

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM

April 10, 2017 CONFERENCE CALL

Meeting Page: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/24981/>

Call Summary

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Action: Lucinda Power will modify the Midpoint Assessment schedule to reflect the following changes recommended by the WQGIT: Initial Phase 6 Scenario Builder outputs review to take place from April 1 to July 31; and deletion of line 8 and line 10. A note will be added that comments from jurisdictions on draft Phase III WIP planning targets must be received by February 1, but comments should be submitted as soon as possible during the 4-month Partnership review process. These changes will be incorporated into the Midpoint Assessment schedule and presented at the April 13 Management Board meeting for approval.

Action: A Word document of the proposed Phase 6 modeling review process will be sent out to the WQGIT for comments. WQGIT members should submit comments and edits by COB April 17. A determination will be made by the leadership of the Modeling Workgroup and the WQGIT as to whether the document will need further approval at the next WQGIT conference call.

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

Discussion:

- Announcement: The April 14 Webinar on 2025 Land Use Growth Projections is also listed on the [Bay Program Calendar](#).
 - Power: This is a technical webinar that will not focus on policy or crediting approaches.
 - Michelle Williams will send out another reminder this week, and the webinar will be recorded and posted on the webinar calendar page for those who can't attend on Friday. [ppt presentation and recording can be accessed here: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/25069/>]
- The WQGIT is asked to hold Sept 11-12 or Sept 25-26 as potential Face to Face meeting dates.
 - Power: Right now we have a hold on the CBPO's Fish Shack, but we can look into other conference spaces that are centrally located.

Approval of Revised Midpoint Assessment Schedule—James Davis-Martin (VA DEQ) and Lucinda Power (EPA)

James and Lucinda presented the revised schedule for WQGIT discussion, based on feedback received from the membership during the March 13 conference call.

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: We had a chance to take a look at land cover data that was developed and big picture land uses, but we haven't had a chance to look thoroughly at the inputs for the Phase 6 model. All those inputs should now be in and the calibration is underway.
- Power: I'll go over major changes that were made: Calibration should be completed by end of May so the fatal flaw review period can start June 1. We received a suggestion to include dates when the WQGIT and the Management Board will approve the revised Midpoint Assessment schedule. We have a one-month review of the Phase 6 Scenario Builder model outputs.
- Davis-Martin: When will the Partnership be able to see the land use outputs?
 - Gary Shenk (USGS): Land use information is on the [Modeling WG page](#) under the Projects and Resources tab.
 - Davis-Martin: So I would suggest that one-month review begins when that data is available.
 - Dave Montali (WV DEP): If this is a formalized process before the fatal flaw review, a month to review and a month to resolve issues—we're already 2 weeks in and we're behind with Tableau. Is this a formalized process for review and resolution, or is this like a pre-fatal flaw process where we just accept comments and address them within the context of the fatal flaw review period?
 - Tanya Spano (MWCOCG): I concur with Dave's comments, and I've shared a graphical representation of the Midpoint Assessment schedule that the WQGIT should be aware of.
- Bill Angstadt (Angstadt Consulting): Who is going to do this review? Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee (AMS)?
 - Davis-Martin: I thought the Partnership would be doing that review, including the AMS. For instance, I don't think nutrient spread algorithms have been looked at with the new Phase 6 land uses.
 - Angstadt: I'm not sure we're ready to do this until the Phase 6 Scenario Builder documentation is done. All the review has been conducted over the past 2 years with the AMS, and we've noted where we have comfort and discomfort.
 - Davis-Martin: You've reviewed Phase 5.3.2 animal numbers, but not Phase 6 land cover, animal numbers, and land use/manure spread/nutrient spread. We should have an opportunity to review this before the June 1 fatal flaw review period. We want to address concerns on a rolling basis. We shouldn't wait until August to share information on these issues. We should address issues sooner rather than later.
 - Angstadt: We should let the Modeling team focus on what they're doing and get the Phase 6 documentation done by June 1. We can't start picking things apart too soon. Until all the pieces are together, we run the risk of looking at silos and judging components separately without seeing how they fit together. We follow the logic and we follow the documentation.
- Montali: The documentation isn't done, and earlier documentation needs to be revised. The reviewers won't be able to go back to the text and look at the numbers that were used. I don't know that we'll have the luxury of doing this in addition to the fatal flaw

review in the 50 days we have. The Modeling team believes it's silly to go out with the fatal flaw review when you've already decided to recalibrate. Being available to judge the significance of the perceived flaw would be better.

