

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
April 25, 2016 CONFERENCE CALL
Meeting Minutes

Summary of Action and Decision Items

ACTION: The WQGIT will pursue scheduling a face-to-face meeting for October 2016. Members should please contact Lucinda or David if they are aware of any particular conflicts.

ACTION: The WQGIT was not able to reach consensus on the Street Sweeping and Storm Drain Cleaning BMP Expert Panel report. The membership was polled for their stance on approving the report as-written, as well as for approving the report with Virginia DEQ's proposed amendment, and the poll results will be sent to the Management Board for their consideration and final decision.

ACTION: The WQGIT will schedule a presentation during an upcoming meeting to get clarification on how fractional land uses could work in the Phase 6 Watershed Model, and whether it is conceivable to have extractive acres simulated as mixed open with an overlay.

ACTION: WQGIT members should provide feedback on the Oyster Panel's presentation and current progress to Julie Reichert (jreichert@oysterrecovery.org) by May 13.

ACTION: WQGIT members should consider the options presented during Jeff's presentation for re-running the history, in order to make a decision during the May meeting. Please email comments or questions to Jeff Sweeney (JSweeney@chesapeakebay.net).

ACTION: Lucinda will add language to the Midpoint Assessment Schedule revisions document to define a timeframe for evaluating the model's capabilities and constraints.

ACTION: Lucinda will capture feedback on the proposed alternative Midpoint Assessment and Phase III WIP schedule revisions and will distribute them to the WQGIT for final review.

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

- There is a potential conflict between the planned September WQGIT face-to-face meeting (Sept. 26-27) and the Executive Council meeting (Sept. 27). WQGIT were asked whether the group should pursue a new date for our face-to-face meeting in order to avoid overlap with the EC meeting.
 - It was noted that the advisory committees would be at the Executive Council (EC) meeting and would not be able to participate.
 - Pennsylvania and Delaware also noted that they would have similar conflicts.
 - October 11-12 and October 24-25 were suggested as possible alternatives.

ACTION: The WQGIT will pursue scheduling a face-to-face meeting for October 2016. Members should please contact Lucinda or David if they are aware of any particular conflicts.

Street Sweeping and Storm Drain Cleaning Expert Panel Report – Tom Schueler, CSN

Tom provided an overview of the panelists' comments on Virginia DEQ's proposed addition to the Street Sweeping and Storm Drain Cleaning Expert Panel report. All ten panelists provided responses, and the vote was tied 5 in favor of the proposed addition to 5 opposed. Tom explained that although there were indications among some panelists in favor of the proposal, it is not implementable as-written. If counted in that manner, panelists voted 2 in favor of including the proposal as-written to 8 opposed.

Discussion:

- Norm Goulet (NVRC): I have concerns about the methodology in Virginia DEQ's proposed addition to the report (SCP-12), and some general concerns about how this is being applied to the BMP. I see SCP-12 as being more of an issue with policy than with science, which I feel is reflected in the panelist full set of comments.
- Teresa Koon (Vice-Chair): Does the WQGIT approve the report as originally written?
 - James Davis-Martin (VA DEQ): Virginia cannot live with the report as originally written.
 - Jen Sincock (EPA): I would like to reiterate my proposal from the last meeting, to separate the two issues. Put forward a consensus vote that the BMP panel report goes to the Management Board as originally written, and separately we would further explore Virginia's proposal. I don't think SCP-12 has the details needed to be fully implemented yet.
 - Davis-Martin: I would say again, that Virginia does not support approval of the report as written. To do so, even with a commitment to address SCP-12 separately, would not be a viable option. With our previous decision that we locked down our Model, there is really no demand to have this in place before the end of 2017 as we approach the end of the 2017 milestone period. If the amendment requires additional work, I would recommend we do it. Additionally, I don't believe anyone has collected historical data as defined in this new expert panel report, so it would seem counter-productive.
- Koon: Because we do not have consensus by all states we will have to elevate this report to the Management Board for decision. We will now take a poll of WQGIT members. Do you support the Street Sweeping and Storm Drain Cleaning expert panel report as originally written, without the Virginia DEQ's proposed addition of SCP-12?
 - Kristen Wolf (PA DEP): Pennsylvania does not have a problem with the report as-written. We feel that Virginia's proposal should be looked into further, because the panel members were divided, but we do support the panel report as written.
 - Jim George (MDE): Maryland supports the panel report as-written.
 - Dinorah Dalmasy (MDE): Maryland would also like to reiterate that we still have concerns about how the recommendations from this report would be applied in the Phase 6 Model in order to avoid double counting due to in-stream attenuation. That said, we do approve the report as written.

