

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM

May 11, 2015 CONFERENCE CALL

Conference Call Phone Number: 866-299-3188 Code: 410-267-5731

The conference line plays music when **any** participant's phone is put on hold. If you need to take another call during the meeting, please hang up and call back in to prevent disruptions. Thank you!

Adobe Connect: <https://epa.connectsolutions.com/waterqualitygit/>

Summary of Action and Decision Items:

ACTION: WQGIT leadership will flag public comments that are likely to result in revisions to the Water Quality Outcomes Management Strategy and will distribute the proposed revisions to WQGIT membership for fatal flaw review and comment. Comments must be submitted prior to COB May 20th so the completed document can be forwarded to the Management Board by the 22nd. (Post-Meeting Note: Public comments and proposed revisions were distributed to WQGIT membership on May 13th)

ACTION: Peter Claggett will provide WQGIT members with an updated table that lists the current land use categories and overlays being proposed for use in the Phase 6 Watershed Model.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will send WQGIT members the links to the webinar presentations he gave to MDE and PA DEP on the land use categories.

ACTION: Lewis Linker will provide the APEX model data on local impoundments and a template for updating the data for the Phase 6 Model. Jurisdictions are encouraged to focus on updating information on impoundments that may have minimal discharge to streams and the Bay, such as drinking water reservoirs.

DECISION: WQGIT members approved the updated 2015 land use projections for 2015 progress. Land use projections are not final at this point; this revision is an interim step intended to improve the projections, and approval represents an endorsement of the revision.

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

- James convened the call and verified call participants.

Discussion:

- Scott Phillips (USGS): The Toxics Workgroup will be meeting Wednesday, May 13th to review comments on their two Management Strategies. That meeting is open to WQGIT members if they are interested in hearing those comments.
- Davis-Martin: We have until May 22nd to respond to comments on the Management Strategies. The best way for WQGIT members to provide input in the Toxics strategies is to be on that call.
- Lucinda Power (EPA): For the WQGIT membership, we will flag comments that will likely result in a revision to our Management Strategy and send out those proposed revisions for fatal flaw comments. It is a very tight timeline, but we will send those out in an email by next Monday, May 18th at the latest.

ACTION: WQGIT leadership will flag public comments that are likely to result in revisions to the Water Quality Outcomes Management Strategy and will distribute the proposed revisions to WQGIT membership for fatal flaw review and comment. Comments must be submitted prior to COB May 22nd.

- Dianne McNally (EPA): Can you generally give an indication of the kind of comments you're seeing?
 - Power: I haven't had a chance to review all of the comments yet. So far, some comments have stated we need to be doing more than what is currently committed to in our Management Strategy. I haven't seen anything so far that is likely to result in a change except for some monitoring comments from USGS, and some additional comments from the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). But that is just based on my initial take.
- Davis-Martin: Please be aware of an email sent on my behalf regarding potential changes to the WQGIT Governance Protocols. It appears likely that there will be a change to the Governance Protocols that would bring an end to any voting below the Management Board level. Goal Teams, Workgroups, etc. will only be allowed to make decisions by consensus only. For us, that may not mean much since we strive to reach all of our decisions by consensus. However, we will have to modify our own Governance Protocols, which will involve a lot of work in order to more clearly define our GIT membership. That discussion will be on our agenda in June. In the meantime, continue to focus on consensus decision making.
 - McNally: What prompted this change?
 - Davis-Martin: It was a letter from CAC to GIT 6 and the Management Board.
 - Jessica Blackburn (CAC): I would be happy to share the letter with the full WQGIT.

Eastern Shore Monitoring Report – Judy Denver, USGS and Scott Ator, USGS

Scott and Judy provided the WQGIT with [more information](#) about the management implications of the Eastern Shore Monitoring Report that was presented by Scott Phillips during the December WQGIT meeting.