- Angstadt: The big hitch for me was the one-month review and resolution process.
 - Davis-Martin: Perhaps we can phrase it more appropriately. We don't want to imply that review of model inputs is constrained to that one-month process. On the other hand, we don't want to push everything off until June 1 if we have data now that we can begin to review.
 - Angstadt: We've been going at this for 2 years, and we've been going through and correcting problems as they occur.
 - Davis-Martin: We have been reviewing piecemeal, but we haven't been able to look at them with the benefit of the application of the new Phase 6 land cover data.
 - Angstadt: That doesn't change our review. We do review by land use segments, so it doesn't matter how much the land use changes, we still have the same outputs. New issues could certainly materialize, but until we won't know that until we do the calibration.
 - Davis-Martin: I think we will know that, since that data comes out of Scenario Builder but not calibration.
 - Spano: Harking back to Dave's point, when you look back at the graph and look at things stacked, we are running out of time to fit things in the timeline available. None of this looks at resources either, and we have to make sure we have appropriate resources to do all this. We said we would re-evaluate schedule this in August. We need to actually have this information available at the times listed on the table and we need to devote appropriate resources.
 - Davis-Martin: The block of 7, 8, and 10 is what we're specifically talking about. Bill and Dave, I suggest for line 7 to change dates to April 1 through the end of the fatal flaw review period in July 31 so we can review as soon as data is available, continue reviewing through the fatal flaw review process. I suggest that line 8 and 10 be deleted, and that all issues with model inputs, calibration, and outputs be dealt with in August.
 - Angstadt: That's fine with me.
 - Dave Montali seconded.
- Sarah Diebel (DoD): Is everyone expected to deal with those issues in that one-month time?
 - Davis-Martin: No, we will have to figure out how to resolve issues on a rolling basis.
 - Shenk: Bay Program staff will be more available in July than in June. In June, we expect to finish up calibration and we expect to receive and work through comments in July. So if we get comments now through June, we won't really have the bandwidth to address those comments while we're trying to finish up calibration.

- Davis-Martin: I just suggest that we have to have a strategy for dealing with issues when they come up, and I would rather not wait until August to work through that.
- Lew Linker (EPA): It makes sense to have a rolling review so we address what we can when we can.
- Diebel: Is there a plan to keep track of the issues partners have raised throughout this process? How can we make sure that we don't have duplicated comments?
 - Lew: Look soon for a webinar that will explain this process.
- Spano: I request that there not be a complete deletion of line 8 and I think we should pick a date to do a deliberate check with the WQGIT so we can see where we are in the review process and take stock of issues so far.
- Montali: That kind of formal meeting should happen in June, either the first or second meeting. We can maybe keep a continually updated list of comments so everyone can see what's been raised so far.
- Davis-Martin: Other comments on review of Scenario Builder outputs? We will modify the schedule to have that review go from April 1 to July 31, delete line 8, and we will see clear documentation to document issues, and deletion of line 10.
- Power: On May 17th, we have a meeting with the PSC. I added line 12 to the Midpoint Assessment schedule and a targeted STAC review of the WQSTM.
 - Spano: I couldn't see a feedback loop. It appears that STAC does their review and then it's done and it doesn't go anywhere or affect anything.
 - Shenk: When we do the WQSTM, when we apply a regulatory model, we ask reviewers not to look at things that are already established, but to look at new elements and assess how the model will deal with new problems, like Conowingo and climate change. Those new elements will be what STAC reviews, and there will be feedback from them on issues, and what we can change or revise based on their feedback.
 - Spano: Can we add something in the notes or the comments to make that clearer?
 - Davis-Martin: Will that be done prior, concurrent, or after the calibration is done?
 - Linker: That documentation has to be a draft because final inputs won't be out until June 1. The WQSTM is very stable, so the load in 2010 will be very similar to the loads we see for 2016. STAC will be reviewing with the May draft of that documentation and their review will be starting in early June.
- Marel King (EPA): I thought the purpose of that check-in date was for the purpose of changing subsequent dates?
 - Power: We discussed changing this to a more relative schedule, but EPA's preference is specific, target dates to shoot for.
 - Davis-Martin: We know there are relative schedule fans, and we did try to incorporate both for all camps.

