farmers are not fully complying with, or following the full plans. The concern among our stakeholders is that if we give credit for having nutrient management plans, then we need some mechanism to account for the fact that many are

not being complied with. I think the panel was trying to keep in mind those concerns with this recommended path forward.

- Davis-Martin: That is all part of the BMP verification process, and the partnership already has a timeline and process for verification. If you want to ask jurisdictions to prioritize nutrient management in their verification plans or to justify the basis upon which they choose to report tier 1 versus tier 2 plans, I am okay with that. Once we are talking about compliance rates though, there are lots of ways to define compliance. I think it is too complicated of a question to answer in a table produced by a subcommittee.
- Verna Harrison (CAC): I thought John said that the purpose was merely to document an explanation from each jurisdiction saying how they would identify the tiers. Maybe the word “compliance” is the sticking point. John’s explanation seems reasonable.
- Volk: Can we modify the second bullet to avoid the term compliance?
- Dave Montali (WV DEP): Are we just explaining how a jurisdiction’s program determines how a nutrient management plan is folded into each tier? If that is all it is, that is fine.
 - Rhoderick: Definitely. The key here is to be responsive to the comments we received. The subcommittee is just gathering the information already out there. We are really looking for the discussion of where that information is used and how it is used to occur at the AgWG level. We would set up that scope of work this week.
- Witkowski-Heaps: In the absence of the compliance information, how are acres under a nutrient management plans calculated? Is there a compliance factor involved in that calculation?
 - Rhoderick: There is in some states, but not in others. But we want to put that in a table to evaluate it.
- Davis-Martin: I think we should drop that task for the subcommittee altogether.
 - Harrison: That sounds as though you are disregarding a very important issue for the stakeholders.
 - Davis-Martin: No, I just think it is already being considered and developed under the BMP verification programs.
 - Harrison: But those BMP verification plans don’t take effect until 2018.
 - Davis-Martin: Correct.
- Dianne McNally (EPA R3): I am concerned with removing this request for information for the same reasons as Verna. I thought I understood that these tiers were specifically for use just until 2017 in the Phase 5.3.2 Watershed Model.
 - Volk: That is correct, Dianne.
- Montali: The problem is that we are talking about potentially limiting the reporting of just this one BMP for a verification reason. This would be the only BMP in Phase 5.3.2 that would have that limiting factor.
 - Volk: I don’t think the proposal has been put on the table to discount anything, just to document it.
 - Rhoderick: That is correct, Jenn. We are only looking for documentation.

- Lee Currey (MDE): Is your second bullet to help you create the crosswalk?
 - Rhoderick: The first bullet is the crosswalk.
- Currey: So that information collected as part of bullet 2 doesn't reflect how tier 1 or tier 2 is determined for the current version of the Watershed Model, it is just additional information?
 - Rhoderick: Correct. The second bullet was a request that we start to look at this issue.
- Sears: So they will be judging the BMP verification issue at the workgroup level?
 - Davis-Martin: That is what it sounds like to me.
- McNally: This is just for the next 3 years. We want to understand how the states report this information and how they will be using these 3 tiers. It seems completely independent of verification for now.
 - Volk: That is correct. Rich, would you be able to provide insight on the distinctions?
- Rich Batiuk (EPA, CBPO): We are not talking about limiting any reporting of nutrient management with this effort. Given this issue and the concerns that were raised, we are asking states to describe how they determine the acres of nutrient management plans that are fully implemented and that they report for annual progress. We just want transparency in terms of how you make those acreage determinations. We want clear understanding for the next 3 years, as the verification programs are put in place, how states report actual acreages in Phase 5.3.2, separate from the BMP verification process, which will be on the partnership's agreed-upon schedule.
- Montali: So states could say they track and report nutrient management plans based just on the number of plans written. Another state could say they do that but also check 50% of the plans every year and discount the number of acres reported based on how many plans aren't being followed, and you just want to document those processes?
 - Batiuk: That is correct. Getting it in writing so that, in one place, we understand the crosswalk as well as the procedures the states are using to do their reporting.
- Volk: Are there concerns with putting this subcommittee together?
 - Zemba: I don't recall discussions at the WQGIT or Management Board where we were looking at individual states' compliance programs and I don't want to see us go down a route where we start to question those. I don't want to submit comments on how other states are running their programs. That is generally EPA's role. I want to take the words compliance out of the subcommittee's proposed tasks and see if there is agreement that this subcommittee won't be questioning states' compliance procedures.
 - Volk: Would you be comfortable with the words "information that may include compliance rates" to describe what the subcommittee would be collecting?
 - Zemba: I'm okay with that but I really want to make sure we are not going down a route where we are looking at an individual state compliance program.
 - Sears: I would agree with Andy.