Discussion:

- Carl Friedrichs (VIMS): The phosphorus application in fertilizer has gone down by 75%, but at the same time, the poultry farming has doubled. So where has all that manure been put now?
 - Scott Ator (USGS): The chart in my presentation is showing chemical fertilizer application. We don't have estimates of whether manure has gone up or not. Given the production increase, you can likely surmise the manure application has gone up.
 - John Schneider (DE DNREC): Yes, there are tens of thousands of tons of manure and litter that move out of Delaware and Maryland when it is in excess.
 - Keeling: For decades we applied manure at a nitrogen-based rate which meant we over-applied phosphorus significantly. It is not just tillage, it is tillage and the historic over-application of phosphorus.
- Schneider: Everyone suggests buffers as a way to control nutrients leaving the fields. As Scott has explained, as nitrogen and dissolved phosphorus moves down the soil profile, it hits an impermeable layer and moves laterally, and it doesn't come in contact with the roots zone on the buffer, so you are back to source control on the field.
- Davis-Martin: Isn't the Agriculture Workgroup considering a panel for ditch drainage management?
 - Mark Dubin (UMD): Yes, that is something we are currently looking at for down the road.
- Davis-Martin: Is this a unique phenomenon to the Eastern Shore?

- Ator: It is somewhat unique, but there are certainly other places where you can get some interesting geochemistry. A lot of the principles will be similar elsewhere, but the Eastern Shore is certainly unique.

Land Use Update – Peter Claggett, USGS

- Peter provided an update on the jurisdictional review period for the Phase 6 land use categories as well as an overview of the overall timeline for land use decisions.
- Claggett: There are three land use datasets that will be developed for the Phase 6 Watershed Model. The first dataset uses regional and national data to characterize land uses similar to how we did in the Phase 5.3.2 Watershed Model but with slightly updated methodology and information. It includes all the agreed-to land use classes from the October, 2014 WQGIT Face-to-Face meeting, with a few small tweaks. This will represent the gap-filling methodology. If we don't get local info, this first dataset is what we will use to characterize those jurisdictions.
- Claggett: The second dataset has local data, which we will have in June, 2015. Once we have that local data, we will open it up to a six week comment period for the state and local jurisdictions that will extend from mid-June to the end of July. We will work with the Local Governments Advisory Committee (LGAC) to notify the local jurisdictions that they will have those 6 weeks to look at the web viewer for their review and comments. The web viewer will allow jurisdictions to download the locally provided data and compare it to the satellite imagery. Wherever we have local data, we are developing a metadata sheet to show how we cross-walked the information that the jurisdictions provided to the land use categories we have in the Phase 6 Watershed Model. In mid-June we will hold a webinar to go over the data review process, and how to use the web viewer. We have done webinars already with PA DEP and MDE, but we will do one for everyone in June.
- Claggett: The third dataset will incorporate the high resolution land cover data that the Chesapeake Conservancy will be developing. That high resolution land cover data will be under development from this summer through the end of May, 2016. We will be having a rolling jurisdictional review of the high resolution data. As the Chesapeake Conservancy finishes a county, they will run it through QA/QC and it will be sent to the jurisdictions for review. The length of the review period will likely be two to three weeks, but that hasn't yet been finalized. Then, the Conservancy will respond to any comments received and send them to the Bay Program. Rolling review will likely begin in January 2016.

Discussion:

- McNally: The land use categories were preliminarily approved by the WQGIT in October, 2014. I thought we were going to loop back around on final decisions at some point.
 - Claggett: Yes, we will be providing feedback to the WQGIT later this summer on some remaining land use issues. For riparian buffers, wetlands, and stream corridors we are still working through some technical issues and we aren't ready to brief the WQGIT on those yet. But when we have those sorted out we will provide you with a briefing and a chance for input.
- McNally: So in June and July of this year, the jurisdictions will review the land use data the way it exists as of that date, but come September you could come back to us with some possible changes?

