

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
MARCH 11TH, 2013 CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES

ACTION ITEMS & DECISIONS

DECISION: The WQGIT members approved three Partnership response letters to STAC on multiple models, the umbrella criterion, and healthy watersheds.

ACTION: A discussion on the development of the 2015 land use projections for the 2014-2015 milestones will be included on an upcoming WQGIT agenda.

DECISION: For the alternative outreach option in the Urban Nutrient Management BMP Panel Report, the WQGIT members decided upon Option 2, which is the drop the alternative outreach option as a credit but retain the current language on alternative outreach in Section 7 of the Report.

DECISION: The WQGIT members approved the Urban Nutrient Management BMP Panel Report with Pennsylvania's objection noted for the record.

ACTION: Lucinda Power will schedule a meeting with the WQGIT Workgroup Chairs and Coordinators to discuss overlapping midpoint assessment priorities and actions.

MINUTES

1. Welcome and introductions

- Larry Merrill (EPA) announced that the Management Board approved the appointment of Russ Baxter as Chair of the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team and Jenn Volk as Vice-Chair at their February 27 meeting, and that this would be his last WQGIT call.
- 2012 progress runs are complete. Nick DiPasquale, CBPO director, will be sharing the results individually with the jurisdictions for their and their Management Board representatives' approval. Jurisdictions can contact Katherine Antos (Antos.Katherine@epamail.epa.gov) with any questions on the progress run.
- The Management Board met on February 27. The Water Quality Indicators will be discussed at their April 11 meeting.
- The Principals Staff Committee call was held on March 7 with the discussion focused on governance and goals.
- Workgroup updates will be sent in the follow up email to this call.

2. Approval of Partnership responses to STAC letters

- Merrill introduced the three STAC letters, which were distributed to WQGIT members for their approval before being submitted to the Management Board.
- Discussion of the [role of natural landscape features in the transport of nutrient and sediment](#) letter
 - No comments or questions.
- Discussion of [umbrella criterion](#) letter
 - No comments or questions.
- Discussion of [multiple models](#) letter

- Bruce Michael (MD DNR): Noted importance of shallow water monitoring data included in responses to both multiple models and umbrella criterion reports. No edits suggested.
- Lew Linker (EPA): Confirmed that it would not be possible to do the shallow water analysis without the data.

DECISION: The WQGIT members approved three Partnership response letters to STAC on multiple models, the umbrella criterion, and healthy watersheds.

3. Background Conditions for Two-Year Milestones

- Suzanne Trevena (EPA) discussed the recent decisions from the Milestones Workgroup on what background conditions to use to measure progress for the two-year milestones.
 - Background conditions include projected land use, animal numbers and septic numbers for a given year.
 - All jurisdictions agreed that milestones should be developed and evaluated on the same background conditions.
 - The 2012-2013 numeric milestones (i.e. input decks) were developed using 2010 background conditions. All jurisdictions agreed that the progress for the 2012-2013 numeric milestones should be evaluated using 2010 background conditions.
 - Future numeric milestones will be developed and evaluated using the out year for the milestone period (i.e. 2014-2015 will use 2015 background conditions; 2016-2017 will use 2017 background conditions).
 - The above decisions will require that out year projections for background conditions be developed with enough time for jurisdictions to review the conditions prior to development of new milestones.
 - The decisions of the Milestone Workgroup are only through the year 2017. This does not impact decisions for milestones or background conditions beyond 2017.
- James Davis-Martin (VA DCR) noted the work required to develop 2015 land use far enough in advance to develop the 2014-2015 milestones in the coming months.
- Pat Buckley (PA DEP) clarified that the Milestone Workgroup agreed this decision should not influence any decision of 2025 land use for Phase III WIPs.
- Davis-Martin: Can the plan for development of the projected 2015 land use be discussed at the next WQGIT meeting?
 - Merrill: Will try to set that up for April.
- Sarah Diebel (DoD): Is a write-up of the Milestone Workgroup decisions available?
 - Trevena: Will provide Milestone Workgroup meeting notes to be posted to the calendar.
- Lee Currey (MDE): Did the Milestone Workgroup adjust the submission schedule?
 - Trevena: Discussion topic for next Milestone Workgroup call, participation welcomed.

ACTION: A discussion on the development of the 2015 land use projections for the 2014-2015 milestones will be included on an upcoming WQGIT agenda.

