

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM

May 8, 2017 Meeting Summary

Meeting Materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/24983/>

Summary of Actions & Decisions:

Decision: The WQGIT endorsed moving forward with seeking AgWG feedback in collecting animal population data for poultry and swine, to potentially be used in the Phase 6 Watershed Model.

Decision: Pending additional minor edits, the WQGIT approved the revised Phase 6 Approval Process document.

Decision: The WQGIT recommended working to revise the Multi-Functional Riparian Forest Buffers funding proposal, and to re-distribute it for another RFP.

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

- NFWF is accepting grant funding applications for projects that benefit habitat and water quality improvements in the Bay watershed. Lucinda Power will serve as the WQGIT liaison for this process. All reviews should be completed by the week of June 12. Jenn Volk and Teresa Koon offered to help in the proposal review.
- Jeremy Hanson is developing a BMP reference guide for approved Phase 6 BMPs. These fact sheets will provide basic information on each practice, and Jeremy will present them during the May 22nd WQGIT meeting.
- Dave Montali: There is a [Modeling Workgroup webinar](#) tomorrow on an overview of the Phase 6 model and the decisions these tools are intended to address.
- The WQGIT will hold a 2-day face-to-face meeting on September 25 and 26. The proposed location is Annapolis, MD at the CBPO Fish Shack.

Proposals for Industry/Partnership Efforts to Collect Swine and Poultry Population Data – Mark Dubin (UMD)

Mark Dubin presented two proposals for efforts to collect supplementary [swine](#) and [poultry](#) population data for potential use in the Phase 6 Watershed Model.

Discussion:

- James Davis-Martin: With the fatal flaw review period coming up and the expectation of another calibration in August, I think we need to talk about time frames and deadlines we would need to associate with this dataset, so the Partnership has time to evaluate and integrate the data as needed.
 - Mark Dubin replied that the proposals target July 1st to have all information available to the Partnership, for a decision to be made in July and data to potentially be incorporated in August.

- Matt Johnston: I want to note that this is a best-case-scenario, and we can't predict what the outcome will be with such a large dataset. It may be that we, as a Partnership, need more time to analyze.
- James Davis-Martin: I think the July 1 date is reasonable, but I think that anything we can do to get it completed before then would be ideal.
 - Mark Dubin: In the poultry sector, we're looking at discrete populations, and some of them may be able to provide information more quickly. So there is a potential that we could deliver some of the data earlier. We would also work with the CBP Modeling Team, so they would be part of setting up the data collection template.
- Ted Tesler: I spoke with our AgWG representatives, and they haven't really seen this presented to them yet. So I'm not prepared to endorse this without having it go before the AgWG first. I understand we're trying to parallel track this, but I just wanted to raise that concern.
- Dave Montali: I have a general concern about timing. The possibility is very real that we won't be able to accommodate this data in Phase 6.
- Tanya Spano: If we don't get this data, then we're not any worse off than before. By the same token, if we get this external data and it tells us we have major issues – then getting to what Dave mentioned, what would we do about it? That's where the same scheduling concerns would come up.
 - James Davis-Martin: I get the sense that Mark is trying to strike that balance, with the July 1st deadline. I haven't heard anyone suggest that we shouldn't pursue this, though.
 - Mark Dubin: Because of the work we've been doing already with the industry, the proposal notes that we already have livestock data for the period of interest for VA turkey production. We also have the swine data for VA. If the Partnership is interested, we could provide that data in aggregate for the CBP Modeling Team to review. That could serve as an indication of how the data looks in comparison to the information we currently have.
- Bill Angstadt: We have a process with the AMS and the AgWG to deal with data issues. I'm not sure why this is a timely variance that needs to be addressed. We haven't started the fatal flaw review, but to be changing data inputs could get very confusing.
 - James Davis-Martin: I think we're talking about data inputs that would be used for recalibration post-fatal flaw, not pre-fatal flaw. Our review would proceed, but we would discuss adjustments we would make as a result of the review. For VA, we do have a number of concerns about animal distribution data.
 - Bill Angstadt: I would recommend that this go to the AMS then, to deal with data input issues.
 - Matt Johnston: I think one of the reasons why you're seeing this now is because the AMS has talked about animals and they are prepared to go to the AgWG to say that the AMS isn't opposed to new data, but the Partnership had the December 31 deadline, and the AMS is more comfortable letting the AgWG and WQGIT decide on whether to incorporate of new animal data.