- Davis-Martin: We are being responsive to concerns raised about a BMP that we haven't even started talking about whether it has been approved or not. So I think we should see whether or not the Panel's recommendations are even approved, and then we can revisit this discussion.
- Jenn Volk polled the WQGIT with the following question via Adobe Connect: "Do you approve the Tier II and Tier III nitrogen recommendations by the Expert Panel (which were approved by both the AgWG and WTWG)?"
 - There were 2 "No" votes logged via Adobe Connect.
 - The following jurisdiction representatives were not on Adobe Connect and logged their preferences verbally:
 - James Davis-Martin (VA): Yes.
 - Andy Zemba (PA): Yes.
 - Karl Brown (PA): Yes.
 - George Onyullo (D.C.): Yes.
 - Ben Sears (NY): Yes.
- Volk: For those who said they would not approved the Tier II and III nitrogen recommendations, please explain the rationale.
 - Jason Keppler (MDA): My vote was "no" because I feel the entire report should be voted on, not individual pieces.
- Volk: I will ask for approval of the full report. Is there consensus on approving the complete recommendations of the Phase 5.3.2 Nutrient Management Expert Panel report?
 - Allison Prost (CBF): The Chesapeake Bay Foundation would not be able to support the full report recommendations because we do not support the Tier II phosphorus recommendations.
 - McNally: EPA has concerns with Tier II phosphorus as well. We are really concerned with how it is being applied in the decision making tools. Our AgWG representative had concerns, and I would like to reiterate those concerns at the WQGIT level. There may be an ultimate overestimating of the phosphorus reductions as a result of this practice and we don't want to go down that path when some of the monitoring data is not showing that reduction. We want to know how we best use this information in applying it to ensure we don't overestimate any phosphorus reductions.
 - Davis-Martin: By that logic, can we assume EPA will never support any BMP with a proposed phosphorus reduction?
 - McNally: No, I am just concerned that it is an overestimated reduction in this particular case.
- Russ Baxter (VA Secretary of Natural Resources Office): We established this expert panel, stocked with experts, according to the process that EPA made us agree to, and now we are hearing you don't want to approve the result of that process because you don't like the outcome. Where will we go from here? If EPA has an objection, object to a state program that uses the recommendations from this report. Don't trump the recommendations of who we call experts. This is getting distressing for states trying to implement these practices and who are counting on these panels.