- Claggett: Wetlands and riparian buffers were not what we were planning to have a jurisdictional review of because those are more related to efficiencies and highly technical processes. The review will focus on our characterization of their land use.
- Davis-Martin: What about other overlay classes presented in October, 2014 like MS4 and federal facilities overlays?
 - Claggett: Yes, those are some of the layers we will be putting up for review. We will have those overlays available.
- Davis-Martin: The table presented back in October, 2014 had some broad categories of land classifications, some more detailed classes broken out where applicable, and then there was a grouping of overlays. Could you regenerate a table like that with the current list of land use categories and overlays we will be looking at for the Phase 6 Watershed Model. We can potentially review that table during our June conference call.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will provide WQGIT members with an updated table that lists the current land use categories and overlays being proposed for use in the Phase 6 Watershed Model.

- Tanya Spano (MWCOC): Having that table is important to emphasize the need for an adequate review of these land use layers. We don't want to short- change the review period.
- Mary Gattis (LGAC): If we are not able to justify a loading rate for streams specifically, we would take that off of the land use classification? Because I have concerns about that. Even if it doesn't have a specific load associated with it, localities will want to know that the Bay Program knows it is there.
 - Claggett: Whether or not the sediment delivery factors are adjusted will not affect the mapping of streams, it just will affect how we interpret the sediment factors happening on the land.
- Spano: I don't think this is something that could be covered in a single webinar. One webinar should be focused on agriculture and one on urban. It will take a lot of focus and the urban and agriculture audiences are not the same.
 - Gattis: I would encourage you to look at Peter's presentation for the PA DEP. It was very good. Maybe look and see if you have feedback on those.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will send out links to the webinar presentations he gave to MDE and PA DEP on the land use categories.

Modeling Update – Lee Currey, MDE and Dave Montali, WV DEP

- Lee and Dave provided a [status update](#) from the April Modeling Workgroup quarterly meeting and some information about future activities and communications with the WQGIT.

Discussion:

- Dave Montali (WV DEP): At the September WQGIT meeting we will spend a lot of time on a comprehensive overview of the Phase 6 Watershed Model and the schedule going forward.
- Gattis: When considering groups that need to be updated, think about potential implications to local governments and please begin early messaging to local governments. It will help build the early momentum and understanding and prevent them from being caught off-guard.
 - Montali: I appreciate that comment. I assume you are talking big picture updates? Along the lines of the schedule and key communication points?

- Gattis: Yes.
 - Spano: For those who have concerns, make sure they also know where and how they can get more detailed questions answered.
 - Davis-Martin: Maybe we can engage the Communications Workgroup and get their help with this.
- Spano: We need to convey what has changed and have the confidence that that it truly is an improvement.
- Bruce Michael (MD DNR): I'd just like to provide an update on Conowingo. Exelon has funded a \$3.5 million project over two years to enhance monitoring of the Dam as well as the sediment transport model. We have monitored our first two high flow events out of the six total we need. The University of Maryland is doing a lot of that work and they will be working on analyzing that data and putting it in an enhanced sediment transport model.
 - Montali: And that may be another tweak in the year of review of the Model in 2016.
 - Michael: And there are some STAC workshops that will help us with that.
- Davis-Martin: You might want to consider including the Watershed Technical Workgroup chair on the list of workgroup chairs you will be reaching out to.
- Spano: As far as the application of global targets - what will that meeting be about and will the meeting be making decisions, or just saying how the land uses will influence the targets?
 - Lee Currey (MDE): The Modeling Workgroup is responsible for making decisions with respect to global targets but we wanted to work collectively with workgroup chairs so they understand the process that went into the decision. The global targets set the relative differences between the source sectors so it was very important to make sure we had full understanding from them, as well as consensus.
 - Davis-Martin: I agree. Would it be useful to build off of Peter's table that shows the land use classes? That way everyone can see the land use class, the targets for nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment, the sensitivities for nitrogen and phosphorus, and what the lag times would be?
 - Currey: We are talking about relative targets, not the specific targets. We could come back with the process for how we set the targets for that specific land use. We could work on something like that but I can't guarantee it will be one target in a table.
- McNally: When you use the term global targets, you are referring to the relative difference of the land use loading rates between sectors?
 - Currey: Global targets are the relative differences between the larger source sectors: agriculture, urban stormwater, and forest. Within those three broad sectors, there would be information coming specifically from the workgroups and the relative differences between the loads within those sectors. This is the information we want to bring back to you for a more detailed discussion in September. Remember we have been calibrating for over 30 years.
- Spano: Questions will come up about the eastern shore report, we know the lag time is still a concern. Please make sure that is still addressed.
 - Currey: Absolutely.
- McNally: I want to reiterate, that while I don't know how it fits into the Model, we need to remind ourselves that the TMDL was based on having practices in place by 2025, and that EPA is concerned about how we will be using lag times in our decision making.