- John Schneider (DE DNREC): Delaware supports the report as-written. Additionally, we feel it would set a bad precedent to reject the panel's report on the basis of a policy issue.
- Mary Searing (DOEE): The District of Columbia supports the panel report as-written.
- Dave Montali (WV DEP): West Virginia supports the panel report as-written.
- James Davis-Martin (VA DEQ): Virginia does not support the panel report as-written.
- New York was not present and did not submit a stance prior to the meeting.
- Marel King (CBC): The Chesapeake Bay Commission supports the report as-written. We ask if Virginia would be open to considering applying a discount to the credit under this SCP-12 practice. It seems a lot of opposition has to do with accuracy of the numbers weighed in the hopper.
 - Davis-Martin: I would argue that lab analysis would be more accurate, and I think we have already discounted it substantially already. The proposal only suggests credit for the fine sediment fraction rather than the entire mass. I think the fine fraction is a substantial discount from what is already collected. We also included a cap to the credit at the land-river segment scale that would preserve the integrity of the Model.
- Jen Sincock (EPA): EPA supports the panel report as-written.
- Tanya Spano (MWWCOG): I support the panel report as-written.
- Bill Angstadt (Angstadt Consulting): I support the report as written. I think we need to respect the experts' recommendations, but I would be okay with moving the report ahead and then considering the SCP-12 proposal in more detail as an amendment later.
- Chris Thompson (LCCD): I support the report as written. Unfortunately, I am not familiar with the Virginia DEQ proposal, so I cannot weigh in on that at this time.
- Beth McGee (CBF): It looks like many on the expert panel really don't think the science supports credit for the mass balance approach. For that reason, I am inclined to not support continued credit. However, if the compromise being proposed is to phase out these practice after 2017, then I could live with that. *(Submitted via email in advance of meeting)*
- Jenn Volk (U of Delaware): I have no objections approving the expert panel's recommendations. *(Submitted via email in advance of meeting)*
- Sarah Diebel (DOD) was not present and did not submit a stance prior to the meeting.
- Koon: Could the WQGIT support the expert panel report as-amended, with the inclusion of Virginia DEQ's proposed addition of SCP-12?
 - Montali: West Virginia could not live with the report as-amended. I think the cap is arbitrary and the details relative to necessary monitoring to validate the mass balance crediting approach, are not specified.

- Sincock: EPA would not support the report as-amended. We do not feel the proposed addition is detailed enough. It could be further considered, but is not implementable.
- Ted Tesler (PA DEP): Yes, Pennsylvania could support the report as-amended.
- George: Maryland does not support the report as-amended. Is there an issue of whether or not that method would be used through 2017 time period?
 - Matt Johnston (UMD): No, we have a lockdown on BMPs for this milestone period so we are talking about a Phase 6 BMP for 2019 milestone period.
- Schneider: Delaware does not support the report as-amended.
- Searing: The District of Columbia does not support the report as-amended.
- King: The Chesapeake Bay Commission does not currently support the report as-amended. We would like to see some of the questions addressed with regard to the methodologies before we could support the amended report. We could eventually support the amendment, but we would like to see those questions answered first.
- Angstadt: I do not feel I have enough information to take a stance on this proposal.
- Thompson: I do not feel I have enough information to take a stance on this proposal.
- Koon: We will provide the Management Board with the results of this poll and ask for their decision.