- James Davis-Martin asked the WQGIT if they supported the proposals presented: to allow for the collection and incorporation of additional data.
 - Bill Angstadt: I think this is a dangerous precedent to set. If we're doing a Partnership and jurisdiction review, but halfway through we start changing inputs – as Matt said, we've been reviewing animal numbers for 2 years. I don't see how we can start changing inputs at this point.
 - Ted Tesler: I'd like to see it go through the AgWG first.
 - Tanya Spano: It's a process question – having the information externally helps us evaluate what we already have is one thing. But incorporating it as new data brings up new issues. Can't there be a charge from the WQGIT that changes to the inputs could only occur if there's some way of quantifying the changes would be limited?
 - Bill Keeling: It needs to be reiterated that we're not talking about changing anything in the current calibrated model – the fatal flaw review would continue as normal. It's already been determined that this is a significant flaw with the redistribution of state-wide numbers to places where animals don't exist. So it's being proposed that additional datasets be used to inform that adequacy if there is a calibration in August and all of the data can meet the quality conditions and approvals of the workgroups.
- Gary Shenk: I think this is different from the fatal flaw review – the review is about whether the Partnership's directions were followed, etc. The Partnership also had rules regarding timing for when data would come in. In my mind, this is separate from the fatal flaw review – it's whether to bring new data in that wasn't part of Partnership decisions. It's fine if the Partnership brings in new data, but I want to emphasize that the staff at the CBPO is working at the direction of the Partnership and we have limited resources. The more time we spend on changing things in the models, it runs the risk of endangering deadlines in the future.
- James Davis-Martin: I think it would be bad form to ask the industry for data if we don't believe there is a chance of us using that data, unless we notify them of that beforehand. But do we support Mark moving forward with his proposals to ask the industry for data?
 - Ted Tesler: I think the scope of the ask needs to be defined. Do we know which integrating operations we're going to get the data from? I know this is in the weeds, which is why I think it's best handled at the AgWG level. We want to know if the data sources are representative of our state.
- James Davis-Martin: I want to ask if we can come to consensus on the larger idea of being open to new datasets? Is there anyone opposed to allowing for new datasets as long as they are submitted in time and go through the appropriate channels for approval?
 - Dave Montali: I think this is a dangerous precedent. We're so far past the deadline for which we said all inputs are final, and we're trying to move to a schedule for WIP development which has already been pushed back.
 - James Davis-Martin: What if we add the condition that the new data does not adversely affect our currently approved schedule?

- Sarah Diebel: I will add to Dave Montali’s comment, in that I wonder if this would potentially bring us to a point where there is disparate information where not everyone is using the same information.
 - James Davis-Martin: Yes, but we included local government sources of data into the land cover. So in my view, we’ve accepted the premise that we don’t require consistent, regional data in the modeling tools.
 - Tanya Spano: That’s consistent with the perspective from the WWTWG. We set a minimum that everyone can live with, if there is inconsistent data.
 - George Onyullo: I think time-constraints are key here, especially in terms of approval processes for submitting this data. So unless there is a clear and verifiable need that the data has a real impact as determined by the Modeling Team, then I think the constraints and time limits should be respected.
 - James Davis-Martin: I agree. We want to make sure that this data is needed, is addressing a concern, is consistent with our established timeline for Phase 6 model development, and that we understand the impact it’s going to have in terms of unintended consequences.
 - Tanya Spano: If this isn’t a problem that we anticipate as a fatal flaw, then we really need to ask ourselves if it’s really of significance.

Decision: The WQGIT endorsed moving forward with seeking AgWG feedback in collecting animal population data for poultry and swine, to potentially be used in the Phase 6 Watershed Model.

Phase 6 and Fatal Flaw Review Document—James Davis-Martin, Chair
The WQGIT was briefed on edits made to the [Fatal Flaw Review Document](#).

Discussion:

- Dave Montali reviewed the changes that were made to the document.
- Tanya Spano: We just wanted to make sure the issue of scale was differentiated. And if this is how it’s addressed – that it’s not necessarily a fatal flaw – then from a local perspective, we have that concern. But I think this language is close enough – thank you.
- Tanya Spano: I ask, with the Modeling Workgroup’s review, that they deal with and help explain any shifts in sector loads.
- Gary Shenk: The loads webinar will describe how we split between the different sectors – this described the rationale for how we got to the load splits between sectors by using multiple models. From that point, it’s a simple matter of comparing those numbers between Phase 5 and Phase 6. Is that what you’re looking for, Tanya?
 - Tanya Spano: Yes – to put some of the change in context would be very helpful.
 - Lew Linker: The difficulty we had was that we thought that understanding was applied – but if we add another bullet under the Modeling Workgroup’s review of the calibration “to cover a review of sector loads from the Phase 5 and Phase 6

models, with an eye toward providing context and understanding in how sector loads may be changing” – would that address your request?