- Power: Line 16 is also new. We have sign off on the Phase 6 modeling tools by the Modeling Workgroup and the WQGIT. We are still targeting a late October PSC retreat to discuss outstanding policy issues. Line 20 reflects the widespread consensus to have 4 months for the Partnership to review the draft Phase III WIP planning targets. Line 22—EPA will update its Phase III WIP expectation document once the PSC makes final policy decisions on Conowingo, climate change, and accounting for growth. Lines 23 and 24 are also new— those are for the submission of 2018-2019 milestones on January 15, 2018.
- Davis-Martin: Maybe we should move that special case request due date to a little earlier in February so the Partnership has time to run through the process. How about February 1 for special cases?
 - Montali: I plan to start evaluating the draft Phase III WIP planning targets right away. I wouldn't wait four months to provide comments.
 - Kristen Wolf (PA DEP): We'd be fine with that.
 - Montali: This isn't just about special cases. I want to make sure we have enough time to provide comments beyond just special case requests.
 - Power: I imagine that happening on a rolling basis, so let's make a note in the comments saying that comments should be submitted on a rolling basis, but all comments should be submitted by February 1.
 - Diebel: I have a question on line 17. The timing here is not right from a milestones perspective for partners, for programmatic and BMP implementation.
- Spano: 4 months is good, but not as good as the 6-9 months originally. This does occur over the fall and winter holidays, so we need to consider whether this is really 4 full months.
 - Davis-Martin: When you have a schedule longer than 12 months, you will always have some dates on holidays, unfortunately.
 - Spano: Yes, but is that an issue in terms of stakeholder input?
 - Davis-Martin: Things always come up, you could throw general assembly sessions, elections, and such in there as well.
 - Diebel: I just want to point out that the 2018-2019 milestone input decks will be submitted prior to finalization of the Phase III WIP planning targets. If we don't have Phase III WIP planning targets for states to develop local planning goals, that will be a challenge for milestone reporting.
 - Davis-Martin: The Phase III WIP planning targets we discuss here are at the state-basin scale, so that's far from local planning goals for sure.
 - Diebel: That is something that may be missing from this schedule. Local planning goals were one of the elements of the Midpoint Assessment, so including a schedule for that would be very helpful.
 - Davis-Martin: Perhaps we could add that after item 27.
 - Mary Gattis, LGAC: From what I have gathered from different jurisdictions and local governments, there's not a lot of local engagement in milestone development. I wonder if jurisdictions could set up something

formal to develop milestones in tandem with local governments in the September/October time frame.

- Power: We can add in a line item where jurisdictions work with local governments to develop those milestones.
- Gattis: It doesn't need to be a line item, but maybe we could note in the comments that jurisdictions can work with locals to develop milestones. That could be part of a process to build capacity to engage local governments.
- Spano: That will be crucial to implementing the Phase III WIPs. I like what Mary suggested.
- Suzanne Trevena, EPA: This topic of milestones will be discussed during an upcoming Milestones Workgroup conference call. I'm working on the call agenda now.
- Davis-Martin: I want to thank EPA for their flexibility in agreeing to extend the deadlines for the Phase III WIPs. I think the proposed changes give the Partnership the time needed to develop the documents. It was a really important change to the schedule. We will make edits based on today's discussion and present to the Management Board for their concurrence later this week.
- Karl Berger: I have a question about final Phase 6 land uses for review. At our LUWG meeting Wednesday, we discussed the new land use data. Virginia had a request for something to add? I'm not clear whether the Phase 6 land use posted represented that change Virginia wanted.
 - James: We decided that since calibration was underway, we can't resolve it now. We will revisit this issue during the Partnership's fatal flaw review.