- McNally: I recognize the panels are made of experts and I'm not questioning their judgment, I just have concerns about how these estimates will be applied. I am asking that we look towards using the Phase 6 expert panel process, and defer the decision on Tier II phosphorus until Phase 6 of the Watershed Model.
- Baxter: I say we let this report go through and we will have verification in Phase 6. We are spinning our wheels here. I say let's move forward with this report, objections noted. We have time for the panel to continue its work, and EPA will continue evaluating the jurisdictions verification programs. You could say this about every BMP. For this small period of time, it may not be perfect, but we have time for the final push with the Phase 6 model.
 - Harrison: Does that mean you disregard the recommendation of the AgWG? They recommended to move forward on some tiers but not to accept Tier II phosphorus.
 - Rhoderick: I think we are in tricky ground again. At this time, the AgWG membership and governance policy are up in the air. We conducted an opinion poll. I caution you to say it is an AgWG proposal.
 - Volk: The AgWG submitted a summary of its polling results. There was no consensus. The Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG) reviewed the report and there were no objections to the full report. The AgWG also sent the recommendations for the subcommittee that we have already discussed.
- Currey: We struggled with the shoreline management BMP expert panel report because of how the recommendations would be applied, and we seem to have this recurring problem of how we apply the recommendations. Is there a way to approve the report and recognize that we need to apply it in the modeling tools correctly, and establish a group to help us accomplish that?
- Marel King (CBC): The Chesapeake Bay Commission was one of the objecting parties at the AgWG level. Part of the reason why was that we also saw compelling evidence about the Tier II phosphorus recommended efficiency number itself, and by the panel's own admission, the lack of real research that was used to establish that number. We are not compelled by the rationale that it was good enough to use previously. We want to improve moving forward. Assuming these recommendations ultimately move forward, how can we use this to make sure future panels have everything they need and a process for what to do when information is lacking, so that we aren't setting them up to fail.
 - (Unannounced): There will always be research gaps. You charge them with giving their best expert advice. I can't see why this is so different.
 - Harrison: Why it is so different is that one of CAC's members asked to bring in a panel of farmers and other agriculture experts, and they sat in front of us and told us about the problems with nutrient management plans and how they aren't followed. Then a report took actual nutrient management plans and the AIRs, and documented how many farms don't have the plans, unlike what is being reported, and they are not followed. The farmers' data in the USDA CEAP report shows there are nutrient management plans that are vastly not followed. From the public's

perspective, this report is taking plans that the farmers say they don't follow, and increasing the nutrient reduction credit for having them.

- Zemba: You make good points, but the Bay Program is trying to address that through the BMP verification effort. I just think that needs to be taken up through the verification process, not at this point.
- Brosch: The panel has not delved into that issue of verification. We used real science, we drew from a paper that used modeling data for our Tier II phosphorus efficiency value, but we chose to use that in place of real world data on manure incorporation. We turned down real science results in favor of a model that used the P index.
- Volk: I knew we had these issues with Tier II phosphorus. Where do we fall on the Tier II phosphorus recommendation? Can the group agree to move forward with the Tier II and III nitrogen recommendations and pass the Tier II phosphorus decision up to the Management Board? Or do we table the entire report altogether?
- Baxter: If it is unresolvable, the phosphorus question, what does that mean for our reporting of this practice in this upcoming cycle?
 - Davis-Martin: The Management Board has the option to take a supermajority vote.
 - Matt Johnston (UMD, WTWG Coordinator): From the WTWG perspective, the WTWG approved the full report with all the tiers. For 2015 progress, if there was no additional Tier II phosphorus credit approved, any acres reported under Tier II P would default back to Tier I P credit.
 - Davis-Martin: So what we are saying when we do that, is we don't believe that having the addition of P indexes and manure incorporation has any benefit to water quality. By the same logic, states could stop using the P index and manure incorporation, and have no water quality detriment.
- Currey: I am concerned with a different message. We are responsible for pulling together these BMP expert panels. When we get their recommendations, we don't want to follow them. That is a real structural problem with our decision making. We want to rely on the best science possible. If the nutrient management plans were being fully implemented, would those efficiencies be correct? Then there is a separate piece where we would need to apply those recommendations.
- Harrison: I just want to also note that there were very significant phosphorus scientists, notably, Tom Simpson and Beth McGee, who had significant problems with the Tier II phosphorus recommendations. Not everyone on the panel was a phosphorus expert.
- Volk: My proposal is we have consensus on approving the nitrogen recommendations but not on the phosphorus recommendations and that we move the phosphorus vote to the Management Board.
- McNally: Am I hearing that folks don't like the approach of having Tier I phosphorus credit as a fallback?
 - Davis-Martin: I think you are jumping from one thing to another. There are many potential reasons why phosphorus loads in the Watershed Model would be

different than what monitoring data is showing regarding phosphorus. I don't know that it's appropriate to assume that it is because of nutrient management.

- Volk: To answer your question Dianne, I think there is not comfort with that approach.

DECISION: WQGIT approved the Phase 5.3.2 Nutrient Management Expert Panel's recommendations for the Tier 2 and Tier 3 nitrogen efficiencies.

ACTION: WQGIT will forward the Phase 5.3.2 Nutrient Management Expert Panel's recommendations for the Tier 2 phosphorus efficiency to the Management Board for a decision during their September 30 meeting, as the WQGIT could not reach consensus on this recommendation.