ACTION: The WQGIT was not able to reach consensus on the Street Sweeping and Storm Drain Cleaning BMP Expert Panel report. The membership was polled for their stance on approving the report as-written, as well as for approving the report with Virginia DEQ's proposed amendment, and the poll results will be sent to the Management Board for their consideration and final decision.

Extractive Land Use in Phase 6 – Matt Johnston, UMD

The WQGIT was asked to reach a final decision regarding the exclusion of the extractive land use from the Phase 6 Model as a separate land use, and endorsement of the Land Use Workgroup's proposed inclusion of extractive lands (where such information is available) into either mixed open or a fractional land use.

Discussion:

- Johnston: As a reminder, we reached a decision a while ago for how to deal with the extractive land use in the Phase 5.3.2 Model, but the WTWG did not reach consensus on extractive in Phase 6. When we polled the WTWG members, the results were 5 in favor of removing the extractive land use and placing those acres into the open space land use, and 1 in favor of keeping the extractive land use in Phase 6. That is why we brought it to the WQGIT for final decision. The decision being requested is really to approve rolling the extractive acres into open space, but also to approve the LUWG's concept of a

fractional land use. The idea with fractional land uses is that there are a lot of land uses rolled into open space, and they may function differently. Fractional land uses allow states to provide overlays to that type of land and when the land use teams are assembling the land use acres, they can reflect those acres more accurately.

- Dalmasy: During the April 11th call, we didn't know the jurisdictions were going to submit extractive acres that were going to be put into fractional open space. During the 2015 WTWG discussion, there was not an option for a fractional land use, and at that time, the option Maryland proposed was to explicitly keep the extractive land use in the Phase 6 Model. For Maryland, most extractive lands have permits, and we don't want to mix them up with non-permitted lands. We think the fractional approach is reasonable and a good approach, but we would prefer to keep extractive land separately. We have expended a lot of time and resources to explicitly map extractive lands in the state and we don't see why we can't allow jurisdictions who have the information to include it in Phase 6. We are not asking for any specific loading rates, we will accept the loading rates for the mixed open land use that are being proposed.
- Davis-Martin: So to summarize, Maryland's preference is to have an explicit extractive land use even if it means using the mixed open loading rate, or the loading rate that was in Phase 5.3.2. The alternative, being proposed by the LUWG, is that extractive lands would still be quantified and then rolled into the mixed open land use.
 - Johnston: Yes, with the caveat that the fractional land use may make extractive acres more likely to be lumped into impervious or pervious if the GIT approved the fractional methodology. The exact fractions have not been defined yet.
- Davis-Martin: Do we need an explicit extractive land use in Phase 6?
 - Dalmasy: Some jurisdictions could have their extractive land use removed and wouldn't need the fractional approach. But those that have the data would still keep the explicit acreage of extractive lands in the model.
- Johnston: I believe the Bay Program also runs MAST, which allows Maryland to create 50-100 land uses for this reason. Is that reasonable to do this in MAST but not in the Phase 6 Model itself?
 - Dalmasy: I am not sure I can make that decision.
 - George: I guess the question in my mind is, if we have it in MAST but not in the Model, is it a problem that they wouldn't line up?
 - Davis-Martin: From my perspective, we wouldn't want the model to show zero extractive acres in Virginia. We would advocate that there should be no listing for extractive. I think we would be best served by having our models consistent throughout jurisdictions.
- Gary Shenk (USGS): From a modeling perspective, the overhead isn't huge, but there is some overhead to put this in and track it even if Maryland is supplying the information. The modeling team is limited in time, so it would be kicking something else out at the end. It also raises some questions about how you have extractive lands forward and backward through time. Maybe you have it, but we would definitely need it. Finally, when states have different rules for putting things together, it affects target load methodologies. One of the key principles is that everyone's modeling is done the same

way. As much as we can keep all the rules the same for the states, the target loads methodology is a fair way to come up with the target loads.