Action:

Lucinda Power will modify the Midpoint Assessment schedule to reflect the following changes recommended by the WQGIT: Initial Phase 6 Scenario Builder outputs review to take place from April 1 to July 31; and deletion of line 8 and line 10. A note will be added that comments from jurisdictions on draft Phase III WIP planning targets must be received by February 1, but comments should be submitted as soon as possible during the 4-month Partnership review process. These changes will be incorporated into the Midpoint Assessment schedule and presented at the April 13 Management Board meeting for approval.

Phase 6 Model Review Strategy: Phase 6 model changes, fatal flaw review process guidance, and review strategy document—Dave Montali (WV DEP) and Lee Curry (MDE)

The Modeling Workgroup Co-chairs presented the Phase 6 model review strategy document that includes a description of (1) what the Phase 6 model is, how it was developed, and any major changes between the Phase 6 model and the previous Phase 5.3.2 version of the model; (2) the fatal flaw review guidelines; and (3) proposed strategic review guide for conducting the fatal flaw review.

Discussion:

- Linker: Because the fatality of flaws is about ability to measure progress or logical flaws, we decided that fatal flaws should really be reviewed at the state-basin scale. The asterisk on the last page of the document is very important. It adds a contingency that for very large flaws requiring recalibration, the June/July deadline will no longer be feasible.
- Davis-Martin: Who has thoughts or concerns relating to this document?
- Nicki Kasi, PA DEP: If we have to do local planning goals below the state-basin scale, then I have a problem with the exclusion of local targeting. To me that would be a fatal flaw if we find something wrong at the local level with Phase III WIP planning targets.
 - Linker: We're not saying that you can't make a comment about something in the model that you think is an impediment. We welcome those comments, but we will be using this definition of what a significant impediment is. We're not excluding those kinds of comments, but we do think that the scale that folks should think about is the scale of the Phase III WIP planning targets.
 - Davis-Martin: It seems that the state-basin level is the scale we should focus on, but the scale of the Bay TMDL is much finer than that.
 - Kasi: If there's a problem with developing local planning goals below the state-basin scale, then I have a problem if that doesn't count as a fatal flaw.
 - Davis-Martin: If states are required to meet Water Quality Standards per the Bay TMDL, then I would think that a fatal flaw would extend to issues with local planning.
 - Linker: The Bay TMDL is allocated by state-basin, and then states have tools available for further extension to local planning goals.
 - Montali: James, is your question whether the Phase III WIP planning targets will hit the numerical value spelled out in the Bay TMDL?
 - Davis-Martin: No, it's the stipulation that if EPA will be evaluating our Phase III WIPs for implementation at the state-basin scale, then local planning goals should be included.
 - Linker: As the scale gets finer, the error gets greater, so we can't really do an assessment of these very small localities.
 - Davis-Martin: Ann Carkhuff, as our EPA representative, is that EPA's intention for evaluating our Phase III WIPs?
 - Power: I can probably answer that. This question has come up before and EPA will be providing additional clarification on this issue.
 - Currey: I see where James is coming from and I tend to agree. The model should be evaluated at the state-basin scale, as that was good enough for establishing the Bay TMDL. When we go from a larger basin to a smaller scale, our expectations for a fatal flaw should also scale somewhat, but I think local planning goals should also be evaluated.
 - Spano: This text implies something broader and raises questions as it's written. If there are constraints about the ability to develop goals at different scales, that should be a footnote. This text implies that this is part of the fatal flaw review, and that violates the Watershed Model's stipulation that it can't be used for small local areas. I'd be glad to suggest some language later this afternoon.