- Tanya Spano: If we can address these limited comments, then I support this document.
- Bill Keeling requested language in the document be revised to include: “Review the individual station calibration plots looking for overall patterns with respect to region, **flow**, scale, or nutrient species.”
 - Lew Linker supported this suggestion.

Decision: Pending additional minor edits, the WQGIT approved the revised Phase 6 Approval Process document.

FY16 GIT Funding Projects Review and Discussion –Emily Freeman (CRC) and Greg Allen (EPA)

One approved GIT-funded project proposal did not receive bids in the RFP phase. The WQGIT discussed options for redirecting these funds to another project.

Discussion:

- Greg Allen: There are four options:
 - 1) resoliciting for a bid on this project,
 - 2) funding a new project (either a brand new solicitation, or to fund an existing proposal that was submitted for the FY16 round),
 - 3) using the \$65,000 in allocated funds to augment an existing project, or
 - 4) releasing the funds for another Goal Implementation Team’s project.
- Greg Allen: The Toxic Contaminants Workgroup (TCW) is working on a PMP and trackdown study guidance that could use additional man-power – so we may be interested in putting forward a new proposal.
- Norm Goulet: Regarding the MTDs proposal that is underway, I think we’re okay financially.
- Sally Claggett: I would like to go back and see who was involved with the riparian buffers proposal, because I’m sure we could get one to a point where we get some of what they were looking for originally, and we also could get some bidders.
- Ted Tesler: If we could table this while we get some more information, that would be great. We need to assess what direction we should go.
- James Davis-Martin: Perhaps we should go one more iteration to get this proposal back out for another RFP, and hopefully in a form with Sally and PA’s help to identify some potential bidders.

Decision: The WQGIT recommended working to revise the Multi-Functional Riparian Forest Buffers funding proposal, and to re-distribute it for another RFP.

Briefing by the Oyster BMP panel on preliminary recommendations for WQGIT input—Julie Reichert (Oyster Recovery Partnership) and Jeff Cornwell (UMCES)

Julie and Jeff briefed the WQGIT on the Oyster BMP Panel's [progress](#) on developing protocols involving the nitrogen and phosphorus assimilation in oyster shell and enhanced denitrification crediting pertaining to oyster aquaculture and/or restoration practices. These preliminary recommendations will also be reviewed at a public feedback meeting on May 22.

Discussion:

- Julie and Jeff will distribute a survey to the WQGIT that will elaborate more on their questions for the audience. Written feedback will be solicited.

Update on Results of State-Specific 2025 Forecasted Projections –Land Use Workgroup Chair and Coordinator (Karl Berger, MWCOG and Peter Claggett, USGS)

Peter and Karl discussed [preliminary results, decision criteria, and the overall schedule for developing the 2025 forecasted projections](#). WQGIT members are also invited to participate in a joint LUWG/LGAC [meeting](#) on June 7.

Discussion:

- James Davis-Martin: Regarding the schedule, I thought September was when we would develop draft planning targets, and that we were supposed to be using multiple options to evaluate those planning targets – one of which is forecasted land use.
 - Lucinda Power: Right, and we still need to make a decision on what year to set the Phase III WIP planning targets. That decision is separate from these forecasts. For the Phase III WIPs.
 - James Davis-Martin: I'm not sure this schedule lines up well with the Midpoint Assessment schedule.
 - Peter Claggett: This schedule is completely focused on Phase III WIP development – we will have data in September, including the historic trends and current policy scenarios.
- Dave Montali: Will there be an efficient way to look at what the land use changed to? In terms of broad land use classes?
 - Peter Claggett: We can provide summaries by NHD catchment, and those can be further aggregated by county.
- Sarah Diebel: Will this information also be available by the federal facility viewer?
 - Peter Claggett: We're currently treating federal lands as protected, so we are not developing future scenarios specifically for those federal lands.
- Tanya Spano cautioned against trying to assess these forecasts at localized scales.
- Sarah Diebel: If you are interested in looking at DoD personnel by state and seeing whether that fluctuation over time is significant, I can direct you to those reports.
 - Peter Claggett: If we knew facility-by-facility, the percentage increase at a specific location, then we could use that location in the same way we use other features as an attractor for growth.
- James Davis-Martin: How has the request for data collection been distributed?