- Dalmasy: Can we find a way to get the acreage output? We would be happy with that. The fractional approach is very good and reasonable, we could live with it.
- Davis-Martin: Do you know how the model would handle these fractional land uses?
 - Shenk: My understanding is that if there are extractive acres and, for example, the fraction defined is 50% pervious and 50% impervious, the land use team will turn the extractive acres into those two land uses in that ratio and extractive is not tracked.
- Montali: I see a lot of work here and I don't see the reason for it. With extractive being rolled into mixed open, you can have the BMP applied to the mixed open land use and still get the reduction applied. I am failing to see why all the work to create a land use or fractional land uses is needed.
- Davis-Martin: I feel it is really late in the process to be contemplating a new land use in Phase 6. I am leery of trying to add in a land use at the last minute.
 - Dalmasy: It was never officially decided to remove the extractive land use from Phase 6. Now we have to prove why we should keep it, when instead the burden should be on proving why we should take it out.
 - Davis-Martin: I think it was, indirectly. Extractive was never on the list of land uses we agreed to in 2012.
- Dalmasy: We are fine with going with the fractional approach. We just wanted to explain why it was important for Maryland.
- Davis-Martin: Isn't mixed open both regulated and unregulated?
 - Johnston: Yes, it encompasses a lot. I can't speak to EPA's decisions about load allocations versus wasteload allocations.
 - Dalmasy: In the Bay TMDL, extractive is together with other permitted land uses in the wasteload allocation.
- Davis-Martin: Doesn't sound like we are at a place of consensus. It sounds like Maryland is of the mind that extractive should be an independent land use. Any other thoughts to support Maryland's position?
- Tesler: I recognize the position regarding wasteload allocations and the TMDL. If we remove extractive, we then have the question of where that load should be allocated. I am most concerned about the fractional land use. I don't think the data is there to support that proportioning. We haven't adequately characterized the loads off of extractive lands in the past and to make broad assumptions again on a lot of acres in Pennsylvania is a concern. Having extractive lands exist as a data layer and having them behave as open space in the model could work, but there is the question of how it relates to the TMDL.
- Dalmasy: I understand there are a lot of issues with keeping extractive explicitly.
- Davis-Martin: We need to hear more about how fractional land uses would work in order to have a better collective understanding. I am not comfortable making a decision of fractional land uses at this time. For whether extractive should be explicitly simulated, I would default to the current list of land uses. I also like Ted's idea of an overlay where the portion of mixed open that is extractive could be quantified.

- Dalmasy: The overlay may address our concerns but I would like to better understand how that works. We just want to be able to quantify exactly what portion of mixed open is extractive.
- Spano: The point about decisions being made regarding what falls in the wasteload allocations versus the load allocations will be important, and I suggest a protocol for bringing these forward and making sure we are clear where loads will be allocated for TMDL purposes. I think more of these issues will be coming forward in the future.
 - Davis-Martin: I agree. Are we comfortable going back to Peter Claggett (USGS) for more clarification on how the fractional land use would work, and whether it is conceivable to have extractive acres simulated as mixed open with an overlay to differentiate what should be in the wasteload allocation versus load allocation within the mixed open land use?
- Montali: I would also like information on the tentative BMPs that Maryland would put on this land use, as well as information on how to fractionalize. There is no data about nitrogen and phosphorus coming off of extractive lands. If Maryland has data to support how to fractionalize, I would like to see that.
 - Dalmasy: We have requested that information from our permit program. We don't have data now, which is why we never challenged the loading rate. Later on we hope to have some actual data.

ACTION: The WQGIT will schedule a presentation during an upcoming meeting to get clarification on how fractional land uses would work in the Phase 6 Watershed Model, and whether it is conceivable to have extractive acres simulated as mixed open with an overlay.