- Davis-Martin: I don't know if I can support the proposed subcommittee. I think we want to refine their request and ask for the subcommittee again once we have seen their scope.
 - Zemba: Pennsylvania supports James' approach.
- Volk: Could we have the scope of the proposed subcommittee this week, John?
 - Rhoderick: Yes.

ACTION: WQGIT charged the Agriculture Workgroup to develop a clear charge to the subcommittee which will be responsible for working with the six states to: a) develop a cross walk between the states' nutrient management programs and the adopted Phase 5.3.2 nutrient management tier definitions; and b) identify the information associated with states programs, including compliance rates, to be used in reporting acres of nutrient management implementation by the appropriate tiers referenced above. The Agriculture Workgroup will address and discuss the subcommittee's charge during their September 17-18 meeting and report its recommended charge back to the WQGIT for review and approval.

Phase 6 Land Use Categories – Amy Jacobs, TNC; Pam Mason, Panel Chair

Amy gave an [overview](#) of the proposed [wetlands land uses](#), and the WQGIT was asked to make the final determination on the wetlands land uses, as approved by the Wetlands Workgroup.

Discussion:

- Zemba: The National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) is not perfect, and in Pennsylvania it is in particularly poor shape. We are interested in finding out how to address that in the future as we get better data. We don't want to have a situation where we run out of wetlands acres to report BMPs because there is poor land use data in our state. Maybe the Chesapeake Conservancy project would help with that? Is there a way to get NWI updated?
 - Volk: I think that is a good question, I don't know if there is anyone who could address that. If better data became available in the future, is there an opportunity to utilize it?
 - Gary Shenk (USGS): I don't know what will be available for wetlands, but the expectation will be that the third phase of the land uses that will be brought into the Watershed Model in 2016 will change all the land use acreages.

- Zemba: If we do get better data, is there agreement that we can get it submitted and considered to see if we can improve upon the NWI?
 - Shenk: It all depends on timing. Once we have a calibrated model, we need to only be measuring actual on-the-ground changes. We can't have a jump in wetlands or decrease in wetlands because of accounting changes.
- Jeremy Hanson (VT, CBPO): October 2016 would be when those land uses are locked in?
 - Shenk: Yes.
- Jacobs: We have discussed Andy's concern from the Wetlands Workgroup perspective, and there were some really good suggestions for how to improve the NWI coverage. I think it would be reasonable to have that to the modelers by this time next year.
- Currey: The absolute cutoff date, assuming we build the wetland land uses in now, is September 2016. If you give us acres by then, we would be able to incorporate that into the final calibration.
- Volk: So the proposal is to have these two classifications of wetland land uses. The acreages in those categories could change between now and next September, so as long as the work on Pennsylvania could be done by next September it could be included, but the two classifications would be locked in.
- Ken Murin (PA DEP): Amy, could you elaborate on the types of data the states could provide?
 - Jacobs: Rob Brooks articulated that the info was available to incorporate NWI-plus. I think we could also consider other information. Mark Biddle offered to assist with that as well.
- Murin: NWI-plus would need to be done by Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and I don't know what kind of agreements EPA or CBP may have with them to provide that updated info in the next year.
 - Jennifer Greiner (FWS, Wetlands WG Coordinator): I checked on that and they are very open to working with the Bay Program on incorporating better information into NWI at any point and would like to do that. The question is on whether the data can be merged with NWI.
- Davis-Martin: So we are talking about NWI data as one point of information. Does that data exist through time? I think we need to know not only what we have today, but how many acres and where they were throughout the calibration period.
 - Jeff Sweeney (EPA, CBPO): The Land Use Workgroup has methods for back-casting any of this data through 1985 and these options wouldn't be on the table without that methodology.
 - Hanson: One of the strengths with NWI is that we do have that data over time.
 - Pam Mason (Panel Chair): There are chunks of the watershed where the data would be usable as-is. Anything more recent than 1985 can be back-casted.
- Davis-Martin: So what would be used to forecast then?
 - Mason: That would really be the issue. We have wetlands records that have to be reported by jurisdictions on all the gains and losses over time and we could modify based on that.