4. Approval of Urban BMP Panel Report

- Tom Schueler, Urban Stormwater Workgroup Coordinator, presented the [Urban Nutrient Management BMP Panel Report](#) for WQGIT member review and approval. ([Tom's presentation](#)).
- WQGIT member input was requested on the issue of whether the alternative outreach option should be retained or discarded.
 - Option 1: Drop the alternative outreach as a credit
 - Option 2: Drop it the alternative outreach as a credit but retain the current language in section 7 of the report
 - Option 3: Retain the credit
- Schueler: Outreach efforts would target behavioral change. This could include social media, training for commercial applicators, retail point of sale outreach, and would be a three year credit.
- Schueler reviewed the three options and noted that the main advantage for keeping the credit would be a chance to experiment with improvements on a homeowner level. The disadvantages are that this experiment may fail to achieve results, and that this BMP does not have a physical existence or address. The middle ground option retains the language without offering numerical credit.
- Russ Baxter (VA DEQ): Recommend the alternative outreach option for future study. Given the uncertainty surrounding this issue that social science data has raised, it would be unreasonable to add a credit at this point.
- Mark Dubin (UMD): The AgWG recognizes the value in education and outreach but agreed that Option 2 would be best.
- Matt Johnston (UMD): Confirmed the WTWG decision as presented by Tom.
- Ken Murin (PA DEP): Raised a concern that with PA having no regulatory authority in this, it would be strictly a voluntary effort. Urban pervious acres in PA provide a load in the model that there is currently no way to address. Fertilizer reductions in other states could be applied to benefit PA, but only for three years.
- Baxter: The benefit from the Phosphorus ban on fertilizers would be an ongoing credit.
- Schueler: Clarified that this is anticipated to be an ongoing credit. After three years, the credit would be maintained and reductions would be based on change in non-farm urban fertilizer statistics.
- Davis-Martin: Does the model currently not use state non-farm fertilizer sales as a basis for inputs?
- Schueler: Non-farm fertilizer statistics were looked at to determine current assumptions. Given change in fertilizer products and marketing, the Panel recommended using actual fertilizer sales moving forward. Phase 6.0 offers the possibility for multiple pervious categories to improve simulation.
- Davis-Martin: Concern about having to demonstrate more reduction into the future using sales data, and compare against the model's current assumptions, which are only in part based on the sales data. If it's possible to document change in sales data, that should be the basis for future credit.
- Johnston: The sales and fertilizer data is a midpoint assessment issue that will be discussed with the workgroups in upcoming years.
- Dubin: The AgWG is also looking at the issue as part of the midpoint assessment over the next few months.

- Murin: If only 0.2% of urban pervious land is allocated as high risk in the watershed, it's not worthwhile for PA to go through this because there would not be significant reductions.
- Schueler: Clarified that the Panel assumes 20% high risk and 80% low risk. Even without writing UNM plans, jurisdictions are still eligible for phosphorus credit, and in three years if able to detect change in non-farm fertilizer sales, eligible for nitrogen credit.
- Murin: Panel assumed that 5% of applied fertilizer nitrogen available for export in high risk category.
- Schueler: Refer to table 14 on page 44 of the report; a high risk acre receives a 20% reduction in the pervious load and a 10% reduction in phosphorus (less for phosphorus because credit is already given for P fertilizer phase out).
- Murin: Is the reduction based on fertilizer sales?
- Schueler: It will be an automatic reduction starting in 2014.
- Lee Currey (MDE): On pg 39, highlighted section states: the Panel felt that a reduction credit could be supported if before and after surveys were conducted to evaluate their effectiveness. Does option 2 preclude a local government from having an outreach program and getting credit but then following up with a survey?
- Schueler: Not a unanimous decision by the Panel. One approach is that a local government can invest in outreach, and it will get credit based on each verified UNM plan. Some Panel members supported waiting until more data is available. USWG was mildly supportive of option 1.
- Beth Horsey (MDA): Noted that anything local MD governments get credit for must also comply with state regulation.
- Merrill: Given the comments and discussion, option 2 seems the most supported. If there are no other views, does the GIT agree to support option 2?
- Baxter: Clarify that outreach language in section 7.1 already exists; Panel will not be creating new language?
- Schueler: Correct.

DECISION: For the alternative outreach option in the Urban Nutrient Management BMP Panel Report, the WQGIT members decided upon Option 2, which is the drop the alternative outreach option as a credit but retain the current language on alternative outreach in Section 7 of the Report.

- Merrill: The WQGIT is now asked to approve the overall report.
- Buckley: PA declines approving the overall report.

DECISION: The WQGIT members approved the Urban Nutrient Management BMP Panel Report with Pennsylvania's objection noted for the record.

5. Presentation of Midpoint Assessment Low Priority Work Plans

- Buckley: Are these products of the WWTWG?
- Tanya Spano (MWCOC): The workplans are a work in progress, pulled together by Bay Program staff.
- Buckley: Are the workplans up for WQGIT approval today?