- Currey: One way to think about lag times is that they are informational. It is about implementation on the ground by 2025 to meet our goals. But if the Model can say we do expect the lag times, it adds another element of communication and information that we didn't have before.

Agriculture Workgroup Update – Mark Dubin, Ag Workgroup Coordinator, Jeremy Hanson, VT

- Mark briefed the WQGIT on the proposal for approving recommendations from Ag BMP Expert Panels both pre- and post-October 2015. Mark and Jeremy Hanson discussed the [proposal and timeline](#) for finalizing the agricultural loading targets.

Discussion:

- Matt Johnston (UMD): We have been saying all input data for the Model has to be submitted to the Bay Program Office by April, 2016 for the October, 2016 calibration. I saw that a few expert panels may extend through July, 2016 as they go through the partnership review process. I think that is okay, but I think the WQGIT should really pay attention once we get to January and February of next year which panels will make the deadline.
 - Dubin: I think we are budgeting in extra time. Our hope is that we will be done before July, 2016. We are making sure we are managing our timeframes with the needs of the Modeling team.
- Davis-Martin: The panel charges and membership lists will be distributed today or this week for the WQGIT and others to provide review and comment?
 - Dubin: Yes, we are finishing up Group 1 now. Group 2 still needs approval by the AgWG.
- Davis-Martin: Remember that the source sector workgroups do have the final say on the panel charges and membership lists, but they do need to call for input from the WQGIT and WTWG.
- Johnston: If the agriculture land use loading rates are approved by September, 2015, do we expect this info to be used in the October calibration?
 - Shenk: Yes, this is pretty straightforward to get into the Model.
 - Dubin: We are hoping that preliminary information is in by July.
- Davis-Martin: It seems we are being asked to revisit the decision made last October that if we don't have information by April 30th then we will not include that information and will move forward. How does the WQGIT want to deal with the fact that these timelines are being missed? How does the WQGIT feel about moving away from that initial decision and waiting until September to find out how detailed the land use classifications are?
 - Dubin: The subgroup that reviewed the Tetra Tech document and Water Stewardship document had preliminary input and suggested relationships between land use loading rates. Those were used by the Modeling Workgroup in preparation for their meeting. That task was done and delivered on time and we are just working to build on that with the project Jeremy described.
- McNally: On extending the schedule, you suggest we should be defaulting from very detailed agriculture land use classes to very general classes. But if we get into these detailed agriculture land uses, the states are likely to still report the general land use classes for annual progress. That is a concern, because then where are the detailed land uses classes getting us?
 - Davis-Martin: For Virginia, in all probability for most BMPs, we will be reporting in general classes.