- Murin: I think most jurisdictions are working on a “no net loss” kind of perspective and that the Wetlands Workgroup did not want to track the regulatory changes or mitigation efforts. If that is going to be used for forecasting, we would need to know that, because that was not our understanding.
 - Mason: I think you are right, I was thinking of inventory/monitoring data, not regulatory data.
 - Murin: Primarily, that data would be with NRCS and we have data sharing issues.
- Sarah Sand (DOEE): We are updating wetland plans this year so we would have that information for the Phase 6 Model.
- Davis-Martin: One of the reasons for including these land uses was to better understand the unique role of wetlands, but if we are treating them the same as forest in terms of the loading rates, that seems contradictory. So it sounds like the Panel wants to be able to continue to investigate the efficiency reduction impacts rather than the loading rates. Can we also change loading estimates up until September 2016?
 - Shenk: Yes, that is actually one of the easier things to change.
 - Davis-Martin: Traditionally, we can’t go back and re-characterize BMPs post-calibration. The wetlands included in the Phase 6 calibration will either be loaded like the forest land use, or new information will change them relative to forest. That would be great, but it would need to happen before the calibration.
- Jacobs: One other important note is that one of the BMPs the Panel will address is wetland enhancement. We can’t get credit for that currently because there is no wetlands land use in the Model to apply it to.
 - Davis-Martin: I think you would get credit for it under floodplain reconnections.
 - Jacobs: There are other examples of wetland BMPs that currently do not have a land use that they can be applied to.
 - Shenk: There isn’t any harm done one way or another. There is no reduction benefit or loss of benefit by having these wetlands land uses in the Model. It is a good point you raise that if we give them something other than the forest loading rate, it would need to happen in 2016 to get them into the Phase 6 Model. The benefit of describing where the wetlands are, is that it gives us the ability to describe ways of implementing the BMPs that would be more spatially distinct. Think of it as riparian buffers, which have a forest loading rate, but also treat upland loads.
- Murin: Since we heard a commitment from FWS to update NWI mapping, and since Pennsylvania has the biggest land area, can we get a commitment that we would be a priority to get the NWI data updated?
 - Volk: That is a good question, I don’t know who would be responsible for making that commitment.
 - Greiner: Just to clarify, the NWI base maps will continue to be maintained by FWS. The funding for future NWI coverage collection is not there. They are focused on working with partners (jurisdictions, Chesapeake Conservancy) to

incorporate improved data wherever possible to bring NWI up to date. We can't commit to the funding, but if there is better info to incorporate into NWI, Pennsylvania can be a priority.

- Shenk: Often the best way to incentivize better data collection is to make a BMP visible.
- Peter Claggett (USGS): High resolution land cover data will have some information on emergent wetlands. They are not mapping non-tidal wetlands, so it will be of limited utility to improving the accuracy of our wetland maps.
- Zemba: Could we recommend to the Management Board that EPA and FWS have a discussion about getting NWI updated before September 2016? I don't know how big of a request that is, but it would be helpful.
 - The WQGIT agreed to make that recommendation.
- Volk: Do we have consensus on approval of the two proposed wetland land use classes?
 - Davis-Martin: I offer that we approve the wetland land uses as a placeholder until August 2016. Unless we can ensure we have accurate maps and the ability to forecast and hind-cast, and ensure that there is sufficient information to justify treating this land use differently than forest, then we should just default back to wetlands being included in the forest land use.
 - Currey: Do we need to have a distinct loading rate? There may be other benefits to tracking wetlands. I don't agree with your condition related to having a need for treating the land use differently.
 - Davis-Martin: Okay, I can drop the condition on the loading rate.
 - P. Claggett: I would caution about the hindcasting requirement as well. We have limited data on all land uses, and if we cut our land uses because of that, we would be changing a lot of land uses. We have to make the best assumptions we can based on the information we have.
- Montali: In 2016, is it established that if we make enhancements to wetlands, we have to do that through NWI?
 - P. Claggett: Different states have flexibility as far as the information they supply for Phase 6. If you have a better data set, we want to use it. We are not wedded to a national data set over some better local data set. We can merge those together.
- Volk: Do we have consensus on approval of the two proposed wetland land use classes?
 - No objections were raised.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the inclusion of the two proposed wetland land uses in the Phase 6 Watershed Model. The WQGIT also agreed to ask the Management Board to urge EPA and FWS to work to update the NWI database prior to September 2016.