- Peter Claggett: We've distributed the request through the LUWG, and made clear in the LUWG meeting that we would be relying on the states to coordinate with their localities on that local collection effort.

Briefing on Results of 2025 Climate Change Forecast Analysis –Lew Linker (EPA) and Zoe Johnson (NOAA)

Lew and Zoe presented the [climate change storyboard](#), which includes the most recent estimated influences of climate change on the Chesapeake Bay.

Discussion:

- Ted Tesler: I understand that generally climate change scenarios were fairly flat, with maybe a slight improvement for anaerobic conditions in the estuary - is that correct?
 - Lew Linker: To expand, when we combine all elements of the system with sea level rise, that is the result we're seeing today in terms of our best estimate from these preliminary models.
- Tanya Spano: MWCOG definitely wants to be plugged into the BMP work. And I'm still concerned with the 'what if we're wrong?' question. So we need to be careful with messaging.
 - Lew Linker: We have to make a 30-year projection, understanding there is uncertainty, but it's based on observed data. That said, what we've presented here is very preliminary, but we think we're giving you the best look forward possible at this time.
- Sarah Diebel: Regarding the policy issue – do we have policy options, or is it singular?
 - Zoe Johnson: It's one option, but it is the combined version of Options 5, 6, and 7 from our original proposal.
 - Sarah Diebel expressed concern on BMP prioritization.
 - Zoe Johnson replied that the wording is intended to encourage jurisdictions to think about their implementation with regard to the potential impacts on climate change.
- Michael Forlini: Are you concerned about storm surges?
 - Lew Linker replied that the Phase 6 model is now able to simulate the Conowingo Dam's dynamic equilibrium and characteristics based on research into the future.
- Jim George: Quantitative option #2 is limited to changes in the watershed, and another option had changes that occur in the estuary. It seems that your analyses incorporate both, and it's my understanding that Option #1 is off the table. So have you given thought to the wisdom of moving ahead with Option #2 by itself?
 - Lew Linker: The decision-makers need to tell us what to run. I guess I would say that we probably want a complete understanding of what we can expect in 2025, so it would be important to run the whole system. If there's a priority that the WQGIT wants to hand down, then we would be happy to do it.

Participants:

Name	Affiliation
James Davis-Martin	VA DEQ WQGIT Chair
Teresa Koon	WV DEP WQGIT Vice-Chair
Lucinda Power	EPA CBPO WQGIT Coordinator
Lindsey Gordon	CRC WQGIT Staff
John Schneider	DNREC
George Onyullo	DOEE
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Jim George	MDE
Bruce Michael	MD DNR
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Emily Dekar	USC
Bill Keeling	VA DEQ
Russ Baxter	Virginia Office of Natural Resources
Dave Montali	WV DEP/Tetra Tech
Ann Jennings	CBC
Ann Carkhuff	EPA
Lew Linker	EPA
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Chris Day	EPA
Kelly Gable	EPA
Ruth Izraeli	EPA
Pat Gleason	EPA
Bill Angstadt	Angstadt Consulting
Chris Thompson	LCCD
Beth McGee	CBF
Chris Moore	CBF
Sarah Diebel	DoD
Jenn Volk	UD
Tanya Spano	MWCOG
Heidi Bonnaffon	MWCOG
Karl Berger	MWCOG
KC Filippino	HRPEDC
Julie Reichert-Nguyen	Oyster Recovery Partnership
Jeff Cornwell	UMCES
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Gary Shenk	USGS
Scott Phillips	USGS
Peter Claggett	USGS
Sally Claggett	USFS
Kyle Runion	CRC
Paige Hobaugh	CRC
Kyle Hinson	CRC
Jessica Blackburn	CAC
Mark Dubin	UMD

Matt Johnston	UMD
Karl Blankenship	Bay Journal
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Ross Mandel	IC PRB
Lisa Ochsenhirt	V/MAMWA
Jamie Mitchell	HRSD
Will Hunly	HRSD
Dave Maginnes	
Julie Rose	NOAA
Tom Ihde	NOAA
Zoe Johnson	NOAA CBPO
Emily Franke	ERT/NOAA
Paula Jasinski	CEC
Bill Wolinski	Talbot Co. DPW
Lisa Kellogg	VIMS
Kim Huskey	VA Seafood Council
Michael Forlini	Clean Chesapeake Coalition