

CWGT 1-on-1s Summary

In August-September 2026, CWGT Chairs met with each CWGT voting member to brief members on two substantive decisions related to the Phase 7 model that will be requested at the September 28th CWGT meeting – the Hydrologic and Critical Period and the Scenario Base Year. Informational presentations and initial discussion on both topics have occurred since Spring 2026. These 1-on-1 sessions served to: 1) Ensure all members have a baseline understanding of the two topics to make informed decisions, and; 2) Gather pulse checks of where each member is leaning to help frame the decision for September 28.

This document is a high-level summary of some main considerations and questions raised during these meetings. Note: this only covers comments and positions from those that we were able to meet with and we did not have time to cover both topics for all meetings. Pulse checks are considered tentative positions for all.

This is provided for informational purposes for the benefit of CWGT members and interested parties. It is not comprehensive and CWGT members are encouraged to raise missing or new key points to the CWGT Chairs ahead of the meeting.

Key Overall Points

- In general, members felt more informed about the Scenario Base Year decision prior to the meetings than the Hydrologic & Critical Period. However, more members shared definitive preferences on the topic of Hydrologic & Critical Period.
- The Hydrologic & Critical Period has a larger overall influence on the suite of models than the Scenario Base Year, which is only used to calculate the controllable load, or the difference between the “no action” and “E3 Scenarios”.
- Many members asked for a greater explanation of the impact of these choices on planning targets and implementation. However, it was stressed that partners cannot know the ramifications (loads) until the Model is completed and run. The decision should be made based on the science and analysis conducted, consistent with the Principles of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement.
- Multiple members requested a summary of these conversations and talking points to be developed for communicating the decisions after they are made. This document fulfills the first request; a later document can be provided following the September meeting at the CWGT’s request.

Hydrologic and Critical Period

Pulse Check: 9 voting members shared support for updating to the new hydrologic and critical period of 1998-2007 and 2004-2006, 2 shared support for keeping the status quo, 3 were undecided, and 2 did not participate in one-on-one check-ins.

- The Hydrologic Period is a 10-year period representative of long-term average hydrology. The Critical Period is a 3-year period within that Hydrologic Period that represents higher than normal flow used to establish planning targets.
 - In simple terms, the Hydrologic Period tells us how to divide up the pie and the Critical Period tells us how big the pie is (higher period of stress means a larger pie).
- The options discussed from the analysis are:
 - A new hydrologic and critical period of 1998-2007 and 2004-2006.
 - A hybrid of the status quo hydrologic period (1991-2000) but a new critical period within that (1996-1998).
 - Status quo hydrologic period (1991-2000) and critical period (1993-1995).
- Changing the Hydrologic and Critical Period from the status quo will result in an estimated 6-9 month delay to the Phase 7 Model development timeline, but timing is uncertain.
- Main reasons for updating to the new periods include using the most up to date science, ensuring the trustworthiness of the model, and integrating more data including monitoring stations in the new period. With all the effort going into model development, we want to get it right and can accept the delay.
- Main reasons for keeping the status quo include the change in flow for different basins, particularly the increase to flows in the Susquehanna, and concerns with Model development delay (Modeling Team workload and lost public support by perception of further inaction).

Scenario Base Year

**Note: this topic was covered less extensively than the Hydrologic & Critical period, and sometimes not at all, at most of the 1-on-1s.*

Pulse Check: 6 voting members shared support for option 2022a/generally updating the Scenario Base Year, 1 shared support for keeping old Scenario Base-Year of 2010, 6 were undecided or ran out of time, 2 did not participate in one-on-one check-ins.

- The Scenario Base Year is only used to compute the Controllable Load for (difference between the No Action and E3 Scenarios).
- Options: 2010, 2022a or 2022b.
 - 2022a and 2022b represent two options for how to account for growth.

- For 2022a, the scenario base year would be moved to 2022 and the difference between 2010 and 2022 would be taken to reallocate the growth in loads to the jurisdictions where it occurred
 - For 2022b, NY and WV growth would be held constant between 2010 and 2022 and the added responsibility is divided between other jurisdictions.
- All shared support for making sure that impacts from growth go to the places that it occurred.
- Multiple questions on how 2022a would actually work, which are outlined on slides.
 - Note 2022a essentially results in the same thing as 2010 in terms of growth, but it uses new data and was preferred by many for the public perception and support of most up to date science.
 - Some raised concerns over the methodology being confusing, while others noted the whole concept is confusing so it can't be avoided even with a different choice for Scenario Base Year
- One additional concern not noted in the previous materials is a potential problem that if 2010 is used, there is a risk of not being able to find a scenario within the controllable load range that meets water quality standards. However, it was noted that we could go back and reevaluate the E3 Scenario recommendations if this were the case.
- It was requested that the growth accommodation methodology be clearly documented and that conversations on special allocations for NY and WV still occur when discussing planning targets.