- Davis-Martin: Sounds like this line needs a major rewrite.
 - Linker: We'd welcome that. If you want to suggest some language, we can work with that.
 - Kasi: I like the document overall, and if Tanya will add some language I think that would be great. Can you send out a Word version so we can edit it ourselves? I caught some typos, and there's some language I don't understand, as well as this paragraph. We can give you comments within track changes.
 - Linker: We could certainly do that within track changes. We just need to approve this soon and move on. What's the schedule for approving this document and moving ahead with the review process? Should we bounce this document back to the Modeling Workgroup and get their blessing and bring this back to the WQGIT in 2 weeks?
 - Davis-Martin: I hope we won't have to go that far back. We just have some editorial changes to clarify this issue of scale. In the interest of time, let's just put it out there for edits and comments, and let's lock this up in terms of formal reviews and approvals.
 - Kasi: The Modeling Workgroup elevated this to us. We don't have to take this back to the Modeling Workgroup as a whole, we can just take it back to our specific Modeling Workgroup representatives for approval of changes.
 - Davis-Martin: We'd have to make sure the Modeling Workgroup as a whole does approve these changes. Let's circulate, accept comments, and the deadline for comments will be April 17th.
 - Linker: As long as the changes aren't substantive and are only clarification-related.
 - George Onyullo, DOEE: We can easily reconcile the scale issues in this document in the last sentence. We measure performance by adhering to the Phase III WIP expectations document that was alluded to earlier.
 - Kasi: It's the last 2 sentences. This has to be consistent with the Bay TMDL, not just the state-basins. Tanya, if you want to go back and suggest edits for this last paragraph via email that would work.
 - Spano: That works.
 - Davis-Martin: Tanya, Dave, Nicki, Lew, Lee, George, and I will take the lead on making those edits.
- Davis-Martin: In this document, links and dates for documentation should be updated with the accurate target dates. Access to model inputs should be changed to April 2017.
- Montali: The first thing is, when we get comments they go Gary and Lew and then they assign to the appropriate Workgroup. We thought about creating a page so people could see what comments have been submitted in the fatal flaw review process. This was mentioned earlier in the call.
 - Davis-Martin: We should agree whether that's something we want. People need to know who to contact for the technical lead, support work, etc. Is Gary still the

point of contact for the Watershed Model or do we need a Scenario Builder team representative as well?

- Shenk: It's fine to just be me, I can always get in touch with Jeff or Matt if needed.

Action: A Word document of the proposed Phase 6 modeling review process will be sent out to the WQGIT for comments. WQGIT members should submit comments and edits by COB April 17. A determination will be made by the leadership of the Modeling Workgroup and the WQGIT as to whether the document will need further approval at the next WQGIT conference call.

Midpoint Assessment and Phase III WIP Communications Strategy—Rachel Felver (Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay)

Rachel provided an overview of the draft communications strategy for the Midpoint Assessment and Phase III WIPs, on behalf of the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership's Communications Office.

Discussion:

- Onyullo: I think this is a good starting point. Providing information is the lowest level of engagement, but providing data as well allows partners and stakeholders to learn and apply data to their projects.
- Spano: I really like this. I'm really glad that you are taking the lead on this outreach, and that our staff won't have to also worry about doing this ourselves. I can volunteer my staff to help you review and tweak the materials you send out.
- Davis-Martin: How can we measure whether our engagement has been successful or not?
- Felver: That's a great question, and it's something we're discussing. Whether we're fulfilling stakeholder needs and the needs of their audiences really affects how effective we are as well.
- Davis-Martin: I'd like to mention a recent [survey of VA voters](#) through Christopher Newport University. The poll showed that a nearly unanimous majority of voters strongly supported cleaning up the Bay.
- Marel King, CBC: I want to emphasize the importance of the Midpoint Assessment products, especially those that say how the modeling changes came about and what they mean relative to our previous tools. I reference the PA congressman who misinterpreted forest loads in the model to mean that forests are pollution sources to the Bay.
- Spano: We want to make sure that when people view these messages, we are clear about what we are showing people.
- Davis-Martin: We will share documents related to the Local Government Engagement Initiative (LGEI) meetings.
 - Gattis: All our materials are available on the [LGEI page](#).
- Zoe Johnson, NOAA: In the LGEI discussions or communications plan, is there a plan for better communication of the new pieces of the model? Especially how Conowingo, climate change, and land use is modeled?