Phase 6 Calibration Methodology – Lee Currey, MDE

Lee provided a [briefing](#) on the methodology for the Phase 6.0 Watershed Model calibration and an overview of the Phase 6 modeling review period in 2016.

- Currey: I'd like to come back at another meeting with a status update. Today, I will review the Phase 6 Model review process.

Discussion:

- No questions were raised.

Oyster BMP Panel – Ward Slacum, ORP and Julie Reichert, ORP

Julie and Ward [presented](#) the Oyster BMP [expert panel charge](#) and membership. The WQGIT was asked to approve the charge and proposed membership for the Oyster BMP expert panel.

Discussion:

- McNally: How does this timeline fit into the schedule for getting information into the Phase 6 Watershed Model?
 - Reichert: We have been working with Lew Linker (EPA) on the schedule because the hope is to have a draft by May 2016 and have all the approvals by August 2016 for approvals.
 - Lew Linker (EPA, CBPO): We already have oysters simulated in the Water Quality Sediment Transport Model and this panel will further refine and improve the information we are already using in that model. It is very much adaptive management, and we are definitely good to go from a scheduling perspective.
- Volk: Do we have consensus on approving the Oyster BMP panel charge and membership?
 - No objections were raised.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the proposed charge and membership for the Oyster BMP expert panel.

Adjourned

Postponed to a later meeting:

GAMs Development Briefing – Rebecca Murphy, UMCES

Rebecca will provide a status update on the General Additive Models (GAMS) method for detecting and describing trends in estuarine waters.

BMP Expert Panel Update – Lucinda Power, EPA

Lucinda will present the proposed schedules for the Phase 6 BMP Expert Panels, which encompasses the convening of an expert panel to final partnership approval of the panel report.

List of Call Participants

Member Name	Affiliation
Jenn Volk (Chair)	U of Delaware

James Davis-Martin (Vice-Chair)	VA DEQ
Lucinda Power (Coordinator)	EPA, CBPO
David Wood (Staff)	CRC
Lindsey Gordon (Staff)	CRC
John Rhoderick	AgWG Co-Chair
Chris Pomeroy	Alterra Trading
Karl Blankenship	Bay Journal
Verna Harrison	CAC
Marel King	CBC
Ann Jennings	CBC
Joe Wood	CBF
Allison Prost	CBF
Jill Witkowski-Heaps	CCW
Kyle Runion	CRC
John Schneider	DE DNREC
Lindsay Thompson	DMAA
Sarah Diebel	DOD
George Onyullo	DOEE
Sarah Sand	DOEE
Rich Batiuk	EPA, CBPO
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO
Kelly Shenk	EPA, CBPO
Lew Linker	EPA, CBPO
Chris Day	EPA, R3
Suzanne Trevena	EPA, R3
Dianne McNally	EPA, R3
Jennifer Greiner	FWS
Jenny Tribo	HRPDC
Erin McGlaughlin	MD DNR
Jason Keppler	MDA
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Lee Currey	MDE
Zoe Johnson	NOAA
Ben Sears	NY DEC
Julie Reichert	ORP
Ward Slacum	ORP
Andy Zemba	PA DEP
Ken Murin	PA DEP
Karl Brown	PA DEP
Kevin McGonigal	SRBC
Amy Jacobs	TNC
Rebecca Murphy	UMCES
Matt Johnston	UMD, CBPO

Gary Shenk

USGS

Peter Claggett

USGS

Joel Blomquist

USGS

Russ Baxter

VA Secretary of Natural Resources Office

Angela Redwine

VDH

Pam Mason

VIMS

Jeremy Hanson

VT, CBPO

Chris Brosch

VT, VA DCR

Teresa Koon

WV DEP

Dave Montali

WV DEP