Oyster BMP Crediting Framework – Julie Reichert, ORP

Julie provided an update on the responses to comments received on the Oyster BMP nitrogen, phosphorus, and suspended sediment reduction effectiveness decision framework and the Panel's evaluation of data thus far.

ACTION: WQGIT members should provide feedback on the Oyster Panel's presentation and current progress to Julie Reichert (jreichert@oysterrecovery.org) by May 13.

Discussion:

- Russ Baxter (VA Secretary of Natural Resources Office): What is enhanced burial?
 - Reichert: It is an indirect process the oysters are associated with. During filtering, they deposit nutrients and sediment to the bottom faster than it would be without oysters. That happens naturally, but oysters speed up that process.
- Baxter: Is bottom culture always uncaged?
 - Reichert: The panel has decided that all caged oysters would fall under the water column category because they are raised off the sediment.

Updating Information for Two-Year Milestones – Jeff Sweeney, EPA

During the December face-to-face meeting, the WQGIT agreed upon a partnership policy to hold the assumptions set at the beginning of each milestone period constant over the two year period.

The GIT also decided to re-run the history, back to 2009, at the end of each milestone period in order to incorporate new information. The discussion in December did not include a decision regarding whether or not to re-run the history at the start of the 2-year period in order to include the latest information for the purpose of evaluating milestone commitments. Jeff presented the pros and cons of rerunning the history at the beginning of the milestone period.

Discussion:

ACTION: WQGIT members should consider the options presented during Jeff's presentation for re-running the history, in order to make a decision during the May meeting. Please email comments or questions to Jeff Sweeney (JSweeney@chesapeakebay.net).

- Angstadt: I suggest you bring this topic back to the AGWG and lay out the need for a 2009-2015 running of history on nutrient management so we can establish more realistic trend lines. I think the AGWG would be able to wrestle with this and help you out.
 - Spano: I had a similar observation. If it is difficult to numerically quantify, maybe we can qualitatively explain differences by checking with technical folks.
 - Sweeney: The reason the process seems a little backward is the decision made by the WQGIT in the December face-to-face. We were hoping that there would be a way to determine compliance levels reasonably for the whole history, but it turned out to be very difficult in most states for just 2015 Progress. I don't know if the nutrient management task force would reconvene, but they did come up with a template and maybe we can resurrect that. But even after the template it took a long time to work through it.
- Davis-Martin: I have a more basic question. Nutrient management is just one of the BMPs that would have this, or similar issues. I understand it has one of the largest impacts, but before we jump down this path, is there value in rerunning the history at this point, or should we let this lie and know in 2017 or 2018 we will have a new model with a better version of the history?
 - Sweeney: If we do this, there will be winners and losers when we do our evaluations in 2017 of whether states and sectors meet those goals. If you change those now, it would be advantageous to some, and not for others, but it would be a better measure of what really happened and whether the 60% reductions were achieved.
 - Davis-Martin: That would rely on rerunning 2025 projections as well, with our new WIPs.
 - Sweeney: No, the end point remains solid, it is just the starting point that changes.
 - Davis-Martin: I can see both sides of it. I can see holding the TMDL constant, but the WIPs are what we are trying to achieve. We could completely implement our WIPs and not meet the goals by following this approach. In 2017, when we have the new version of the model, we will need to rerun 2017 anyway so we have a good planning point going forward. EPA could assess those jurisdictions who may be the "losers" in

the current approach, using the new modeling tools that wouldn't have all of that noise.