- Spano: Not up for formal approval, the workplans are an update of the workgroup's intended direction. WQGIT members are welcome to raise any particular issues they would like the workgroup to address.
- Buckley: Noted that PA WWTWG members are not intending to participate in development of data.
- Spano: As always, jurisdictions are not obligated to contribute if data is not applicable to them.
- Tanya Spano presented the [WWTWG MPA work plans](#), outlining the necessary tasks, deliverables, and schedules for completion.
- Pat Gleason (EPA) presented [TOWG Technical Memorandum MPA Low Priority Workplan](#), The [Accounting for Trades and Offsets Work Plan](#), the [Delivery Factor Changes Impact on Trading and Offset Programs](#) and [Offset Demand Work Plans](#).
- Spano: Suggest holding a conference call with WQGIT workgroup chairs and coordinators to discuss cross-cutting midpoint assessment issues.

ACTION: Lucinda Power will schedule a meeting with the WQGIT Workgroup Chairs and Coordinators to discuss overlapping midpoint assessment priorities and actions.

6. Oversight Document and Schedule

- Dianne McNally (EPA): EPA Region 3 and the CBPO have drafted a plan and schedule for conducting an annual assessment of progress based on the jurisdictions' WIPs and 2-year milestones, and the Federal Agencies' 2-year milestones. Through quarterly oversight meetings; hot topic calls between EPA and the jurisdictions; 2-year milestone and input deck submissions; and annual progress runs, EPA will conduct oversight of both programmatic and numeric goals. Assessments will help jurisdictions in meeting their goals.
- Davis-Martin: Will federal agencies develop implementation forecasts to provide to EPA or the jurisdictions as part of milestone input deck development?
- Antos: Expecting to see this in the 2014-2015 milestone period. Adjustments can be made to federal milestone submission deadlines, so that jurisdictions can take them into account when putting together their input deck commitments. The reconvened Federal Facilities Team will work through this process with the federal agencies.
- Davis-Martin: Prefer that input decks be referred to as milestone projections rather than commitments.
- Antos: Milestones are two-fold: numeric (on the ground BMPs) and programmatic, which reflect the water quality program. EPA recognizes that weather and other outside factors affect BMPs. If jurisdictions commit to a different set of BMPs that make the same load reduction target, that is acceptable. However, if something is falling behind the commitment or projection, we will want to know what the cause is, which is the reason for interim assessments.
- Trevena: The Milestone Workgroup refers to input decks as targets.
- Merrill: Dianne noted that a draft will be developed and shared with jurisdictions.
- McNally: The results of the annual assessment will be shared with jurisdictions in April or May.
- Sarah Diebel (DoD): Recommend understanding the reporting requirement for submitting BMP implementation milestone targets. Federal Agencies have a good understanding of

- programmatic elements; more instruction on BMP implementation inputs would be helpful.
- Antos: Will pass that along to Greg Allen. If there is a need for it by the team, can offer similar input decks trainings as before.
 - Diebel: Our preference is to report to the jurisdictions.
 - McNally: Will pass that along to Greg Allen as well.

Meeting adjourned

Next WQGIT Conference Call:

Monday, April 8th, 2013

1:30 P.M. – 3:30 P.M.

Calendar Event Page: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18970/>

Participants

Name	Affiliation
Larry Merrill	EPA
Russ Baxter	VA DEQ
Jennifer Volk	U Delaware
Lucinda Power	CBPO
Katherine Antos	CBPO
Greg Allen	CBPO
Karl Berger	Metro Wash Council of Gov.
Karl Blankenship	Bay Journal
Patricia Buckley	PA DEP
Collin Burrell	DC Dept. of Env. (DDOE)
Lee Currey	MDE
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
James Davis-Martin	VA Dept. Cons. And Rec. (DCR)
Sarah Diebel	DOD
Jim Glancey	U Delaware
Jeremy Hanson	CBPO
Teresa Koon	WV Dept. Env. Planning
Lewis Linker	EPA
Kevin McGonigal	SQ River Basin Commission
Dianne McNally	EPA
Bruce Michael	MD DNR
Jamie Mitchell	HRSD
Matt Monroe	WV Dept. of Ag.
Dave Montali	WV Dept. Env. Planning
George Onyullo	DDOE
Sheryle Quinn	US DON
Marel A. Raub	Ches. Bay Commission (CBC)
John Schneider	DE DNR and Env. Control
Tom Schueler	CBPO
Jennifer Sincock	EPA
Tanya Spano	Metro Wash Council of Gov.

Emma Giese	CBPO
Helen Stewart	MD DNR
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Tom Thornton	MDE
Suzanne Trevena	EPA Region 3
Jennifer Tribo	Hampton Roads
Matt Johnston	UMD
Peter Bouxsine	CBF
Kim Snell-Zarcone	Conservation PA
Ning Zhou	CBPO
Steve Gladding	NYS DEC
Jack Frye	CBC
Nita Sylvester	EPA
Peter Tango	CBPO