- Felver: All those issues are listed under the Phase III WIP portion of the communications plan, available on our [March meeting page](#). That is one of the messages we are trying to craft. We will be reaching out to you, Zoe, to help us craft the climate change message.
- Linker: We put together a [Conowingo webinar](#) a few months ago, and we are putting together a climate change webinar for the Bay community. As we go further into summer and fall, we'll have near final messages on those parts of the modeling tools.

Local Government Engagement and Communications template – Mary Gattis (Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay)

Mary received WQGIT feedback on the draft local government engagement and communications template that is intended to assist the jurisdictions in the Phase III WIP development process.

Discussion:

- Gattis: Rachel had a list of 20 or so different audiences. Our strategy is specifically geared towards local governments. We are only focused on local elected officials, and we are crafting a very tailored message. We have several products available, including a fact sheet and schedule for the Midpoint Assessment and the Phase III WIPs. As part of the Phase III WIP development process, jurisdictions have to present what their plans are for local engagement to the Partnership, so we are working on a template for that.
- James Davis-Martin opened the floor to questions and comments.
- Beth McGee, CBF: Is there a web page for this initiative?
 - Gattis: It's on the [LGAC web page](#), under projects and resources. We are also trying to post some materials developed by the jurisdictions. They will all have their own Phase III WIP websites, but we also have a central resource set up to support them. I only have the presentation up on the calendar page, and we are working on fine tuning the template before we release it. We will post it on the [calendar page](#) once that's ready.

Davis-Martin: Our next WQGIT meeting is scheduled for the 24th, are we still planning on that?

- Power: We currently don't have any agenda topics, so we can cancel it as long as nothing comes up last minute.

Adjourned

Call Participants:

James Davis-Martin, WQGIT Chair
 Teresa Koon, WQGIT Vice-Chair
 Lucinda Power, WQGIT Coordinator,
 Lindsey Gordon (CRC), Staffer
 Michelle Williams (CRC), Staffer
 Sarah Latessa, NYS
 Nicki Kasi, PA DEP

Russ Baxter, VA DEQ
Kristen Wolf, PA DEP
John Schneider, DNREC
Jim George, MDE
Dinorah Dalmasy, MDE
Alisha Mulkey, MDA
Lee Currey, MDE
George Onyullo, DC DOEE
Angela Redwine, VDH
Kate Creef, VA/MAMWA
Alana Hartman, WV DEP
Dave Montali, WV DEP/TetraTech
Marel King, CBC
Anne Jennings, CBC
Anne Carkhuff, EPA
Chris Day, EPA
Lew Linker, EPA
Jeff Sweeney, EPA
Suzanne Trevena, EPA
Emily Trentacoste, EPA
Kelly Gable, EPA
Jenn Volk, UDel
Bill Angstadt, Angstadt Consulting
Tanya Spano, MWCOG
Sarah Diebel, DoD
Chris Thompson, Lancaster Co. Conservation District
Mary Gattis, LGAC/Alliance for the Bay
Jessica Blackburn, CAC/Alliance for the Bay
Scott Phillips, USGS
Zoe Johnson, NOAA
Gary Shenk, USGS
Mark Dubin, UMD
Sally Claggett, USFWS
Norm Goulet, NVRC
Karl Berger, MWCOG
KC Filipino, HRPDC
Joan Smedinghoff, CRC
Jeremy Hanson, VT
Michael Forlini, Clean Chesapeake Coalition
Beth McGee, CBF
Joe Wood, CBF
Rachel Felver, Alliance for the Bay