- Sweeney: For the next version of the model there will be many reasons why the numbers are different.
- George: My sense is you are trying to get a better handle on 2009. That is the key piece of info, not that it is every year in between?
 - Sweeney: To calculate the 60% it is really based off of 2009, so that would be the most important point. But we planned to run all of the years in the history.
 - George: It is conceivable that there could be a modification of the evaluation process in light of this snag if it just doesn't make sense. But it is also conceivable that all you need is to get a decent handle on compliance in 2009 to get a better idea of 60%.
 - Davis-Martin: That would help with the nutrient management issue, but that is just one issue.
 - Sweeney: The other BMPs aren't nearly as important because they are more logical in terms of how to handle them back through the history. For instance, incorporating the ag census data is easy to do using interpolation. Nutrient management is so different because it has changed drastically by using tiers.
- Spano: Is it heresy to suggest evaluating that sector's progress separately? If we are looking for a definitive pass/fail review we are out of luck. If we want to know if we are making progress and moving forward, that is a different evaluation. Maybe we evaluate progress differently than we originally planned until we get the Phase 6 Model implemented.
 - Sweeney: We are looking at the whole load as a composite first and foremost, but even that changes. In Phase 6, we have a potential issue because we don't know if the panel is even going to use tiers moving forward, so it could change again.
- Angstadt: One of my concerns is if we run Phase 6 Scenario Builder and the ag sector has substantially reduced its load, we can be accused of manipulating the model rather than getting something done on the ground. Having that historical perspective is something we should have ready to defend.
- Mark Dubin (UMD): As far as the Phase 6 nutrient management panel goes, they presented a preliminary report on Thursday. During the May AGWG meeting, the workgroup will be asked whether or not they support the direction of the panel. I think it is early for the WQGIT to get into that level of detail before they have made a decision. They have also been asked to make recommendations about how to handle historic data collection over time.
- Davis-Martin: I ask that the membership review the options and give this issue your consideration. We will bring it back on a future agenda. Certainly for rerunning history at beginning of 2017 milestone cycle, I would say don't expend a lot of resources at this point in time.

Rebecca presented the findings from a recent STAC research workshop on roadside ditch management.

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: I think we have an expert panel underway that is discussing agricultural ditches. Are there enough similarities between roadside ditches and agricultural ditches for opportunities there?
 - Schneider: We have done some work with agricultural ditches and there are some similarities in how they function. They often direct agricultural ditches and tiles to the roadside ditches, at least in New York. They are also often controlled by many other jurisdictions. And when I say the ditches are scraped, that occurs in otherwise pristine looking areas. There is some overlap, but not a lot of it.
 - Dubin: We are just getting the ditch panel underway. There are a lot of differences and they are looking at ditch systems that are not part of the public roadside ditch system. In Delmarva, the roadside ditches often drain into the agricultural ditches, which is the reverse of how it seems to be in New York. I think this is a different area of the terrain.
- King: It was mentioned that roadside ditches can be a significant source of sediment. How are they captured now in the Bay Program Model? What land use are they attributed to?
 - Davis-Martin: I think in our model framework, areas adjacent to roads are characterized as urban landscapes, and in terms of land uses, are considered urban pervious. But in terms of loads originating from the ditches, I don't think they are simulated in the model, so they are redistributed based on calibration stations.
 - Shenk: That is correct. With this new information, having explicit information for loads from roadside ditches would be a nice long term goal.

Revised MPA and Phase III WIP Schedule – Lucinda Power, Coordinator

The WQGIT was asked to provide any additional feedback on the revised midpoint assessment schedule, particularly as it relates to the finalization of the Phase 6 modeling tools and the development of the Phase III WIPs. The revised schedule, as well as all WQGIT recommendations and feedback, will be presented to the Management Board and the Principals' Staff Committee for approval during their spring 2016 meetings.

Discussion:

- Lucinda reviewed the alternatives for schedule adjustments, which are based on feedback from WQGIT, and highlighted where there is agreement between the alternatives.
- Power: All data inputs, with exception of land use, should remain with a September 30th deadline, and final land use dataset would be due to the Modeling Workgroup in December 2016. Any concerns with those points of agreement?
 - None were raised.