- Norm Goulet (NVRC): Is this study looking to further inform the global targets or inform the disaggregation of the global targets?
 - Dubin: It will replace the Tetra Tech report developed to look at Phase 6 land uses.
 - Gary Shenk (EPA): The disaggregation.
 - Dubin: It isn't touching on the relationship to other sectors. Just within the agriculture sector itself.
- Goulet: If we give this until September, will those six months come out of what was to be the jurisdictional review period?
 - Davis-Martin: I think the opportunity we are losing is really the ability to provide any historical data record at the scale of resolution.
 - Shenk: That is right, we are absolutely planning on having all information we receive by October. We initially laid out the schedule for the land uses last October so that we could get into the development process and begin feeding back to the technical groups how things were going so that the partnership could better understand the tweaks being made over the summer. In delaying the process, we are missing the opportunity to make some of those tweaks we had planned on making or to understand them as fully. But I don't see another option.
 - Dubin: The September product is looking at a fully cited report that will serve as a Phase 6 Model reference for years to come. But the data behind the report is already preliminarily available, and they will have a better set of data by July. The full report in late summer is just the icing on the cake.
- Davis-Martin: We are just putting all review off until 2016. I think that is unfortunate and leads to a potential for larger swings as we "tweak" because we haven't had time for an incremental review of decisions.
- Katherine Antos (EPA): Does not having these land uses finalized going to interfere with historic data cleanup?
 - Johnston: No. The first cut for historic data is due June 30, 2015 and the states have already received a list of the land uses available in NEIEN. We fully expect states to use the larger, less specific land use groups for this process.
 - Davis-Martin: But when states provide that data to you Matt, if the more detailed classes end up as the final result, you will have to have a set of assumptions for how to distribute those to the detailed classes.
 - Johnston: But those are easier assumptions. It is just a proportioning exercise like we do in Phase 5.3.2.
 - Davis-Martin: But that isn't necessarily representative of what is happening on the landscape, although I agree that proportioning is the way to go.
- McNally: I don't have any comments on the timeline but I ask that some decision guidelines be put in place for when states don't report at the disaggregated level of land use. I want it to be clearly documented that there is agreement on how the modeling team will handle that. If everyone is fine with the method, that is fine. But there will need to be agreement on how that data is handled.

MPA Schedule – Lucinda Power, WQGIT Coordinator

- Lucinda presented the current midpoint assessment [timeline](#) to the WQGIT members, as well as the [key decisions](#) that will be made over the next several months.

Discussion:

- Lewis Linker (EPA): We want to make sure we get through the Modeling Workgroup's July quarterly meeting first, so we may be pushing the climate change inputs back until at least August, maybe later. The first priority is the Phase 6 Model prototype. For Conowingo in Phase 6, we would want to get all the data by the end of this year to refine the Model. August 2015 will likely be pushed back until the end of 2015.
- Davis-Martin: Please remember to provide the jurisdictions and WQGIT a template for reporting local impoundment data?

ACTION: Lewis Linker will draft a template for reporting data on local impoundments for the Phase 6 Model, and will provide it to the jurisdictions and the WQGIT.

2015 Land Use Projections Update – Matt Johnston, UMD

- Matt discussed the [updated 2015 land use projections](#) in the urban and forest sectors and ask for WQGIT approval of the revised projections.

Discussion:

- Montali: When I look at the difference in acres for our state, it is a much smaller acreage than if it was just a difference in our construction acres. Why would that be?
 - Johnston: You are trying to fit Peter's projections and our projections into small land river segments, and that has overlap, so you don't see a one-to-one comparison with construction acres represented with this difference.
- Davis-Martin: The change you are recommending is only related to an interim update to the progress land uses that we will have another chance to review in October? This will not change the milestones land uses scenario in any way?
 - Johnston: Correct.
- Davis-Martin: Are there any other comments or objections, or can we consider the update approved?
 - No other comments or objections were raised.

DECISION: WQGIT members approved the updated 2015 land use projections for 2015 progress. Land use projections are not final at this point; this revision is an interim step intended to improve the projections, and approval represents an endorsement of the revision.

AMS Double Cropping Methodology – Matt Johnston, UMD

- Matt [provided an update](#) on the AMS' proposal regarding the methodology for handling double-cropping in the Phase 6 Watershed Model.

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: Is this methodology for the Phase 6 Watershed Model, or for the Phase 5.3.2 Model as well?
 - Johnston: Phase 6 only, although we have a similar method for Phase 5.3.2.
- Davis-Martin: These are more of the detailed land use classes that are in Scenario Builder, but we are considering simulating these detailed classes in the Watershed Model as well?