- Power: New calibration dates for the Phase 6 Model would be January-March 2017 and would allow for a fatal flaw review of the model. The discrepancies between the alternative schedules begin with how long that fatal flaw review should be. Are there any other points of agreement?
 - Davis-Martin: In my mind, the same time the fatal flaw review is going on, there is a need to understand what the model's capabilities are. We have talked about this in terms of an uncertainty analysis. It is not explicitly on the schedule anywhere, and I thought we may want to talk about it during the model review timeframe. I think it does have other implications to the schedule.
 - No concerns were raised with adding in this language

ACTION: Lucinda will add language to the Midpoint Assessment Schedule revisions document to define a timeframe for evaluating the model's capabilities and constraints.

- Lucinda describe each alternative and solicited membership comments and feedback.

Alternative 1:

- Davis-Martin: I think there is a potential conflict where we have the Local Area Target (LAT) Task Force being established with a goal of finishing in March, but it is not clear in this document if the decision is to develop numeric targets – i.e. whether county level numeric targets would be developed by March. I think the LAT Task Force recommendations would be more conceptual. I think the expectations documents and targets documents require a better understanding of the modeling limitations and uncertainties prior to being developed. If the model is final in June and then the uncertainty analysis can begin, it would be after that when you would establish expectations for LATs so you don't cross yourself up by doing something the model can't support.
 - Shenk: As far as the uncertainty analysis, we don't have the STAC report yet. The definition for an uncertainty analysis covers a lot of ground, and it wasn't something that could be done in a few months. It is a multi-year effort and we don't know how to do it yet. I don't know if we can put that into this schedule because we need a reasonable definition of what that means. In the short term we could list some things that would contribute to uncertainty, but to determine what that is numerically would be unrealistic.
 - Davis-Martin: I agree that we need to do that. It may not be quantitative, but at least we can say we like how it looks better in these areas than others, or determine a scale at which we don't think we should try to exceed.
 - Shenk: We can try to put something like that together but we won't have numbers.
- Nicki Kasi (PA DEP): What is the difference between planning targets and expectations?
 - Power: Expectations is the narrative outline of what we expect Phase III WIPs to include. Targets are numeric state basin allocations from the modeling tools.

might not undergo the WIP planning effort that would be most effective for engaging local governments, or you set expectations that can't be realized. You can't set timelines until you know what you're dealing with.

- Spano: I echo James' concept. I want to understand how this option shortens one element or makes another piece more robust. The way this table lays it out misses the tradeoff.
 - Power: I will take the feedback from today to develop list of pros and cons for each alternative in order to try and capture those tradeoffs.
- Sincock: I am concerned about the request to have everything in lockstep. We should be engaging local governments now, as the WIPs are currently in place. I don't see the need to wait until we have the targets.
 - Davis-Martin: I didn't mean that we couldn't start to engage them to get them up to speed. But if our goal is to meaningfully engage them in helping us get from 2017 to 2025, they need to understand what the level of effort is, and as a state we need to understand what those expectations are. To start a meaningful planning exercise without that information is a challenge.
 - Spano: I agree. You can't plan if you don't know what you are trying to accomplish.
- George: Is there value in having planning targets that might inform the fatal flaw review? Does that give you any insights?
 - Davis-Martin: Because of the way we look at the planning targets, I am not sure how any fatal flaws would change those numbers. I will have to give that some thought.
- George: Would it be possible to see draft planning targets before the official draft planning targets are released?
 - Power: My understanding is the modeling team needs one month after the final model release to develop the draft planning targets. To be honest, I'm not sure if I see the benefit of releasing pre-draft planning targets without all of the information in the model. The planning methodology is something we need to discuss at a later date. It was scheduled for partnership decision by June 2016, but we will not make that date. Gary will give an update at a future WQGIT call on where we are and what we need to accomplish in order to finalize the target methodology.
- George: What do we expect to change between draft planning targets and final planning targets? Anything obvious?
 - Davis-Martin: The way I understand it, we would use the agreed upon planning targets methodology to produce a draft planning target, and that would be the opening statement in a dialogue with the jurisdictions to see how to constrain the curve, see if it is representative, etc.
- George: So the use of draft planning targets isn't so much for communication to localities as it is a starting point for state partners to talk about changes prior to them being finalized.

- Davis-Martin: I wouldn't want to take draft planning targets out to localities, although I think some people see those as the starting point for getting out to local governments.
- George: If there is a sense that fatal flaws are large flaws, do we expect planning targets to change?
 - Power: It depends on when the planning targets are released.
- George: Is there value in having the planning targets set to give us more negotiating time versus allowing enough time to make fatal flaw changes?
 - Kasi: If there are fatal flaws in the model, then that needs to be fixed before the targets are developed.
- Spano: I think we need a placeholder. What is viewed as a fatal flaw at the state level may be very different than what shows up as a flaw at a local level. If you don't have those outputs at a local scale, how do you assess the model's effectiveness? I think there needs to be a process to help you judge if there is a fatal flaw.
- George: If you have draft targets for a longer time as a state, you have more time to process those things and think about those targets. My hope is that there are not any fatal flaws, but if there are, you will screw up the schedule anyway, so having the draft targets could be beneficial for the fatal flaw review.

Alternatives 3 and 4

- Davis-Martin: On Alternative 3, when you have a planning target that is subject to change, you can't use them to communicate level of effort with localities. We can't fully get into the nuts and bolts of local government planning until we have final planning targets. I think the critical point here is that these 3 alternatives fail to account for appropriate time between the planning targets and WIP development. Even though it is a year from draft planning targets to the draft Phase III WIPs, there are 6 months from the final planning targets to the draft Phase III WIPs.
 - George: I have similar thoughts.
- Spano: When will this material be pulled together for our review prior to being sent to the Management Board?
 - Power: My plan is to capture the pros and cons and have it ready for final WQGIT review prior to the end of the week. We will then send it to the Management Board in advance of their call.

ACTION: Lucinda will capture feedback on the proposed alternative Midpoint Assessment and Phase III WIP schedule revisions and will distribute them to the WQGIT for final review.

Adjourned

List of Call Participants

Member Name	Affiliation
James Davis-Martin (Chair)	VA DEQ
Teresa Koon (Vice-Chair)	WV DEP
Lucinda Power (Coordinator)	EPA
David Wood (Staff)	CRC
Lindsey Gordon (Staff)	CRC
John Schneider	DE DNREC
George Onyullo	DOEE
Mary Searing	DOEE
Rachel Rhodes	MDA
Jim George	MDE
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Bruce Michael	MD DNR
Jackie Lendrum	NYSDEC
Kristen Wolf	PA DEP
Nicki Kasi	PA DEP
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Jill Whitcomb	PA DEP
Russ Baxter	VA Secretary of Natural Resources Office
Dave Montali	WV DEP
Alana Hartman	WV DEP
Sebastian Donner	WV DEP
Marel King	CBC
Lew Linker	EPA, CBPO
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO
Jen Sincock	EPA, R3
Suzanne Trevena	EPA, R3
Chris Day	EPA, R3
Ann Carkhuff	EPA, R3
Bill Angstadt	Angstadt Consulting
Tanya Spano	MWCOG
Chris Thompson	LCCD
Jessica Blackburn	CAC
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Mark Dubin	UMD, CBPO
Matt Johnston	UMD, CBPO
Peter Claggett	USGS
Jeremy Hanson	VT, CBPO
Sally Claggett	USFS
Jenny Tribo	HRPDC
Zoe Johnson	NOAA

Gary Shenk
Tom Schueler
Julie Reichert
Lindsay Thompson
Karl Blankenship
Rebecca Schneider

USGS
CSN
ORP
DMAA
Bay Journal
Cornell University