- Johnston: We have 120 crops in Scenario Builder, but we lump those in the Phase 5.3.2 Watershed Model. In the Phase 6 Model, we will be a little more specific by simulating some of the largest crop categories in the Watershed Model, but still nowhere near the 120 crops that we will continue to have in Scenario Builder.

BMP Protocol – Lucinda Power, WQGIT Coordinator

- Lucinda updated the WQGIT on the list of proposed changes to the BMP Protocol.

Discussion:

- Power: We received comments from all three Advisory Committees, Virginia DEQ, the AgWG, and Hampton Roads PDC. Many of the comments highlight the need for closed panel meetings, and we do have that per the current protocol. There was also suggested language on conflicts of interest, such as the requirement for signed conflicts of interest disclosure forms. Nick DiPasquale (EPA, CBPO) and I will meet with the leadership of the Advisory Committees in early June to go over our responses to their comments. That will push the WQGIT approval of the revised Protocol to July, which I am comfortable with. A revised protocol will go out for final review once the Advisory Committee's responses have been addressed.
- Bill Ball (CRC): I'm wondering if there are conflicting recommendations and if the purpose of the meeting between you, Nick and the Advisory Committees is to work those out.
 - Power: There were not really any conflicting recommendations, but we do have some clarifying questions to make sure we fully understand the recommendations. So the meeting is really about sharing feedback, getting some clarification, bringing forward those recommended responses to the Advisory Committees and the WQGIT.
- Ball: The final approval would be in July?
 - Power: Yes, and final approval does lie with the WQGIT, but we do want to be as responsive as possible and address as many comments as we can.
- Ball: How do these potential changes affect panels that have already started their work?
 - Power: They will be grandfathered in. We have added language in the Protocol to that effect.
 - Davis-Martin: Panels would not have to go back and redo anything.
- Blackburn: The Citizens Advisory Committee is okay with that approach.

Other Comments:

- McNally: I still have concerns over the disaggregation of agricultural land uses.
 - Johnston: I will document the process we use for that disaggregation. It is a process that happens in the current version of the Model, so this is a method that is not changing, just the land uses are changing.
- Spano: I suggest the Midpoint Assessment schedule be a standing item on these WQGIT calls.

Adjourn

Next WQGIT Conference Call:

Monday, June 8, 2015

List of Call Participants

Member Name	Affiliation
James Davis-Martin (Chair)	VA DEQ
Lucinda Power (Coordinator)	EPA, CBPO
David Wood (Staff)	CRC
Emma Giese (Staff)	CRC
Jessica Blackburn	Alliance for the Chesapeake
Seung Ah Byun	Brandywine Conservancy
Verna Harrison	CAC
Marel King	CBC
Beth McGee	CBF
Bill Ball	CRC
Mary Searing	DDOE
Sarah Sand	DDOE
John Schneider	DE DNREC
Ann Baldwin	DE NRCS
Gary Shenk	EPA
Dianne McNally	EPA
Lew Linker	EPA
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Jennifer Sincock	EPA
Chris Day	EPA
Kristen Saacke-Blunk	Headwaters LLC
Jenny Tribo	HRPDC
Mary Gattis	LGAC
Bruce Michael	MD DNR
Lee Curry	MDE
Tanya Spano	MWCOG
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Ben Sears	NY DEC
Andy Zemba	PA DEP
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Kristen Wolf	PA DEP
Ross Mandel	PRC
Kevin McGonigal	SRBC
Mark Dubin	UMD
Matt Johnston	UMD
Sally Claggett	USFS
Scott Ator	USGS
Judy Denver	USGS
Scott Phillips	USGS
Peter Claggett	USGS
Bill Keeling	VA DEQ
Carl Friedrichs	VIMS
Jeremy Hanson	VT, CBPO
Tom Simpson	Water Stewardship

Teresa Koon
Dave Montali

WV DEP
WV DEP